

MIGRATION FROM THE SPANISH AND THE PHILIPPINES PERSPECTIVE*

La migración desde la perspectiva de España y Filipinas

María Isabel Torres Cazorla

Profesora titular de Derecho Internacional Público,
Relaciones Internacionales y Derecho Comunitario
Universidad de Málaga
mtorres@uma.es

doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18543/ed-66\(1\)-2018pp335-348](http://dx.doi.org/10.18543/ed-66(1)-2018pp335-348)

Recibido: 12.04.2018

Aceptado: 26.06.2018

Resumen

El objetivo de este trabajo es, en pocas palabras, analizar la situación de la migración en Filipinas y España. En particular, la perspectiva de la Organización Internacional para las Migraciones (OIM) nos proporcionará datos relevantes sobre esta materia.

Actualmente, 169 Estados son miembros de la OIM, España y Filipinas incluidos. Se estudiará, en primer lugar, la participación de ambos países en las labores de la OIM. A continuación, se analizarán separadamente las condiciones particulares de ambos Estados en relación con el fenómeno de la migración (referida tanto a la emigración como a la inmigración). Un tercer aspecto a tratar será la Convención internacional de las Naciones Unidas sobre la protección de los derechos de todos los trabajadores migratorios; Filipinas es parte de esta Convención, aunque España no. También se estudiarán los motivos de estas diferentes posiciones en la Convención internacional antes mencionada, junto con la práctica internacional en la materia.

* Cómo citar / Citation 'Chicago-Deusto' (Autor-fecha / Author-date / Lista de referencias / Reference list entries): Torres Cazorla, María Isabel. 2018. "Migration from the Spanish and the Philippines perspective". *Estudios de Deusto* 66, n.º 1: 335-348. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.18543/ed-66\(1\)-2018pp335-348](http://dx.doi.org/10.18543/ed-66(1)-2018pp335-348).

Palabras clave

OIM; migración; España; Filipinas.

Abstract

The aim of this paper is, briefly speaking, the analysis of the situation of the Philippines and Spain concerning migration. In particular, the perspective of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) will provide relevant data about this topic.

Nowadays, 169 States are members of the IOM¹; Spain and the Philippines are included in the list provided by the Organization. Firstly, the participation of both countries in the labour of the IOM will be studied. After that, particular conditions of both States concerning the migration phenomenon (referred to outward and inward migration) will be analysed separately. A third aspect to be covered will be that concerning the United Nations Convention on Migrant Worker's Rights; the Philippines is a State party to this convention, but it is not the case of Spain. The reasons of these different positions about the aforementioned international instrument will be studied, together with international practice on the subject.

Keywords

IOM; Migration; Spain; the Philippines.

¹ See <https://www.iom.int/member-states>.

SUMARIO: I. INTRODUCCIÓN: ESPAÑA Y FILIPINAS COMO MIEMBROS DE LA OIM. II. ESTADÍSTICAS SOBRE MIGRACIÓN EN AMBOS PAÍSES. III. ¿QUÉ PASA CON LOS DERECHOS DE LOS TRABAJADORES MIGRANTES? PROBLEMAS CONCERNIENTES A ESPAÑA Y FILIPINAS. *BIBLIOGRAFÍA.*

I. INTRODUCCIÓN: ESPAÑA Y FILIPINAS COMO MIEMBROS DE LA OIM

Both States are members of this International Organization, founded in 1951,² the same year as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.³ The situation of Spain is something original, being admitted as a new member the 8th of June 2006.⁴ The Philippines is a member of this Organization since 19th November 1988. It is a curiosity that establishes one of the first differences, concerning migration phenomena, between Spain and the Philippines.

In Manila, the capital of the Philippines, the Organization has fixed the Manila Administrative Centre, with relevant functions to develop the labour of the Organization in the area.⁵ Two years after the admission of Spain, this country and the IOM adopted the Headquarters Agreement to set up a representation office of the Organization in Madrid (Spain).⁶ The aforementioned

² See Andrijasevic and Walters 2010: 979, where the authors explain the origin of the IOM, as affirming that “initially called Provisional Intergovernmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, it was the product of a Belgian and US initiative”.

