



International Catholic
Migration Commission

Dignity Across Borders

*Gaps and Recommendations regarding
Migrants and their Families in an Age of Mobility*



*Based on a Consultation on Issues and
Priorities in Migration in and from Asia
Manila, August 28-29, 2008*

Published by:

International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)

1, rue de Varembé, P.O. Box 96
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Tel. +41 22 919 10 20 / Fax +41 22 919 10 48
icmc@icmc.net / www.icmc.net

Design and layout:

ICMC/Marc Aellen

Photo cover:

© IOM 2006 - MTH0105 (Photo: Thierry Falise)

Printed by:

imprimerie genevoise sa

© ICMC Geneva, Switzerland, 2008

Dignity Across Borders

*Gaps and Recommendations regarding
Migrants and their Families in an Age of Mobility*

*Based on a Consultation on Issues and
Priorities in Migration in and from Asia
Manila, August 28-29, 2008*



ICMC

Created in 1951 by the Holy See, the **International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)** is an international operating organisation of the Catholic Church serving and protecting uprooted people - refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants - regardless of faith, race, ethnicity or nationality. It advocates for rights-based policies and durable solutions directly and through a worldwide network of member organisations.

ICMC is composed of representatives appointed by the Catholic Bishops Conferences and Episcopal assemblies of similar juridical status worldwide, particularly of those countries concerned with migration and refugee issues. In June 2008, the Vatican granted ICMC canonical public juridical status, testifying to the strengthened relationship between the Secretariat of State, the Pontifical Council for Migrants and Itinerant People, the Bishops Conferences and the organisation.

In over 50 years of expertise and action, ICMC has served millions of refugees, internally displaced persons and migrants in various action areas: return and reintegration, local integration, refugee resettlement and cultural orientation, technical cooperation with governments, extremely vulnerable individuals, counter trafficking and rescue, local NGO capacity building, emergency response and advocacy. Since 1998, ICMC has been directly collaborating with the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) in refugee resettlement operations.

“We live now in a globalizing world in which peoples and cultures are being drawn into ever closer and more complex interaction. Yet, paradoxically, we see greater ethnic, cultural, and religious tensions, which severely affect migrant peoples, who are especially vulnerable to the prejudice and injustice which often accompany these tensions.

That is why the Commission’s advocacy with governments and international organizations and its promotion of laws and policies to protect the less powerful are important aspects of its mission.”

Pope John Paul II in a message to ICMC
September 2001

Table of Contents

Foreword	5
Roads of Fairness, Dignity and Cohesion	7
Consultation on Issues and Priorities in Migration in and from Asia: Perspectives, Gaps Analysis and Recommendations	15
○ <i>Defending family unity and well being</i>	<i>18</i>
○ <i>Promoting alternatives to forced migration</i>	<i>22</i>
○ <i>Addressing the positives and negatives of labour migration</i>	<i>25</i>
○ <i>Fighting human trafficking and protecting victims</i>	<i>31</i>
○ <i>Managing developmental impacts of migration</i>	<i>34</i>
○ <i>Broadening information sharing, policy mechanisms and network engagement</i>	<i>36</i>
Global Forum on Migration and Development A new energy in consultation and cooperation	41
ICMC Statement to the Global Forum 2008 <i>Dignity across Borders</i>	45
Annex: Migration in Asia - a Country-by-Country Snapshot	53

Foreword

THE LIVES AND HOPES, the sacrifices and contributions, the needs and rights of migrants and their families worldwide call all of us to explore how civil society, including Church institutions, can organize to better promote human dignity, family unity and universal common good within migration policies at national, regional and international levels. In order to exchange experiences and to better respond to these and the many other challenges, the International Catholic Migration Commission regularly consults its members, the Bishops Conferences worldwide. Very recently ICMC invited its members in Asia for a consultation meeting, which was considered by all participants to be an important step in exchanging useful information and achieving better analysis of identified focal points.

This consultation focused on a more regional reading of the current challenges related to labour migration, human trafficking and the need for protection, the well being of migrants and their families, migration and development and the modalities to enhance collaboration. The bird's eye view of these challenges raised a number of factual elements and challenging statements we invite you to discover in this publication.

What you will find here is a series of on-the-ground perspectives from leaders and practitioners directly engaged with and accompanying migrants and their families in countries of origin, transit and destination, in Asia and worldwide. The gaps in migration policies and practices noted here - and the recommendations to address them - are presented in a spirit of collegiality, collaboration, and conviction, for further commitment and action.

Together with migrants and their families, the ICMC members as well as broader civil society welcome the opportunity to convey the key messages from consultations like this in national, regional and international processes that build migration policy, beginning with both the civil society and States components of the Global Forum on Migration and Development in Manila, 27-30 October, 2008.

Roads of Fairness, Dignity and Cohesion

WAR, POVERTY, OPPRESSION, inequities, unemployment, food insecurity and economic realities have throughout human history motivated people to move away from their homes to survive or simply in search of better perspectives. For individuals, communities, economic entities and governments alike, migration has become a necessity nurtured, pushed and pulled by these and other different factors, reasons and motivations. The end of the previous and certainly the beginning of this century are marked by increased mobility on communication, economic and human levels. Human mobility has become the watermark of our new global village, indisputably defining new patterns of social relations, cohesion and community building. Migration is therefore one of the major defining social phenomena of our time, leading to fundamental changes and coloured by challenging contradictions: opposing those that consider the need to defend the security and well being that they have acquired against those in search of the very same things.

The driving forces for human mobility are unavoidably marked by basic human behaviour and instincts, including the search to protect one's life and the lives of loved ones, the desire for a better future for oneself and the endeavour to improve prospects for future generations and for the community one belongs to. These are recognizable, common feelings we probably all share and which have greatly contributed to the building of our communities, societies and nations. It is a seeming paradox to note that the very same basic human aptitudes of self defence and aspiration also serve the protection of oneself and one's community against those that are still on the road to achieve these societal and individual securities. It should indeed be understood that people who strongly oppose the arrival of increasing numbers of migrants do not necessarily reject the developmental progress to which migration contributes, nor is there obvious or generalized willingness

to withhold the benefits of such progress from those in search of better lives, but rather the greater priority is put on the protection of one's own environment, with little willingness to put at risk what has been acquired.

Treating causes, not symptoms

However, if migration remains insufficiently organised and if poverty, oppression and inequities are not successfully combatted, the very same self defence mechanisms will prove to be major road blocks towards a global and common future. The close reading of the root causes of migration is therefore essential and development efforts should be dramatically increased. Even as the universal human right to migrate must be acknowledged and protected, better living conditions and perspectives are indeed essential to reduce the motivations that *compel* individuals into a decision to migrate. When human mobility is understood as a symptom or as another indicator of the many needs and differences in our world, equitable distribution of the common good and development become part of the key solutions.

The enormous economic, societal, pastoral and psycho-social challenges in migration call with growing urgency for global policies to be integrated in the national, regional and international policy frameworks. The building of such policies is today hampered by widening contradictions anchored in fundamental oppositions and related strategies, including the opposition referred to above between those focused on protecting their security and well being and those searching for it. Another contradiction is that, on the one hand, governments of more than a few migrant *sending* countries promote emigration to reduce unemployment pressures at home level and to increase remittances, which clearly serve national economic purposes. In the opposite direction however, most of the traditional migrant *receiving* countries have tended to focus more on limiting their admission of immigrants as much as possible to just those that are economically needed - and even then, often only for temporary periods of time. Both logics arise with varying relation to economic realities or perceptions, but while normally they each generate opposite policies, the two logics converge in their effect at the human level: they tend to reduce the human person to just another economic commodity.

Towards better dialogue and governance

We believe that better dialogue between the various parties interested in migration - including migrants themselves, directly - could help define economic paths that fully respect the human dignity of every person. The “win-win-win” situation suggested by, among others, Mr. Sutherland, the UN Secretary General's Special Representative for

Migration, which is to say, countries of origin and destination and migrants each winning - can only be achieved if human dignity and human rights are implemented and respected *as a first matter*. The present efforts of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, which is an output of the UN High Level Dialogue in New York in 2006, is no doubt an important step to achieve such dialogue but its informal and non-binding character is not conducive to the implementation of multilateral commitments.

There is a need for a more defined authority as the establishment of global policies that regulate and organize labour migration flows in an organized way will need to be normative as well as operational. Today's absence or deficiencies of legal frameworks that could secure the travel, the labour contract, work relations, the basic rights as well as the very survival of migrants is a dramatic reality and it doesn't take long to understand this indirectly also impacts on the economic goals. Furthermore, the consequences of short term political thinking too narrowly related to utilitarian or economic viewpoints will have longer term impact on the social cohesion of future societies. Migration therefore calls not only for better management of the flows but also for more serious efforts in development and for a better appreciation of human solidarity.

Acknowledging successes... and suffering

Moving away from home has allowed millions to get an education, find steady employment, support their families and/or enjoy greater economic opportunities than might have been available at home. For many millions of migrants, today as before, the migration process and the new life it brings are thorough successes - if not entirely for themselves, then for their children. But the increasing numbers in the migratory flows also generate pictures of dramatic suffering: in the frustration and sorrow of those who feel they have no other option than to leave home, in the hopes and false expectations borne of inaccurate information, in the misery of those who have become victims of human trafficking and other forms of modern slavery, and in the terror of those whose lives are at risk on so many paths of irregular migration.

When debt bondage and family ties weigh as additional responsibilities on the migrant, his or her mission is altogether too heavy, and the road leads to accepting the unacceptable. Migration is then very often manifested in dreadful scenes of exhausted boat people not even aware of where exactly they stranded, in images of people hiding for many hours - and even days - in dark and unventilated containers, and in a flow of reports of homicidal actions whereby migrant passengers and stowaways are thrown off of boats and trains by smugglers and carriers in order to avoid being caught, imprisoned and/or charged fees for bringing irregular migrants.

Beyond humanitarian concerns

These are shocking images which incorrectly tend to reduce the whole migration reality to “just another humanitarian issue”. Such an approach would be as short-sighted as looking at the top of an iceberg only. Indeed, while the individual and societal effects of such traumatic experiences may at present be hard to assess, it is obvious that they urgently call for better accompaniment, protection and human solidarity.

