

Rethinking Global Migration New Realities, New Opportunities, New Challenges

On May 25, 2006, Immigration Studies at New York University, the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University, and the Pew Hispanic Center convened a conference entitled “Rethinking Global Migration: New Realities, New Opportunities, New Challenges” with the aim of exploring new empirical, conceptual, and theoretical work on international immigration with a focus on Mexican migration to the United States. This joint publication by the Pew Hispanic Center and Immigration Studies at NYU provides an edited transcript of the two major addresses delivered at the conference: The first is by Mary Robinson, former president of Ireland and former U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights. The second is by the foreign minister of Mexico, Luis Ernesto Derbez Bautista. The conference also featured two roundtable discussions by scholars of immigration. A video of the event can be found on the website of the Institute for Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings at the Steinhardt School of Education at New York University, which hosted the event.

(<http://steinhardt.nyu.edu/igems/CONFERENCE/program.html>)

The Pew Hispanic Center, a non-partisan, research organization, does not advocate for or take positions on issues. The views expressed by the conference participants are their own and do not represent either the Pew Hispanic Center or the organization that supports it, The Pew Charitable Trusts.

About the Pew Hispanic Center: Founded in 2001, the Pew Hispanic Center is a nonpartisan research organization supported by The Pew Charitable Trusts, a Philadelphia-based charity. The Pew Hispanic Center’s mission is to improve understanding of the diverse Hispanic population and to chronicle Latinos’ growing impact on the nation. The Pew Hispanic Center is a project of the Pew Research Center, a nonpartisan “fact tank” in Washington, D.C., that provides information on the issues, attitudes, and trends shaping America and the world; it does not advocate for or take positions on policy issues.

About Immigration Studies at NYU: IS@NYU is devoted to the scholarly study of immigration with a focus on children, youth and families. IS@NYU focuses on basic research that is comparative, interdisciplinary and longitudinal. Through research, lectures, publications and media outreach, it endeavors to enhance the scholarly understanding of one of the most pervasive and complex issues of our times.

Contents

Contents	ii
Introduction.....	1
By Marcelo Suárez-Orozco-Orozco and Roberto Suro	1
Conference Participants	3
Speech by Mary Robinson	4
Q&A for Mary Robinson	15
Speech by Luis Ernesto Derbez Bautista	24
Q&A for Minister Derbez.....	35

Introduction

By **Marcelo Suárez-Orozco-Orozco and Roberto Suro**

Immigration today is too large a phenomenon to fall into the easy trap of American exceptionalism. Indeed, immigration is not simply a matter of US - Mexican or US - Latin American relevance. It is a global phenomenon that, for the first time in human history, has high stakes implications everywhere. With nearly 200 million migrants around the world, immigration today affects every continent on earth. *Rethinking Global Migration: New Realities, New Opportunities, New Challenges* sought to offer a broad, comparative perspective on this topic of growing importance and to help place policy debates in an international context.

This special joint publication of the Pew Hispanic Center and Immigration Studies at NYU includes two reflections on global migration that framed the roundtable. The opening address by Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland and former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, frames immigration as an international dynamic and argues for a series of human rights principles that ought to guide policy work on its regulation and management. The closing address by Luis Ernesto Derbez Bautista, Mexico's Secretary of Foreign Relations, provides a Mexican perspective on the current U.S. immigration debate largely missing from most discussions.

Migration has been a defining feature in the making of humanity from our very emergence as a species in the African savanna. Yet, perhaps for the first time in history, nearly all nation-states have become either countries of immigration, emigration or transit countries. As President Robinson argues in her address, immigration today is best understood in the context of increasingly interdependent, globally linked, economies and societies.

First, transnational capital flows and economic development tend to stimulate migration. Where capital flows, immigrants follow. Second, new information, communication, and media technologies stimulate migration because they generate new desires, tastes, and consumption practices. Would-be immigrants

imagine better lives elsewhere and mobilize to achieve them. Third, deeply globalized economies are increasingly structured around a somewhat voracious appetite for foreign workers—both in the highly remunerated knowledge-intensive sector and in the least desirable economic sectors. Fourth, the affordability of mass transportation has put the option of migration within the reach of millions who previously could not find the financial means to travel. Fifth, globalization has stimulated new migration because it has produced uneven results. In short, factors that extend beyond the boundaries of the nation state are both stimulating and structuring the new migratory flows. The enduring concern over undocumented immigration in many parts of the world suggests that as a result of these factors—economic, social and cultural—substantial migratory flows are not easily managed by state actions such as unilateral controls of international borders.

As scholars, government leaders, and the public seek to understand the realities of contemporary immigration and the policy challenges it presents, broader perspectives are certain to become increasingly useful. The aim of the conference was to look across academic disciplines and beyond borders in search of those perspectives. We hope that the two presentations that follow below offer a good point of departure.

Conference Participants

Rethinking Global Migration: New Realities, New Opportunities, New Challenges

—Major Addresses—

Mary Robinson, former president of Ireland and former U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights

Luis Ernesto Derbez Bautista, Secretary of Foreign Relations, Mexico

—Roundtable Discussions—

I. Rethinking Immigration Policy

Francisco Alba	El Colegio de Mexico
Cristina Rodriguez	New York University
Saskia Sassen	University of Chicago
Jorge Santibanez	El Colegio de la Frontera Norte
Marcelo Suarez-Orozco (chair)	New York University

II. Rethinking Immigration, Integration and Assimilation

Richard Alba	State University of New York
Guillermina Jasso	New York University
Robert C. Smith	City University of New York
Carola Suarez-Orozco	New York University
Roberto Suro (chair)	Pew Hispanic Center

Speech by Mary Robinson

It is always a pleasure to be back at NYU. As some of you may know, one of the hats I wear these days is that of professor at Columbia University, that “other” New York university! So I welcome opportunities like this to do my small part in reinforcing the strong links between these two great institutions, but also to bring back to Columbia the lessons I learn here at NYU!

When Professor Marcelo Suarez-Orozco and his colleagues in immigration studies at NYU kindly invited me to participate in this conference of leading scholars on the theme of “rethinking global immigration” – an issue close to me and the work I am now involved with at Realizing Rights: The Ethical Globalization Initiative – I was happy to be able to accept. Allow me also to thank the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, Harvard University and the Pew Hispanic Center for organizing this important event.

It is a great privilege to take part in a conference which brings together colleagues from different academic disciplines who are addressing similar issues. My aim is to bring the perspective of the field I know best – international human rights – to your discussions today. I will argue that without a common set of principles to inform more effective and coherent policy on migration related issues, and without greater international commitment to protecting the fundamental rights of migrants, the contentious debates around migration we see in so many countries today, including here in the US, will not be resolved. Without a common framework, the chances are that the future will bring only more barriers between nations and peoples rather than more bridges of shared responsibility and understanding.

I was pleased to see that your format for this event consists of two round tables which will encourage dialogue and debate. I would welcome a similar dialogue with all of you this morning. My prepared remarks will hopefully set the scene for our discussion by providing an overview of what I mean by “a human rights approach to migration”, based on my past experience as United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, my participation during 2005 as a member of the Global Commission on International Migration and my current work with

colleagues at Realizing Rights – the project I started after leaving the UN in 2002 in collaboration with Columbia University, the Aspen Institute and the International Council on Human Rights Policy.

Our mission at Realizing Rights is to demonstrate how internationally agreed human rights standards and mechanisms, including a strong gender perspective, can be used more effectively to address some of today's most pressing global challenges, from inequities in international trade policies and global health standards to the subject which is central to this conference – problems and opportunities associated with the growing movement of people across national borders.

After providing this conceptual overview, I will seek to explain how the human rights approach links to the current debate here in the US around immigration reform and US relations, in particular, with its neighbor to the south - Mexico. I should note that I will deliberately avoid commenting specifically on any of the legislative proposals currently being considered by the US Congress. Instead, my aim is to highlight how policy makers and the American people might think differently and reach more effective and equitable solutions to addressing the opportunities and challenges of migration in the 21st century if their starting point was greater attention to human rights and shared responsibilities for effective migration policies in the years ahead.

Globalization, migration and human rights

Let me begin by pointing out what may seem obvious but is often overlooked in my experience. The forces of economic globalization have encouraged the free movement of goods, services, capital and ideas around the world. But despite these trends toward greater openness and interdependence between nations, we all know that barriers to cross-border movement of people are still firmly in place. Globalization of markets has not been matched by globalization of the work force and labor markets. National sovereignty in immigration matters remains the rule. We continue to see sharp discordance between the number of individuals who wish to migrate and the legal opportunities for them to do. This fact has fueled irregular migration and the increasing smuggling of human beings across borders in life threatening conditions.

As population and poverty trends continue to further divide the world between overpopulated, young and poor states on one hand, and wealthy, aging and declining population states on the other, migratory pressures will only intensify, making the need for a coordinated and principle-based policy framework to guide this phenomenon ever more urgent. That is where I believe greater attention to human rights can make a difference.

Human rights concerns can be seen at every stage in the migratory cycle: beginning in the country of origin, during transit, and in the country of destination. While some migrants, usually skilled workers who leave their home countries to take up professional jobs elsewhere, may encounter relatively few human rights problems, unskilled workers, who form the majority of today's migrants, are vulnerable to a wide range of rights violations. Indeed, in many instances, they have made the decision to migrate precisely because of the human rights situation in their own countries.

I saw for myself during five years as UN High Commissioner for Human Rights how, at the first stage in the migration cycle, "push factors" which triggered migration often included violations of economic and social rights to a decent standard of living, to adequate health care, education, and housing among others. At the same time, violations of civil and political rights, including during civil conflict that fall below the persecution "threshold" needed for a successful asylum claim, are also fueling much of today's migration.

