

**CROSSING BORDERS, KEEPING CONNECTED:  
WOMEN, MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN  
THE OSCE REGION**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND  
COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 24, 2008

Printed for the use of the  
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe



Available via <http://www.csce.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2015

75-411

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

SENATE

BENJAMIN CARDIN, Maryland,  
*Co-Chairman*  
RUSSELL FEINGOLD, Wisconsin  
CHRISTOPHER DODD, Connecticut  
HILARY RODHAM CLINTON, New York  
JOHN KERRY, Massachusetts  
SAM BROWNBACK, Kansas  
GORDON SMITH, Oregon  
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia  
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina

HOUSE

ALCEE HASTINGS, Florida,  
*Chairman*  
LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER,  
New York  
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina  
HILDA SOLIS, California  
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina  
CHRISTOPHER SMITH, New Jersey  
ROBERT ADERHOLT, Alabama  
JOSEPH PITTS, Pennsylvania  
MIKE PENCE, Indiana

EXECUTIVE BRANCH COMMISSIONERS

DAVID KRAMER, Department of State  
MARY BETH LONG, Department of Defense  
DAVID STEEL BOHIGIAN, Department of Commerce

**CROSSING BORDERS, KEEPING CONNECTED:  
WOMEN, MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN  
THE OSCE REGION**

---

**APRIL 24, 2008**

**COMMISSIONERS**

	Page
Hon. Alcee Hastings, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	01
Hon. Hilda Solis, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe .....	02

**MEMBERS**

Hon. Gwen Moore, a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin .....	03
Hon. Doris Matsui, a Member of Congress from the State of California .....	03
Hon. Lois Capps, a Member of Congress from the State of California .....	08
Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson, a Member of Congress from the State of Texas .....	10
Hon. Diane Watson, a Member of Congress from the State of California .....	15

**WITNESSES**

Susan Martin, Director, Georgetown University Institute for the Study of International Migration .....	04
Manuel Orozco, Remittances and Development Program, Inter-American Dialogue .....	10



# **CROSSING BORDERS, KEEPING CONNECTED: WOMEN, MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE OSCE REGION**

APRIL 24, 2008

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,  
*Washington, DC.*

The hearing was held from 10:00 a.m. to 11:48 a.m. EST in Room B-318, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C., Congressman Alcee L. Hastings, Chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, moderating.

*Commissioners present:* Hon. Alcee Hastings, Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe; and Hon. Hilda Solis, Commissioner, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

*Members present:* Hon. Diane Watson, Member of Congress from the State of California; Hon. Gwen Moore, a Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin; Hon. Doris Matsui, a Member of Congress from the State of California; Lois Capps, a Member of Congress from the State of California; Hon. Eddie Bernice Johnson, a Member of Congress from the State of Texas; and Hon. Diane Watson, a Member of Congress from the State of California.

*Witnesses present:* Susan Martin, Director, Georgetown University Institute for the Study of International Migration; and Manuel Orozco, Remittances and Development Program, Inter-American Dialogue.

## **HON. ALCEE HASTINGS, CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Mr. HASTINGS. We have an excellent panel with two distinguished witnesses who are going to share with us their knowledge of this issue. And there's much on this issue that we need to learn in order to meet the needs of women, their families and their home countries.

Migration is a complex issue that every country deals with. And some countries are sending migrants abroad. Some countries are transient points and others are the destination country. Their status can change over time. And as we've seen to be the case in many of the OSCE countries, particularly in Southeast Europe, some countries are a combination of all three. I'm going to place my full statement in the record without going into detail, because I do want us to hear from the witnesses and don't want a vote to interrupt us.

But I'm interested to hear from our witnesses their suggestions on how to respond to the new generation of women migrants. But before I turn to the panelists, I'd like to recognize my fellow commissioner, Representative Solis.

In addition to serving as a commissioner on the Helsinki Commission, Ms. Solis also serves on the OSCE parliamentary assembly as special representative on migration. And as such, her work is particularly focused on the issue of migration within the OSCE region. She brings to that position extensive experience on the issue of immigration here in the United States. And I'm pleased that she's here today for this hearing.

And I'd also like to note that with Ms. Solis' active participation, the commission is going to focus more of its attention on the issue of immigration. And our next event is going to be a field hearing in Los Angeles on May 9 to study the regional impacts and opportunities for migration. And I encourage all who are interested to attend that event.

Now, I'd like, if she would have any opening statement, Ms. Solis to make that statement. And then I'll recognize Ms. Moore, our colleague as well.

**HON. HILDA SOLIS, COMMISSIONER, COMMISSION ON  
SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE**

Ms. SOLIS. I want to thank our chairman and also the staff of OSCE and our witnesses and also my good colleague and friend, Congresswoman Gwen Moore. And I know we'll be visited by other members of the Women's Caucus that have also learned about this issue and want to participate.

I won't read my entire statement either. I'm very anxious to hear what our witnesses have to say. Migration and, for those of us who are domestic here in the states, talk about migration and immigration. And I'm very pleased to know that we're going to have some information given to us about some of the positive aspects of migration.

