

***MIGRATION, GLOBALIZATION AND PROTECTION:
A PERSPECTIVE FOR PUBLIC SERVICE IN DEFENSE OF HUMAN
RIGHTS AND DIGNITY***

**Keynote address at the
PUBLIC SERVICES INTERNATIONAL
Conference on public services and migration**

Bari, Italy

9 March 2010

by

Patrick Taran

(Senior Migration Specialist, ILO*)

Introduction

This event is about public service and migration; it is about upholding the noble sense of public service to serve, to defend and to empower the public, including the most vulnerable populations.

To act effectively, we need information and understanding. As a contribution to this discussion, I offer perspective on what migration is about today and about why we must take a “rights based approach” to migrants. With this context, I suggest ten key lines of action as a basis for prioritizing work of public service and the unions that represent public service workers.

I speak from the perspective gained over 33 years of full time professional work –in public service—in the fields of refugee resettlement, migrant support, anti-discrimination and integration, and migration policy. I also have the privilege of speaking to you as a public service unionist, an elected member of the executive committee of the Staff Union of the ILO, a 2,000-member strong union now affiliated with PSI.

I. LABOUR MIGRATION IS ESSENTIAL TODAY

Migration today is about labour. ILO estimates that some 105 million of the total 214 million people living outside their countries of birth or citizenship in 2010 are economically active, engaged in the world of work.¹ This means most working-age adults in the global migrant population—including refugees-- taking into account that the migrant population includes children and aged dependents. In Western European countries, the foreign-born proportion of the work force is ten percent or more, nearly 15% in Ireland and 40% in Luxembourg.² It is 25% in Switzerland.

**** Organization noted for identification purposes only. Paper presented in author’s personal expert capacity; the observations and ideas herein do not necessarily reflect or engage the views of the ILO.***

¹ ILO 2010. Towards a Rights Based Approach to Labour Migration; (Geneva, International Labour Office)

² EU. Employment Report 2008 European Union DG Employment. Brussels. Issued 2009.

Migration serves as an instrument to adjust the skills, age and sectoral composition of national and regional labour markets. Migration provides responses to fast-changing needs for skills and personnel resulting from technological advances, changes in market conditions and industrial transformations. In countries of aging populations, migration is replenishing declining work forces and injecting younger workers, in turn contributing to increased dynamism, innovation and mobility in those work forces.

In this era of internationalisation of labour mobility, migration is driven not only by demographic changes, but especially by globalization and the dynamics of capitalist development itself. Mobility of capital and rapid evolutions in technology and organization of work requires that labour and skills be available where new investments are being made and where rapid changes in work activity are taking place.

Deregulation

However, labour migration is taking place in a context of deregulation of work and of labour markets. Salient characteristics of changes in work today include increased precarisation of employment, increased informalisation of work and economic activity, and deteriorating conditions at work. These changes affect large numbers of workers in industrialised countries as well as in developing countries.

Deregulation –the reduction in application of labour standards as well as market and financial controls—occurs in the context of huge competitive pressures on wages and conditions of work. Liberalised global circulation and marketing puts goods, services and technology produced in low wage, low protection countries in direct and unfettered competition with goods and services produced under regimes of more regulated and higher wages and working conditions.

These competitive pressures provide a huge incentive for seeking and hiring labour compelled to accept lowered standards and more precarious and ‘flexible’ employment, in industrialized as well as less-developed countries.

On the supply side, a large and continuous availability of labour is assured by what may be the biggest failing of globalization: its inability to create decent employment in countries with growing and youthful populations. Generally high unemployment rates, lack of formal jobs and absence of decent working conditions in many less development countries assure a high supply of labour and skills compelled to look elsewhere for sustenance and employment.

In day-to-day reality, migration has become a central and significant arena of dispute and redefinition in relations between labour and capital. Migration is the terrain of contention over the distribution of benefits deriving from economic activity; in other words, how much of wealth generated is returned to capital and how much is paid out in wages and benefits to working people. It is THE zone of contention over the levels of protection and regulation of conditions of employment and work. In the most dramatic cases, that contention over protection, or lack of protection, is now fought out literally in the streets as well as workplaces. Migration also has become a defining context for the extent that working people –foreign workers in particular-- can –or cannot-- organize to articulate and defend their interests.