However, notwithstanding all-too-common media images, political rhetoric and perhaps public perceptions, migration is not simply about humanitarian assistance alone: it is about individual and societal decisions that are already carrying us into a different future and which call for adequate societal, economic and political management. Moral values are changing, solidarity seems reduced; the unit of the family as a fundamental positive nucleus of society has been deeply affected and the upbringing of children separated from their parents will beyond doubt generate a fundamentally different understanding of society. Many societies are pushed and governed by economic and consumerist-oriented attitudes, with a gradual moving away from more traditional patterns and values. There is no need to look nostalgically at the ‘better times’ of the past but rather a clear and urgent need to question the present and prevailing consumerist attitudes and their future societal effects.

Some decisions to migrate may also prove to integrate aspects of this economic and consumerist attitude. The remittances sent home may well deliver money for the education of the children; they also contribute to the desire and purchase of commodities, generating growing dependence on the remittances from abroad. This dependence in turn may generate new mobility and contribute to further widen the social gaps within societies from which people migrate, and even more deeply within families already geographically scattered.

Challenges for future social cohesion

All this contributes to the moving away from traditional cultures and from what has long been a fundamental preference for a cohesive society based on stable concepts and on united families. We witness today an evolution towards societal patterns that are no longer framed by the general propensity of people and cultures to stay in place, but that define a world of mobility where national and cultural borders are given very different dimensions. Traditional cultures and life style are deeply affected when up to one out of three of the population is foreign born, as is the case for Singapore, or when 20 % of the total labour force is employed abroad, as is the case for the Philippines. Our new human environment will be different and calls for differentiated definitions.

It is clear that both the socio-economic reading and the understanding of the effects of migration at individual and family levels raise fundamental questions on the future social cohesion of our global society. This concern is parallel to and affected by the growing interdependence of the nations and their economies. What began so recently as a US crisis has rapidly spread worldwide and its effects will be measured long after today. Concurrent with the collapse of the housing market in the US, the annual growth rate of the foreign born population in the US fell dramatically by 50 %, directly affecting, of course, many families that had formerly relied on earnings from work in America. In Mexico, where migrant remittances are the second largest source of foreign income after oil, officials suddenly projected a 12 % drop in remittances, the biggest decline on record.

When one considers the assessment that for every Filipino worker abroad, four to five people in the Philippines are dependent on his or her earnings, one easily understands the huge implications on local economy and family survival of an economic crisis, even in a very distant country or region. The economic crisis of the one country or region becomes the crisis of the other, resulting in a serious decline in development which, in turn, generates again new types of humanitarian crises - situations for which we are altogether not adequately prepared.

Asia and the challenges of migration

Migration realities in Asia mirror all of these challenging aspects. Asia hosts close to one quarter of the 200 million international migrants worldwide and the region includes countries that promote migrant workers emigration, countries that are receiving important numbers of these migrant workers, and countries through which migrants transit. The region currently receives almost US \$114 billion in migrant remittances through official channels annually, which is nearly 30 % of all such remittances worldwide.

Migration in Asia has become such a part of the economic reality that children in many of the Asian countries grow up with the perspective and the hope to emigrate. The effects of changing demographics, the current global economic crises, reduced development assistance, increased food prices and even climate change will inevitably lead to continuing internal and international migratory regional movements in the coming decade. Meanwhile, uneven economic growth and distribution of wealth has already contributed to increase the scale and scope of border migration in many countries, and it is painfully evident that people move more and more into situations of risk. Related societal challenges, the rapidly growing urban poverty, the sociologic components and the effects of emigration on families left behind and on the well-being of all, are quickly becoming major 21st century concerns in Asia.

It is on the other hand noteworthy that emigration has led in various Asian countries and sub-regions to at least some reduction of unemployment and that human mobility has significantly contributed to the economic growth of the region. Accordingly, major steps have been taken in some countries to promote emigration and legal frameworks built to improve protections for migrant workers. The Philippines, for example, has developed a framework for the protection of their emigrant workers which includes a regulatory system intended for recruitment agents and other intermediates, mechanisms for the workers' protection and a re-integration procedure.

Labour or compromised dignity?

The general focus on migration in Asia has therefore been much more on labour market values whereby risk and individual security issues are still too easily overlooked or ignored. While it is not uncommon for migrants to be regarded as amongst the privileged, because they are believed to have reached the green pasture on the other side of the hill, reports reveal widespread practices - insufficiently discouraged - that clearly darken the picture: excessive labour placement fees, post factum contract modifications, 18 hour working days with no days off, poor living conditions, social isolation and physical abuses of household labour and irregular workers in particular.

In the absence of better policies and protection, the 'migration dream' can, for large numbers of migrants, actually be a perfect societal trap that the migrant can neither avoid nor escape. Psychologically, the migrant himself may be unable to abandon the chance he has been craving for so long. Moreover, a return to his country of origin may run counter to the societal mainstream and expectations, and destroy the hope of others in the family for the remittances needed to feed, educate and provide health care for them and/or increase material benefits. The result of the dilemma is that millions of migrants see no other choice but to accommodate and accept what is unacceptable: miserable working conditions and the shameful disregard of their human rights and dignity.

Asia may well be one of the regions of the world most exposed to such degrading consequences of migratory movements.

ICMC : a critical role to play

The list of challenges is growing and the Church has repeatedly expressed its concern for the well being of all migrants and for preserving human dignity in a world marked by other priorities. In a recent message Pope Benedict XVI highlighted the dramatic

situations of irregular migrants, pointing at the responsibility of the States to “remove the causes of illegal migration as well as to eliminate at the root all the forms of crime connected with it.”

The *Consultation on Issues and Priorities in Migration in and from Asia*, recently organised in Manila and highlighted in this publication, affirmed that ICMC has a critical role to play in addressing these challenges. As a voice of the Church commissions and committees involved in migration worldwide and through its international character, ICMC is seen as a valuable platform to link to the UN and other intergovernmental organisations; to contribute to the development of new international processes, especially with respect to labour migrants, migration and development; and to connect and interact with other ICMC members and regions.

While the general focus in migration has too often emphasised defensive mechanisms and either its economic or humanitarian aspects, it is part of the ICMC mission to go further: to pro-actively contribute to the building of roads of fairness, dignity and cohesion towards a more just society. Migration is indeed not only about people leaving one country for another, but part of a global and human process leading us all into a different and hopefully better world.

Johan Ketelers
ICMC Secretary General

*Consultation on Issues and Priorities
in Migration in and from Asia*

*Perspectives,
Gaps Analysis
and Recommendations*

IN THE LAST QUARTER OF 2007, ICMC began collaborating with members engaged in migration and development activity in Asia on a plan for a region-wide consultation, in part to provide input to the Global Forum on Migration and Development (“Global Forum”) in October 2008.

Rationale for the Consultation and Objectives

The initial concept was to organise a civil society conference with 100 of the principal actors in migration and development throughout Asia, including not only Church and non-government organisations but also a number of international organisations and government officials.

In the course of circulating the concept and in further discussions with ICMC members and partners in the region, it became clear that a more strategic challenge was to convene and consult at a decision-making level with the leaders of Church institutions engaged with migrants and migration throughout the region.

The principal objectives of the Consultation were to:

- facilitate a series of national level consultations and reports for a reading of critical migration issues and trends across Asia
- explore convergences, orientations and response mechanisms within the region
- prepare a distinct, regional input to the Global Forum 2008 in Manila
- reinforce Church networking and action in Asia as a contribution to the ongoing migration agenda and other regional and international collaborations in migration and development.

The national consultations and reporting took place over the period of June through August. The Consultation was held over the two days of August 28 - 29 in Manila. The

participants came to Manila from: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam. The 30 participants in the regional consultation included 15 archbishops and bishops, as well as other leaders of Church programs directly engaged with migrants and development issues throughout the region.

National Reports

National reports were developed by participants and circulated in advance of the meeting. These national reports and processes elaborated the context of migrants and migration in or from the country, concrete practices and programmes and related concerns and challenges with a view not only to raising issues and awareness but promoting a discussion at the Consultation of transnational perspectives and regional possibilities for action and advocacy.

The Programme of the Regional Consultation

The programme of the Consultation revolved around **a survey of migration issues and gaps on a national level**, with reference to the individual country reports and consultations that participants had undertaken in preparation for the Consultation, and **discussion of common regional concerns and priorities**, particularly with respect to labour migration, human trafficking, the well-being of migrants and their families, and migration and development.

Three main areas for intensified collaboration were discussed:

1. Increased information sharing and awareness rising activities. It was felt that a continued process of information sharing would greatly contribute to a better understanding of the challenges and solutions and to a better preparation of national, regional and international policy building activity. Better networking with relevant commissions or committees of bishops responsible for pastoral and policy areas of migration, as well as with other groups and individuals active in the field of migration and refugees, is of the essence. The Church in Asia will therefore consider organising a process to look broadly and more systematically at migration in the region. Such a process would look at the movements of people from a sociologic viewpoint as well as with pastoral concern, to identify critical factors, characteristics and needs within migration where the various structures of the Church, from the national bishops and parishes to regional and international bodies, could play a greater part in offering assistance and protection to people already on the move, as well as to promote long-term solutions for those and others who may otherwise feel compelled to migrate.

2. More and intensified policy-building and advocacy. It was agreed that well targeted advocacy was of growing importance in these matters and that the efforts should focus on emphasising the fullness of human dignity within economic frameworks that tend to alienate the human person when they lack holistic approaches. A strong, united Asian Church voice to be heard in the international debates on migration and development would therefore focus on human dignity, the protection of family unity, the identification of the root causes of forced migration, irregular migration and human trafficking; and advocating for the right to stay home, for legal avenues of migration, and for genuine, targeted, sustainable development and co-development, especially as alternatives to forced migration of all kinds. It was understood that many national, regional and international actors, including in Asia, recognise, welcome and even expect the very specific role of the Churches in these matters.

3. Capacity building. It was noted that the key to effective work in these areas is specialisation and competence in both operational programming and policy-building. The need to build capacities to not only serve present and immediate needs but to cure to the greatest extent possible the situations that create need calls for developing the capacity of partners at all levels to think and collaborate *pro-actively*. Front-line capacity itself naturally resides and is most to be strengthened in national and regional structures of the Church and other actors. It was recognised that a broadening and deepening of relationships among those structures, with and/or within the ICMC network, will add concrete opportunities to increase that capacity.