So oftentimes we hear on the news, media, reported about the heavy drain on our society here. We hear that also in Europe. We hear it regarding other third world countries that are sending many of their workers or labor force. Sometimes it's forced upon them because of poverty, economic and political issues. And we want to understand better what that means here for us and our experience here in the United States.

And I do want to say that I'm very interested in hearing of the role that women immigrants or migrants that come to this country—play; and the fact that, in some cases, remittances, whether they're sent from men or women here, outnumber the foreign aid that this country sends to many of those countries that send immigrants here to this country.

So I will respectfully submit my testimony also, my statement for the record, Mr. Chairman. And thank you again for this hearing.

Mr. HASTINGS. We're also joined with our colleague, who is also very active in international affairs and has traveled with us in the Helsinki Commission. And I look forward to her traveling with us to Kazakhstan in July with my good friend from Wisconsin, Ms.

Moore—any statements you may wish to make. And welcome Tori. We're glad you are here.

**HON. GWEN MOORE, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE  
STATE OF WISCONSIN**

Ms. MOORE. Yes, Tori is here from Memphis, Tennessee with Girls, Inc. And this is a great way to train women for leadership roles, to have them come and spend the day with the members of Congress. I just want to commend the president of the Helsinki Commission, Mr. Hastings, for his outstanding stewardship. He really has focused on gender equality and gender issues throughout his stewardship, not only as the president of the Helsinki Commission, but as a past president of OSCE.

And, of course, my dear colleague, Hilda Solis—her vice chairmanship of Human Needs Committee of the OSCE. I want to thank them for really calling this briefing, this hearing, together today. I'm very interested in OSCE. And I have, of course, traveled with them. More particularly, I'm a member of the financial services committee. And I have been appointed as part of the parliamentary network on the World Bank.

And so I am very, very interested in hearing from you what the impact of international migration remittances have, not only on issues such as brain drain, or perhaps strain from receiving companies—but what the World Bank research has shown about the spurring of development from female migration—very interested in hearing any particular information that you might have regarding the economics of migration.

Thanks to you again for inviting me.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Moore. My good friend and colleague from the Rules Committee has joined us. And she has a continuing interest in these matters. And as our witnesses can see, you know, you will see some other members come and go, a number of them have been involved in women's issues.

But let me ask Doris Matsui if she would offer any comment at this time.

**HON. DORIS MATSUI, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Ms. MATSUI. Thank you very much, Chairman Hastings. I enjoy serving with him on the Rules Committee. He sits about right there in relationship to me. And he's just absolutely wonderful, and also Congresswoman Solis and Congresswoman Moore. I mean, we travel together, and we have bonded together on many of these issues.

I want to thank you very much for being here today too, both of you. Women migrants have become very of interest to me, because as we study women around the world, we realize that lawmakers really must look at the economic opportunities in countries regarding women as well as work trends and family development. Women seem to be the key to a lot of this.

And today's hearing is really an opportunity for us in Congress to present the American public with true life stories on the issues of women in other countries. And during a time in this nation's his-

tory that has yielded, sort of, somewhat unfortunately visceral reactions, responses to incidences in our own country, it's important for us to investigate the trends and economic reasons behind women and migration and remittances.

And I know the World Bank and others have other witnesses we'll hear from shortly are analyzing how gender plays a role in dynamics and determinants of international migration. And they're also uncovering the economic circumstances that lead to migrant workers.

In many developing countries, remittance flows make up the second largest source of external financing. And that's coming. More and more people are beginning to understand this. And it raises many important policy questions for all of us.

And as Congress and other lawmakers continue to delve into issues surrounding migrants and gender differences in migration, we have the opportunity to develop policy based on implications for growth and welfare in both origin and destination countries.

And today's hearing really gives us a good forum to ask the kind of questions necessary to understand and design policies for the migration of women. And I look forward to hearing from you. And I thank Chairman Hastings for putting together this hearing today.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Ms. Matsui, Ms. Solis and Ms. Moore. I'd like to turn now to our witnesses. And joining us today is Dr. Susan Martin, director of the Institute for the Study of International Migration and Georgetown University, and Dr. Manuel Orozco, with the Remittances and Development Program at the Inter-American Dialogue. We've distributed their biographies. And if the audience would pick them up at the table, it would be appreciated. But in the interests of time, I'm not going to read them.

As a backdrop before beginning with you, Dr. Martin, I just wish to add to the record what is not a direct relationship, but it demonstrates among other things the attitudes that are extant here in the Congress. And that would be yesterday's inaction of the United States Senate on disparity as it pertains to women. I just would like to add my voice as one that was sorely disappointed.

So Dr. Martin, if you would begin.

**SUSAN MARTIN, DIRECTOR, GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL MIGRATION**

Ms. MARTIN. Thank you. Thank you for this opportunity to testify this morning about the situation of women migrants in the region covered by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. I have a longer statement that I'd like to have added to the record. Thank you.