It thus makes migration a cutting edge of contention between the economic logic of globalization and the values embodied in human rights and labour standards concepts and law.

Migrant labour largely fills “three-D” jobs: dirty, dangerous and degrading. Efforts to fill 3-D jobs and to acquire economic competitiveness at internationally competitive low cost produce a continuous demand for cheap and low-skilled migrant labour in numerous sectors of national economies. Small and medium size companies and labour-intensive economic sectors do not have the option of relocating operations abroad. Demands for migrant workers provide a significant impetus to labour flows and facilitate incorporation of undocumented migrants.

Migrant workers are concentrated in sectors and activities where labour standards are weak, and or where enforcement of existing standards is lax or non-existent. Migrant workers face lacunae of real protection of health and safety. In Western Europe, foreign workers face occupational injury and death rates twice as high as for nationals. More generally, employment for many is associated with underpayment or non-payment of wages, physical abuse, sexual harassment and violence against women workers, denial and repression of freedom of association and trade union rights.

The ILO estimates that, globally, some fifteen to twenty percent of international migrant workers are in irregular situations: without legal authorization for residence and/or employment, or undocumented. A recently established on-line database project on irregular migration in the European Union provides detailed country by country estimates indicating that migrants in irregular situations numbered between 1.9 and 3.8 million in 2008,³ giving a range of 6.2% to 12.3% of total migrant stocks (foreigners residing in) the EU-27.⁴ “Results (of this research) for 2002, 2005 and 2008 show a clear decline in the stocks of irregular resident populations in the European Union over time.”⁵

Migrants in irregular situations are even more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse. The presence of unauthorized migrants seems all too often tolerated by authorities in certain circumstances – such as in sectors or areas where national workers are unavailable, or to sustain enterprises or economic activity that would otherwise disappear if prevailing wages had to be paid and/or conditions of work enforced. The appeal of recruiting migrants in irregular situations is that it can impede upward pressures on or indeed push down local wages and protections. The absence of legal recognition heightens the exploitability and lowers the costs of migrant labour, in some cases arguably allowing marginally competitive activity to remain in business.

The flow of low-skilled migrants is channelled by clandestine means precisely because of the non-existence of legal migration categories that would allow for legal entry in destination countries. Once they are in host countries, these migrants remain confined to jobs in unstructured or informal sectors, in irregular work and under exploitative conditions of employment. In contrast, ILO research underlines that legal labour migration channels contribute to both reducing trafficking and the smuggling of migrants.

³ CLANDESTINO *Undocumented Migration: Counting the Uncountable. Data and Trends Across Europe* Research project funded by the European Commission, DG RTD, FP6, 2007-2009. http://irregular-migration.hwwi.net/Stock_estimates.6170.0.html For more information, visit <http://clandestino.eliamep.gr> (country reports and research briefs), and <http://irregular-migration.hwwi.net> (database).

⁴ Estimated at 30.8 million in 2008 by Eurostat (including EU nationals residing in other EU states). See <http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tps00157&plugin=1>

⁵ Cited at footnote 3

Policy conundrums

These structural contradictions play out in contradictory behaviour of governments. Tough political rhetoric and border control measures contrast with a degree of tolerance of irregular migrants working on their territories, providing for a supply of cheap and flexible but vulnerable and unprotected workers. Flows of low-skilled migrants are channeled by clandestine means in the absence of legal migration categories that allow legal entry; once in host countries, migrants in irregular status remain confined to jobs in unstructured or informal sectors, under exploitative conditions of employment.

Economic and administrative policy dilemmas are reinforced in political discourse and ideological frameworks. The utility of migrants in irregular and exploited situations contradicts normative and ideological values of most industrialized countries. In response, irregular migration is associated with crime, arms, drug trafficking and terrorism while social stigmatisation is reinforced by language of illegality.