We should also note that common explanations of migration — to find work, to secure a better livelihood — tend to obscure the degree to which different flows of economic migration are, in fact, less than voluntary. For example, research concerning why some women, who make up a growing percentage of migrants today, are at greater risk of trafficking has shown that illiteracy, gender discrimination enshrined in national law and practice, violence against women and girls, and low economic status of women and girls all result in heightened vulnerability to trafficking or migration in less than voluntary circumstances.

Human rights concerns are also evident once the migrant has arrived in the receiving country. It is clear that as strangers to a society, migrants are often unfamiliar with the national language, laws, and practice, and so less able to know and claim their rights. They are more likely to face discrimination, unequal

treatment, and unequal opportunities in the workplace and more likely to work in sectors where labor standards are not applied or not applicable.

Equally important, illegal migrants face deportation if they come to the attention of the national authorities so it is understandable that they often do not seek protection under the law of the society in which they live. They fear that contact with the police, reporting abusive working conditions, or even taking part in civil formalities such as property ownership, marriage, registration of the birth of a child or using schools and hospitals could result in deportation. This creates marginalized communities, which are not in the interests of the host country – particularly at a time of when challenges such as preventing the spread of disease like HIV/AIDS requires public information, public education and public health measures which make no distinction between citizen, legal immigrant and illegal migrant.

Racism and xenophobia are also particular problems, as we have witnessed in many European countries, not only in response to perceived threats of migrants to the economic security of citizens, but also to national security concerns as has been the case here in the US against some immigrants following the terrible attacks of September 11, 2001. We have seen how at times of political tension, migrants may be the first to be suspected as security risks. By linking anti-terrorism measures and immigration control in the context of the so called "war on terror," many governments have encouraged — however unintentionally — xenophobia against migrants and refugees.

It is important to stress that a human rights approach to migration recognizes the place for law enforcement, but also recognizes its limitations. A human rights perspective would ensure that undocumented or illegal migrants are not seen as one undifferentiated group, but instead make clear, for example, that asylum seekers and refugees who might move illegally have a right to do so under international law. Equally, it would ensure that persons who have been trafficked are seen as victims and not as offenders.

I believe we must give greater attention to protecting the human rights of migrants as a starting point for better policy in a range of areas – from security to labor to health, to name only a few. We should keep in mind that historically there has been what is sometimes called a “protection gap” for migrants, falling as they do between the two stools of citizens’ rights and those of internationally protected individuals, such as refugees, the stateless and – even - diplomats. Despite their

inherent vulnerability, migrants have never enjoyed a special status under international human rights law, except in the special case of refugees.

Seeking to fill this gap, UN member states agreed in 1990 to adopt new law. The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrants Workers and Members of their Families codifies provisions found in different human rights treaties, and protects undocumented as well as legal migrant workers. It constitutes the standard which we should apply to protect both regular and undocumented migrants. The Convention affirms the fundamental human rights of all migrant workers and members of their families. It offers a set of standards: protection against arbitrary arrest, rights to due process, privacy, and trade union membership and activity and requires treatment which is ‘not less favorable’ than that which applies to nationals in respect of pay and conditions of work. The Convention also defines the economic, social and cultural rights of migrants, for example, that urgent medical care must be provided as it would to a national, and that children of migrant workers have the basic right to access to education, irrespective of legal status.

It is important to note that although the migrant workers convention has not yet achieved wide ratification, this does not mean that migrants are without protection under international human rights law. Clear and relevant principles exist, for example, in the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, which has been ratified by all countries but two, Somalia and the United States. A quick review of that Convention’s principles shows that they provide the framework for good policy from the standpoint of states, as well as essential protection for the children of migrants.

And while I think there is much that could be done to promote such standards further, the reality is that no international migration institution or mechanism frames or manages the rights of people who move between countries. At the national level, policies tend to focus overwhelmingly on the legal exclusion of unauthorized migrants.

Global Commission on International Migration

I was pleased to serve during 2005 as a member of a Global Commission on International Migration which sought to address these challenges. Our aim was to

reframe in a more positive way the migration debate around the world and offer principles which could guide future national and international policy making.

The GCIM final report titled “Migration in an interconnected world: New directions for action” was presented to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan last October. Its central message is that the international community has failed to realize the full potential of international migration and has not risen to the many opportunities and challenges it presents. Greater coherence, cooperation and capacity are required for a more effective governance of migration, at national, regional and global levels.

One of the key issues we addressed during the work of the GCIM was how today’s migratory process has created multidimensional links between countries of origin and destination. To be sure, such links are not new, but their significance is only now being understood. For example, two key issues – the so-called “demographic deficit” in Europe as a catalyst for new migration, and the dominance of remittance flows over ODA as a form of economic assistance – have been recognized only in the last decade, as have the economic benefits of migration to the economies of receiving countries.

The Commission stressed in its recommendations that co-operative approaches to policy and planning are urgently needed between and within governments for situations where – as in the recruitment of health workers from the global South to North - skilled migration impacts asymmetrically on sending and receiving countries. We called on all countries to recognize common interests and shared responsibilities for managing migration more effectively in the 21st century.

Essentially, such policies should recognize migrants as participants in economic and social development, and encourage this participation through enabling frameworks in both countries of origin and destination, and through greater integration. Policy making must also become more coherent, and reflect the interests of different parts of government. For example, for too long migration has not been considered a part of the development agenda, nor have development objectives been integrated in national migration policies. This situation, which is sometimes characterized as institutional ‘incoherence’, is increasingly seen as unrealistic and even counter productive. The reality is that migration cuts across every department of government – labor, agriculture, budget, housing, health, social security - in addition to interior ministries. A deliberate link needs to be made by policy makers between migration and development.

U.N. Dialogue on Migration and Development

How such approaches of what I like to call “co-development” - borrowing from the term coined by the French government but used here in a more expansive sense - are applied will, of course, differ from situation to situation. A great deal of learning and sharing of experiences between countries and regions still needs to happen. Fortunately, an opportunity for such exchange at the international level presents itself this September at the United Nations here in New York. For the first time in its history, the UN General Assembly will take up the issue of migration and development. This High Level Dialogue will gather leaders from around the world to identify policy actions to maximize the development benefits of migration and minimize its negative impacts.

My hope is that the GA dialogue will build on GCIM recommendations, for example, that diasporas should be more involved as participants and agents in development, working directly with states and development agencies to improve conditions in sending and receiving countries. Institutional arrangements – official and unofficial - to strengthen connections between diasporas and their countries of origin; for example, India’s High Level Committee on the Indian Diaspora, and Mexico’s Presidential Office for Mexicans Abroad, or independent bodies with representatives from government, private sector, professional organizations, voluntary agencies and migrants are all examples which should be studied by others.

Similarly, economic arrangements such as lowering the costs, and facilitating the means, of remittance transfer as is the case in Mexico’s POFECO project which monitors the remittance market, giving Mexicans in the US information about prices and consumer rights; and enabling migrants to channel remittances into public projects, and then matching individual and community migrant remittances with public money – as France has done to develop schools, health centers and infrastructure building in Senegal and Mali - are all good practices demonstrating what can be done through greater cooperation.

Because of our focus on bringing the experience and voices of Africa to globalization issues, we at Realizing Rights will be highlighting the issue of health worker migration during the UN dialogue on migration and development.

A recent visit we made to Ghana provides an illustrative example of the migration pressures that many African countries feel in a rapidly globalizing world. Between 1995 and 2002, Ghanaian medical schools trained 702 doctors, and 487 of them emigrated. In 2002 alone, 94 were trained, and all but 4 left. The outflow in Ghana means that its people are not benefiting from their own investment in health professionals. Currently, Ghana has only one-third of the doctors it needs to fulfill its own citizens' right to health, and even fewer nurses. In contrast, 23% of the doctors here in New York City are Ghanaian.

The 'push factors' underlying health worker emigration are not hard to see. They include working conditions and low pay in the health sector in many countries, as well as wider aspects of poor governance, corruption and development deficits. Until these are reversed, health workers in many developing countries will continue to leave.

Countries of health worker emigration and of recruitment have common interests and shared responsibilities. In some cases, where there is a pattern of health worker recruitment between two countries – as the example of Ghana and the US shows - it is possible to speak in terms of a single health market in which both participate.

While I in no way am advocating that the rights of those who are willing and able to migrate for professional reasons should be restricted, it is clear that the development gains to recruiting states must be recognized in some way through reimbursement, compensation or contribution to sending countries. Responsible and effective policies must coherently reflect the views of all 'stake holders' in this equation – sending and receiving governments, their health services, budgetary and educational authorities and diaspora communities. In a globalized world, the emigration of skilled workers is not necessarily wrong in itself, provided the negative effects on the sending country are addressed.

My hope is that the UN dialogue in September will not only help to highlight such concerns, but will also identify ways in which the international community can begin to address such issues in an ongoing and more structured way. Despite all its shortcomings and the continuing difficulties of achieving reform, I believe the United Nations must play a central role in providing a space for greater international cooperation on migration and development issues in the years ahead.

U.S. immigration reform

Finally, allow me to say a few words about how this broader international context I have stressed applies to current discussions here in the US on immigration reform and to some specific aspects of your agenda for today.

I wish to be clear that I speak both as a friend of America and as a “temporary migrant” in this country. I believe the United States continues to offer unparalleled opportunities for people from every part of the world. But Americans also rightly see that the present immigration system is broken. A way must be found to address the situation of the estimated 12 million unauthorized immigrants living in the United States today. Equally important, a comprehensive US immigration system fit for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century is needed.