A reading of Migration Issues, Gaps and Recommendations

Drawing on direct engagement with migrants and migration in their own countries and the perspectives presented in the national reports and consultations, participants in the Consultation shared their reading of migration in and from Asia today and recommendations for action, including regional collaborations, in six areas:

- Defending family unity and well being
- Promoting alternatives to forced migration
- Addressing the positives and negatives of labour migration
- Fighting human trafficking and protecting victims
- Managing developmental impacts of migration
- Broadening information sharing, policy mechanisms and network engagement

Defending family unity and well being

Perspectives

Migration is rarely an act of a solitary human being moving without consequence to his or her family, whether parents, siblings, a spouse or children. In fact, the movement of people reverberates with effect on families worldwide, and Asia is no exception. In the Philippines for example, where current statistics indicate about 8 million nationals working or living abroad (official and unofficial; of whom some 70% are women), it is estimated that, counting just members of the households of those overseas, as much as five times that number are directly affected by the migration of one or more close relatives. UNICEF has further estimated that some 9 million Filipino youth - more than 1 out of every 4 - are children left behind. *“Whatever type of migration a Filipino embraces,”* observes the report of the participants in the Consultation from that country, *“there is always a family that depends on him.”*

So even as international migration has helped to lift many millions of families and communities from poverty worldwide, the Church and others are witness to the shattering effect that distance and long-term separation have had on migrants and their families

throughout Asia. Migrant families are under heavy pressure: spouses and parents are living at large distances from one another; many have sold what they had, exhausted savings and/or borrowed large amounts of money to migrate, and need time to pay related debts and fees to agents even before saving enough to pay for the trip home; children are being brought up by grandparents or relatives; the search for material improvement of one's life and short term visions is increasingly more important than traditional family values and longer term thinking.

Families and entire societies increasingly suffer the effects of the departure of mothers and fathers from their children and the separation of wife and husband. In particular, separation from family members that is prolonged generates psychosocial stresses in single parent households, for children left behind and adolescents, and among isolated migrants - one of whom encapsulated the anxiety saying, *"I ask the Lord to forgive me for being so far away from my kids."*

The Holy Father Benedict XVI stressed the concern of the Church for migrant families in his 2007 Migration Day message:

"...look at the difficulties that every migrant family lives through, the hardships and humiliations, the deprivation and fragility of millions and millions of migrants, refugees and internally displaced people. The Family of Nazareth reflects the image of God safeguarded in the heart of every human family, even if disfigured and weakened by emigration."

Separately, migration for marriage is a trend rising dramatically in the Republic of Korea, Japan, Taiwan and other countries in the region, with large numbers of young women migrating from Cambodia, China, the Philippines and Vietnam into intercultural marriages arranged for demographic or financial reasons or for reasons of convenience. Often, it is a form of labour migration where young women marry older men in a different cultural setting in order to send money home to their families living in poverty.

Brides are rarely prepared prior to departure, either culturally or in the language of their spouse and new society. While many of the marriages succeed, it is also true that domestic violence and divorce rates among these couples are substantially above the norm. It is not uncommon for the children of such unions to suffer discrimination (frequently, for example, in the Republic of Korea and Japan) and a lack of cultural or religious identity.

Finally, a more subtle but equally disturbing issue of families in migration is the stateless child phenomenon, i.e., where the children of immigrants become stateless. One

of the origins of statelessness for children is migration from a country where nationality is conveyed by birth to a country where it is restricted to lineage. This is presently a concern in Japan, for example, where many children of Brazilian immigrants, Vietnamese refugees and second generation resident Koreans have become stateless. In Malaysia and Thailand, there are a substantial number of adults as well as children who, notwithstanding a migrant background or heritage, are considered stateless, and are stuck in a limbo of extreme uncertainty and vulnerability.

The fragilisation of families is among the highest social costs of migration, in Asia and elsewhere, and yet that cost is almost ignored in international and national debate and decision making. To the very contrary, a growing number of countries - including the Philippines, Indonesia and Sri Lanka - may unintentionally be promoting such fragilisation with official policies that set high annual quotas for their nationals to migrate overseas for work. Though there are signs of the ability of market forces to reverse some of these flows (e.g., Chinese professionals returning from the US, Polish workers returning from the UK), the general trend of reliance on ever higher numbers of workers abroad is only accelerating with globalisation.

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A gap in respect for families and *family unity as a first value.* The current discussion of migration must be rehumanised: restored from what has become too utilitarian a focus on economic aspects of migration where migrants are considered merely as units of labour, to a renewed respect for family unity. The sociologic merits of family unity should be advocated more strongly and systems of family reunification promoted. Among other things, it should be made possible for migration to be a free and informed decision that close family members make together.

2. A gap in recognising family unity as essential for social cohesion. There needs to be greater recognition, in research, policies and socio-legal systems, of the objective contribution that family unity makes to social stability and social cohesion. Policy makers should integrate the concern for this essential sociologic component in both existing and new frameworks, with protection for the family as well as the individual migrant advancing the common good of the whole society. For States, the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families merits special reference not only for the explicit incorporation of family members within its purview, but as a practical framework immediately available for ratification and/or further transposition in national legislation. The voice of civil society, including not only the Church but the academic community, human rights organisations and non-government organisations (NGOs), needs to be stronger and more constant in all these respects, in countries both to and from which people migrate.

3. A gap in supports for fragile families. More must be done to assist families made fragile by migration, especially mothers and children "left behind" by migrant workers. At the same time, greater attention must also be paid to supports for the workers themselves, including pre-departure and post-arrival support in adjusting to their new society; processes for integration and protection regardless of their immigration status or length of employment; opportunities to preserve core cultural and religious practices; and fair, concrete and safe options for communicating with and remitting earnings to their families, accumulating savings and returning home.

4. Gaps in research on the trends, effects, and alternatives regarding the separation and de-unification of families in countries of both origin and destination, including the longer-term effects on societies in which children are raised at important distances from their parents as well as the ways to reduce obstacles and increase incentives to voluntary return. In view of the explosion of government dependency, policies and systems on migration and labour that favour the presence of foreign workers without family members, it is imperative to study and make recommendations with respect to these phenomena, in particular experts in academia, communities of faith and international organizations.

5. Gaps arising in the context of marriage migration. The growth and conduct of marriage migration need to be carefully examined, especially aspects that involve business activity and profits. Marriage and the decision to start a family cannot be business-based or migration motivated. Furthermore, the risk of being entrapped and degraded in such contexts requires better preparation and information. At a minimum, pre-departure counseling that includes such preparation, and basic cultural orientation that provides information about risks as well as the new socio-cultural environment, should be offered to the women in processes where migration is being required as a condition of marriage, particularly young women and those for whom the marriage has been arranged by others. It is essential to accompany and advocate for the rights and well being of migrant spouses, their children and families. There is a growing need for national and transnational policies that ensure fairness in legal protection and adequate social support in situations of domestic violence and broken marriages.

6. Gaps related to stateless persons, including children. With great urgency, policies and procedures must be either strengthened or put in place and implemented to identify, protect and remedy the vulnerability of people who are considered stateless, for whatever reason, and to prevent further conditions for statelessness among current or future populations. In this direction for example, recent legislation in Nepal led to a major campaign in early 2007 that issued citizenship certificates to a large number of people formerly considered stateless there.

Promoting alternatives to forced migration

Perspectives

There has long been controversy over the meaning and use of the term “forced migration.” Much of the agitation however, has arisen from different perceptions or apprehension about what rights someone who is “forced” to migrate may claim, and which international institution would have the mandate (or resources) to defend or implement those rights.

With little more than two very important exceptions - the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees, which effectively settled both the rights and the institutional question for refugees fleeing persecution, and the growing body of international and regional instruments regarding victims of human trafficking - there is no such formal clarity for other migrants. If anything, most efforts at distinguishing other categories of migrants, most notoriously “economic migrants,” have actually been for the purpose of *excluding* them from claims to rights and responsibilities on the part of States and international institutions.

Actively involved in the drafting of the ’51 Convention, the Church remains unequivocally committed to the protection of the refugees. In Asia, Church bodies of national, regional and international scope have long worked with and for large numbers of refugees in India, Malaysia, Nepal and Thailand, among others, typically alongside the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and NGOs, often with funding and other resources provided by government donors.

The Church however, has consistently asserted - and been joined by a number of other actors, notably NGOs and even a number of States - that history and experience also call most clearly for special attention to migrants forced to leave their countries of origin for other reasons, even economic. Noting that the ’51 Convention did not expressly extend to “*victims of armed conflicts, erroneous economic policy or natural disaster*,” the Pontifical Council Cor Unum in 1992 observed that nonetheless “*human conflicts and other life-threatening situations have given birth to different types of refugees*”, only one subset of which is covered by that Convention. Moreover:

“For humanitarian reasons, there is a growing tendency to recognize such people as ‘de facto’ refugees, given the involuntary nature of their migration. [...]

In the case of so-called “economic migrants,” justice and equity demand that appropriate distinctions be made. Those who flee economic conditions that threaten their lives and physical safety must be treated differently from those who immigrate simply to improve their position.”

Indeed there are signs of fresh impetus in that direction. Recently for example, a growing number of State and international participants in new and influential processes, namely the Global Commission on International Migration in 2005, the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2006 and the first Global Forum on Migration and Development in 2007, have begun to re-approach the matter by asserting, not a definition or regime, but a goal: that “*migration should be by choice, not by necessity.*”

Clearly that formula reflects an appreciation of two fundamental human rights, which are two sides of the same coin: the right to migrate, and the right to *not* migrate. As explained in *Erga Migrantes Caritas Christi*, the Instruction of the Holy See on Migration, the right of persons “*not to migrate*” is the right of a person “*to be able to achieve his rights and satisfy his legitimate demands in his own country.*” (No. 29).

This question of being forced to migrate goes not only to the *fact* of the migration but also to its *form*.

Of course, the first aspect of migration that may be forced is the very decision to migrate. What forces such a decision? The Global Commission on International Migration summarized three *root causes* - “three ‘D’s” in fact: differences in development, demographics, and democracy (which encompasses rights violations and persecution.) Sadly, as the national reports of Indonesia and Pakistan to this Consultation recalled, the experience of natural and man-made disasters, and not only scientific projections but proof of dramatic climate change, point to yet a *fourth* “d” that forces migration: degradation of the environment.