Contradictions pitting an amalgam of restriction and control measures against a rights-based approach to regulating migration are further reflected in international political developments. A growing assault on the universality of international principles of human rights evolved over the last decade and is now focused on migration and the treatment of non-nationals.

Post-September 11 doctrines articulate the notion that the extent and nature of threats to national and State security posed by ‘international terrorism’ justify --even require-- restrictions on human, civil and judicial rights of migrants –migrant workers to be precise.

Meanwhile, a “utilitarian consequentialist” approach argues for an explicit trade-off of lowered application of rights and unequal treatment for non-national workers in exchange for increased opportunities for employment in potential host countries. In this approach, rights are commodified as negotiable bundles that may be traded, sold or renounced in exchange for economic benefits in form of access to foreign labour markets.

Discrimination plays an important role in maintaining –and justifying–stratification and segmentation in the labour market. Compounding the challenges of discrimination and integration are identities of nation-states constructed around mono-racial, mono-cultural, monolingual, and mono-religious definitions of belonging.

So what is at stake?

On one hand, we see explicit application of the deregulatory agenda to an important and growing, but especially vulnerable part of working populations.

On the other hand, we are seeing dehumanization and exclusion of a growing part of the working population.

Both the deregulation and the dehumanization are justified in *alienating* imagery of migrants – foreigners-- as outsiders, unequals, opportunist competitors, and as associated with criminality.

A significant number of workers are confined by legal, economic and political circumstances to non-existence, to outright illegality. I still hear too often brothers and sisters called illegals as if they are criminal and abhorrent by definition. If we accept the logic that there are some humans who are not, who are “illegal,” the foundations of the rule of law are stripped of their meaning. I

underscore: labour rights are human rights. If they are not universal –in employment, in the workplace, how can anyone be protected?

In the bigger picture, this combination of deregulation and dehumanization may add up to a broad economic and social restructuring reinforcing dichotomisation of nation states ...

Historical experience shows that regulation providing protection for migrant workers –indeed any workers-- cannot be left alone to market mechanisms. When highly competitive and now globalized market pressures are brought to bear in the absence of protections and appropriate regulation, migration is usually characterized by abuse and exploitation of migrant workers, marginalization and social exclusion of migrant and immigrant origin populations, fear of loss of jobs blamed on immigration, increasing anti-immigrant sentiments and, ultimately, communal violence.

III. INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS FOR A “RIGHTS-BASED APPROACH”

The development experience of Western industrialized countries showed that reducing exploitation and ensuring equality of treatment were essential elements for building prosperity, social cohesion and democratic governance of societies. A comprehensive body of law recognizing and providing for protection of rights of migrants evolved over the last century. International instruments explicitly establishing principles and defining norms for protection of human and labour rights emerged at the beginning of the 20th century.

The central notion of human rights is "the implicit assertion that certain principles are true and valid for all peoples, in all societies, under all conditions of economic, political, ethnic and cultural life." Universal principles of human rights implemented in the rule of law provide the foundation for governance—governance of nations, of community relations, and of international migration. This notion reflects historical experience that social cohesion and social peace can only be sustained under conditions of democratic rule, which in turn requires the accountability, the credibility and the enforceability provided under rule of law.

The need to provide for protection of workers outside their own countries emerged early in this process; it was explicitly raised in the Treaty of Versailles that ended World War I (and established the Constitution of ILO); the first specific international treaty on migrant workers was drawn up in the 1930s and the ILO Convention on migration for employment was adopted in 1949, shortly after the Universal Declaration of Human Rights emerged in 1948.

Three fundamental notions characterize the protections in international law for migrant workers and members of their families.

- Equality of treatment and non-discrimination between regular migrant/immigrant workers and nationals in the realm of employment and work.
- Universal human rights apply to all migrants, regardless of status.
- The broad array of International Labour Standards providing protection in treatment and conditions at work –safety, health, maximum hours, minimum remuneration, non-discrimination, freedom of association, maternity, etc.—apply to all workers.