In my view, the only viable long-term solution to the issue of undocumented immigrants is through legalization. Most estimates suggest that of the 12 million undocumented immigrants in the US, well over 7 million are working and contributing to their communities and the life of the nation. Even the strongest critics of legalization acknowledge that if it were possible to send unauthorized immigrants back to their home countries, it would have huge impacts on US economic competitiveness in the world and create all kinds of problems for families and communities.

The fact is that protecting migrants’ rights is central to any effective migration management. It is also a pre-condition for migrants’ ability to lead economically productive lives. In the broadest sense, policies which promote legalization of status, access to health care and adequate housing, training, and language acquisition all build the capacity of diaspora communities to access the labor market integrate into their new society, even while maintaining close ties to their countries of origin, and lead economically productive lives.

The ability of migrants to contribute to development in their countries of origin is greater where they are integrated in the country of settlement. Contributions to

development are limited from communities in which many members face discrimination, fear the police and courts rather than seeking their protection against exploitation at work or assault, are not incorporated in the formal labor market, and do not get an education of quality. These are all conditions which make it likely that their resources will be meager and largely absorbed by their own daily survival needs. Where they have no secure legal status, they cannot maintain contact with their home countries because once they had left the destination country, return may be impossible.

I believe it is becoming clear that any country with a significant population which is “illegal” will face a range of problems - border security, dealing with businesses which employ illegal immigrants, collecting taxes, fostering a shared sense of security and community - among others. It is also clear that no single country, even the most powerful, can “manage” migration effectively without a commitment to cooperation and a sense of shared responsibility for this issue with its neighbors. I am pleased to see that the President of Mexico has been here in the US this week seeking to understand better the views of Americans on immigration and that President Bush has stressed the importance of working closely with the Mexican government to shape more humane and effective immigration policies.

I was interested to see the recent proposal by the Mexican Congress which called for a new ‘migration framework’ which would address the ‘complex effects’ of migration on economic and social life. This framework would be based on the principle of shared responsibility, acknowledging that both sending and receiving countries must ‘do their share’ in order to obtain the best results from the bilateral management of migration. This proposal takes as its starting point that well managed migration is a development resource for receiving countries as well as, generally, for countries of origin. I am sure the Foreign Minister will discuss this further in his remarks later today. I think it is a proposal for further dialogue that the US government should study and seek to engage with Mexico on in the future.

I conclude by returning to the importance of human rights, not only as ends in themselves, but as a framework which can guide policy making in the years ahead. I hope that during your discussions today you will keep in mind what I see as four relatively straight forward points:

- First, that respect for migrants' rights actually contributes to economic and social development in sending and receiving countries. Migrants who do decent and legal work contribute more to development than those who are exploited.
- Second, that these rights are not a matter of choice, to be selected and enforced a la carte, but are legal obligations under international law, which bind all governments.
- Third, that under international law, the fundamental rights of all migrants are protected, regardless of their migration status,
- And finally, that the human rights framework can contribute a great deal to the harmonization of attitudes and approaches to policy making in today's world through the acceptance of common basic principles.

I believe all of these are important foundations for the management of international migration in the 21st century.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to speak with you this morning. I look forward to your reactions and to further discussion.

Thank you.

Q&A for Mary Robinson

Q: I'm Josh DeWind. I direct the migration program at the Social Science Research Council, and I welcome your championing of human rights as a way of approaching social issues, particularly since our alternative religious and political ideologies seem to lead to conflict whereas rule of law seems to be a safer way to proceed. But my question is towards how do you use human rights to get at basic social problems – or that's my concern that frames my question. So the basic question – if poverty drives migration, or much of it, then my question for you is, is poverty a violation of human rights? And if so, is asylum a right for people who are subjected to poverty or are states responsible for providing asylum as a way of dealing with the impoverishment of migrants?

And the second part of the question is, does human rights then become – in terms of migration policies, is the goal, or should the goal of human rights be, to facilitate migration as a solution to issues such as poverty, or should the goal of human rights be to alleviate the basic problems so as to make migration not an imperative?

MS. ROBINSON: I'm glad you stopped there. (Laughter.) Hugely important, but a number of questions bundled there, which I hope will be fruitful for the discussions later on, but I think important questions that we did discuss during the Global Commission on International Migration. And, indeed, in realizing rights, we're really trying to address these issues.

Briefly, I wouldn't be in favor of trying to expand the asylum refugee law. I think what we need to do is to perhaps flesh out more substantively the notion of co-development. What I was talking about in the context, say, of Ghana, that Ghana spends money training doctors and nurses, as do many other countries of sub-Saharan Africa, and then they emigrate because there are the push factors – the low jobs, low pay, perhaps other factors – and at the same time, the countries that they come to – the United Kingdom, the United States, et cetera – get a benefit gain. And we haven't taught in those terms before, so that's one aspect of it.

Another aspect is that if we link migration and development more closely, we see that what I was describing as those push factors are going to be incredibly dramatic unless we have more balanced development, so very linked to the Millennium Development Goals and actually accelerating development. Professor DeAlba will remember our hearing in Cairo for both sides of the Mediterranean. For me, that almost said it all. We were in North Africa and the meetings involved representatives of government, representatives of international institutions, and experts on migration, and wider civil society groups representing migrants' groups, human rights groups, business, faith-based, et cetera. But we had a kind of profile of the region we were in and the profile of North Africa was a region that needed a hundred-million new jobs between now and 2015 to have any hope of reasonable economic development in that region.

And then you look across at the other side of the Mediterranean at the aging, declining countries of Europe and the estimate that Europe needs somewhere between 40 (million) and 70 million migrants at certain skills over the same period. But actually this wasn't what we were focused on; we were focused on barbed wire in an enclave, the pressure on the North African states of a migration from sub-Saharan Africa – not to get to North Africa, but to get to Europe.

So all of these realities were extraordinarily significant I think and, as I said, I'm hoping that the debate in the General Assembly linking migration and development will actually help us all in every country to look at the linkages between the movement of people, the push factors at home, the pull factors.

If you take, again, the health situation, my understanding is that the United States between now and 2015 needs 500,000 nurses and 200,000 doctors and will not train anything like that number, so it's pulling from areas of huge health problems. And even the preparations for the debate in September are refreshing because to the best of my knowledge – and somebody may be able to contradict me on this – Sweden used to have a Ministry of Migration and development but they don't anymore. And I don't think any other country has an actual single ministry on migration development, which is very helpful because it's bringing about a little bit of that coherence that I was mentioning, that all different departments of government have a need, whether in a sending state, a receiving – well, most countries now are a bit of sending, transit, and receiving, but there needs to be more interaction and coherence at national government level, better coherence at regional level, and above all at international level.

You didn't ask this in the question, but I just wanted to reflect on the discussion I had just the other day in Geneva with the incoming chair of the Human Rights Council, Professor [Luis Alfonso] de Alba, who happens to be also an expert interested in migration issues. And he was making the very valid point that the human rights council within the UN system and the Office of High Commissioner needs to have much more capacity to focus on. It has begun to be interested, but not sufficiently in this area. So I think we're in, hopefully, a new context and we really need that broader context of linking. And that's (my answer about ?) poverty.

Interestingly, I do think poverty is a terrible deprivation of human rights both rights to food, safe water, health and education, but also if you're very poor you don't go near the police because they beat you up. You don't go near authority. You look to neighbors as being the best help you can get. And if the reason for the poverty is a government failure to realize the international commitments which are to progressively realize without discrimination economic, social, and cultural rights, and money is being spent on military equipment which isn't necessary and on palaces, et cetera, then I think you can talk about poverty being gross violations of economic and social rights as well as potentially civil and political rights. A bit of a long answer, but it was quite a complex question.

Please.

Q: Yes, I think that we're beating around the bush. I think we have to come down to the real issue, which is the redistribution of wealth, and I'll take as an example Guatemala. I think it's 5 percent of the people that control 90 percent of the land, and this population is growing very rapidly. Now, it behooves the government to get them out. And who's going to apply the pressure on the aristocracy – their oligarchy – to change the structure that they have? Because the same structure exists here. We're not going to do it. Our government officials are not going to do it. So until we really focus on this issue, we're really going around in circles.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, in a way, by encapsulating the debate about migration as the human face of globalization, it does tend to speak to your point. If you have the kinds of inequalities in our world that are currently there, and if in fact a

lot of the economic policies that we accept and advance are policies that, as I said, accentuate and promote movement of goods, capital, services, information, et cetera, but not people, then we're actually worsening some of those problems, so we need to see the issue within its context.

And that's why I think the debate on migration and development is an opportunity for developing countries to open up a new emphasis on the issues of migration. It has been too narrowly focused; I certainly agree with that. Too much focused on border security, on whether migrants take jobs from nationals of a country rather than the wider context. And this is the first time we have an opportunity.

Q: (Off mike) – from Columbia. I think we've met up there once or twice.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes.

Q: Your observations invite the kind of criticism of human rights advocates that is very common, save my own department of political science at Columbia. And I'm trying to understand the incentive, phrased differently than the prior question, that states how to prevent migration (under ?) the kind of investment you make. Let me give two examples. And I found it interesting that in your discussion of the migration stream, you didn't talk about domestic politics. The Mexican state, as is now becoming common, is being criticized for its failure to deal. I met with some very high human rights officials in Mexico to talk about this. Their comment was they don't – "they," the government – doesn't care about those people when they live in Mexico; why should they care about them in the U.S.? That's a very different question. Colombian migration reflects a failure of a potentially failed state development.