³ The IOM was formally linked to the United Nations in 2016, as an agency of the UN system, by an agreement signed in New York on 19 September 2016. The IOM Director General, William Lacy Swing, said that “the signature of this historic agreement brings the leading global migration agency, International Organization for Migration (IOM) – into the United Nations – the culmination of a 65-year relationship. For the very first time in 71 years, the UN now has a UN Migration Agency”. See this information in <http://www.iom.int/news/summit-refugees-and-migrants-begins-iom-joins-united-nations>. The same date, the Member States of the UN, in a Summit on this topic, adopted the New York Declaration for Refugee and Migrants (to view the text, see <https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/declaration>). The inclusion of the IOM as an agency of the UN family is a step further, because the IOM was granted Permanent Observer status to the UN General Assembly in 1992, and both Organizations signed a mutual cooperation agreement in 1996.

⁴ See *BOE (Spanish Official Journal)* núm. 255, 23.10.2012 (<http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/10/23/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-13124.pdf>), including the official publication of the Constitution of the IOM, adopted the 19th October 1953, with some amendments of 20th May 1987. The Constitution, with amendments entered into force internationally the 14th November 1989.

⁵ See <https://www.iom.int/administrative-centres>.

⁶ The provisional application of this Agreement, done in Madrid on 14 July 2008, was published in *BOE* núm. 244, 9.10.2008 (<http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2008/10/09/pdfs/>

facts may be considered starting points to advance in the field of migration issues, between the IOM, the Philippines and Spain.

But there is an unsolved question that needs to be answered: why Spain has not decided to be a member of the IOM until the 21st Century? It seems to be a complex subject matter not exempt of doubts. It is true that this Organization has increased the number of member States (in 1998, 67 member States; in 2006, 116; in 2009, 127 members and today 169). The IOM “stands at the intersection of the nation-state, international human rights regimes, and neo-liberal governance”,⁷ working “not only in the legal gray zones between domestic and international law but also in geographically ambiguous zones, where state jurisdiction remains unclear”.⁸ This institution, “strategically placed between the nation-state and international civil society”⁹ plays an essential role in the management of migration issues today.

There is a curious aspect surrounding the IOM: such as ANDRIJASEVIC and WALTERS affirm, “despite the fact that the IOM has become a major operator in the field of international borders and migration governance, there is surprisingly very little academic research that has interrogated this agency”.¹⁰ It seems to be a contradiction because, following the opinion of the aforementioned authors, “migration scholars routinely use IOM material as data and often participate in IOM research and policy programmes. But rarely has the IOM been the subject of critical scrutiny itself”.¹¹ Maybe, this situation will change after the agreement signed in 2016 with the United Nations, being considered as an agency of the UN family. To see the impact of the IOM in this area (migration in Spain and the Philippines), the next point will be devoted to the data provided by this – now – agency of the United Nations.

II. STATISTICS ABOUT MIGRATION IN BOTH COUNTRIES

The IOM provides data concerning outward migration from Spain: 1.230.415; in 2015, 2.60% of all citizens of Spain lived outside their country

A40506-40508.pdf). This entered into force the 23 March 2012, as may be seen in *BOE* núm. 91, 16.04.2012 (<http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/04/16/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-5089.pdf>). As a way to develop the relations with the IOM, the 17 December 2009 was done in Madrid an Agreement between the Kingdom of Spain and the IOM (see *BOE* núm. 93, 18.04.2012, <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/04/18/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-5237.pdf>).

⁷ See Ashutosh and Mountz 2011: 22.

⁸ See Ashutosh, I. and Mountz, A., *loc. cit.*: 27.

⁹ See Ashutosh, I. and Mountz, A., *loc. cit.*: 34.

¹⁰ See Andrijasevic, R. and Walters, W., *loc. cit.*: 980.