Certain principles and rights at work are deemed to be fundamental for the protection of human rights for all workers, including migrant workers, by the ILO and its member States. The 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work established that all ILO members (which include all EU member States) have an obligation to “*respect and to promote and to*

*realize in good faith and in accordance with the Constitution, the principles concerning the fundamental rights which are the subject of those Conventions.”*⁶

Furthermore, International Labour Standards are considered applicable to the protection of *decent work* conditions for all migrant workers. These include conventions on occupational safety and health, conditions of work, protection of wages and labour inspection, employment policy, social security, maternity protection, the regulation of private and public employment agencies, as well as those covering sectors employing a large number of migrant workers.

The notion of universal applicability of labour standards to all workers was explicitly upheld in an international court. In 2003, the Inter-American Court on Human Rights “...decide(d) unanimously, that...the migrant quality of a person cannot constitute justification to deprive him of the enjoyment and exercise of his human rights, among them those of labor character. A migrant, by taking up a work relation, acquires rights by being a worker that must be recognized and guaranteed, independent of his regular or irregular situation en the State of employment. These rights are a consequence of the labor relationship.”⁷

Three specific international instruments define the application of human and labour rights to migrant workers: ILO Convention 97 on Migration for Employment (of 1949), ILO Convention 143 on migrant workers (Supplementary Provisions) (of 1975), and the 1990 International Convention on the Protection of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICRMW).

These three instruments comprise an *international charter on migration*, providing together a broad and comprehensive framework covering most issues of treatment of migrants. These are not just instruments on rights, they contain provisions to encourage and guide intergovernmental consultation, information sharing and cooperation on nearly all aspects of international migration.

82 countries –nearly two thirds of the some 130 countries for which international migration is an important feature-- have ratified at least one of these three complementary conventions. Eleven member States of the EU have ratified one or both of the ILO Conventions on migrant workers, among them most of the larger migrant destination countries: Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Portugal and the UK. On Southern shores of the Mediterranean, Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Morocco have ratified the ICRMW; Algeria also ratified ILO Convention 97.

The ICRMW now has 42 ratifications plus 16 additional signatories. Ratifying States will have already incorporated its content into national legislation, while signatory states are generally also bound by its content. National studies conducted in a number of EU member states (including Belgium, Italy and Portugal) found that national legislation of most of these States is already entirely or largely in conformity with the content of the ICRMW. These studies concluded that resistance to or difficulties in ratification are primarily for political, not legal, reasons.

Law versus Policy

Migration –and regulation to deal with it-- is manifestly essential to assure the present and future well-being, if not economic survival, of the EU, and soon will be for countries on the South side

⁶ ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, 1998. International Labour Conference 86th Session June 1998. (Geneva ILO): para.2

⁷ Corte Interamericana de Derechos Humanos: *Condición Jurídica y Derechos de los Migrantes Indocumentados*. Opinion Consultativa OC-18/03 de 17 de Septiembre de 2003.

of the Mediterranean as well. The elaboration of explicit policy and legislation is, however, fraught with tension given the nature of migration and its susceptibility to conflicts of interests.

Recent developments in the EU context are not encouraging. Nor are they much better elsewhere around the Mediterranean. References to international standards are conspicuous by their absence in elaboration of EU policy and directives. While most Southern Mediterranean countries have ratified one or more of the international Conventions, full implementation seems also lacking.

The EU has been unable to elaborate common policy on migration beyond certain high skilled categories. This leaves a huge and untenable gap in Community and member State ability to regulate and ensure protection for a large part of migration --that of low and middle skilled migration, where the needs for rights protection, regulation and cooperation are considerably more demanding than for high-skilled migration and inter-company transfers.

The lack of adoption of protection and regulation standards suggests a trend towards a regime of non-application of law protecting human and labour rights –*une espace de non-droit*—for a substantial and growing part of European work forces in order to secure its status as a reserve of cheap, flexible and unprotected labour.