Now, I don't hear how what you're saying is going to literally address domestic political problems, which you must address in order to deal with this problem. And to suggest this is an opportunity – everything is an opportunity or everything is a crisis, so I'm finding some real lack of coherence.

MS. ROBINSON: Well, thank you for your question. And certainly I did refer to some of the push factors, which are bad governance, violation of human rights

in the country from which the migrants leave. And, again, we looked at this in the Global Commission on International Migration. People leave because of violence. They leave because of conflicts. They leave because of inequalities that leave them very poor and very marginalized and they have no possibility of getting jobs – failures of economic policies that would address that of their home countries, and they have to be addressed as well as the sort of buildup of a better situation in the home countries.

I think that because in realizing rights we're very focused on African countries, I spent quite a lot of time going to African countries like Tanzania recently, like Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia most recently, and Ghana, as I mentioned – all in the last couple of months. And I find it quite difficult personally to go from this rich world of surplus to the stark realities of going for an hour's drive outside Dar es Salaam or Acra in Ghana into a local clinic where you have one nurse and 14 assistant nurses for 100,000 people in a rural, very poor area where the level of maternal mortality is very high, the level of child mortality is very high, et cetera.

Now, Ghana is a country that's really trying to address these issues. It takes time. It will need a lot of aid and better trade conditions. This is also linked to fairer trade at the global level. So, as was said earlier, I think everything is interconnected, but what I am of the view is that if you take a human rights approach of the kind that I've been outlining, it does balance some of those connections. It shows that some of the pull factors, like the fact that you have under-investment in medical and nursing education here in the United States, you'll get your nurses and doctors – many of them – on the cheap. They've been educated at the expense of poorer countries. That's just an example of some of the issues that we need to be thinking about in this way, but I certainly didn't intend to either gloss over or minimize the bad governance, corruption, violations factors that are push factors in our world, and of course we must address those.

And it's another reason, but I think that ultimately if we look at migration in this broader more holistic way, I believe that it actually helps to bring home the point – and maybe that was the thrust of the last question – that we cannot have a secure and balanced world where the world is so uneven and unequally divided. We have to address those issues of equity and fairness in trade in the WTO and in our development policies. And so I'm glad that we have an opportunity to discuss migration and development because I think it opens up a whole range of new good practices, bad practices, and issues that we have to address.

Q: I wanted to ask if you see the possibilities of connecting the civil rights of ethnic and racial minorities, including diaspora members of communities; for example, Mexican-Americans and others, to an analysis of human rights in order to enlarge the protections and services for migrants – documented or undocumented, thinking in terms of the civil rights games and principles in countries like the United States as a basis for strengthening or enlarging the space for the human rights and civil rights of migrants – education, social services, healthcare.

MS. ROBINSON: I think it's an interesting area where quite a lot is happening and I only know of certain developments that are happening. A number of you here may know of some others. Again, because realizing rights focuses a lot on Africa, I am more in touch with African diaspora in the United Kingdom and to a certain extent here in the United States who are focusing on issues back home, issues to do with building up local community development, health centers, education particularly for those who are vulnerable in the society and discussing these issues certainly. There's a trust being established in the UK to match what diasporas provide up to £50,000 I think – match it pound for pound. And I mentioned the French practices in Mali and in Senegal.

As that kind of discussion continues, I would hope that it might also reflect on some of the issues that you were speaking about, but I haven't heard that to date. I think this is maybe the next stage.

Q: I'm thinking specifically of the Universal Declaration of Rights relating to the right for minority languages, to racial and ethnic minorities and that right being a basis for asserting rights of undocumented and documented children to bilingual instruction, both native language and English as a second language.

MS. ROBINSON: Yes, I think it's perfectly possible that we will see that kind of debate emerging more and the reports of the committee on minorities of the United Nations and other ways in which this can be brought in to the debate.

Q: One last question.

Q: Thank you. Mrs. Robinson....Several of the things that you've underlined require coordination, both internally within a country – that being the coordination of immigration policy with development policy – and internationally, particularly between neighbors that are sharing the – one being the donor country and the other being the receiving country. I'd be interested in your perspective about something. Usually the receiving country is a democracy governed by people that have constituencies with particular viewpoints, and one can imagine that there are a couple of different ways of trying to get that accomplished.

Recently, our own experience seems to have been counterproductive. I know it's not your intent to discuss our issues, but there has been a national debate which has led, for example, to a very negative formulation a law in the House, and while it probably won't pass, nevertheless it's a reflection. The House of Representatives has a lot of people that are elected by the public and they're very sensitive to public opinion. So it would seem to me that the kind of public debate way of resolving that issue has not worked particularly well in our case. The alternative might be some kind of quiet diplomacy – just get the thing done and then we'll work at it that way rather than a sort of catharsis.

So my question to you is, if you leave the policy level and get to the practical, is there an argument for less public debate rather than more?

MS. ROBINSON: Thank you for a very thoughtful set of questions. I'm afraid I think we're in for more debate because the issues are just so kind of both complex and, as you said, they are increasingly divisive. That's a sad thing. But I think how I would like to answer your question is to touch on something I didn't really develop. What happens after the high-level dialogue on migration and development? What are going to be the ways of bringing things forward? Because it is a stark reality that migration issues are deeply part of the sovereignty of individual governments. They like it that way. They want to hold on to it as hard as they can.

And under international law, you have a right to leave your country but you do not have the right to enter any other country unless that country authorizes, so that's the kind of impasse of it. It's not an issue that can be dealt with solely at national level. I think that's what we have to realize. So in looking for a better discourse, which I think was really what you were saying in your question, I do think we need to think about a framework for governments to be able to come together initially without a deciding power – not legislating, not taking binding decisions but discussing on an ongoing basis and then neighbors on the margins discussing even more discreetly the huge issues that we have to address better. We have to manage all these issues better.

There are a number of regional fora, but there is not forum either within the United Nations or linked to the UN in some way for that. Secretary General Kofi Annan designated a special representative for the preparations for the high level dialogue, my fellow countryman Peter Sutherland. And Peter has proposed at least informally the possibility of some kind of a forum to enable governments to come together. I've heard a critique of that proposal which I think I would probably agree with: that if it's just a forum out on its own, it's not going to achieve very much – that you need a forum linked in connection with the United Nations so that as issues are dealt with in a more coherent way and agreed upon, we can have UN leadership, UN policies that reflect that because that's ultimately going to be necessary.

So I think it may well be part of your discussions: How do we have a good follow up to the high-level dialogue? The recommendations of the Global Commission on International Migration on a global migration facility with its separate secretariats were not fully accepted within the UN. The UN has strengthened its – there was a consultative group in Geneva. We now have the global migration group, which has enlarged to include UNDP and other agencies, and it hasn't decided to have a separate secretariat, which again I feel would give more weight and consistency. But it shows how tentative even the UN is in the agencies that share a piece of the migration issue – being able to come together more coherently.

So, again, I would hope that at the high-level dialogue on migration and development there would be a need for more coherence at the international global level, including the IOM, the International Institution for Migration, and the High Commission for Refugees, the ILO, the UNFPA – all of the bodies that have a certain role to play – that they will become more coherent – the World Bank, et

cetera. And secondly that there will be some forum linked to the UN for governments to continue this debate and to take all aspects of it to heart because it's just an incredibly important debate.

And I think I was with you at the launch of the Immigration Studies Center here in New York, I referred to how deeply I feel about this issue and that on the night of my election as president of Ireland I said I would put a light in the window of my official residence, which is called Áras an Uachtaráin, and I was the Uachtaráin, the house of the Uachtaráin, as a link with all the Irish who had to emigrate. And I totally underestimated the power of that light and the way it really shaped an emerging Irish diaspora. But I also saw what we did discuss in the Global Commission: the beginnings of what's sometimes called circular migration, the talented Irish who had left and done well in Silicon Valley – done well here in New York – wherever – were looking back at Ireland and all else being equal quite keen to come back.

So in the recent years, because Ireland has prospered, we have seen a return of those, particularly with young children who actually prefer to live in Ireland. Great as this country might be, believe me, I'm the same; I'm waiting to go back and retire gracefully in the west of Ireland. So thank you very much.

Speech by Luis Ernesto Derbez Bautista

We have two countries, Mexico and the United States, two countries that are in many ways linked by geography, by a very clear definition. We are where we are and we will not be moving away from there.

In the past 12 years, we had a very close relationship. It became very close because, in addition to geography, we decided that trade was an important element of the relationship between the two nations. So we started by signing the North American Free Trade Agreement, NAFTA as it's called, and we decided that we have to be closer and that that closeness will have to be put together with the idea of what kind of commercial and trade relationship will exist between the two countries.

And at the time of discussion and signing of the NAFTA, there was one thing that was left out. And it was not left out because it was an oversight; it was left out because it was considered at the time very difficult to deal with that as a specific issue of the trade agreement between Mexico and the United States, and that was labor. So when we signed an agreement, we signed an agreement on the assumption that by doing trade, that will by itself create the labor relationship on both sides of the border that will allow the labor problem in Mexico and the United States to be settled. But we didn't put anything of that in NAFTA, so we didn't have in the end a labor section on the North American Free Trade Agreement.