Policy makers throughout the world, including in the OSCE region, are seeking to make migration a win-win-win situation—a win for host countries, destination countries; a win for the source countries, origin of migrants; and of course a win for the migrants themselves. In thinking through strategies to increase the benefits of migration in this win-win-win situation, and also to deal with some of the negative consequences of migration, it's important to keep the gender dimension in mind.

More women are migrating from south to north. And the highest proportion of women migrants is in the OSCE region. Women migrants now represent 53.4 percent of the total migrant population in Europe. And the U.S. figures, or North American figures, are similar. Gender perspective is essential to understand both the causes and consequences of international migration. Gender and equality can be a powerful factor in precipitating migration, particularly when women have economic, political and social expectations that actual opportunities at home can't meet.

Globalization has increased knowledge of options within and outside of home countries. And it's opened a range of new opportunities for women who want to leave their homes. However, globalization has also failed to live up to its potential, leaving women throughout the world in poverty and without economic, social or political rights.

In such cases, migration may be the best or indeed the only way out of a desperate situation for many women. The migration experience is also highly gendered, particularly in relationship to social and family relationships and employment experiences. Traditionally, most women migrate through family reunification channels. They migrate to join spouses and children who have already migrated.

When such migration is the only route for women to take, it often leads to fraud and abuse, where they seek marriage opportunities, because it's the way of finding better opportunities. And of course, having migrated, they may find it very difficult to leave abusive situations where their husband is their only link to remaining in legal status.

Today, though, more women are migrating on their own as principal wage earners, not just following to join their husbands. Their experience is gendered as well. They tend to take jobs in very familiar female occupations, whether it's as domestic workers, nurses, teachers. They tend to follow the gender, the gender prospects and terms of employment.

Women who migrate, another aspect of the gendered experience, is that they often find themselves at risk of gender-based violence and exploitation. Whether labor migrants, family migrants, trafficking victims or refugees, they face the double problem of being female and being foreign. In addition, it's important to keep in mind that gender does not operate in isolation from race, ethnicity and religion. Since many migrant women differ from the host population in these respects, they may face additional discrimination based not only on being foreign, being women, but also of a different race, religion or ethnicity.

The migration experience, though, can also be positive. It's not all a negative process. Migration can be an empowering experience for women who have the opportunity to do things upon migration that they couldn't do at home. Even a migration of their spouses, of their husbands, can be empowering as they are left behind to operate, make decisions, and decide how resources will be utilized and gaining empowerment as a result of this process.

In other respects, though, migration can reinforce traditional gender roles, because migration is a very complex process. Often women are expected to preserve cultural and religious norms after

migration. And they're supposed to be preserving the family values of the societies from which they come. Very often immigration rules reinforce this process, particularly again through the family reunification process, when their status is so much linked to their husband's status or their children's status.

It's important, though, to note that changing gender roles in destination countries can also influence migration. I posited, amongst other experts, that we were going to be seeing a huge increase in migration pressures in the years ahead, and particularly related to female migration. As our societies age, as more of us in my generation enter retirement age require health care services, social care to help with work at home, the demand for female migrants to fill these jobs are going to be increasing. Of course, as more younger women enter the job market, the demand for daycare, child care services also increases. Women tend to provide these services.

Migration also has an effect, as some of the opening statements said, on the development of the source country. It isn't only an impact on the destination country. It happens very often through remittances. But it's important to keep in mind that the connections between migration and development are a two-way connection. Underdevelopment causes migration. Migration can influence the development process. It operates in both directions.

In the best case scenario, migration should be voluntary. And women, particularly migrants in general, should not have to migrate as a result of deepening economic or political pressures at home. They should be migrating because it's their choice, and of course the choice of the destination country, so that they operate through legal channels.

There's been a lot of attention to the economic factors causing migration. There's less attention, though, in dealing with stay-at-home development programs to gender roles and relationships in gender equality. And I think that has to be taken into account.

Now, a pernicious form of migration for women, who were denied rights and denied economic opportunities, is trafficking in persons—trafficking where they—through coercion and deception are forced into migrating in a way in which they will be exploited, either for forced labor or for sexual exploitation.

The international regime for addressing trafficking is developing—and I must admit that the OSCE, I think, has one of the best institutional structures in place now amongst international and regional organizations for addressing trafficking. And this is an area, where it needs to be applauded in terms of the steps already taken, but certainly requires more resources, more attention from the commissioners' member states as to what it is doing in this particular area.

So even though economic development and human social development is the best long-term solution to migration, migration is likely to continue certainly for the short to medium term. And in fact economic development theory says can increase migration as people have more resources, more knowledge, and more opportunities to move.

So there we get into the migration as a support for development issues. And here women play a particular role. I'll let my colleague, Manuel Orozco, talk a bit more about remittances, because my tes-

timony relies on some of the research he and my other colleagues have done.

But I think it's also important to look at the broader way in which diasporas can support development. Hometown associations are very important as a way of bringing resources back to their home communities. Too often, though, women migrants are shut out of those hometown associations. They don't have the means by which they can influence decisions about how to spend the money that's being spent back home. And since we know that women have a predisposition to spend money on health, education, things that benefit human development, it's important that they get attention, and that they have an opportunity.