In broader terms, non-protection for a substantial group of people poses a serious challenge to the rule of law, to democratic governance and to social cohesion. This exclusion risks formalizing an explicitly divided society characterised by a socially marginalized, legally unprotected and often racially differentiated labouring class serving a population whose relative freedoms and benefits deriving from the arrangement are justified by reinforcement of exclusive ethnic and national identities.

Recent manifestations of discontent and sometimes-violent protests and police repression in communities of immigrant origin across Europe as well as in countries on the Southern shores of the Mediterranean highlight the threat to social cohesion arising from exclusion. Imposition of a regime of repressive control on movement, on recognition and on access to and conditions of work may subdue marginalized populations for a time. However, it is at the cost of the ethos and practice of democracy that presume universal and inalienable application of human rights, non-discrimination, and equality of opportunity and treatment.

IV. IMPACT OF THE CRISIS

The global financial crisis has evolved into a deepening global employment crisis. This employment crisis also has a huge impact on labour mobility and labour migration, both in itself and in perceptions of migration and migrants. This impact and these perceptions only intensify the pressures on and challenges for “getting it right” on migration policy.

It is now clear that the biggest single danger to social cohesion everywhere is the rising tide of xenophobia and violence against foreigners. This is as true in Africa, Asia and the Americas as it is in Europe.

Scratch a headline and behind it is a story of hostility, attacks, tensions, conflict involving foreigners, usually migrants, migrant workers although sometimes it is refugees or other outsiders.

The global employment crisis –following the financial crisis—is only beginning. The 2009 Global Employment Trends (GET) report issued by ILO estimated an increase in global unemployment in 2009 compared to 2007 by more than 50 million persons. Most predictions are that layoffs and downsizing of employment will continue for some time, and that job recovery will be slow. The experience of economic crises over the last 70 years shows that it usually takes four to five years or more for employment levels to reach the pre-crisis levels. And in between, unemployment levels can go very high.

In times of crisis, migrants are victims of the shame that has no name, or rather, the shame that is not named. Migrants become the first to be blamed; they are the scapegoats for unemployment, insecurity, crime, even rising disease and ill health. And angry, frustrated citizens follow the lead of politicians and sometimes governments that concur in blaming migrants by taking direct action. The reported body count of murdered migrants for last January in just one city in an industrialized country was 24. The problem won't simply go away soon. Rather, we can anticipate it may get worse.

In times of economic insecurity migrants easily become scapegoats; xenophobic sentiments and discrimination against migrant workers rise. This alone presents one of the most formidable challenges for social peace and cohesion, and therefore for governance, in hard times.

Data compiled by ILO over the last year confirmed multiple impacts of the crisis on migrant workers:

- 1) Migrants and persons of foreign origin have been hard hit, they are disproportionately among those already laid off or rendered unemployed.
- 2) Those migrants remaining employed are often affected by reductions in pay, working time, and worsening working conditions.
- 3) Migrant workers have less access to social safety net support. This is especially true for migrants in irregular situations.
- 4) However, many migrant workers are not returning home, unless forcibly expelled. This is the case even when they are offered financial incentives to voluntarily depart. Simply put, conditions at home are even worse, with no opportunities for any kind of work.
- 5) Migrant workers are compelled to take whatever work they can find. They accept even more substandard pay and abusive conditions than before. This presents a major policy challenge for governance and for stabilization of labour markets and working conditions.
- 6) Scapegoating of migrants and xenophobic violence against foreigners are on the rise throughout the world. These are expressed in increased murders and lynchings of migrants in some countries, in generalized expressions of anti-foreigner sentiment, in hostile political discourse, and in calls for exclusion of migrants from access to labour markets and emergency social protection benefits.
- 7) Many countries have reduced quotas or intake of foreign workers; some countries have embarked on deliberate policies of exclusion and expulsion of migrant workers.
- 8) Migrant remittances home are declining.

- 9) The further deteriorated situations in home countries make whatever remittances migrants can send an even more crucial lifeline for their families and local communities.
- 10) What employment opportunities existed earlier for those remaining at home are also evaporating, meaning even fewer options for persons coming back from abroad. This also makes the return of migrant workers potentially a greater threat to labour market stability and ultimately, social stability at home.