¹¹ See *ibid.*: 980.

of origin¹²; most of them, to different European countries. As a curious data, 1.305 Spaniards lived in the Philippines in 2015. Following the information indicated by the web site of the *Dirección General para las Migraciones* in Spain,¹³ the number of Spaniards in the Philippines was 3.575 persons. On the contrary, Spain may be described as a reception country for migrants. The inward migration to Spain was 5.852.953 of people in 2015, following the information provided by the IOM. It means that 12.69% of the Spanish population – in 2015 – are foreigners, coming from different countries (in particular, 41.334 from the Philippines).¹⁴ We find an event related to migration in Spain: this country, “with the lowest fertility rate in the EU of only 1.25 children for every women of childbearing age, found that the immigration influx reversed the country’s population decline”.¹⁵

Dealing with the Philippines, the outward migration from these islands was about 5.315.848 in 2015; 5.01% of all citizens lived outside their country of origin¹⁶ (most of them in Japan and China). The culture of migration is present in the Philippines, as usual.¹⁷ On the contrary, the inward migration to the Philippines is about 211.862, nearly 0.21% of the total resident population (most of them coming from India, United States or China). In general, the number of Philippines women in Spain is higher (66%) than men; most of them are employed in private residences or in the tourism sector.¹⁸

A recent information concerning migration to the Philippines is related to the so-called Alien Registration Project (ARP), recently adopted.¹⁹ By this, “all foreign nationals are required to present themselves before the Bureau of Immigration for biometrics capturing and issuance of Special Security Registration Number (SSRN)”. This rule is applied to foreigners living in the Philippines (workers, students, or residents), or tourists (spending more than 59 days in this country). It plays the role of being a security control instrument and, at the same time, a way to solve all the transactions with the Bureau of Immigration.

¹² See <https://www.iom.int/world-migration>.

¹³ See <http://www.ciudadaniaexterior.empleo.gob.es/es/portada/mapa/asia/index.htm>.

¹⁴ See <https://www.iom.int/world-migration>.

¹⁵ See Arnold 2011: 90. It is true that the economic crisis after 2008 has changed some of these considerations.

¹⁶ See <https://www.iom.int/countries/philippines>.

¹⁷ See Arnold, G., *op. cit.*: 231. In the same way, see O’Neil 2004; and Asis, Maruja 2006.

¹⁸ See PE-PUA diciembre 2004-enero 2005: 57-58.

¹⁹ See the information about this, provided by the General Spanish Consulate in Manila, in http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Consulados/MANILA/es/Consulado/Paginas/Articulos/20141017_NOTI.aspx.

What do these data indicate? In general, welfare conditions are an indicative of the way of live; in time of crisis (due to economic or external factors), population movements may be used as an indicator of living conditions. It is true that these data are not absolute, but they may be used as a balance to understand the context in one State or region particularly considered.

If we compare the data referred to the year 2015 – provided by the IOM – some conclusions may be detailed:

- a) The number of migrants that came to Spain (inward migration) was similar to those that left the Philippines (outward migration), at least more than 5 million of people. Nowadays, more than 10 million of Filipinos live abroad.²⁰
- b) The Philippines may be qualified as a country of migrants, taking into account the number of persons that left their country of origin and the percentage of them, comparing these data with the global population of this State (more than 103 million of people²¹). If we compare some of the States of this region (for example Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia and the Philippines), the last – that is to say, Indonesia and the Philippines – may be considered as migrant-sending States, without doubt.²²
- c) Spain has a changeable context, depending of the evolution of the economic situation. In the 20th century, migration to South America in the 30's (as a consequence of the Spanish civil war and due to political reasons) was frequent; similarly, during the 60's to the 80's, migration of Spanish people to surrounding European countries (France, Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands) was usual. In the former decades of the last century, the situation of Spain changed: people coming from African countries, Asia and America – in particular – considered our country as a “welfare State”, because of “good economic conditions”. As everybody knows, this context was dramatically transformed when the global economic crisis appeared in the 21st century.²³ Once again, the Spanish population is forced to migrate – in particular,

²⁰ See <https://www.iom.int/news/philippines-report-tracks-rise-migration>.

²¹ See <http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/philippines-population/>.

²² See *Migration and Integration in Europe, Southeast Asia, and Australia: A Comparative Perspective*, Pietsch, J. and Clark, M., 2015, IIAS Publications, Amsterdam, Amsterdam Univ. Press, p. 82, with a table comparing the situation of the aforementioned States. A relevant data is that concerning the percentage of population below the poverty line that in the case of the Philippines was about 34%.