Less obvious and rarely recognized, there is another dimension of forced migration: where what is forced is not necessarily the act but the *form* of the migration, e.g., when migrants are forced into the hands of human smugglers and brutal traffickers; or on more and more dangerous sea and desert crossings; or into inappropriate recourse to national asylum processes or marriage for the purpose of migration, or toward other forms of irregular migration. What forces people into these forms of migration? Root causes, *plus* a lack of legal options, either real or perceived. That is, when there seems to be no other way to migrate.

As a practical matter, a reinforced right to not migrate would mitigate a range of problems that arise in various forced migration contexts: challenges of integration and resettlement, brain drain, separated and broken families, human smuggling and trafficking - and even re-migration after voluntary or enforced return. Indeed, a growing body of research is indicating that return of all kinds, including at the end of temporary work permits and forms of cyclical migration, are generally not sustainable where the conditions in the country of origin that motivated migration in the first place (i.e., root causes) have not improved.

There is in fact an unequivocal convergence between the right to development and the right to not migrate. As noted in the Concluding Communiqué of the XVIII Plenary Session of the Pontifical Council for the Pastoral Care of Migrants and Itinerant People:

“The need to address the root causes of migration and the role of development is a call that the Church raises distinctly, with particular fidelity and at national and international levels.”

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A gap in incentives to not migrate or re-migrate. There is a clear need for policy-building to reverse and reduce three related dependencies: the dependency of sending countries on what is actually referred to as their labour “export” industry; of receiving countries on “imported” foreign labour, and of migrants and their families on jobs (and remittances from) abroad.

2. The development gap. The single most important element of reducing forced migration (that is, effectuating the right to not migrate) throughout Asia and the world is the creation of decent jobs at home. For education and training to better match employment and societal prospects, positive national policies will need to be complemented - not contradicted - by corresponding regional and global approaches. Women especially should be empowered and supported with opportunities to secure employment locally, or be trained for skilled work abroad that is less open for abuse.

3. Structural gaps. Despite the large numbers of forced (involuntary) migrants and near-universal calls to better manage migration overall, there is neither a framework of viable solutions for reducing and responding to the range of forced migrants, nor any institution charged with developing such a framework. States, international institutions and civil society, including the Church, should collaborate on such a framework and related institutional responsibilities, perhaps using the mandate of the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, and its success with “three durable solutions”, as inspiration for a model of *three viable solutions for forced migrants*: targeted, sustainable development in countries of origin, including decent jobs; safe and legal channels of migration; and earned regularisation for migrants in irregular status.

4. A research gap. The Global Forum and other processes at international and regional levels regularly raise the question of the effect of *migration on development*, driving research as well as deliberations almost exclusively in that direction. In order to better reflect - and reduce - current phenomena of forced migration, there is a need for research, debate and policies that consider the dynamic the other way around: the effects of *development on migration*, including concrete data, practices and evaluations.

5. A sincerity/convergence gap. As much as States, international institutions and civil society actors increasingly declare that migration should be by choice, not by necessity, at times it is not clear that the convergence is much more than verbal. Stakeholders of all kinds need to acknowledge that no discussion of forced migration, managing migration, fighting irregular migration or creating sustainable systems of circular or temporary migration will be productive without an authentic commitment to discuss and address the root causes of such migration.

Addressing the positives and negatives of labour migration

Perspectives

The International Labour Organization (ILO) notes that of the world's 200 million international migrants, most are engaged in or directly benefit from economic activity, principally labour. South-south and north-north migration numbers are about as big as south-north migration: each between 50-60 million.

In Asia, a consequence of uneven economic growth and distribution has been the increase in the scale and scope of cross border emigration and immigration. Approximately 50 million worldwide are migrants *from* Asia, sending about US \$114 billion home in remittances each year. *Within* Asia, there are some 22 million migrant workers (which the ILO suggests is a little over 1 of every 4 migrant workers in the world.) In Indonesia, Myanmar and the Philippines, "*migration has become a culture,*" to use the words of the report of the Myanmar participants in the Consultation.

Increasingly, the movement is an urban migration, as described in the national reports of participants from Pakistan and Vietnam for example. More and more migrants and displaced people are going to *cities*, within their own countries as well as across borders.

In recent years, both in Asia and more widely, there has been significant change in the extent and character of undocumented, cross border movement of women and children. From invisible and often reluctant dependents simply accompanying or joining male relatives in migration, women have increasingly become independent service workers, and many forms of low-skilled contractual arrangements involving irregular women migrant workers have appeared in recent years.

This feminisation of migration is a *not* a change in net numbers, which is still roughly 50% worldwide, though the female-to-male ratio often varies depending on the country of origin. For example, women account for only a small percentage of emigrants from Nepal, while among Filipino immigrants in Brunei, females outnumber males 2 to 1. What has

changed is rather the nature and circumstance of women migrating: now more for work, independent and not accompanied by men, a phenomenon that is increasingly evident in movement to and from the region.

As the Holy Father Benedict XVI described in his Message on World Migration Day 2006:

“Today... female emigration tends to become more and more autonomous. Women cross the border of their homeland alone in search of work in another country. Indeed it often happens that the migrant woman becomes the principal source of income for her family. It is a fact that the presence of women is especially prevalent in sectors that offer low salaries. If, then, migrant workers are particularly vulnerable, this is even more so in the case of women.”

Across the region (as well as globally), female migrants are even *triply* vulnerable - because they are (1) foreigners; (2) women in cultures that for the most part continue to be heavily male-oriented, and (3) often working in domestic or other jobs that are out of view. Many are exploited and abused. Such vulnerabilities extend as well to the rising number of women in the region who migrate as brides. As a result, there are signs that policy makers may be moving to reduce at least some of these vulnerabilities with firm measures to decrease the number of women migrating for certain purposes. In 2007, for example, the government of Sri Lanka debated a ban on overseas employment of women with small children, though it ran into strong resistance from NGOs and human rights groups, among others. As explained by the report to the Consultation regarding that country, *“there is a general feeling that these women should be discouraged from migrating for cheap labour. Instead they should be empowered and prepared.”*

As in other regions of the global South, demographic imbalances exert enormous pressure for emigration, with extraordinary ratios of young and working age men and women. Fully 62% of the population of Cambodia, for example, is 24 years of age or younger, with between 150,000 and 200,000 people reported to be entering the labour market each year faced with job shortages at home (in both formal and informal sectors) but *labour* shortages abroad. And in fact, emigration is demonstrated to have led to a considerable reduction of unemployment in some countries and regions, as in the large Indian state of Kerala. Furthermore, as recounted in the report prepared by Filipino participants in this Consultation, such an *“impermanent response to unemployment has now become a permanent fixture.”*

Indeed, a powerful dynamic in contemporary labour migration is that a growing number of sending countries depend on the countries that are providing jobs that workers and the economies of the sending countries need. Over the past thirty years for example,

migrant remittances have financed much of India's balance of trade deficit and have thus helped to reduce the current account deficit.

These enormous movements of people within and from Asia in a time of increased global concern, commitment and support for maximizing economic benefits and minimizing social costs present opportunities and challenges to States, international organisations, and to civil society, including the Church in Asia. Given the ethnic, cultural, racial, religious, political and economic diversity of these movements, the structure of migration varies within Asian countries, often demanding country-specific solutions within the transnational phenomena of mobility and migration policy.

Complementing, and most constructively partnering with public institutions, civil society actors including the Church may help in educating migrants to the laws, values, special sensitivities and expectations of their new societies. Such interaction will be of particular value to serving new migrants of different cultures and languages. Ideally such communication can be organised even before the movement of large numbers of migrants.

Many adverse impacts and abuses can be reduced and controlled by communication systems that are relevant to the particular socio-economic setting. In India for example, the Pope's annual "message to migrants" on the World Day of Migrants and Refugees is circulated among all of the churches in the country. Timely views on current issues are communicated in printed form and these are made possible through various diocesan, regional and national movements. Seminars and workshops provide migrants with awareness and guidance on important issues and problems and hopeful ways of protection. The website of the Labour Commission of the bishops of India helps to communicate with state, national and international agencies and NGOs for the welfare of migrants.

Existing frameworks however, both legal and social, are found to be inadequate to manage the mobility and to guarantee the necessary protection for the migrant worker. Despite the increasing mutuality of need between receiving countries that need workers and migrants that need jobs, there is a notable lack of systems and procedures for workers to migrate legally, most conspicuously among the lesser skilled workers. Moreover, the levels of rights and protection that current laws provide to migrant workers are often different depending on the particular kind of work or worker. For example, professional and other highly skilled workers generally have greater rights, such as freedom of mobility and family reunification, while lower skilled and rural workers do not. Factory workers are widely covered under national labour laws, while domestic workers and caregivers typically are not. This is a problem that particularly afflicts large numbers of female migrants. Finally, many migrant labourers (in some countries, such as India, even *most* of them) are actually employed in the unorganized or informal sector, where the lack of regulation compounds their vulnerability.

Even in countries considered to be ahead of or a model for other countries with respect to rights of migrant workers and their families, many of the laws and policies look better on paper than they are implemented in reality. Among the challenges: legislation fails because regulatory authorities are overstretched, the State sees migrants as a low priority, migrant workers are in any event unaware of whatever laws, rights or processes might help them, and they do not receive enough support from trade unions or broader civil society. In Bangladesh, India, Malaysia and throughout the region, labourers commonly endure long hours, low wages, poor working conditions and substandard housing. In Taiwan, a practice of “no days off” is the norm; though it is illegal, the law is not enforced. As described in the report of the participant in the Consultation from Singapore, “*many if not all were unaware of the difficult conditions they would be faced with.*” Nor is child labour uncommon among migrant populations, and many suffer untold misery. Recruitment and deployment agencies are notorious for leaving people in terrible debt and working conditions, and are difficult even for labour attachés and other government authorities to regulate. In any event, the level of embassy support varies greatly from country to country.