However, it is incontestable that, given long term labour market, demographic and technological trends, immigrant labour and skills will be as essential for recovery from the crisis as they already have been to European productivity and economic progress in recent years. This is increasingly also the case for the North African countries.

V. ELEMENTS FOR POLICY RESPONSES

Protecting migrants –and national workers—and ensuring functional labour markets while upholding social cohesion requires deliberate policy attention and a comprehensive set of measures and institutions to achieve. Public service institutions and public service workers have particularly crucial responsibilities in shaping, and implementing, policies and practices that provide for rights protection, dignity and empowerment of migrant workers and their families.

Policy and action addressing migration and integration need to cover administration of immigration, legal protection measures, labour market regulation, labour inspection, social protection, health, education, housing, policy protection and much more. An array of measures are needed to prevent abusive practices and promote decent and productive work for women and men migrants in conditions of freedom, equity, security, and human dignity. This is all the more so in these disruptive times of crisis.

The International Labour Organization has developed guidance for development, strengthening, implementation and evaluation of national, regional and international labour migration policies and practices. This guidance, based on international norms and good practice experience, is contained in the *ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration: Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration*.⁸

Based on this knowledge and experience, and taking into account the global economic and employment crisis, we can suggest the following action lines as a framework for *the way forward*. I offer lines for a comprehensive approach; not all may be directly relevant to roles and responsibilities of public service, but public service institutions and workers certainly need to see their work as crucial components of a global approach.

Three broad areas for intervention are: (1) shoring up legal protection and decent work conditions for migrant workers –and vulnerable national workers; (2) enhancing employment creation and social safety net protections; and (3) resolutely repressing xenophobic violence.

⁸ ILO. *Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration: Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration*, Geneva, International Labour Office, 2006.

Lines of Response

The way forward is summed up in this Twelve Point Programme of policy and action priorities:

1. Wider ratification and application of relevant ILO and UN Conventions: ILO C-111, CERD, the ILO migrant worker Conventions 97 and 143, and the 1990 International Convention on rights of migrant workers, to set policy on a foundation in the rule of law.
2. Utilization of the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration in advocacy with governments to put in place effective labour migration policies and administrative measures to ensure decent work and fair treatment of all migrant workers and their families.
3. Expanding efforts to organize, unionize and support migrants workers
4. Increasing capacity and extending labour inspection to sectors and workplaces where migrant workers are concentrated --to ensure decent treatment in the face of pressures to cut pay, increase exploitation and thus foment unfair competition with national workers.
5. Strengthening anti-discrimination measures in employment and especially in provision of public services. In particular, this means ensuring that basic services are available without intimidation to all persons in need, including all migrants.
6. Expanding public and private support for employment intensive recovery measures, notably employment retention, for example by job sharing, and employment creation.
7. Preventing cutbacks to social protection measures; extending them to the most affected populations
8. Using all appropriate legal and administrative means to repress racist violence and xenophobia against foreigners, and to prosecute perpetrators to the fullest extent of the law.
9. Explicitly discouraging scapegoating of migrants in public discourse. This implies avoiding forced expulsions or returns of migrant workers –which implicitly scapegoat them, and maintaining intakes of foreign workers for agriculture and other sectors where labour and skills remain necessary and will be required for recovery.
10. Enhancing cooperation among social partners, civil society and governments to put into practice the Durban program of action on discrimination and xenophobia. The Ireland National Action Plan Against Racism is an exemplary model, built on cooperation between government, employers, trade unions and civil society.
11. Strengthening action by standards-based international organizations, ILO, OHCHR and UNHCR in cooperation with global union federations such as PSI, IUF and ITUC, and civil society bodies.
12. Broad exchange of examples of ‘good practices’ More than 140 profiles of anti-discrimination and equality action regarding migrants from 24 countries are now on an ILO website.⁹

⁹ See: www.ilo.org/migrant/equality Go to “practice profiles”

Meeting labour needs, ensuring productivity and competitiveness and improving well-being in today's globalized world necessarily mean migration and increasing diversity everywhere. However, how our societies treat migrants and how diversity is incorporated will determine whether we succeed in building societies of justice, dignity, democracy, and human security.