²³ As a result of this crisis, Spanish policy establishes “migration focus on voluntary assisted return and reintegration programmes for those in social exclusion situations”; see more information in <https://www.iom.int/es/countries/spain>.

young people – trying to find their first employment and better living conditions. This situation remains today.²⁴

- d) The population of Spain is about 46 million people. Nothing to do with the Philippine's global rate. Another interesting data to be compared is the medium age of both countries: 24.4 in the case of the Philippines and 43.7 in the case of Spain.²⁵

Is the welfare state leaving Europe and Western countries? This is a relevant question to be answered, to understand migration and the consequences of this phenomenon in these countries, so different in essence, but involved in the “atmosphere” of those States directly concerned with this event. For this reason, the next paragraph will study the role played by both countries about one of the most recent international instruments adopted on this field.

III. WHAT ABOUT MIGRANT WORKERS' RIGHTS? SURROUNDING PROBLEMS CONCERNING SPAIN AND THE PHILIPPINES

- a) The United Nations Convention on the subject

An international instrument that may prove the awareness of a country about migration phenomena is the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of all Migrant Workers and Members of their families. It was adopted in New York, the 18th of December 1990, and entered into force the 1st of July 2003.²⁶ The Convention may be defined as “the most comprehensive international treaty in the field of migration and human rights”, and “as a vital instrument to ensure respect for migrants' human rights”.²⁷

Unfortunately, the Convention cannot be described by its success. On the contrary, “it suffers from marked indifference”.²⁸ Only 52 States have ratified it – most of them Asian, American and African countries – and no major immigration country has done so. Spain is not an exception to this tendency, and it is not a Party to the Convention. The Spanish position is described as follows by DE GUCHTENEIRE and PÉCOUD:

²⁴ See the evolution of the Spanish context regarding migration in García San José 2012: 421-440. Some recent problems may be seen in the document “Razones para el cierre de los CIE: del reformismo a la abolición”, 26 June 2017, in <https://ocspi.wordpress.com/2017/06/26/descarga-aqui-el-informe/>.

²⁵ See <http://www.worldometers.info/world-population/spain-population/>.

²⁶ See UNTS, vol. 2220, p. 3.

²⁷ See De Guchteneire and Pécoud 2009: 1.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*: 1.

“More paradoxical is the situation in Spain, where members of the Socialist Party called for ratification just a few months before coming to power in 2004; but did not follow up once in the majority”.²⁹

A similar position was adopted – in general – by developed countries (such as European Union member States, United States, Australia, Canada, China, France,³⁰ Japan, Norway, New Zealand, Gulf States, Russia, Switzerland, merely as examples...) together with destination States; on the contrary, the Philippines – as an origin country – signed the convention the 15 November 1993 and it was ratified the 5 July 1995.³² Such as PIPER explains:

“The Philippines was among the early signatories (1993) and was the first Asian country to ratify. This is not surprising considering that it participated in the deliberations during the Convention’s drafting process in the early 1980s and had been a significant labour exporter since the mid 1970s”.³³

The Philippines has been, together with Japan, the only Asian country “that joined the working group deliberations at least during the final phase of the drafting process”³⁴ of the Convention. This interest of the Philippines on migration may have historical reasons; this country have “the longest history of labour export in Asia”.³⁵ This case may be considered unique in the Asian context, introducing the so-called Migrants’ Workers Act in 1995,³⁶ around the time of the ratification of the Convention. More recently, voting rights for overseas Filipinos were implemented.³⁷

²⁹ *Op. cit.*: 15-16.

³⁰ Dealing with the EU members, some authors have qualified this negative to ratify the Convention as erratic, saying, for example, that “the French Government using as a pretext for non-ratification the fact that competence in the field of migration was exclusive to the Union according to the *AETR doctrine*”; see Iglesias Sánchez 2015: 177.

³¹ See the opinion of González Vega enero-abril 2017: 27-75, in particular p. 32. The author considers this Convention a resounding failure because although it has formally entered into force, it has only received the support of the countries from which the migratory flow comes.

³² See https://treaties.un.org/pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=IV-13&chapter=4&clang=en.

³³ See Piper 2009: 171.

³⁴ See Piper, N., *op. cit.*: 176.