Let me conclude with a few recommendations that I state in my testimony as to ways that the United States and other destination countries in the OSCE region can perhaps help to stimulate the win-win-win situation. Certainly, the U.S. should be supporting programs and policies to empower women migrants and those left behind by male migrants to participate actively in the decisions that affect them and their families, including support for voluntary organizations of women migrants, so they can participate in this process.

Improvements are certainly needed in protection of migrant women's rights and safety, also in improving their socio-economic situation to avoid the exploitation that too often accompanies migration. Policies to help reduce the cost of remittance transfers, so more money actually end up with families. The important other factor, truth in transfer policies, so people know what they're actually sending, what will be received.

Programs are needed to stimulate diaspora contributions to economic, social, education, health, political, development and home countries. So is the identification of ways to better promote stay-at-home developments, so people can migrate by choice not necessity—particularly looking at helping women to gain economic opportunities, education, health care, other services, legal rights, protection from violence at home. And then improvements in data collection. Unfortunately, we don't have good sex and age segregated data on emigration or immigration. That makes it hard to target policies and programs at women migrants.

There are numerous international and regional fora in which these issues are being discussed. OSCE is one of them. The U.S. participates very actively in a number of regional fora. And I would urge that that process continue. There is growing, though, international multilateral discussion of migration issues, particularly through the Global Forum on Migration and Development, a state-owned process trying to get governments to talk about how they can cooperate, source, transit, destination countries.

U.S. so far has been missing an action from that process that we've not taken a very active stance as a government, even though this is a governmental process that I think holds a lot of promise for having a real dialogue with the source countries about how to best manage migration. And I would hope that the U.S. could start to become much more actively engaged in all of the international discussions on this important issue. Thank you.

Mr. HASTINGS. Dr. Martin, thank you. And Dr. Orozco, I hope you will all permit, I know we've been joined by two of our colleagues. And I do know that Ms. Capps has to leave. But I would like to hear from her. And I don't know, Ms. Johnson may well have to as well. But let me if she has anything that she would wish to say at this time. My very good friend and colleague from California, the chair of the bipartisan Women's Caucus, Lois Capps.

**HON. LOIS CAPPS, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Ms. CAPPS. Thank you, Chairman Hastings, for holding this very important hearing. And I want to thank Congresswoman Solis for your great work. I've been hearing about some meetings that you've been having in your particular representation on migration within the commission. This is a very timely hearing. And I much appreciated Dr. Martin's remarks. And I know that Dr. Orozco will be a very instrumental in educating us as to the good side and the hard side to what this topic addresses for us.

I think you can tell, Chairman, that holding this hearing evoked a strong response from the Women's Caucus in terms of our membership. We who are here representing, not only women in our congressional districts, but as women are very sensitive to how migration affects women and, of course, their families.

It goes without saying that, when we talk about women, there's a sort of stereotype. You talked about women who are wage-earners. But it's often the man of the household is sent first, at least, and finds the way and sends back those remittances. And it's left to the woman to hold the family together. And then, there's oftentimes—I'm now talking about my personal experience. And all of us have our anecdotal experiences with this topic in our congressional districts.

And over the many years, I was a public health nurse in my community. I became very closely involved in the migration patterns of families who—and we've even structured in Southern California our school year around certain migration patterns; because oftentimes it's a back and forth for economic reasons and familial reasons.

I think a signal issue in terms of my experiences, particularly to the south of our border, for those families that I've become acquainted with is the disparate family, the separated family. And that the particular challenges that holds for a woman who, in the interest of unification, oftentimes embarks on risky behaviors and decision making, because she has that overarching drive that can't be quelled to have the family united.

And that impacts our school calendar. It impact employment. It impacts transportation and legality in terms of crossing. There are so many issues of safety and of family unity, which is so core to what we define as being American. I mean, these are very fraught issues.

And yet, it's so ripe with opportunity for us to address this in a good way. Our immigration policies, as I think everyone would know, are no up-to-date. That's the nicest way I can say that. And it comes down to bear so dramatically on the life of the women that

we all know from our experiences at home. And seen as a totality, it has tremendous impact on this country.

It's become politicized in quite negative ways that are with very strong consequences to, again, some of our fundamental ways of treating one another in terms of justice and fairness and compassion as a nation. So we are being put to the test.

And yet it comes down to the state I represent—and there are a couple of us here now. Ms. Matsui was here earlier—is one of the younger states of the nation. But we know very dramatically the strong role migration has played on the strength and the development and the advancement of our state. There's just evidence everywhere, with new work forces as each generation comes along, of extremely hardworking people who have sacrificed and are sacrificing a great deal to be in this country.

Almost all of us have immigrants in our family histories. And you know that those first generation of people to come to this country are the reason we have succeeded as a nation in so many ways, because of hard work, determination, and that American dream that no one knows more clearly than someone who is yearning to come, or someone who has come, and now seeks very intently on fulfilling their dreams in this country.