Over and above these challenges, there is enduring *fear* among migrant workers and their families throughout the region, especially where even a member of the family is in undocumented or irregular status, among those who were victims of trafficking, torture, trauma or violence while they migrated, even among migrants with *legal* status who, as the report of the Cambodian participants in this Consultation noted, “*can be as vulnerable to fraud and exploitation as undocumented migrants.*” As further described by the participant in the Consultation from Hong Kong, it is a known fear, indeed: of being further exploited, of being caught, of once again facing forced separation from loved ones, of being imprisoned and deported under at best unpredictable conditions.

While the Church, people of other faiths and other actors in global migration recognise that more than mere “protection under the laws” is needed, it is also true that more must (and can) be done to respond to migrant workers and members of their families whose need of protection and help is *immediate*.

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A gap in respect for human dignity. The starting point for the Church on these matters is a respect for the profound dignity of each human being and his or her labour. Indeed, “... *the dignity of every person before God is the basis of the dignity of man before other men.*” (Papal encyclical letter *Octogesima Adveniens*). Today, be it through policies that actively

promote emigration, insufficient legal frameworks for the protection of migrants and their families, the granting of fundamental rights only to migrants that are highly skilled, or immigration statuses that insist on contracts and residence of the most temporary, cyclical or short terms possible, the human person and his or her dignity are being reduced to the level of an economic commodity. The whole migration process must be re-centred on an acknowledgement of the dignity of human beings and their labour. Such recognition in legal frameworks regarding employment leads back to and reinforces that dignity.

2. Gaps in matching legal channels and admissions to realities. Industrialised countries and others that have become increasingly dependent on foreign labour need to adjust their immigration and labour laws, and build appropriate migration mechanisms, to better and more fairly match the reality of their need for workers from abroad. Among other things, this calls for honesty and fairness with respect to *lower* skilled workers, including rights to long-term status, residency, family unity and family reunification, most especially where it has become clear that their labour is structurally essential to the economies of the countries in which they work.

3. Gaps in protection frameworks and mechanisms. There is a need for international structures that can be persistent in encouraging governments to generate missing policies and missing rights related to the protection of migrant workers and members of their families, and especially with regard to female migrants and lower skilled workers. At a minimum, this calls for greater ratification and implementation of the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. For purposes of protection of migrants as well as integration and social cohesion, a better understanding should be promoted of migrant *duties and responsibilities* in transit and destination countries. For greater self-protection, dignity and efficiency in these directions, vigorous policy building is needed to strengthen labour and diaspora organising mechanisms through which migrants and their families can meet and work together on their needs, develop and articulate their own distinct voice, and defend their rights *directly*.

4. An information and awareness gap. The experience of millions of migrants in Asia and worldwide is that both the decision to migrate and the form of migration are often based on false promises, even guarantees, of safe passage, certain employment and a better life. Given the reality of very different, dangerous and destitute situations into which so many migrants are plunged, it is imperative to broaden the availability of accurate information so that people and their families can consider the real risks involved in the act, forms and result of migrating. As an essential part of this effort, government authorities must take stronger steps to combat the dissemination of gross misinformation, especially by agents motivated by profit or links to irregular movements of people.

5. A gap in integration efforts. Even in the case of temporary migrant workers and members of their families, there are clear needs for appropriate processes of integration - not assimilation - to assist them in their new environment as well as the host society to maintain cohesion. Integration begins with validating the presence of the migrant and his or her employment.

6. A gap in intermediary actors. Mechanisms are needed to help bridge two important gaps between migrant workers (especially those in more “hidden” occupations, such as domestic workers and caregivers) and their employers. First, a better - and legally secured - mechanism for recruiting and deployment processes, which might involve the development of new, either private or public-private structures for transnational labour matching. Second, conflict resolution mechanisms for mediation between workers and their employers that can help - and protect - both of them in disputes, including situations of harassment and early termination, even before such a problem moves to termination or court. In India for example, domestic workers gather at certain churches weekly to discuss problems with an animator, who can then go to the employer in search of remedies.

7. An accountability gap. There is a distinct need for *monitoring* what really happens to migrant workers, in origin, transit and destination countries alike. Some form of accountability is essential for recruiting and deployment agencies to be made accountable in both their own countries and the countries to which they send migrant workers. It would be positive and proactive for Church bodies to redouble their efforts in this regard, in collaboration with government agencies, NGOs and other civil society actors. For example, efforts should continue at elaborating and implementing effective *Codes of Conduct* between countries to and from which people migrate, not only in bilateral agreements but in more comprehensive regional and other multilateral formats. A further possibility to explore is the development of a “quality label” that awards a grade to recruitment and deployment agencies on the basis of evaluations against a set of rights-based standards for fair, honest and safe labour placement and protection.

8. Social security gaps. Rights-based and secure systems are needed to organise and guarantee social security protections for the migrant worker during periods of employment, unemployment and retirement. These systems must provide migrant workers a portability of the coverage and benefits to other countries of employment and to his or her country of origin upon return.

Fighting human trafficking and protecting victims

Perspectives

Human trafficking is closely related both to unethical labour migration and to the broader range of irregular migration in general. The trafficking of persons for forced labour, including sexual exploitation, continues to be one of the foremost concerns in international migration, and it has been growing rapidly. The ILO estimates that there are 12.3 million victims of forced labour in the world at any given time. Of those, some 2.4 million have been trafficked, the majority of whom are women and children. For the traffickers, human trafficking is today one of the world's most highly lucrative activities, with profits estimated at anywhere from US \$10-32 billion *annually*; for those trafficked, it is predominantly a function of poverty.

Trafficking always hides. As a result of its clandestine nature, there is a widespread lack of adequate data and intervention by the governments and NGOs. However, available reports and statistics offer at least a sense of the scale and scope of the problem, worldwide and in regions like Asia. Generally, trafficking flows from developing countries to industrialised nations, or toward neighboring countries or provinces with marginally higher standards of living. In Asia large numbers of victims are trafficked within their own country and do not cross state borders. The largest number of victims trafficked internationally are still believed to come from Asia, mainly from Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. For example, roughly 10,000 women and girls are trafficked annually from Nepal to India for sex work. India itself is also a transit point for the trafficking of women to Bangladesh, Dubai, Kuwait, Malaysia and Qatar. Thailand too is both a source and destination country. Israel, Japan and Turkey are significant destination countries for victims trafficked from Southeast Asia.

Although some women are kidnapped or handed over in payment of family debt, in most cases, traffickers entice victims to migrate voluntarily with false promises of well-paying jobs in foreign countries as au pairs, models, entertainers, domestic workers, etc. Traffickers advertise these "jobs" as well as marriage opportunities abroad in local newspapers and on the internet. In some cases, traffickers approach women or their families directly with offers of lucrative jobs elsewhere.

After providing transportation and false documents to get victims to their destination, they subsequently charge exorbitant fees for those services, often creating life-time debt bondage. Trafficking victims are often subjected to cruel mental and physical abuse in order to keep them in servitude, including beating, rape, starvation, forced drug use, confinement, and seclusion. Once victims are brought into destination countries, their

passports are often confiscated and they are subject to sexual harassment by employers and agents. They usually work unsustainably long hours and many suffer break-downs and are exposed to sexually transmitted diseases, including HIV/AIDS. A recent assessment in Indonesia showed that 70% of all trafficked women rescued (including domestic workers) had contracted venereal diseases. They are often denied medical care and those who become ill are sometimes even killed.

However, from a belief that trafficking is synonymous with prostitution, current discourses have become more inclusive of all kinds of forced labour and slavery-like practices. In fact, Church leaders as well as others in government, academic and NGO communities have come to describe the full range of the phenomenon as “modern day slavery.”

During the course of this decade, definitions of trafficking and human smuggling provided by the UN Palermo protocols on human smuggling (*Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air*) and human trafficking (*Protocol to Suppress, Prevent and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children*) have become accepted by all major global players working on trafficking. Although human smuggling and human trafficking are widely confused and conflated, the two activities and protocols are different in important ways. By definition, smuggling involves the provision of a service, generally procurement or transport, to people who knowingly consent to that service in order to gain illegal entry into a foreign country.

Of critical importance (and what most technically distinguishes smuggling from trafficking), smuggling ends with the migrant’s arrival at his or her destination. Trafficking however, does not; in fact, the circumstance of *control-for-exploitation* that is the hallmark of human trafficking may even just begin upon the migrant’s arrival. Further, the protocol against smuggling considers those who have been smuggled as willing participants in a criminal activity who should be given “humane treatment and full protection of their rights” while being returned to their country of origin. The trafficking protocol, on the other hand, considers people who have been trafficked (who are assumed to be primarily women and children) as “victims” entitled to protection and a broad range of social services from governments.

On the ground however, the understanding of that critical distinction is at best wildly inconsistent. One result is that like smuggling, trafficking has also come to be perceived across the world almost exclusively as a criminal justice issue. Accordingly, one of the areas for concern in the action against human trafficking is whether criminal justice systems are attending to the needs of those victims *as victims*.

In short, there are three types of regulatory approaches focusing on human trafficking: *prevention* strategies aimed at bringing about greater clarity and awareness about human

trafficking so that communities, administrators, and police and border guards are able to prevent the act of trafficking; *prosecution* mandates concerned with punishing traffickers; and *protection* regimes dealing with the upholding of the rights of trafficking survivors through provision of services ranging from temporary shelters, psycho-social counseling, legal aid, and livelihood/reintegration assistance.

Protection services can be critical both to those who are permitted to stay as well as to those who return to their countries or communities of origin. The return of women and children who have been trafficked is often the cause of enormous social problems and family destabilisation.

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The gap in recognising, rescuing and protecting victims. Sustained advocacy and policy building is needed to secure universal recognition that the central subject in human trafficking is in fact a *victim* who needs laws and social systems that offer measures of prevention, rescue, and protection. Follow-through on that attention to victims requires governance, resources and coherence across multiple disciplines and mandates, ranging from enforcement to social services, especially at the national level.

2. A governance gap. Trafficking has variously been dealt with as a moral problem, a criminal problem, a migration problem, a public order problem, a labour problem, and a human rights problem. It is necessary to rationalise national legislation and international conventions that have differed in how they characterise trafficking and how to differentiate responses to those involved, especially the victims. Civil society actors, including Church organisations, should continue to engage actively in promoting good governance to develop and implement strong anti-trafficking laws, prevent trafficking abuses and protect victims.