The discussion took place and President Salinas at the time decided that it was too hard an issue and too hot a potato and therefore we should be taking it out off the discussion because it will be practically impossible to have an approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement if it also included a labor element into it. That's a fact of life that happened 12 years ago. And we are back to square one. If you had asked me five years ago whether I really believed when President Fox decided to bring to the table of discussion a migration agreement between Mexico and the United States that we will be today having all newspapers in the United States, most if not all of the major TV chains having as the issue of discussion of the day migration, I would have told you it would be impossible. It's not going to happen that way. And yet this is the one issue that is in all the news and this is an issue that has now tremendous emotional concepts and content in the discussion

between Mexico and the United States, but also within the United States in terms of the definition of what kind of a migration policy you really want to have in order to solve a major problem that will include three elements: one is security in terms of the border security; two is a regularization of the people who are already working and living in the United States, contributing to the society and the economy but have no legal documents so that they can live normal lives inside this society. And thirdly, since for years to come we'll still be having a need on the supply side and on the demand side for labor in to the United States then it's a question of how can we manage that process that will allow us to have a legal, safe and orderly migration between Mexico, Central America, South America countries and the United States in terms of the labor market.

So we think of a labor market solution.... since there is going to be a demand in the United States for a long period of time for people coming from outside and since there is going to be a supply of those people--that element, labor--in many of the Latin American countries. How can you put together a program that will make a temporary working program function between our economy, the economy of many Latin American nations, and your economy – the economy of the United States? And that's the key issue, the key discussion that has been taking place in the past.

Now, when we ask ourselves this question of migration, then we have to ask ourselves: What is the role that we want to have between Mexico and the United States in the future? And I will add not only Mexico and the United States but also all the other Latin American countries that have been providing people and resources in to the United States economy and society. And the answer is we need each other, and we are by definition indispensable partners to each other. The relationship between Mexico and the United States is one that is very well defined over time. It's very well defined on geography and is now very well defined in terms of the integration of our economies and our societies.

And, therefore, there are a few things that we have to ask ourselves. Why is it that the more we look into the future, the more we have to understand that we have to work together – Mexico and the United States? Well, the first one is that for the past 15 years Mexico has become, as a result of the NAFTA, a major player in trade and therefore it has become a major player in this idea that through trade and open markets you can really get development for many nations in our world. And that's part of the globalization process and in Mexico he have understood that and we're working in that process. And as globalization takes hold, the

relationship between Mexico and the United States becomes more important because we share a common sense and value that it's through open markets and free trade that you really reach the levels of development and growth and employment that your economy and your citizens demand and require.

So we are partners in that definition. Millions of jobs in the United States, millions of jobs in Mexico, depend on this trade relationship between our two nations. Thousands – hundreds of thousands of jobs on the American side of the border, which is a common border between Mexico and the United States, depend on Mexican consumers and the fact that they come and cross the border to buy on the American side many of the things that they require in their daily life. And therefore if you look at that, you come to a realization very quickly that, yes, Mexico and the United States are partners in this trade process and both derive benefits from that partnership.

Secondly, Mexico has consistently been a major actor in the shaping of multilateral institutions and both the United States and Mexico recognize in the end that what you require is a world that is ruled by international law, a world where the multilateral institutions have a place, and a role, and therefore we need to work together. Mexico is a nation that systematically has opposed anything that will not be put through multilateral institutions and that, in the conflict between different nations, it believes that this rule of international law is what has to prevail. We are a reliable partner in that sense to a country like the United States.

Thirdly, Mexico is a democratic country. We are the tenth largest democratic nation in the world. Our set of values is a set of values that is very similar to the ones you have in the United States, and the conception of our democratic society is one where the value of democracy is considered an important value for any organized society in the world. We are a democratic country and because of that we are a natural partner of another democratic society, the United States of America.

So when you keep having this relationship, you start thinking very clearly that Mexico and the United States need each other, but that they should also become better and stronger partners over the process of time. And therefore the migration issue is not only an issue that should be looked at from an emotional standpoint,

but one that has to be looked at as the complement that in the end will allow our two societies to settle the few issues where we have differences.

How to handle the process of this integration of people between two labor markets but at the same time between two societies that share values, that understand the world in many similar ways and therefore that have to be working together is a crucial question that will be answered by the way that the migration issue is solved between the two nations.

I'm glad, therefore, to have this opportunity to share with you some ideas about the present and future trends of migration between Mexico and the United States. And I'm sure that from this meeting something hopefully will become for a better understanding of the migration phenomenon, the causes and the consequences for both our nations. Mexico firmly believes that managing the migration phenomenon requires a mid and long-term common policy that goes beyond any partial responses. As friends and strategic partners, as I mentioned, both countries must work on the logic of shared responsibility and bilateral cooperation in order to implement, through this shared responsibility and bilateral cooperation, the proper mechanism that will guarantee a legal, safe, and orderly migration process which will be also respectful of human rights between our nations.

Furthermore, a common migration policy needs to acknowledge that we face a human phenomenon which involves hard-working people who contribute to the economic social and cultural life of both Mexico and the United States. Immigrants are the center and the end of any policy that requires being respectful with their human rights.

Nowadays, the migration phenomenon has acquired a deeper relevance in both nations, originated in a broad debate and involving new social and political actors who years before did not raise their voice in this crucial issue between our nations. Like never before, President Fox's administration was the first one to introduce in the bilateral agenda—the need for a common policy to manage the phenomenon and to promote a fact-based debate between our societies and not an emotional one.

Looking forward towards a comprehensive migration policy, the government of president Fox started a dialogue with different actors in the United States, including federal and local governments, congressmen, commercial chambers, members, the Catholic Church, other churches, social organizations, labor unions to talk about this issue in a way that will imply for each and every one of us what are the consequences but also the benefits of migrants in to your society and in to our society.

As a result of the joint initiative by the Mexican executive and the senate, the relevant actors in Mexico, such as the Congress, scholars, experts and civil society organizations, finally reached a consensus and developed what we call now a state position: a policy statement that comes not only from the Mexican government, but also from all sources of life, academia, NGOs and congress. And that has been indicated to the people in the United States, through a publication in several newspapers, what will be the responsibility that the Mexican society and the state as a whole will agree on if the migration issue will be resolved by your Congress.

And in that sense, the guiding principles that we presented there are: one, Mexico does not agree and will not sustain or support undocumented migration; two, Mexico is very concerned because we understand as a joint responsibility problem the concept of protection on the border and safety and security for the border; third, Mexico also believes, as a state, that we have to keep a program that will fight against human smuggling and trafficking; fourth, we believe that Mexico and the United States, but also Mexico and a group of countries that are working as a team in terms of this migration issue from central America to South America and the Dominican Republic, should have a shared responsibility program so that we can control the flow of immigrants in the future; and finally, Mexico as a state recognizes its responsibility to create those conditions that will give economic and social opportunities to people in our nations so that they will not have to come into the United States by necessity, but rather by decision, and therefore make the migration issue what should be a decision taken by any person where he or she wants to leave, giving reasonable opportunities in the country of origin of that person.

I have to say that this position very clearly, therefore, emphasizes that we have to develop and enforce migration laws and policies that will also provide full respect to the people in our country because that is another issue that was settled and agreed on. What we are asking from the United States government is what we

should be willing to provide to those nationals from countries coming through Mexico or staying in Mexico and therefore our own migration and enforcement policies will have to be created in a way that reflects what we are requesting from the United States in this moment in time.

When the migrant worker goes from an agricultural job to the service sector, which is more stable, we recognize that this creates in the United States economy a completely different phenomenon from what was happening before. The Mexican responsibility at this point in time is to create those jobs into our own economy and not to bring this into the United States.

There is a myth created by many people that one of the big advantages of migration is the fact that Mexico receives on a yearly basis \$20 billion as remittances from its workers in the United States. That implies that a good policy for a country like Mexico will be to keep sending people to the United States so that every single year you will have a larger amount of remittances coming into the Mexican economy. There is nothing farther from the truth or worse for a country than really promoting that kind of a policy. The right policy is to create conditions in our nation so that the people who are getting jobs in the United States today can have those same jobs in Mexico and therefore rather than sending only a small proportion of the wealth that they are creating in this nation, create that wealth in our own nation.

So the vision of the Mexican government is very clear: we have to create the conditions that will be necessary in our economy, in our society, so that people can find jobs there and create wealth there rather than having to cross in a very dangerous way into the United States, and as a result of that be able to send a meager proportion of their income into the Mexican economy. Just think about that for a moment. If we can have \$20 billion in remittances this has to be savings from the people who are living in the United States. It would take a rate of savings of about 10 percent of your disposable income as an accurate and adequate amount that you will be able to save, what we are talking about is that these people do have a disposable income in the United States of close to \$200 billion. If they only send \$20 billion in to Mexico that means that they consume in the United States \$180 billion per year. If we recognize that salaries do not represent 100 percent of the value of production, then you have to recognize that these people are creating wealth in the United States at the tune of over \$300 to \$400 billion per year. The total GDP of Mexico is \$800 billion. We would rather have these people working in Mexico, producing in Mexico, and obtaining the

benefits of \$400 billion of wealth and gladly send as profits to those companies that made the investment in Mexico \$20 billion in remittances. That would be the right combination. (Applause.)

Why then do we believe that we need to create a temporary working program between Mexico and the United States, between the Central American countries and the United States? Because being realistic we have to create those conditions in our nations that will allow the investment to take place in our nations, jobs to be generated there over a period of a certain number of years. That's the reason why Mexico is supporting the concept of a temporary workers program. And the word temporary has to be very clearly there. It's not only temporary in the sense that the American people are thinking, which is you come for a certain period of time and then you go back to your countries. The word temporary for Mexico means, as we put our house in order, as we create those conditions that will make growth, investment and jobs available in my nation, I will need help to have these people, the people who are now at the age or working with a job, but I would rather keep them in Mexico and therefore I will start developing a program in Mexico that will slowly create the conditions to go from the 100,000 – 200,000 jobs that have been created by this administration – up to the point where you will be creating the number of jobs that are required by the new entrants into the labor market in Mexico.