And I want to say how much I appreciate the positive role that migrant families have played. I represent an agricultural district. And it's certainly in that arena. I have a lot of tourism in my district. I know that that's very dependent on certain group of people who will do those kinds of long and very physically demanding jobs that go undone without that.

There's a need on the part of this country to fix and policies and to have the right kind of people here. But respect for the institutions that we have—that's another final point that I wanted to make is that, in some ways, a migrant woman carries within her soul and heart, for the sake of her family and for the dreams that she has, a tremendous desire to honor and respect the local teachers that her kids go to school to study under, the enormous respect with which the privileges of being a part of our society hold, and how that is passed on.

And I just hope we honor that. And I know we are in this discussion. But we'll find ways to sustain that attribute, that positive contribution that women make in this area. I think the migrant woman is the one who carries the desires and also brings with her from the country of origin the culture, the values, the traditions. This is the role that the woman plays in transmitting that to the next generation within the wider culture, so that we have the enormous richness of culture that come also with these women.

So I'm going to stop now. I've been joined by colleagues. It's wonderful to see. I appreciate very much again, Mr. Chairman, that you're holding this hearing.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Ms. Capps. I was awfully glad that Commissioner McIntyre joined us. I was beginning to feel intimidated—and also Commissioner Diane Watson from California. I had said earlier that I would hear from Congresswoman Johnson, my classmate, good friend and colleague from Texas. And Mike, if you and Ms. Watson don't mind, then I would like to hear

from Dr. Orozco. And then we will come to you. All right. Ms. Johnson.

**HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS  
FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS**

Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Congressman Hastings. And let me express my appreciation for you and Ms. Solis for having this hearing and with your continuing leadership. Women really coming to almost any country—because the U.N. has had reports as well as really very vulnerable to mistreatment. Just recently, there was a Latino woman held for four days in jail in Arkansas without food or water or anything. They just forgot they locked her up.

And I think that we need to really get more attention. The International Labor Organization estimates that there are between 80 million and 100 million migrant workers internationally. And about half of that population will be women. And it doesn't take us much to see many of them. They take care of children. They clean houses and any other type of job they can get to work to try to keep families together. And generally speaking, I think that anyone will have to acknowledge that they have been a positive force in this country. And it also falls to the independence, self-confidence and economic status for many women coming under more fair circumstances.

They cannot communicate in their own language for the host country, and are documented, and lack adequate contracts. And that's what makes them so vulnerable. I have read about women being practically enslaved in homes as housekeepers and babysitters, which we have to become more sensitive to, to make sure that we live up to our own constitution of fairness. And many contend that payments and investments contribute to migrant women's poverty reduction. But they're almost held hostage in some situations. And you wonder if they're getting paid at all.

So I thank you for coming as witnesses. And I look forward to hearing the testimony of Mr. Orozco. We need to know from you—and Ms. Solis and Mr. Hastings and all might know this already—but we need to know what actions by the Congress will help alleviate these challenges for women migrants; because I think women are much more vulnerable to mistreatment when they come.

Thank you very much, Mr. Hastings.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you very much, Ms. Johnson. And Dr. Orozco, thank you for your patience. I think you can tell, by the interest shown from the membership that this is an issue of substantial import to those of us here in Congress. Dr. Orozco.

**MANUEL OROZCO, REMITTANCES AND DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAM, INTER-AMERICAN DIALOGUE**

Mr. OROZCO. Thank you very much for inviting me to testify before you. And actually, I'm very motivated to see the interest and the concern over this issue and having a balanced approach also to this. But only look at women as the negative effects of migration, but look at the whole balance, the whole picture; and have an open perspective about the broader issues, especially relating to gender.

There is no question that the member countries of the OSCE have reliance in the country of migration, especially over the past

20 years. And this reliance is related to a number of factors. But particularly it has to do with some of the slow transition of economic growth of many countries who are now members of the Commonwealth of Independent States; but also is related to the increase in economic growth in the Russian economy associated also with the significantly sharp demographic changes that has happened in Russia simultaneously. That has changed different patterns of international migration.

At the same time, there is another process that is happening, which is that there is a global feminization of low-cost labor that has had significant implications in the demand for foreign labor from different countries in the OSCE region.

I will focus my testimony on issues regarding women migration and remittances, particularly in Central Asia, the South Caucasus and Moldova, which are places where I have conducted extensive field work on these issues of migration and remittances. And I will offer some recommendations on developing policy focusing on how to leverage remittances in relationship to gender an economic development in general.

What I'd like to share with you is five different points. One is just general patterns of migration in the OSCE countries. Second, look at the relationship between migration and gender in particular relating to what determinants have shaped these processes; then pay attention to female migrants and remittances, then to female remittance recipients in some of these countries; and finally make some policy recommendations, particularly on health and education and on financial access on the other hand.

On the issue of migration, what you definitely see is that about a quarter of the world's migrants are actually in the OSCE member countries. And that's basically about 50 million migrants are OSCE member countries. And 40 million of these are basically migrants in developing countries from this region, the OSCE region.