3. A gap in opportunities for safe and legal migration. Trafficking thrives in circumstances where men, women and children desperate to migrate feel they have no legal opportunity to do so, and is also closely related to unethical labour migration. It is important that the response not be limited to post factum criminal justice and enforcement systems, but rather with better labour migration policies and management so that those thinking of migrating have options other than falling into the hands of human traffickers.

4. A gap in public awareness. Efforts must be strengthened and more adequately financed to increase public awareness of the ways and risks of human trafficking, especially among rural populations and youth, and also of the important distinctions

between human smuggling and human trafficking. In this regard, more work needs to be done to enlist the media in highlighting trafficking abuses and holding governments accountable both for prevention purposes and for proper response to trafficking victims.

5. Gaps in transnational and regional cooperation. Governments, international institutions and civil society, including Church entities, must continue to advance efforts to collaborate on counter trafficking, rescue, protection and prosecution programmes across borders and regions. At national and regional levels, efforts to identify and punish traffickers need to be coordinated within and among origin, transit and destination countries.

6. Gaps in political will. Public authorities at national and regional levels need to demonstrate substantially greater determination and regularity in combating shadow markets and employers who profit, directly or indirectly, from streams of trafficked victims, in entertainment, hospitality, agriculture, light industry, and household labour, among other sectors. It bears repeating that in all such efforts, it is of the essence for enforcement actors to appreciate that the target of the enforcement is not the victim of the trafficking (who is entitled to victims' services) but rather those who have exploited him or her.

Managing developmental impacts of migration

Perspectives

While migrant labour fuels prosperity in developed and rich receiving countries in Asia and elsewhere, the nearly US \$ 300 billion dollars of migrant remittances that migrants send home each year worldwide (through both official and unofficial channels) also constitute an important flow of foreign exchange to poor and developing countries of origin, and directly reach millions of households.

It is impossible to exaggerate the poverty-relieving effect of remittances, or their value in helping to support nutrition, health care, and education needs of children and families worldwide. In many countries, migration acts as a "safety valve" in poorer areas, though there is also some positive impact on income and investment. One of the most striking cases is the Indian state of Kerala, where emigration has been high in recent decades. In the 1990's, remittances accounted for 21% of state income, a flow that appears to have increased wealth, because where the average per capita consumption in Kerala was below the national average until 1978-9, by the year 2000 it exceeded the national average by

41%. “Changes are quite visible especially in villages and small towns,” observed the report to the Consultation from the participants from Myanmar, including not only personal goods and housing, but even the “success rate in academic matriculation.”

Perhaps inevitably then, migrant remittances have become an important component of the economic development strategies of countries and regions of origin. Indeed as mentioned earlier, a powerful dynamic in contemporary labour migration is that an increasing number of countries of origin are to one degree or another dependent on the countries that are hosting their workers and providing jobs and revenue to their economies.

At the same time, migrant earnings and remittances create issues of concern as well as benefits for migrants and their families and can negatively impact local and national development when large numbers of people migrate to seek better socio economic opportunities. The problem of brain drain is well documented, if more complex than often presented. Its effects however are in a word, acute, especially in certain service or skills sectors, such as healthcare, and in poorer areas of countries and cities. In the Philippines for example, hospitals have been reported to close for lack of resident physicians - even as a large number of doctors continue to migrate out of the country each year, some after studying nursing in order to move overseas where that profession is easier to access.

In Asia as in many other regions of the world, the majority of countries pay more importance to “market and labour” considerations than the insecurity and frustration, anguish and despair that both the personal situations of migrants and migration policies and structures engender. Speaking most broadly, the Church’s concern for the future of humanity calls for a longer-term perspective that will truly promote intercultural solidarity, including values of family unity, common good and spirituality, alongside material improvements. It is evident that the search for material improvement of one’s life and immediate satisfaction of wants through global migration needs is not sustainable in and of itself, and family has a vital place and role here. Finally, only by emphasising human dignity will actors and societies be pledge-bound to relieve the distress of migrants and initiate appropriate measures for their well being.

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. A gap of balance in the “win-win-win” vision of migration. A major shift is necessary in the approach that is dominating the current global discussion of migration and development: more emphasis is needed on pursuing human and social as well as economic development, and on ensuring that the benefits of more holistic approaches of that nature benefit not only countries of destination but countries of origin as well as the migrants themselves.

2. A gap in managing remittance income. There is a need for managing the growth in consumerism fuelled by processes of migration and remittances, a consumerism that is increasingly conspicuous even in remote and rural villages. While such remittances are the private property - the earnings - of migrant workers, they can go well beyond the satisfaction of basic needs to create serious challenges, including overdependence on such income, decisions to prolong work away from the family, new decisions to migrate or re-migrate, and social gaps in countries of origin.

3. A gap in long term planning. With the level and the role of migrant remittances rising dramatically in recent years, it is essential to develop and promote appropriate savings/ investment systems that encourage migrants to invest (e.g., in land) in ways that can support longer-term social security.

4. A gap in the vision of migration for development. It is important to advocate a different, holistic paradigm where migration is not the first, fast and forced answer to meet immediate economic needs, either on individual or national levels.

5. Gaps among national, regional and international efforts. What is needed is a comprehensive set of policies, both pre-migration and pro-development, that builds coherence among global, regional and national efforts. At all levels, this is the work not only of States, international institutions and civil society, but of the migrants themselves, as primary stakeholders, direct participants and full partners.

Broadening information sharing, policy mechanisms and network engagement

Perspectives

The growing number and mobility of migrant workers in the global labour market require greater and more consistent networks and communication to promote legal protection, ranging from working conditions to compensation.

With respect to policy building, four major improvements may be envisaged, which will differ for internal and international migration:

- ensuring migrant rights, including the rights both to migrate and not to migrate, and to family unity
- improving the social and political environment for migrants and migration
- improving synergies between migration and development
- improving labour market outcomes

In each of these areas, the challenge will be to be proactive and not just reactive, to anticipate and prevent risk and harm to migrant families and workers with policies and with consistent and multilateral frameworks (such as the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and the Members of their Families) that make sense in national contexts as well as in a globalised economy, for the profound dignity of each human being and in the transnational world of migration and development.

There is great value - and commitment - to exploring more formal and regular processes for collaboration among Church institutions on migration and development at the various national, regional and international levels, including ICMC and the Federation of Asian Bishops Conferences. There are tensions, and opportunities, between regional and international approaches to migration and development. ICMC stresses the value and complementarity of both and has begun to organise processes to discuss migration and development issues from a regional perspective in order to promote practical, more immediate responses. Indeed, many national, regional and international actors recognise, welcome and even expect the very specific role of the Churches in these matters.

The emerging new process of the Global Forum on Migration and Development provides an opportunity for precisely that collaboration and action. While the intergovernmental format of the Global Forum strictly limits civil society's place and role, the civil society programme for 2008 was structured to include several opportunities to convey perspectives to the States, including from this Consultation. In particular, several sessions were reserved for *regional* migration and development issues. In one of them, ICMC was invited to make a formal presentation of the process, discussion and key messages of this Consultation. Records of that presentation and others form the three reports to the States from civil society during the Forum, i.e., in two separate presentations (one during an interactive session with States) as well as in writing.

Given the rise and range of the phenomenon of international migration, there is an obvious need to think and act globally, with both existing and new governance processes. What is needed is to reinforce the voice of the Church, to insist that human dignity and full development be at the heart of deliberative processes such as the new Global Forum on Migration and Development, right now and in the future. At the same time, there is always the need to think and act at the community level, especially with respect to development, where it is essential to be close to the poor to help the poor.

GAPS PERCEIVED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. The “Asian voice” gap.** There is a need to better formulate, project and sustain a united “Asian voice” - and related mechanisms - in migration and development policy-building processes at regional and international levels.
- 2. Gaps in policy engagement at the national level.** Collaboration and policy building is also important at the national level; one model to consider is the Philippine Migrants Rights Watch (PMRW), which has succeeded at bringing together a group of national organisations with shared values to serve and advocate for migrants and their families.
- 3. Gaps in networking and collaboration across borders and regions.** There is a need to build and/or strengthen networking among bishops conferences and other Church entities in countries from and to which migrants move in order to understand who is moving and how best to help the migrants and their families.
- 4. Gaps in interfaith collaboration.** More interfaith and inter-religion mechanisms are needed to reach out to migrants of diverse faiths and religions.
- 5. The “civil society gap” at the Global Forum.** It is important to continue efforts to convince States to open the Forum to broader and more constructive participation by civil society, including faith-based organisations engaged in migration and/or development and migrants themselves.

Global Forum
on Migration and Development

Global Forum on Migration and Development

A new energy in consultation and cooperation

ALTHOUGH THERE HAS LONG BEEN a call for international examination of how migration and development relate to each other, the 2005 report of the Global Commission on International Migration (on which ICMC member delegate US Bishop Nicholas DiMarzio was one of the 19 commissioners) led to an unprecedented process of international discussion, first the UN High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development in 2006 and now a new “Global Forum on Migration and Development.”

The Global Forum was inaugurated in Brussels in 2007 and scheduled for its second session in Manila the last week in October 2008. In Brussels, the Forum defied skeptics by attracting the participation of 156 governments, most at ministerial level.

The Forum is an informal and non-binding intergovernmental process. As currently structured, civil society is given no formal role and only indirect inputs to the discussion among States, in the form of reports prepared by civil society organisations meeting separately before the State sessions. In Manila as in Brussels, some 200 organisations participate in the civil society component, including ICMC and over 30 other faith-based organisations.

Why is the Global Forum so important? Four reasons. First, it is at last a serious effort at top-levels to examine the *link* between why and where people migrate and the needs and opportunities for development. ICMC believes that this is an occasion to call better attention to addressing root causes of migration—in particular, forced migration of all kinds. Second, the Global Forum seems to reflect a sincere effort on the part of governments worldwide to look at the *positive* role of migrants and migration, as well as the need to reduce negatives of migration, like scattered families and “brain drain.” Third, it is an opportunity to reinforce the centrality of human dignity, rights, and well-being in all migration and development processes. And finally, it seems to be a major step forward for international cooperation between countries of the North and South, countries both to and from which people migrate.

Future sessions of the Global Forum will meet in Greece in 2009, in Argentina in 2010 and Spain in 2011.