³⁵ See Piper, N., *op. cit.*: 184. This author argues that “the Philippines Government began to involve itself in labour emigration when President Marcos launched an overseas employment programme in 1974 to address problems of unemployment, among others”.

³⁶ See Republic Act n. 8042, Migrant Workers and Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995 on the website: [http://www.poea.gov.ph/laws&rules/files/Migrant%20Workers%20Act%20of%201995%20\(RA%208042\).html](http://www.poea.gov.ph/laws&rules/files/Migrant%20Workers%20Act%20of%201995%20(RA%208042).html).

³⁷ See Piper, N., *op. cit.*: 184. More information about the rights of Filipinos migrants on Philippine Migrant Rights Watch website: <http://www.pmrw.org.ph/>. See the Acts – of

The circumstances in the Philippines explain the level of awareness of these issues in this country. Such as PIPER says: “the very large number of Filipinos going overseas to work over a sustained period of time makes “labour export” a very contentious issue within the country. (...) Filipinos (...) constitute a far more diverse migrant labour force in terms of occupation, skill level and geographical destination. Thus, the relatively better protection enjoyed by Filipinos is not the direct result of ratification of the UNRMW but the result of a complex set of issues”.³⁸ The role of the NGOs is significant.³⁹

b) Bilateral Cooperation between Spain and the Philippines

What is the role of bilateral relations between Spain and the Philippines in order to facilitate migration and labour conditions of their mutual nationals?⁴⁰ The *Spanish Official Journal* offers a lot of instruments where this idea – increasing Spanish and Philippines bilateral relations – is present.⁴¹

2003 and 2013 – and all the information about voting procedure for migrants abroad, at <http://www.dfa-oavs.gov.ph/>.

³⁸ See Piper, N., *op. cit.*: 185-186. This author argues that “Filipinos emerge as the best protected and politically most active migrant workforce. This has to do with the social profile of the migrants themselves (skills and education level); duration of the state-driven migration programme; diversification of destinations (not dependent on just a few countries); a vibrant civil society at home; and the most widespread civil society networks resulting in high levels of mobilization”, *ibid.*, p. 190.

³⁹ As an example, see *Migrante International*, a global alliance of oversea Filipinos, with information concerning them, in <https://migranteinternational.org/>. The role of civil society organizations in the Philippines is quite clear; the response to emergencies (for example, in 2013, due to the Typhoon Haiyan/Yolanda) is essential. See SIMM 2016. The project “One Safe Future” is another example to be cited; see Ranque and Quetullo-Navarra June 2015: 50-52.

⁴⁰ For example, in order to ameliorate labour conditions, by the adoption of bilateral agreements on this subject. See Pe-Pua, R., “Los vínculos...”, *loc. cit.*: 63-64.

⁴¹ The bilateral conventions – adopted in last two decades – between Spain and the Philippines deal with different subjects, trying to cover cooperation as a whole; some examples of them may be the following: a) on judicial matters: the Extradition Treaty between the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of the Philippines, done in Manila (2 March 2004) and published in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2014/05/13/pdfs/BOE-A-2014-5048.pdf>; the Treaty on Judicial Assistance on Criminal Matters, done in Manila (2 March 2004) and published in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2009/03/26/pdfs/BOE-A-2009-5029.pdf>; or the Treaty on Transfer of Sentenced Persons, done in Madrid (18 May 2007) and published at <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2008/01/15/pdfs/A02608-02610.pdf>. b) General cooperation agreements: the Cooperation Agreement on Culture, Sports and Education, done in Madrid (3 December 2007) and published in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2009/04/24/pdfs/BOE-A-2009-6771.pdf>; the General Friendship and Cooperation Treaty done in Manila (30 June 2000), published at <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2000/06/30/pdfs/BOE-A-2000-6771.pdf>.