Just looking at Central Asia and the South Caucasus alone, you have 70 million migrants, the majority of which, over 60 percent, goes permanently to Russia. A smaller percentage goes to Kazakhstan. And then you have another percentage that goes to Western Europe. For example, with people from Moldova, 30 percent of Moldovan migrants are going to Italy. And there are as many women as men migrating to Italy.

Unlike migration to Russia, the majority of migrants going there are predominantly males. It's basically three-quarters of migrants are males. And 25 percent are women. One reason for that is because of the nature of the economic development happening in Russian at this point. There is a strong reliance on construction work, which is predominantly gender-based to a large extent where they demand more male labor than female labor in construction or even gas industries. But you see the 25 percent of migrant women in Russia; these are predominantly working in the service industry and also in the informal economy. If you go to Moscow, for example, you will see many women in the street as street vendors, particularly people from Kurdistan and Tajikistan.

Another important aspect is that another reason why there is more male migration to Russia, for example, from these countries in particular, not to Western Europe—it has to do with the eco-

conomic conditions in these countries. These are highly rural societies. The higher rural composition of a country is, the lower the female migration will be. And this has to do with cultural patterns that exist in a society, but also to issues relating to the feminization of labor in agrarian societies.

And at the same time, this relates to income. In places where there is lower income, you will have lower migration. The poor cannot migrate. And in general, we know that women are mostly low-wage earners than men. No matter whether they have the same job, they will still earn less than men. So those are some of the terminance that explain some of the migration patterns going within the OSCE to Russia in particular.

Now, in terms of the broader patterns of remitting, for example, we estimate that remittances of migrants from the OSCE countries amounts about \$55 billion. And just to Central Asia, especially for countries the Caucasus, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Kurdistan, Tajikistan and Georgia—are receiving \$10 billion in remittances, and Moldova.

This is not a small amount of money, especially when we're talking about some of the poorest countries in the world—Tajikistan, Moldova, Kurdistan, Azerbaijan paradoxically. One of the richest countries in oil is also among the poorest countries in the world. There are also countries paradoxically where U.S. cooperation has a strong presence. The Millennium Challenge Corporation is in Armenia, in Kurdistan, in Moldova, among other countries in this region.

But that \$10 billion basically, 20 percent of that is coming from remittances transferred by female migrants. Now, female migrants do remit less than men. The average amount remitted by a migrant is about \$1,500 a year. It's much less than, for example, what a migrant in the United States is remitting to Latin American or Asia. But this is relative to the income conditions of the migrant, but also to the cost of living in their home countries. Cost of living in places like Azerbaijan or Tajikistan is much lower than in Latin America.

But the main reason why they remit less, it has to do because they earn less money. Construction work pays more, pays better than service work in the informal economy. There is also another reason, which is that some of the female migrants are already married in the host country, whose husbands might be native Russian citizens or migrants themselves. But their obligations are more dispersed. And they have to redistribute their resources. The earnings they receive are spent differently than the earnings men do.

So, for example, most males in Russia, migrant males, have spouses back home. And they also have their children back home. So they have higher responsibilities in terms of the amount that they need to send. Whereas the woman migrant is likely to have their children in Russia and their spouses also in Russia.

When we look at the people who receive remittances, we basically learn that 60 percent of remittance recipients are women. And this is a figure based on service we have done in these countries; but at the same time might be a contestable figure, that it might have to do with gender dynamics happening in these countries. Female remittance recipients are receiving less than men. They re-

ceive about 20 percent less than men do, even though they have to manage the same type of household size than men do.

But there is another characteristic that I think is important to keep in mind when it comes to these issues of gender and migration. And it's that when men migrate, and they are married, and they leave their spouses behind, in many cases the women move into the in-laws' homes. And they lose a significant portion of their independence that they have as they were in their own households. And one of the losses of this independence is that they are no longer the household head.

In these societies, the head of the household is generally accepted to be the oldest man in the house. And this can be probably a retired person who has no job, in fact no roles in managing the household. But he is perceived to be the head of the household. And he might be the person receiving remittances and may decide how much to give to the woman to administer the money.

It's not a pattern, but it is something that happens on a regular basis among a percentage of the population that receives remittances and are women. That loss of independence is a policy issue that one needs to keep into consideration. But it's a difficult one to also provide a solution, because it might inflict on issues of privacy within the household.

A third issue that deals with the work we have been doing on remittances and development focuses on the fact that the women remittance recipients have much less financial access than men do. In most of these countries, financial access is plainly low. Less than 20 percent of people in Central Asia or the Caucasus have access to a bank account.

Remittance recipients have a slightly higher access, about 25 percent, and that's because the money allows them to accrue savings and eventually mobilize them into financial institutions. But when it comes to women, even though they might be the larger remittance recipient proportion, they do not have as much access to banking institutions as men do.