Some of that is happening already. Through the whole program that the Fox administration has put forward in the past five years, this year with a stable economy the growth is happening in our nation and the jobs are beginning to be created. Over 700,000 jobs will be created this year in our economy. That implies that, in fact, the numbers that were too big in the past are slowly being decreased. If we continue with that kind of program and policies what you will see slowly happening in our economy is the creation of the number of jobs that would be sufficient to provide opportunities for every single person entering into the labor market in our nation.

That's the reason why the concept of a temporary worker program makes sense for us because what we want is to really become a temporary working program; in the end the idea being that hopefully the only people that will come in to the United States looking for a job are those who really want to have a job of that nature in this country.

What will happen if that really takes hold? If we create one million jobs in Mexico what will happen is that many of the people who are coming from Central America and South America in to the United States will stay in Mexico, and therefore one of the questions that we will have to ask ourselves in the long run is, if the United States still requires a certain number of people to have an equilibrium in its own labor market, then the temporary worker program will be the solution in the long run for the United States because it will allow the United States to have the people that you will be requiring in this country as well as for us to finally have an equilibrium of our labor market in our own nations.

Now this is a very important question that the United States will have to ask itself, if the projections that are given by all these institutions that over the next 10 years you will have a need of about 700,000 unskilled workers in your economy are true, the question that you will have to ask yourselves is, where and how are we getting these people to come to work in to our economy?

I know that emotionally it's very difficult to put these things on the table, but this is the reality of the labor market. Slowly people will have to understand that if we find a solution to create jobs in our own economies then you will have to ask yourselves where am I going to be getting the people to satisfy the labor needs that my economy has. A temporary working program makes sense because it will allow the creation of those conditions of equilibrium between your economy and our economies over the long run. That's why we believe in that, because we believe that being a country of origin but also of transit of people that will be the way to solve the problem of the safe, legal and orderly migration process between Mexico and the United States.

We also believe that, as we look into this concept, we have to start thinking of something that goes beyond the simple question of migration, and it's a question of overall integration of our economies and our societies. We have started a program with the American government and the Canadian government called the Security and Prosperity Partnership Program. An idea goes beyond a free trade agreement program. And what we are simply defining is that if we really want to think long term, then we have to think what will be those conditions that would create a structure that would allow our three nations to become truly a North American integrated society and economy.

This SPD program is a very important for the long run. It has not been recognized or understood by many people, but this is the future of our three nations. It clearly defines those conditions that will allow our three economies, our three societies, to become better integrated and more competitive vis-à-vis competition from Asia or other parts of the world. By pulling together the resources of the three nations, by pulling together the resources in terms of human resources, capital resources and the rest of the resources that our three countries have, we can become a very competitive North American region. And this is the game of the future in the world. We are going to be talking about becoming competitive as regions as we are facing now the integration that has taken place in Asia and as we're facing the integration that's taking place in Europe.

If we do not integrate ourselves and understand that this is the future, then separated as nations, as powerful as each one of us believes that we are, we will not be competitive in the long run. So the next stage really is to solve the migration issue, put together a program in terms of this temporary working program, and then think about the integration of our three societies, nations, and economies.

This is what we have been doing because we believe that in the long run that is the solution to the problem of competitiveness. We must promote also, and make progress towards, the international organizations that deal with the migration phenomena. And this is another aspect of why Mexico and the United States have to work together and why migration is so important between the two because in the end it is not only a question between Mexico and the United States, in the end it is a question of the migration phenomenon in the world, and no one is immune to that phenomenon.

If you look at what's happening in Europe right now, you realize that the migration phenomenon is also affecting that region of the world. They are facing a different set of concerns, but are facing exactly the same problems. How do you handle the migration issue between Europe and other regions of the world? And that, therefore, becomes a very important concept of how Mexico and the United States can work together. Normally and certainly our own migration situation today but also thinking how we can work through these international organizations in helping shape the policies that will be required so that the global migration phenomenon becomes one that will be dealt with in a humane way but also in a very efficient manner for the rest of the world.

We are concerned about that fact because the central element of a global migration policy will have to be dealing with human beings, will have to be what kind of rights they have and how can we protect those rights in the migration phenomenon through international law and principles. Human rights will become the most important issue in the discussion of the migration aspects of the world. We have to define that human rights will have to be observed without distinction of any kind where neither race nor color nor language nor national social origin will be a decisive factor of how the migration phenomenon is dealt with in the world.

In that sense, the Declaration of Human Rights – this Universal Declaration of Human Rights that we have—provides that concept. Everyone has the right to leave any country including his or her own, and everyone has the right to return to his or her country. Given this concept while we are talking about this in terms of the declaration of human rights in the world, migration policies will have to emphasize this international combination of respect for the rights and at the same time freedom for the process of locating themselves in any country if that is the need that exists.

Migration is by definition an emotional issue. The government of Mexico has promoted or is trying to promote a discussion based not on emotion, but in fact on rationality. The concept of labor markets, the concept of the future of our nations, the concept of how do we handle this possibility of helping each other with a temporary working program is based on the assumption that we can be rational about that and deal with migration in terms of protecting the human rights of every migrant that is now going from one place to another. We are certain at least in Mexico that only if we can put realistic policies between both Mexico and the United States we will find a better way to secure our border and deal with the migration phenomenon. But from the Mexican perspective, both countries have to put forward a modern migratory framework, one through which nations can manage this issue on a more efficient and human basis.

And therefore I want to end by saying that the Mexican government acknowledges the importance of the piece of legislation that is being discussed in the United States Senate today. This initiative, if it were to be approved, represents the recognition of the relevance of migration in both the economic and the social life of the United States and Mexico.

We have to keep in mind, though, that this is just one step and what will be required in the future is to continue working on this so that we can finally put together a program that will make sense for Mexico, the United States and the rest of the Latin American countries, which right now are the ones providing people in terms of labor but are also being benefited by the aspects of those jobs that can be given to them in the United States because we haven't been able to provide those jobs in our own economies.

Q&A for Minister Derbez

Q: Thank you very much for an excellent talk. A quick question: how does Mexico today think of and sort of plan around the whole question of Central American migration into Mexico? Do you see that as part of a continuum that is also in the discussion with the United States?

MR. DERBEZ: As you know, we put together a group of countries. Let me start by giving you the right answer. The concept of sovereignty as it is defined at this point in time implies that you have control of what happens within your borders. Migration has shown all of us that this is not true. Okay? Then what happens is you have people coming through your borders, and in the case of Mexico walking through the whole country, until they can find a job either in my country or mostly in the United States. As a result of that, we finally went and talked to all our Central American friends and told them that unless we work together it will be very difficult to have a solution to the migration issue that will have the three elements that we're talking about, one that will allow all of us to have secure borders in terms of the phenomenon being controlled.

Secondly, to have a common position where we'll be sharing responsibilities amongst ourselves and in relation to the United States. And thirdly, where the things that we will be asking from the United States are the things that we will be giving in our own countries. When we decided that, we put together this group that has been working for the past six months. We have now 11 nations, maybe 12, working together all the way from Mexico through Ecuador, including now Peru and the Dominican Republic. All of these nations are now working together in a common sense of policy for migration. What the Mexican government has done now in the past three or four months is recognize the fact that many people who come through Mexico stay in Mexico and would like to be regularized there. And so we signed our agreements with Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras where we agree to provide these people with regularization assuming that they can demonstrate to us that they have a job and they are working in that job.

This is what we are asking in general from the United States, and this is what we are now doing since the start of the program about six months ago. The problem with this is you have to convince the people that you're going to do it in good faith and therefore once they come out of the shadows and they tell you, here I am

I have this job. You will not say, thank you very much I'm going to send you back. Yes? So what we are doing is working with the Central American countries in a program where they have the right to verify and analyze what we are doing in terms of the handling of migrants.

Now there is a second part which is we want everybody to know that we recognize there are abuses of the human rights of migrants in Mexico. Okay? But that is not a policy from the government; that it happens, yes, and that we have to work together to stop this from happening, A, by training our officers so that they can handle all these cases with respect to the human rights of these people, and, B, that we can be supervised by the officials of those countries where they are coming from so they can be the ones verifying that we are doing everything in our power to respect the human rights of these people when we catch them and send them back to their countries.

This is what we're doing, but there is one more important issue there. Assuming that there is a temporary working program you would require to define not only working visas for Mexicans, but also for Central Americans and some South Americans. If you don't look at that as an integrated approach, there's going to be no solution, okay? Because if there were only visas for Mexicans, but not for Central Americans, then we will have a problem. We will be sending all the people in to the United States through a legal, orderly and safe framework, but the rest of the countries will not be able to do the same and therefore they will continue to be coming through land trying to reach the United States anyway. Unless we understand that, and I think we do understand it now, and we are working with them, and we put together a program therefore that will make sense for all of us, the migration issue, the safe, secure border issue is not going to be settled.

And so that's what we're working with. This is what we have told the authorities in your country and this is what we have been indicating to everybody that we are willing to work together with our friends and brothers from Central and South America so that we can have a common policy that will make sense for all of us, and where respect to human beings will be the most important issue, but also conditions through which we can have a legal, orderly and safe migration process in our region.

Someone else wanted to ask a question? I'm sorry? Left and right, left and right okay. Let it be clear that we started by the left.

Q: You mentioned that you're going to increase the jobs in Mexico by 700,000 but a lot of the people that I've talked to that are here, working here, indicated they had jobs in Mexico but they came over here because the pay was so low. Now, how can you first of all increase the number of jobs and make sure that they are adequately paid without first raising the taxes so that they can have the capital to invest in the country.