The international debate thus far

Led by States but very much guided by actors like the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the World Bank and the International Organization for Migration (IOM):

1. The debate has in fact centred principally on *migration*, not development.

2. Within migration, the focus has been predominantly on *economic* aspects, with lavish attention to labour migration and migrant remittances. Among the many perspectives in the discussion, an unsettling range of utilitarian viewpoints seem to picture migrants, variously, as:

- single units of labour and production, without families and with minimal rights
- preferably highly skilled
- temporary to the maximum extent possible
- formal agents of development, whose remittances in particular must be redirected towards community and national development objectives

3. At the same time, there is a positive convergence emerging among States and between States and civil society on three points in global migration and development:

- migration has many positives which should be recognised
- migration should be by choice and not by necessity
- greater international cooperation and international frameworks are essential

It is striking how widely these simple phrases—at least the words—are being repeated in this global debate: in the halls of the UN in New York and Geneva, in formal statements of States of the global North and South, in policy positions of non-government as well as international organisations. On a subject like migration - which has never been the topic of much international conversation, let alone consensus over the years, even *language* convergence of that kind gives rise to great hope.

4. There is intermittent consideration of creating a new world organisation for *migration*, either within or outside the UN system. (The Global Commission suggested considering either IOM alone or merged with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees for this purpose.) Other forms of global governance that are being suggested include:

- international legal and operational frameworks for labour mobility
- broader ratification and enforcement of international rights treaties, including in particular the UN Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families

Hostile to almost *any* international action on migration, a number of States - particularly among the “industrialised” countries - have aggressively blocked most such possibilities.

5. There are tensions, and opportunities, between *regional and international approaches* to migration and development. ICMC stresses the value and complementarity of both and, beginning in Asia, has begun to organise processes to discuss migration and development issues from a regional perspective in order to promote practical, more immediate responses.

6. A particular *challenge for civil society* (including NGOs, faith-based, labour and diaspora organisations) is that a number of mostly northern States have succeeded - for the moment - at greatly restricting the participation of NGOs in these processes, some saying that NGOs talk too much of *rights* and *root causes*, and/or are not “concrete” enough, e.g., with operational responses and program proposals. As a result, civil society is seriously limited in its participation and voice on these issues - even as critical policies are being discussed that will affect millions of migrants and refugees around the world.

ICMC positioning

While many organisations work in either migration or development, Church bodies are among the few that do *both*. The Holy See has been active in all of these international processes, with ICMC and a number of other Catholic organisations also engaged in related operations and policy building.

A big risk for all in this debate is that migration and development is so broad a topic that it is easy to lose focus and impact on the main points. While speaking to an array of issues, ICMC has been especially distinct on 3 points:

- **the right to family unity**, which requires migration options for close family members
- **the right to migrate**, which implies greater channels for safe, ordered and legal migration, in addition to those needed for refugees defined under the 1951 Refugee Convention
- **the right to *not* migrate**, which requires development, decent work and dignity in countries of origin, as the surest remedy to social curses like forced migration, brain drain and families left behind.

Dignity across Borders

ICMC'S NETWORK OF MEMBERS WORLDWIDE and its operations directly engage with migrants and refugees, regardless of faith, on the ground, on the road, on borders, in camps, communities and cities, in jobs, in schools, in development programs, in developed as well as developing countries: before, during and after decisions are made to move, stay, “integrate,” return and/or re-migrate. Our members quite regularly “walk this walk” all over the world in partnership and quite concretely with States, international organisations and local partners.

ICMC welcomes the new energy and spirit of cooperation of the Global Forum on Migration and Development, especially after the success of the first Forum last year in Brussels, with 156 States around the table, plus international organisations and some 200 representatives of civil society - even though civil society's role and contribution was seriously under-respected in that process.

GOOD STEPS, AND NEXT STEPS, IN THE PROCESS ITSELF

We congratulate the Philippines on several *significant* steps forward in its organisation of this year's second Forum, including a number of changes that ICMC and other civil society actors had strongly advocated since the UN High Level Dialogue launched this process in 2006. In particular:

- **the elevation of human rights** both within the core theme of the Forum and to the specific theme of the first of the three roundtables, which we believe responds not only to the *sine qua non* of rights (as indeed so many States

continue to affirm) but also recognises the practical role that rights play in maximising contributions of migration to development and strengthening social cohesion in countries of destination and origin;

- **the increased space for civil society** to contribute, with a second day added for civil society organisations to bring to the process - and the States - the concrete experience and perspectives of practitioners on the front lines and at grass roots levels - including migrants and refugees themselves, operating organisations that partner with States and international organisations in migration and development work every day, and the private sector; and
- **the expanded interaction** with States, in the form of a new session added for interface with States that wish to engage with civil society at the Forum.

We continue to regret however that the fuller contribution of civil society to the Forum remains blocked by the structural segregation of civil society into what is a separate and diminished component that, to their shame, a small number of States and even the Special Representative of the UN Secretary General continue to insist stays officially “outside” the Global Forum process. Given the contributions and concrete partnerships of so many civil society organisations with States in these fields, given the explicitly informal, non-binding nature of the whole Global Forum process, indeed, given the UN tradition of inclusion in these processes, what is accomplished by such segregation?

Like the high level of participation among States, **ICMC and other civil society organisations are eager to contribute** in ways that are concrete and positive, as more formal participants within the process. While disappointed in that regard this year, we look forward to exploring better models for civil society participation with Greece and Argentina as they work to make the Global Forums of 2009 and 2010 in their countries even more productive.

AN EMERGENCE OF CONVERGENCE

Of course, our overall enthusiasm for the Global Forum goes beyond the process itself. We believe that the distinct achievement of the process to date has been a convergence, clear and growing, among a majority of States, international organisations and civil society organisations on three points rarely heard before but now expressed again and again in these discussions:

- migration has many positives which must be recognised
- migration should be by choice and not by necessity
- greater international cooperation and international frameworks are needed

Of course, actions speak louder than words, but considering that skeptics (and some States) had been sure that States would never sit down at the international level to discuss migration, and others (including some in civil society) had said that States and civil society were not likely to ever find common ground in these matters, we find such convergence at so early a stage of the Global Forum process unprecedented, greatly unexpected - and quite hopeful.

HOPE FOR A SHIFT IN THE CORE APPROACH

Moreover, we see in this convergence some hope for a **much-needed SHIFT** in the global discussion of migration and development. In a sentence, the shift that is needed is to **an explicit preference for *dignity* in the debate**: the fundamental human dignity of a *migrant*, his or her labour, and family unity; and the dignity of *States* and other international, regional and political actors to discuss these matters honestly and with humanity, with respect not only to the economic and social forces involved in migration today but also the lives, hopes, challenges, contributions and common good that migrants and citizens *share* and can benefit from *together*.

This is not a soft shift; in fact, it is not even an option. Rather, **it is essential to moving forward**: as a matter of obligations to respect universal rights and as a key to social cohesion, in countries of origin as well as transit and destination. It is a shift to re-centre the debate, including related research, away from what has been - and will otherwise remain - a mono-dimensional, utilitarian and anachronistic approach to migrants strictly as economic units of labour; *commodities*. Echoing references in prior generations to immigrants as *self-loading cargo*, it should be a shock and a warning to all of us that much research, some policy and the current debate are increasingly using language of migrant “import,” “export” and “stock.”

SHIFTS IN 4 SPECIFIC AREAS

The growing convergence among States, international organisations and civil society calls for shifts on *specific* issues as well, again, as a function of human dignity and as a key to securing social cohesion. Faced today with global economic dislocations of epic proportion, and quite predictable and dangerous social impulses to scapegoating and xenophobia, we can no longer afford to trifle with or delay policies needed to **build and reinforce social cohesion**.

In preparation for this Forum, we have **consulted with our members worldwide**. As we see and act upon migration and development, **four issues - four ‘f’s’ in fact - cut across**

all others: family, forced migration, fairness and frameworks. These four require sustained, structured attention in processes like the Global Forum, in more targeted research, and in policy. All four are discussed more fully in *Dignity Across Borders*, a report we have just published, and commend to you, of our consultation with members in 17 countries of Asia in August. By the device of closely examining phenomena of migrants in and from Asia, the report is able to present gaps analysis and specific, practical recommendations on the range of issues that concern our members worldwide as well as those in Asia. In short however, what is needed is:

1. A shift back to **FAMILY**

Family is the foundational relationship of humanity; the building block of society. Increasingly, research demonstrates that measures providing opportunities for families not to be separated and **possibilities for family re-unification play an important role in promoting social cohesion.** For cohesion and coherence of migration policy, for the health of our countries - of origin as well as destination, and for development, human as well as social and economic, we can not put issues of family unity aside:

- as if a worker exists - or can remain - isolated from his or her family (the millions of spouses and children left behind)
- as if large numbers of immigrant workers - or just the lower skilled? - can be kept in some kind of economic “family free” zones.

Nor can migration policies trade the central place and value of close family: husbands, wives, children (biological or adopted), for skilled labour or business employment. In this regard we are alarmed at the direction adopted by the recent European Pact on Immigration and Asylum. ***We must resist the idea that family unity can be made into the opposite of labour in zero-sum migration policy.*** Surely experience tells us - and we can see clearly - that “shop and stop” policies, that is, shopping for workers, stopping close family members, do **not** work, especially in contexts of longer-term employment at *any* skill levels.

2. A shift to a focus on **FORCED** (not just “irregular”) **MIGRATION**

In the Philippines, there are over **3,000 workers leaving the country each day to work abroad. 121 an hour!** At least two other countries in Asia see similar exodus. Why? Many are migrating for survival; for jobs that they tell us, and the government tells us - and we know - do not exist at home. Survival migration. In more than 20 countries in Africa, South and Central America, and Eastern and Western Europe, between 10 and 20% of the people have moved across borders within just this generation, many compelled either by a similar lack of jobs, or by conflict.

Regarding forced migration worldwide, not all - but too much - of it is irregular. Our members tell us that forced migration also involves much more human trafficking and smuggling than comes to our attention.

The Global Forum rings with the saying, “migration should be by choice, not by necessity.” There is so much agreement on that, *but we have to do more than say it.* We need much more government focus on securing and preserving that choice, not only for the humanity and dignity of it (which should always be our first motivation) but because it is the key:

- to managing *all* migration
- to reducing *irregular* migration
- to greatly reducing its worst forms, particularly human trafficking
- and because addressing the *causes* of forced migration is the **only** approach that makes sense for any integrated policy of incentives concerning “brain drain,” circular migration (for other than the classic seasonal workers) and *voluntary* return that is genuine and promotes development and cohesion in countries of origin.