And that poses another problem of a policy nature in the issue of economic development. In Tajikistan, for example, only 5 percent of men have bank accounts. And when it comes to women, it's 3 percent. In Kurdistan, it's about 20 percent for women and 30 percent for men. And the same goes for Armenia and Moldova. So there is a significant disparity about this. There is an unconventional ability between the percent of remittance recipients who are women and the percent of women who have bank accounts.

So I want to now finish with some policy recommendations dealing with these challenges that we face. One important one is that, from the perspective of the Helsinki Commission, especially from the U.S. Congress side, I think we must encourage the development institutions working in those countries to integrate migration as part of the agenda. This is a very important issue, because it's largely neglected.

And especially when we're talking about U.S. government cooperation, USAID, the Millennium Challenge Corporation in particular are two major developing institutions that play an important role in countries like Armenia, Moldova, Kurdistan, Tajikistan, et cetera. And yet, in none of these places there is a

strategy, much less an agenda, in linking remittances and leveraging those flows for development, and much less on gender issues, even though everybody is aware that there is a dynamic relating to the issues, gender migration and remittance.

And definitely, in most of these countries—for example, in Moldova—30 percent of the country's GDP is coming from remittances. Same thing goes with Armenia. There is a significant dependence on this, because there is less labor migration. So that's one issue.

Another issue is that, from the more operational side of development policy, it's important that cooperation focuses on health and education projects for female remittance recipients—and not just for female remittance recipients, it's an issue that applies for everyone. But health and education issues matter for migrants.

Migrants want to improve the health and education of their children. And they will be interested, for example, in investing in the scholarship funds and medical insurance for their relatives. The remittance recipient is a person over 50 years of age in most cases. So they are facing more health challenges than a younger person. And yet, there is no health facility accessible in most of these countries that is affordable or efficient.

Then there are issues on financial access. And there, I propose four major strategies that can be operational at the level of economic development policy—one dealing with getting greater access to remittance recipients into the banking system. The regulatory environment in most of these countries in the OSCE region do not allow anybody but banks to pay, to make money transfers.

So if you go, for example, here to Western Union to remit money to Armenia or to Moldova, the recipient has to pick up the remittance and the bank. Yet, the bank does not offer any financial intermediation. And we have learned that the assets in cash that these people hold among those who receive remittances is about \$1,000. But it's mostly kept informally. So access to the banking institutions is essential.

Another important issue is to support microfinance institutions in rural areas, where at least half of remittances go. This is a different pattern that goes, for example, in Latin America, where only 40 percent of remittance go to rural areas. In OSCE countries, it's a higher percentage that goes there. Microfinance institutions have the ability to work directly with clients who are remittance recipients. Therefore providing them technical assistance to work on designing financial products to those people is essential.

The third issue is financial education. We have learned that financial education does work. It increases people's ability to manage their money, which provides the means for financial independence. But also it allows them to save more efficiently. We developed a pilot project that is about to finalize in Moldova on financial education. And the results have been quite successful in the fact that people are opening bank accounts. But more importantly is that they are making the arithmetic of managing their finances and understanding how to integrate their remittance earnings with the overall earnings, to calculate that 70 percent of their earnings are coming from foreign labor from their relatives.

And finally, another issue to operationalize at the development level is to promote the introduction of new technologies in rural areas for money transfers. And this specifically deals with mobile transfers. And expanding mobile technology into rural areas will have a definite effect in economic development in these countries.

And I thank you for allowing me to speak. Thank you very much.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you Dr. Orozco. I'd like to have Ms. Watson make any comments she may wish, and then Commissioner McIntyre, and then I'll go to Ms. Solis for questions.

**HON. DIANE WATSON, A MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Ms. WATSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having us join this commission. And I want to thank the witnesses for being here. The question arises—and I was just reading your biography, Dr. Martin, is that there seems to be a separation or a division between women who migrate and women who are refugees.

And I am concerned now about the great number of women who have left war zones and particularly, of course, Iraq. I understand there are 2.6 million people that have migrated into the surrounding states. There's a percentage. And reading through the information here—49.6 percent of those who migrate are women. And do you see a difference in those who become refugees?

And the other issue I want to raise, and I'll just throw it all out there now, with Dr. Orozco is in the state of California, and in this country as a whole, the big issue is on illegal immigration. And California, many of the migrants are being accused—women in particular are coming across the border having their children, pregnant women having their children. And so they then become citizens of the United States.

I wish you would comment, Dr. Martin, on the refugee issue. And I wish you would comment, Dr. Orozco, on what your studies show in terms of illegal migration and the reasons and factors and the consequences.

Mr. HASTINGS. Why don't you go ahead, Dr. Martin, and Dr. Orozco.

Ms. MARTIN. Yes. I'm glad that you did ask about refugee women, because that is another component, which I didn't address in my testimony. But I've written extensively on refugee women's issues.

We estimate that about 75 percent to 80 percent of the world's refugees are women and their dependent children. And there's a disproportionately high share of women-headed households amongst those who are displaced as a result of conflict. There's some research now that indicates that people in effect go as far as their resources will take them. And a much larger share of those who flee conflict now are internally displaced. They can't get across international borders. And therefore they don't become officially refugees.