MR. DERBEZ: The first thing that you're seeing right now, and I can give examples how the scheme is working, is when I was the secretary of economy we put together a program to create jobs and investments in the automotive industry in Mexico. In doing that, we created conditions that brought investment into Mexico but we also requested from the companies that were coming and making these investments a program through which you will have second, third, and fourth level integration process because what we discovered is that most of the exports Mexico has only contain about 10 to 15 percent of national inputs. By creating this industrial policy program that is developing the lower levels of integration, what we have been able to create is a series of jobs that are well paid jobs and that create conditions into the globalization phenomenon by linking those enterprises who already are in to the globalization export problem with all those who will be creating inputs for them.

This program requires that you have a stability in your economy and that you have those conditions that would make people believe that investing in Mexico is a certain investment, that you will not be changing the rules or changing the kind of aspects that are – (unintelligible) – and that they need to make a good decision over the long run. Any investment of this kind is a long-term investment.

In addition, we started the program where joint, public and private investments in the infrastructure required in the country is taking place. The combination has allowed us now, in this year, to finally put together the kind of programs that are increasing production, integration and at the same time efficiency by having a better infrastructure in Mexico without having the fiscal resources because we haven't been able to get the fiscal reform.

We need a fiscal reform, but we cannot stop what we're doing just because we don't have a fiscal reform. And therefore this combination of public-private investments, this combination of incentives through investment. But then the chain will have to be linked in, to lower and lower levels of input, and that is the one that will create the jobs. These are the kind of jobs that are happening right now in Mexico. This is why the – (unintelligible) – industry has gone to a higher level of integration but also to a higher level of technology, because you cannot compete only by labor with China, with Malaysia, with the Asian countries. So what we're doing is going slowly into that process by providing the incentives that will make sense, incentives that are not that costly and in the end give you more rewards even with the same fiscal system that we have. This is working already.

Now, we have to continue the industrial policy program? Yes. If we don't do that, then we'll go back to square one. But in keeping with what we're doing right now we are creating more jobs. And I can point to you those sectors where we have done that. The automotive sector, the agro-industry sector, not the textile but the – well, even textile, we're beginning to do things with our Central American friends through the integration package that we can put together for exports in to the United States. But we are also pushing the electronics sector and slowly we are regaining that competitiveness. That's what's going to create the jobs.

Q: (Spanish.)

MR. DERBEZ: Spanish, that's fine with me.

Q: (Spanish.)

Q: Thank you very much for your exposition and it was extremely enlightening. I wish you would get the message out through the media to the United States citizen because we haven't heard this, I'm sure, as much as we have today. But my question to you is you spoke about regional powers in the integration of Mexico, Canada and the United States to form a regional economic power to compete in the world economy with Asian regional powers. Where does Latin America fit in? Does Latin America then become – the continent itself become a

regional bloc as well and facing a giant North American regional bloc? And what would be the framework for that competition of regional versus national powers?

MR. DERBEZ: I'm going to say something that will sound heretic in this environment, okay? But I already said it in Venezuela. The integration of Latin America passes through the United States. Whether we like it or not, it's happening. This is the largest market, this is the one that can provide the capacity to develop the kind of industrial possibilities and growth that we have in our economies. The example is very simple. When Brazil and Argentina went into crisis in the year 2002, the answer that Mexico gave to them was I open my economy to these goods that you have and that they have no internal market anymore. And so we went there – I mean, everybody forgets these things because our critics don't like to see the truth, which is Mexico has been the most friend of Latin America during the term of President Fox than any other country.

Because what we did is unilateral – we went there and we opened our economy and we said fine, I don't have money to give you – at the time, the price of oil was not as high so we didn't have a lot of money – but what we can do is we can open our market to your products with no reciprocity required. That's why we have a tremendous deficit now with Argentina and with Brazil. How can I finance the deficit? Because I have a surplus with the United States.

Integration passes through the United States because, in the end, integration means the capacity I have to buy and sell goods from you so that we can put together the right combination. And as we do that, we need financing to go through the process. The financing is provided by the surplus from the United States. So in many ways the lesson that has to be learned by our friends in Latin America, that we have been telling them over and over, not only speaking but doing things is let's integrate and let's – (unintelligible) – that the market that we want is the United States. And if we can put all these things together, we will be more efficient. The reason why Mexico believes in – (unintelligible) – is because I can be more efficient in the United States markets if I can buy imports from Central America and South America, process those, and then sell them into the United States. If I do that I'm integrating myself with the United States and with Latin America.

We have been fighting for this, and for all kinds of ideological and political reasons, people use any excuses. But the truth is unless you do that you will not be able either to integrate or to become competitive. So my answer to your question is yes, we believe that Latin America has to come along because we belong to Latin America, we believe in Latin America and we know that many of the resources that we have in Latin America can be used so we can go in to integration with the United States and Canada. In doing that, we will all win. And then you have to look at the market in Asia and the market in Europe and slowly develop and build these relationships.

Emotionally it's very difficult, yes. Every time you talk about these things, imperialism, all these wars come to the mind of people. The truth is, forget about all those. Don't think about the imperialism. Think about the logic of creating jobs, giving people the right combination, and then using the markets the right way. There are asymmetries, yes. So let's deal with the asymmetries. And that implies that, like Mexico did, at some point you have to say. I will open unilaterally because I want to help you and because I'm the one who can do that. If you want to live, you have to pay for it. And this is the payment and this is what we have been doing, but it's very different from all the rhetoric, okay? That's why people have to think carefully and in a relaxed matter. Yes, it makes sense to have a free trade agreement if you put those combinations that recognize the asymmetries and therefore defend also the possibility of the integration being done the right way. That's what we believe. That's what we have done. You can check the numbers right there: 2002, 2005, look at it and see what kind of products we're importing from Argentina and Brazil and look how we're paying for them. We're paying for them from here.

Q: You briefly talked about the subject of creating unions throughout the Americas. Would you think a union through the Americas emulating the one in Europe would be a positive long-term way to help stabilize the economies throughout the nations and Americas?

MR. DERBEZ: You're speaking to the converted, so the answer that I will give you is yes. The difficulty here is whether our societies are ready for that. Now, from my experience, the answer is no. Okay? So what we have to do is we have to walk and talk about this and say look, this is how things should be done because in the end that's what will create a friendly environment that we all require so that we can live in the future with peace, prosperity growth and all these things that we believe in. But it is an emotional issue.

If you say that in my country, this country, or many of the countries, you will have all these voices coming and saying no way; we don't want to integrate ourselves. In the end, the question that they will have to ask themselves is what about all the people who are already coming here? Don't you think that they are integrating themselves? Don't you think that they are doing exactly what you're saying the torturous way rather than the easy way? Look at the society that you have in the United States. Look at all the people who are coming from Mexico and staying here and having families and are good citizens and staying and integrating. Don't you think, therefore, that that's the way and that we should be thinking about it in a fashion that will not do it with this very disorderly process?

When you talk about that in a rational manner, everybody agrees with you. When you say, okay, then let's do it, everybody starts jumping back and saying well let's wait, we are not ready. So we are not ready. What we need to do is we need to create the conditions so that we will be ready. I'll give you an example. In my country people will talk to you and say, if you allow a foreign company to make an investment in Mexico and they will dominate the sector and production and economy, then you are losing sovereignty, so you should not allow that to happen. And those who agree with that are because they sell their country. So when you look at that, you think and you say the following answer: let me see, 400,000 people crossed the border and stayed in the United States last year. Do you really think that they are working in Mexican companies in the United States or do you think they are working with American companies in the United States? I would think it's American companies mostly, okay? Wouldn't it be better if they were working for American companies in Mexico rather than in the United States? Wouldn't that make you stronger as a country? It's a very difficult question for many people in Mexico. And the answer, at least my answer is, yes. Wouldn't you think that it would make more sense for them to be staying in their communities with all these problems that they are facing by breaking their families and staying in Mexico?

So the sovereignty issue – that is an emotional issue and it's very difficult to answer, is the one that doesn't allow me to work – (unintelligible). But we'll have to learn and live and do it, so I hope young people like yourselves will do this, even old people like myself, too.

Q: What do you think about one of the proposals in the U.S. Senate to legalization and how would that impact on what you talked about in terms of temporary workers while concurrently building so that people will have a choice of where they want to go?

MR. DERBEZ: It's a very difficult question because voting is taking place as we speak, so I really cannot answer that question yet. If you ask me in about two hours I will be able to. (Laughter.)

Q: Hello. It's a very illuminating project that you suggest could be working for Mexico in terms of jobs and the possibility of income that could be produced in a country, but I think that to have a complete equation here it is important that you could also tell us how does Mexico intend to work out a plan for education reform as well as other health concerns that are important to address. As you are well aware, the Mexican population here in the U.S. has the highest growth of childbirth. And if those people, all these Mexicans are to stay in Mexico, how will you adjust with a higher population?

MR. DERBEZ: The population growth in Mexico according to the NIC (ph) and the latest numbers that they just got out right now is close to 1.1 percent, so in the past five years it has really gone down partly because of immigration of people but partly because the reproductive rate of birth in Mexico has gone down very quickly ever since we started the programs in the years '60s of the past century. So when you look at that, you understand one thing which is very important and it is the rate of reproduction growth in Mexico is peaking and therefore it's going to reach a limit and is going to start going down. This is what's called the population bonus of Mexico.

In terms of health issues, we need to put programs that will transform completely education levels, we need to transform the educational system in to one that will put people in to the new border of technology. We have to shift away from many of the old traditional teaching in to educational, technological, engineering and all these things. Incentives will have to be given for that to happen. Changes in the structure of the education system in Mexico will have to take place.