Trying to solve problems related to Spanish citizens, some new honorary consular offices have been established in the Philippines (for example in Bicol, Cebú, Lloilo, Davao and Zamboanga).⁴²

Another aspect to be considered is the following: the consciousness of the State – Spain and the Philippines – of being a country of migrants. The conclusion to be adopted is different in both countries, such as has been said above: an important percentage of the Philippines' population live abroad, for generations; the Filipinos assume migration as part of their culture and their life.⁴³ This topic is described by the IOM on its 2013 Report⁴⁴; more than thirty years ago, the migration policy was assumed as a reality by the society of this country as a whole.⁴⁵ Natural disasters⁴⁶ and political instability are factors to be assumed, forcing people to migrate to another countries

www.boe.es/boe/dias/2001/06/14/pdfs/A20962-20965.pdf. c) Mutual cooperation agreements to facilitate mutual exchange of citizens: the Convention on Social Security, done in Manila (12 November 2002), published at <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2012/07/03/pdfs/BOE-A-2012-8848.pdf>; the Exchange of Notes on mutual recognition and exchange of driving licences, done in Madrid (28 November 2007 and 23 April 2008), published at <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2008/11/25/pdfs/A47016-47016.pdf> and <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2008/08/14/pdfs/A34476-34479.pdf>; the Protocol on International Adoption, done in Manila (12 November 2002) published and provisionally applied in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2003/11/05/pdfs/A39253-39253.pdf> and <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2003/01/24/pdfs/A03127-03131.pdf>. d) Referred to economic aspects: the Agreement for the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments, done in Madrid (19 October 1993) published in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1994/11/17/pdfs/A35272-35275.pdf> and <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1995/10/05/pdfs/A29253-29253.pdf>; the Convention for the Avoidance of double taxation and prevention of fiscal evasion on income taxes, and Protocol signed in Manila (14 March 1989) published in <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/1994/12/15/pdfs/A37746-37755.pdf>.

⁴² See the publication, setting up these offices at <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/06/20/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-6708.pdf>; <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/05/27/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-5533.pdf>; <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/05/21/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-5315.pdf>; <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/05/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-5001.pdf>; <http://www.boe.es/boe/dias/2013/05/14/pdfs/BOE-A-2013-5002.pdf>.

⁴³ See Brillantes, J.S., “Políticas y mecanismos filipinos en torno a la migración y el empleo en el extranjero”, in http://rimd.reduaz.mx/coleccion_desarrollo_migracion/relaciones-estado1/RelacionesEstado1_2politicas.pdf; in the same way, see the Report of the IOM <https://www.iom.int/news/philippines-report-tracks-rise-migration>, saying that Filipinos are the world's second largest population of migrants living abroad, after Mexico.

⁴⁴ See *Country Migration Report. The Philippines 2013*, <https://www.iom.int/files/live/sites/iom/files/Country/docs/CMReport-Philippines-2013.pdf>.

⁴⁵ See Durand, J., “El modelo migratorio filipino”, in <http://www.jornada.unam.mx/2010/07/04/opinion/014a1pol>.

⁴⁶ See Naik, Stigter and Laczko 2007: 13-15.

or, sometimes, to leave their homes (such as in the case of the internally displaced persons).⁴⁷

c) Surrounding aspects of Migration in both countries

The awareness of Filipinos about migration is clearly reflected on the migration policies and the information that may be easily found in the *Philippines Bureau of Immigration*.⁴⁸ Migration abroad, together with visa requirements for foreigners in the Philippines is provided on this website. On the other side, the Spanish Ministry for Foreign Affairs and Cooperation provides information about living and working in the Philippines.⁴⁹

Migration from the Philippines to OECD countries is a phenomenon that must be taken into account:

- If we analyse the top 15 OECD Countries for Asian Migration in 2013, this idea should be highlighted: Spain occupies the number nine on the list, being the Filipinos one of the main countries of origin (with a 7% of the global amount of migrants), under the Chinese (39%), Pakistani (28%) and Indian (11%).⁵⁰
- The vision of the Department of Labour and Employment of the Philippines is that “Every Filipino worker attains full, decent and productive employment”. The mission of this Department is to “promote gainful employment opportunities, develop human resources, protect workers and promote their welfare and maintain industrial peace”.⁵¹
- Since the beginning of this decade, the migrant remittance inflows in the Philippines have been increased (from 21.369 \$ million in 2010 to 28.403 in 2014).⁵² It is quite important in this country (9.8 % of the GDP).⁵³

⁴⁷ See <https://www.iom.int/news/iom-joins-philippine-government-and-echo-rapid-needs-assessment-displaced-persons-mindanao>.