That is, beyond words and statements, **we need thinking and strategies to support the right to *not* migrate**, and for those who return, the right to not *re*-migrate.

Most of all, **this requires decent work and targeted, sustained development in countries of origin.**

3. A shift towards greater **FAIRNESS** in migration policies

Social cohesion can only be achieved with fairness; in turn fairness requires coherence in the form of policies that respect the human dignity of all people. In migration contexts, this means:

- recognition, assistance and protection for refugees and for migrant victims of trafficking, torture, trauma and other violence in the migratory process
- reality-based legal migration systems that better match the true needs of labour markets, including earned legalisation for law-abiding long-stayers, especially those with family or community ties
- policies that do not discriminate against lesser-skilled migrant workers (including rights to long-term vs. temporary residence and employment; and family reunification)
- protection incertain types of unregulated/unseen employment, such as domestic work

and home care

- enforcement, return and reintegration policies that are sensitive to special vulnerabilities of migrant women and children and migrants who are sick, disabled or elderly.

Where can such fairness most be found? In international frameworks of human rights.

4. A shift to the value of international **FRAMEWORKS** in migration contexts

While all of these issues can benefit from concrete bilateral or region-specific approaches and cooperation, the activities of *all* actors, that is, States, international organisations, civil society and even the private sector, should be conducted with full respect for universal frameworks for human rights and obligations. Given the widespread ratification of so many international human rights treaties whose protections generally cover migrants equally with citizens, *there is no reason for States to further delay ratifying the Migrant Workers Convention*, which, to a large extent, gathers rights from those other treaties. In fact, **we urge greater ratification and implementation of the Migrant Workers Convention** as a distinct *complement* to the other human rights treaties, and no less than a *recipe* for better cooperation, coherence and cohesion in and among countries of origin, transit and destination.

Annex

Migration in Asia

A Country-by-Country Overview

THE STATISTICS PRESENTED in the next pages are taken from official reports of the World Bank, the US Agency for International Development, the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and the International Displacement Monitoring Centre. With the exception of the remittance numbers presented for 2007, which are formal estimates, all other statistics were published as final figures. Please note that the population statistics are consistently presented for the year 2005, as that is the most recent year for which adequate statistics and percentages were available for the national subsets of total immigrants, female immigrants and emigrants.

One important caution. It is essential to note that these statistics are derived from data that is officially reported and recorded. To be clear, actual numbers of immigrants, emigrants, and remittance flows are widely acknowledged to be higher as a general matter, and even substantially higher in certain cases.

Discrepancies between what is officially reported, and what is *actually* the case, occur because of material - and at times quite unexpected - distinctions in national definitions (e.g., “immigrant” and “foreign born”; “emigrant” and “foreign contract worker”, etc.), practical challenges to accurate record-keeping (e.g., the difficulty in trying to incorporate any reliable count of irregular migrants, whether immigrant or emigrant) and significant inconsistencies in country practice (e.g., in defining and recording remittances.) Actual remittance flows for example, are assumed to be as much as double or triple the number officially reported when more informal and unreported flows are taken into account.

Sources

Table 1

Total population [2005]	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, International Migration 2006 Wallchart
Birthrate per 1000 [2007]	Population Reference Bureau, US Agency for International Development, 2007 World Population data sheet
Fertility rate [2007]	Population Reference Bureau, US Agency for International Development, 2007 World Population data sheet

Table 2

Total immigrant population and immigrant % of total population [2005]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008
% of immigrants female [2005]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008

Table 3

Total emigrant population and emigrant % of total population [2005]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008
Emigrants with tertiary education [2000]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008

Table 4

Recorded remittances [2000, 2007]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008
Remittances % of GNP [2006]	World Bank, Migration and Remittances Factbook 2008

Table 5

UNHCR-recognized refugees [2007]	UN High Commissioner for Refugees, 2007 Statistical Yearbook
Conflict related internally displaced persons [2007]	International Displacement Monitoring centre, Global Overview of Trends and Developments in 2007

Table 1

	Total Population [2005]	Birthrate per 1000 [2007]	Fertility Rate [2007]
Bangladesh	142 million	27	3
Brunei	374,000	19	2.3
Cambodia	14 million	26	3.4
China	1.3 billion	12	1.6
Hong Kong	7 million	10	1
India	1.1 billion	24	2.9
Indonesia	223 million	21	2.4
Japan	128 million	9	1.3
Republic of Korea	48 million	9	1.1
Malaysia	25 million	23	2.9
Myanmar	51 million	20	2.3
Nepal	27 million	28	3.1
Pakistan	158 million	31	4.1
Philippines	83 million	27	3.4
Singapore	4 million	10	1.3
Sri Lanka	21 million	18	2
Thailand	64 million	14	1.7
Timor Leste	1 million	44	7
Vietnam	84 million	19	2.1

Table 2

	Total Immigr. Population and % of Total Population [2005]	% of Female Immigrants [2005]
Bangladesh	1 million / 0.7%	13.9%
Brunei	124,200 / 33.2%	46.8%
Cambodia	304,000 / 2.2%	51.3%
China	596,000 / 0%	49.1%
Hong Kong	3 million / 42.6%	54.0%
India	5.7 million / 0.5%	47.4%
Indonesia	160,000 / 0.1%	46.0%
Japan	2.1 million / 1.6%	53.8%
Republic of Korea	551,000 / 1.2%	53.5%
Malaysia	1.6 million / 6.5%	41.6%
Myanmar	117,000 / 0.2%	46.1%
Nepal	819,000 / 3%	69.1%
Pakistan	3.3 million / 2.1%	44.8%
Philippines	375,000 / 0.5%	49.1%
Singapore	1.8 million / 42.6%	50.3%
Sri Lanka	368,000 / 1.8%	53.4%
Thailand	1.1 million / 1.6%	56.8%
Timor Leste	6,000 / 0.7%	47.6%
Vietnam	21,000 / 0%	46.2%

Table 3

	Total Emigr. Population and % of Total Population [2005]	Emigration of tertiary educated [2000]
Bangladesh	4.9 million / 3.4%	4.7%
Brunei	13,000 / 3.4%	21.0%
Cambodia	349,000 / 2.5%	6.8%
China	7.3 million / 0.6%	4.2%
Hong Kong	716,000 / 10.2%	28.7%
India	10 million / 0.9%	4.2%
Indonesia	1.7 million / 0.8%	2.0%
Japan	940,000 / 0.7%	1.5%
Republic of Korea	1.6 million / 3.4%	7.9%
Malaysia	1.5 million / 5.8%	10.4%
Myanmar	427,000 / 0.8%	3.4%
Nepal	754,000 / 2.8%	2.7%
Pakistan	3.4 million / 2.2%	9.2%
Philippines	3.6 million / 4.4%	14.8%
Singapore	230,000 / 5.3%	15.2%
Sri Lanka	936,000 / 4.5%	27.5%
Thailand	758,000 / 1.2%	2.2%
Timor Leste	15,000 / 1.6%	no report
Vietnam	2.2 million / 2.6%	39.0%

Table 4

	Recorded remittances US \$ [2000 -> 2007]	Remittances % of GNP [2006]
Bangladesh	1.97 -> 6.4 billion	8.8%
Brunei	no report	no report
Cambodia	121 -> 322 million	4.1%
China	6.24 -> 25.7 billion	0.9%
Hong Kong	136 -> 297 million	0.2%
India	12.9 -> 27 billion	2.8%
Indonesia	1.19 -> 6 billion	1.6%
Japan	1.37 -> 1.58 billion	0%
Republic of Korea	735 -> 985 million	0.1%
Malaysia	981 million -> 1.7 billion	1.0%
Myanmar	104 -> 125 million	not available
Nepal	111 million -> 1.6 billion	18.0%
Pakistan	1.08 -> 6.1 billion	4.0%
Philippines	6.2 -> 17 billion	13.0%
Singapore	not available	not available
Sri Lanka	1.2 -> 2.7 billion	8.7%
Thailand	1.7 -> 1.71 billion	0.6%
Timor Leste	no reports	no report
Vietnam	5 billion	7.9%

Table 5

	UNHCR-recognized refugees [2007]	Conflict-related IDPs [2007]
Bangladesh	hosted 27,573 - origin 10,243	500,000 - 550,000
Brunei	no report	no report
Cambodia	hosted 179 - origin 17,697	no report
China	hosted 301,078 - origin 149,095	no report
Hong Kong	hosted 97 - origin 11	no report
India	hosted 161,537 - origin 20,462	at least 600,000
Indonesia	hosted 315 - origin 20,230	100,000-200,000
Japan	hosted 1,794 - origin 521	no report
Republic of Korea	hosted 118 - origin 605	no report
Malaysia	hosted 32,243	no report
Myanmar	origin 191,256	at least 500,000
Nepal	hosted 128,181 - origin 3,363	50,000 - 70,000
Pakistan	hosted 887,273 - origin 31,857	at least 84,000 (UNICEF)
Philippines	hosted 106 - origin 1,549	300,000 (WFP)
Singapore	origin 116	no report
Sri Lanka	hosted 182 - origin 134,948	460,000
Thailand	hosted 125,643 - origin 2,313	no report
Timor Leste	hosted 1 - origin 6	100,000
Vietnam	hosted 2,357 - origin 327,776	no report

ICMC expresses gratitude to CORDAID for its financial support in organising the Asia Consultation.



This document will be integrated in the ICMC website (www.icmc.net) and the website on Migration and Development (www.migrationanddevelopment.net), built with the support of Misereor.



“In the misfortune experienced by the Family of Nazareth, obliged to take refuge in Egypt, we can catch a glimpse of (...) the difficulties that every migrant family lives through, the hardships and humiliations, the deprivation and fragility of millions and millions of migrants, refugees and internally displaced people.”

Pope Benedict XVI
World Day of Migrants and Refugees 2007



International Catholic Migration Commission

1, rue de Varembé, P.O. Box 96
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Tel. +41 22 919 10 20 / Fax +41 22 919 10 48
icmc@icmc.net / www.icmc.net