We have done what we can in the past five years – (unintelligible) – the kind of looking at the issues of the scholarship program that President Fox has put together so that people will not abandon school because they have to work, the Program of Oportunidades, all these things that have been assigned have and ideal of trying to keep people in to school, trying to help children to have the capacity to keep growing and learning and slowly going and moving in that process. It's not enough, okay? Fine. This is what we had done. The years of education that now the INEGI has reported have gone up by about one year, from what we got meaning if we had seven years – (unintelligible) – now we have eight years – (unintelligible) – more or less.

All of these things are the things that we have done. In terms of health, we have all the systems, Seguro Popular, all the things that are trying to reach larger coverage. This is what we have been able to do, so maybe your question is can you do more? My answer is this is what we were able to do. It's incumbent upon the next administration to think about all these other things. It's a complicated question because there are too many elements there. One of them is retention, which is what's happening right now, has to keep going up. Then you have two open spaces so it can go in to higher levels of education every single time. Then you have to make sure that the demands on the time of the kids are satisfied so that they will continue to go to school rather than be used for some kind of a temporary job inside the market. All of these elements, and then you have to revamp the whole educational system. I have my own ideas, but it doesn't make any difference anyway at this point because I'm just the minister of foreign affairs. (Laughter.)

Q: (Off mike) – with NAFTA, what words of wisdom would you give to Latin American countries negotiating integration agreements with the United States. Would you encourage them to decide on the labor question upfront or other ideas and lessons and learned?

MR. DERBEZ: I think the labor question is being decided right now in the United States Senate, so I would tell them don't tamper with it, okay? Let these things happen the way they are. But I think what I would tell people is there are certain sectors in your economies that will be less protected after you finished the negotiation than they were before. In all of those cases you have to think of a program to help them adapt to the new conditions that you will be creating in their economy.

I'm telling you this because in Mexico the one sector that we didn't do right, not because it's not right in terms of the NAFTA agreement, but because we didn't do right the internal elements of that program, is the agricultural sector. And in the agricultural sector very specifically what I would call the rural development area. It's all these people who live in those kind of crops which are very inefficient and will not be able to make it efficiently if you want to keep them working in those crops; maize, beans, all the cereals.

When I was in a meeting that was kind of interesting with my friends from the National Agricultural Association, El Campo No Aguanta Mas and all those people, I sat with them and they said this is terrible because it is what the United States is doing to us so I said to them okay, fine, should I then sign a free trade agreement with Brazil, would that be okay? And they said yes, Brazil yes, that's Latin American integration, yes. And I said, do you realize what you said right now? Because I will be happy to do it but the problem is the moment we have a free trade agreement with Brazil all these crops that you are talking about will be wiped out because if there is one country that's efficient in the production of cereals, it's Brazil. And so? It's fine with me, you guys have just signed your death warrant; you will all disappear. In about five years I will not be able to talk to anyone of you because that sector will disappear.

So it's not a question of only United States; even when you're talking to Brazil or other countries you have to see and say well, if I go in to this these sectors are going to win, these sectors are going to lose. That's normal. What do I do to help those sectors where the losses will happen so they can adapt themselves and slowly turn around?

Those programs were promised in Mexico in 1994 and they were not put on, as a result of which those are the sectors where the major damage has happened. That's what I will tell my friends and that's what I've been telling them. Go for the free trade agreements, just be very careful to understand which one is the loser, which one is winner in your economy because then you have to help the losers; you have to help them adapt to the new realities.

They are what they are right now because you have a structure of protection. When you take away that structure of protection, you have to think what kind of

protection you are going to give them now so they can adapt and go through a process of whatever you want to call it – relocation, whatever. But people don't think of that, you know? You do these things you sign you walk away, things happen, and then you start having all these people suffering. In our countries in general, this would be the rural areas because we are still – Mexico is much less but still rural orientated countries so we have to be careful with those countries and help them. That's what I recommend. No one pays attention, but that's what I say.

Q: I have one other question.

MR. DERBEZ: You mean I didn't explain myself correctly?

Q: I just got back from Venezuela and I was really struck by what is happening there in terms of the government helping out the citizenry and I think that Chavez is convincing other countries that his way is the correct way to go. Do you see this creating a problem for Mexico? Because you were mentioning earlier that any plan for the other Latin American countries will necessarily be connected with the United States. This is ridiculous because you have the resources, everything in South America that could create a different block.

MR. DERBEZ: If they can do that, that would be fantastic. The Mexican economy is the largest of the region: \$800 billion. The Venezuelan economy is about the same size, 1.6 altogether. Put together all the rest and tell me if the size of that represents what proportion of the United States market. And then you start thinking, let me see. Yes, we can integrate and make a larger market among ourselves and that makes sense so let's do it, but what about the biggest market which is in our region. Shouldn't we be thinking about that one, too? So I'm not saying no to the integration between ourselves. In fact, it made a lot of sense to have a G-3 and it's not Mexico who is saying I'm walking out. So when you look at that, what you are thinking is that part of an integration has to go to a large integration which has to go to this market that I want to conquer.

Look at China. Look what the Chinese are doing. They're doing trade with the United States – large, large trade. They're growing 10 percent per year. They are using the investments from American companies to grow, create jobs, expand, be

independent and have sovereignty. This is what you do and you have to think that way. The social programs – yes, I think President Chavez has the right idea. You have to help to bring this larger social front because the one thing that we haven't done for the past 25 years in our countries, despite all these policies that we have talked about, is to create that income distribution that is required, those social services that are required, and that's what the population of Latin America is demanding today. What they are saying to us is, 25 years of this and what about me? I'm still poor. Social programs will have to be directed to (help those people?). And you have to do it so I think he's right in that concept, in the concept of how do we do this social programs. But at the same time you have to think that by doing that you're only solving part of the problem: you also have to generate productive jobs, efficient jobs, conditions that will allow you to continue to go that way. Because sooner or later the windfall that we have right now, and I'm speaking of Mexico, in terms of the oil income coming from a price of \$60 a barrel and \$20 a barrel will disappear. Either it will disappear because it will finish and you will have – (unintelligible) – or because the prices will come down again. In that combination, you have to take advantage of that windfall to make the right investment. Social investments? Yes, in addition you have to look for the rest.

Q: One thing that's really different is that Venezuela is spending a great deal of money on the education of the citizens; not so in Mexico, 59 million.

MR. DERBEZ: That may be true. We have a 103 million, but believe me we're doing big investment. Last one, yes? It's up to you. I have a lot of fun in this.

Q: Two more questions.

Q: As you said before, the economy of the U.S. is so much larger than the economies of Latin America combined, they probably somewhat – (unintelligible). How do you think – because you mentioned that Mexicans doing American jobs in America would not be as good for Mexico as Mexicans doing American jobs in Mexico; how much would Mexico even benefit from a country giving, say, jobs to them – how much would they benefit from that as we've seen in Central America that American companies are opening up sweatshops, American companies opening up other businesses in Latin America that haven't seemed to really benefit those countries that much. I mean, these are now the

countries that we're still talking about are in financial crisis. So how would that really benefit Mexico unlike it benefited other Central American countries?

MR. DERBEZ: It's still a question of relative thing. What would you do if you had no job? You will be looking for a job. So the question that the governments have to put together is, what kind of an industrial policy I want to have, what kind of labor policy, what kind of legal structures I have to put? And so what you will do is you will then be creating the environment that will allow you to attract the kind of investments and the kind of jobs that you would like to have.

The question that you're posing is difficult to answer because the comparison would be, do you really think that people are benefiting more by walking all the way from Central America to find a job in the United States, or you think that those jobs are the first generation of jobs and then you can move into a second generation of jobs of higher level, higher content, higher salaries? It's a difficult question because what it implies is you need to have your own set up of legal conditions that will indicate to the people who want to make investments in your country what are those conditions that you will demand from them before they make an investment in your country. And that's been a legal way a bunch of people that will be looking the kind of sweatshops that you are talking about. But you have to decide that. You are free to decide that and your country therefore will have to say these are the rules of the game and unless you respect those rules of the game I don't want you in my country.

But the opposite is also true: once I set out the rules of the game I have to respect them because if I change them then you are going to come to me and say you told me yesterday this was and now you are changing the rules. So we have to either work it out together or from the beginning I have to tell you what kind of rules I am willing to skip.

Q: How many American companies are doing business in other countries on a level of, sure, you've set up these rules that won't make us as much money but we'll be nice to your population. If these American companies that are exporting jobs to other countries can't make as much money there as they could in another country which has no humanitarian limitations on how much money they can make –

MR. DERBEZ: But then don't buy them here, okay? And they will have to come to my country. I mean, honestly I understand what you are saying. All I'm going to say to you is, if those are the rules of the game there is someone who is buying these things. In the end, that's what it is. So you have to tell me whether you really want to help me develop through job creation in my countries or whether what you want is a free market – totally free market type of situation.

I don't know. That depends from country to country. I have the privilege of coming from a country that can now set up rules because we have other aspects that are very positive for companies. So you have to create those conditions. If you don't have roads, if you don't have ports, if you don't have airports, if you don't have hospitals, tell me what kind of people you will attract and that will give you an answer. So in your development program you have to start thinking all of that and saying I have to create infrastructure, I have to create the health conditions, I have to provide educational conditions for my population – what the lady was saying – and in doing that, you will create those conditions that will attract the kind of investors that you want to have in your country. We can discuss and make that that clearer, okay?

No more questions? End of story? Thank you very much.