⁴⁸ See <http://www.immigration.gov.ph/>.

⁴⁹ See <http://www.exteriores.gob.es/Consulados/MANILA/es/VivirEnFilipinas/Paginas/Trabajar-en-Filipinas.aspx>.

⁵⁰ See Hervé and Arslan 2016: 68 y 79-82.

⁵¹ See Baruah, N., “Labour Migration Infrastructure and Services in Countries of Origin in Asia”, in *Labor Migration in Asia: Building Effective Institutions*, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁵² See *Labor Migration in Asia*, *op. cit.*, p. 83; the net migration rate may be seen on p. 84.

⁵³ See OECD, *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development*, OECD Publishing, 2017, Paris, p. 30.

- In the case of the Philippines, emigration can increase women's economic independence.⁵⁴ There is a strong relationship in this country between migration and development.⁵⁵ Migration is a vital attitude in this country, compared with surrounding States.⁵⁶

In the case of Spain, the perspective on migration adopted by governmental authorities – and by the Spanish population itself – changes from time to time, depending of the international context and the evolution of the economic crisis. This situation is not exclusive for Spain, such as some authors have pointed out (studying the similarities with some European Union countries such as Italy or Portugal). Such as ARTAL-TUR, PALLARDÓ-LÓPEZ and REQUENA-SILVENTE states:

“Italy, Spain and Portugal have historically been emigration countries, sending people towards Latin American and European destinations from the very beginning of the past century, until the decade of the 1960s. Nowadays, however, they have become net receptors of migration flows, mainly because of labour supply shortcomings faced in their recent economic expansions”.⁵⁷

Dealing with Spain, the number of immigration sending countries has been increased, comparing the data of years 1980 (24), 1990 (42), 2000 (157) and 2007 (198)⁵⁸; the rules governing migration aspects have been transformed from time to time.⁵⁹ The last data provided by the *Instituto Nacional de Estadística (National Institute for Statistics)* of Spain show a provisional perspective about this subject: the global numbers of inward migration (in 2016, data published in June 2017) is 417.033 (65.572 Spanish people and 354.461 foreigners); on the contrary, the outward migration amount is

⁵⁴ See OECD, *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development*, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

⁵⁵ See OECD, *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development*, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53. In the Philippines, there are three governmental bodies concerned with migration (the Foreign Affairs, the Labour and Employment Departments, together with the Commission of Filipinos Overseas).

⁵⁶ See OECD, *Interrelations between Public Policies, Migration and Development*, *op. cit.*, p. 211 and the comparison between some Asian countries and their culture to migrate.

⁵⁷ See Artal-Tur, Pallardó-López and Requena-Silvente 2014: 5.

⁵⁸ See Ortega, F., and Peri, G., “The Aggregate Effects of Trade and Migration: Evidence from OECD Countries”, in the *Socio-Economic Impact of Migration Flows. Effects on Trade, Remittances, Output and the Labour Market*, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

⁵⁹ See Spanish applicable rules on this official website: http://extranjeros.empleo.gob.es/es/normativa/nacional/general_extranjeria/index.html and the administrative procedures and rules in http://extranjeros.empleo.gob.es/es/normativa/nacional/instrucciones_sgie/index.html.

327.906 (86.112 Spanish people and 241.795 foreigners).⁶⁰ Today, with a population of 46.528.966, there are 4.424.409 foreigners living in Spain.⁶¹