Commitment by public service and public service workers to upholding and applying a rights based approach is key to ensuring social cohesion and the well-being of citizens and newcomers alike. I commend these ideas and proposals for action to you to continue to build on the good work of PSI, its affiliates and their members.

* * *

Patrick Taran,
Senior Migration Specialist, ILO
Phone: (41-22) 799-8091
taran@ilo.org Website: www.ilo.org/migrant

Information and views in this paper reflect the personal perspective of the author.

Key References

Useful websites

ILO International Migration Program (MIGRANT):
<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/migrant/index.htm>

ILO Database on International Labour Standards (ILOLEX):
<http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/english/index.htm>

Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights
<http://www.ohchr.org>

Global Campaign for the convention on rights of migrant workers
www.migrantsrights.org

December 18 (Global network on migrants rights concerns)
www.december18.net

Union Sites

Building and Wood-Workers International (BWI) (Good section on migrant workers)
[http://www.bwint.org/default.asp?Issue=Migrant workers and posted workers&Language=EN](http://www.bwint.org/default.asp?Issue=Migrant%20workers%20and%20posted%20workers&Language=EN)

European Trade Union Confederation
<http://www.etuc.org/>

International Trade Union Confederation
<http://www.ituc-csi.org/>

Public Services International (PSI)
<http://www.world-psi.org/> See migration page

Pertinent documents:

Council of Europe. 2009. *Economic Migration, Social Cohesion and Development: Towards an Integrated Approach*. Patrick Taran (editor) with Irina Ivakhnyuk, Maria da Conceição Pereira Ramos and Arno Tanner. (Strasbourg).

EU. 2004. Common Basic Principles on Integration (CBPs) Justice and Home Affairs. 14615/04 (Press 321). 19 November 2004

EU. 2005 Framework Strategy for Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunities, EC Communication COM (2005) 224 final, 1 June 2005

ILO. 2004. *Resolution and Conclusions on a Fair Deal for Migrant Workers in the Global Economy*, International Labour Conference, 92nd Session, June 2004. (Geneva ILO)
http://www.ilo.org/migrant/download/ilcmig_res-eng.pdf

ILO. 2006. Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration: Non-binding principles and guidelines for a rights-based approach to labour migration (Geneva).
http://www.ilo.org/public/libdoc/ilo/2006/106B09_343_engl.pdf

ILO. 2009. *In Search of Decent Work: Migrant workers' rights. A Manual for Trade Unions*. (Geneva. ILO)

OSCE-IOM-ILO. 2007. *Handbook on Establishing Effective Labour Migration Policies*, Mediterranean edition. (Geneva & Vienna) <http://www.osce.org/item/28725.html>

PICUM. 2005: *Ten Ways to Protect Undocumented Migrant Workers*, PICUM (Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants) Brussels.
<http://www.picum.org/sites/default/files/data/PICUM%20Ten%20Ways%20to%20Protect%20Undocumented%20Migrant%20Workers.pdf>.

Steering Committee (2009): *Guide to ratification of the International Convention on rights of migrant workers*. Available at
http://www.migrantsrights.org/documents/ICRMWRatificationGuide_December2009English.pdf

Taran, Patrick. 2007: "Clashing Worlds: Imperative for a Rights-Based Approach to Labour Migration in the Age of Globalization" in *Globalization, Migration and Human Rights: International Law under Review*, (Bruylant, Brussels)

Taran, Patrick and Demaret, Luc. 2006: "Action Imperatives for Trade Unions and Civil Society" in *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal*, vol 15, n° 3, Quezon City, Philippines, 2006

UNESCO. 2009: *Migration and Human Rights. The United Nations Convention on Migrant Workers' Rights* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press and UNESCO Publishing.