For the aforementioned reasons, the role of Spain is not clear on the field of migration: we are a country of migrants (in the reality, but this situation is not accepted by the authorities) and, at the same time, Spain may be described as a receiving migration State (in most cases migrants coming from North African countries, Latin-America and Asia). Dealing with the Philippines, the population of this country see migration as a route to get a better life and they consider this phenomenon as a realistic way to progress. The different perspective adopted by both States explains the role played by them in the international context about surrounding aspects of migration and, at the same time, as members of the IOM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ANDRIJASEVIC, R. and WALTERS, W., “The International Organization for Migration and the international government of borders”, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 28, (2010): 977-999.
- ARNOLD, G., *Migration: Changing the World*, Pluto Press Ed., (Northampton, November 2011): 90.
- ARTAL-TUR, A., PALLARDÓ-LÓPEZ, V. and REQUENA-SILVENTE, F., “Immigrants’ Networks, Distance and Trade Creation Effects: An (sic.) Study Employing Province-Level Data for Italy, Spain and Portugal”, in *the Socio-Economic Impact of Migration Flows. Effects on Trade, Remittances, Output and the Labour Market*, Artal-Tur, A., Peri, G., and Requena-Silvente, F. (eds.), Springer, (London, 2014): 5.
- ASHUTOSH, I. and MOUNTZ, A., “Migration management for the benefit of whom? Interrogating the work of the International Organization for Migration”, *Citizenship Studies*, vol. 15, n. 1, (February 2011): 21-38.
- ASIS, Maruja M.B., “The Philippines’ Culture of Migration”, *Migration Information Source*, (January, 2006).
- DE GUCHTENEIRE, P. and PÉCOUD, A., “Introduction: The United Nations Convention on Migrant Workers’ Rights”, in Cholewinski, R., De Guchteneire, P. and Pécoud, A. (eds.), *Migration and Human Rights: The United Nations Convention on Migrant Workers’ Rights*, Unesco Publishing, (Cambridge University Press, 2009): 1.
- GARCÍA SAN JOSÉ, D., “Detention of Illegal Aliens in Spain in a European Context of Migrants Concern”, in *Liber Amicorum Professor José Manuel Peláez Marón*.

⁶⁰ See this information on the website http://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=1254736177000&menu=ultiDatos&idp=1254735573002.

⁶¹ Following the official statistics published at http://www.ine.es/dyngs/INEbase/es/operacion.htm?c=Estadistica_C&cid=1254736176951&menu=ultiDatos&idp=1254735572981 (data published in June 2017).

- Derecho Internacional y Derecho de la Unión Europea, M. Hinojo Rojas (coord.), Servicio de Publicaciones, (Universidad de Córdoba, 2012): 421-440.
- GONZÁLEZ VEGA, J.A., “Mitos y mistificaciones: la Unión Europea y la Protección Internacional (a propósito de la “crisis de los refugiados)””, *56 Revista de Derecho Comunitario Europeo* (enero-abril 2017): 27-75.
- HERVÉ, Ph. and ARSLAN, C., “Trends in Labor Migration in Asia”, in *Labor Migration in Asia: Building Effective Institutions*, (Asian Development Bank Institute, International Labour Organization and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2016): 7, 68, 79-82.
- IGLESIAS SÁNCHEZ, S., “Migration Agreements between the European Union and Third States”, in *Protection des migrants et des réfugiés au XXIe siècle, aspects de droit international/Migration and Refugee Protection in the 21st Century, International Legal Aspects*, Goodwin-Gill, G.S. y Weckel, P. (eds.), (Centre for Studies and Research in International Law and International Relations, Brill, Nijhoff, Leiden, Boston, 2015): 167-194.
- NAIK, A., STIGTER, E., and LACZKO, F., “Migration, Development and Natural Disasters: Insights from the Indian Ocean Tsunami”, *IOM Migration Research Series*, number 30, (Geneva, 2007).
- O’NEIL, K., “Labour Exports or Government Policy: The Case of the Philippines”, *Migration Information Source*, (2004).
- PE-PUA, R., “Vínculos entre Filipinas y España: migraciones y relaciones bilaterales”, *Revista CIDOB d’Afers Internacionals*, núm. 68, (diciembre 2004-enero 2005): 53-65.
- RANQUE, Ll. and QUETULIO-NAVARRA, M., “Un futuro seguro en Filipinas”, in *Migraciones Forzadas*, n. 49, (June 2015): 50-52, in <http://www.fmreview.org/sites/fmr/files/FMRdownloads/es/cambioclimatico-desastres/ranque-quetulionavarra.pdf>.
- SIMM, G., “Disaster Response in Southeast Asia: The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Response and Emergency Management”, *Asian Journal of International Law* (2016), in <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/asian-journal-of-international-law/article/disaster-response-in-southeast-asia-the-asean-agreement-on-disaster-response-and-emergency-management/FD77A7CB07AE-4F4232A69237F521C450/core-reader>.