And we think that both socioeconomic status but also gender affect that process. So women are less likely to be able to find a safe refuge in the context of conflict than men are. If you look at the proportion of asylum seekers in the U.S. and Europe and Australia, wealthier countries, a much higher proportion are men. They have

the resources, both financial and contacts. And their families are often pushing for them to get as far away from the conflict then as possible. So there's a huge gender disparity.

Unfortunately for most refugee and displaced women, getting to a refugee or a displaced persons' camp doesn't signify safety—that the conflict spills over into where they are. I've interviewed many women in Kenya, in Burundi and other—in Somalia, other places in Africa as well as in Latin America and Asia—for whom something as simple as collecting firewood or water is a risk to life and limb; that the rape rates amongst women who are going out—and over time, because there's no distribution of firewood in most refugee situations, they may have to go 20, 30 kilometers outside of the camp. That puts them at high level of risk.

One of the simplest things that could happen is if donors provided financing for firewood distribution, fuel distributions in refugee contexts. It's expensive. And in most cases, if it's a choice between buying food or buying firewood, aid agencies of course buy the food. But if women are going to be raped or killed trying to get the firewood to cook the food, it's a must needed victory in terms of that aid.

Ms. WATSON. What about the children then?

Ms. MARTIN. Children, 50 percent or more of the refugees are children under the age of 18; problems in terms of access to health care, access to education; big strides in trying to at least get to primary education. It's happened over the last 20 years; very limited access to secondary education for any children, and almost no access to employment after being able to be educated.

Another problem that still remains terrible for children is either forced recruitment into the military out of either the official or the insurgencies; or for young girls being trafficked, particularly into sexual exploitative situations. My first experience with that was 20 years ago on the Thai-Cambodian border, in which every Sunday, when the aid agencies were out of the camp, the brothel owners were in the camp rounding up girls to bring to Bangkok. And this happens throughout the world. So major problems for children.

Mr. HASTINGS. Dr. Orozco.

Mr. OROZCO. Thank you. Illegal migration is a pattern that happens all over the world. And we looked at, for example, these citizens from CIS countries going to Russia. And they have as much irregular presence as there is in the United States; same thing in Western Europe and elsewhere in the world. What it does reflect is rather a reality which is a lack of commensurability between public policy and global demand for foreign labor and demographic shifts in the industrialized economy.

And to some extent, the inability perhaps of politicians to come to terms if we need to find a balance between the issues that come across. With regard to the question on the issues of women crossing borders and having babies to get their citizenship, I think that's predominantly an anecdotal pattern or explanation.

And to tell you the truth, it's very crude and short-sighted approach; because you can cross the border and have you baby. That doesn't mean that is going to make him automatically a U.S. citizen, or a citizen of Russia or anywhere else. And the cost of investing in that child to get your access to the benefits that the polity

will provide you are not going to outweigh the challenges of dealing with that.

And, you know, we've seen many women who are deported, even though their children are U.S. citizens. And so I think it's more an anecdotal situation. I think the main issue is that illegal migration is a reality that we're having a hard time to cope with. And we need to come with answers that deal with immigration reform issues, legalization of people, as well as deportation and streamlining of the process. But every single county in the world, not just in the United States, is dealing exactly with the same issue.

Ms. WATSON. May I have one more comment?

Mr. HASTINGS. Sure.

Ms. WATSON. Just as a follow-up. In listening to the two of you, my concerns are do women and their children return home? What is the typical amount of time they stay as a migrant somewhere else? And under what conditions can they go back home and continue a normal life? And I'll just end by saying this is something that the Helsinki Commission needs to look at.

You know, what will stabilize these women and their children. Most of them have children. We were in Chad—250,000 refugees, most of them women and children with blank looks in their eyes. And they're trying to do some schooling. But my concern is once they migrate, legally or illegally or whatever the conditions are that force them to do that, how soon do they return, if they return, under what condition? And how can we help them?

Ms. MARTIN. If I could start, I think that's a very variable process. I think there are a lot of people who migrate temporarily or keep circulated return home.

Ms. WATSON. Have you done much research that way?

Ms. MARTIN. The research it's not very good on return patterns. For the U.S., for example, we have immigration data. We don't have emigration data. We don't know who leaves and how long it's been since they leave. One of my colleagues has been doing estimations for what that period of stay is.

And it varies tremendously depending on whether—and the biggest factor is children, that historically it's been a tendency that migrants will return within five years, if they're going to return at all, or after retirement. But as soon as they have children in the school system, they're here. And they're likely to remain permanently or at least until retirement age. And that's a pattern we've seen throughout history.

I want to add a thing to what Manuel said. When I directed the Commission on Immigration Reform, we looked very much into this issue of whether women were crossing to have babies for citizenship. And I agree very much with his assessment, because what we found was that women were here and therefore had babies, not that women were pregnant and therefore came here to have their babies. They came for a variety of other reasons. But it's been human nature, a fair number had children.

Ms. WATSON. That anecdote is used in California all the time. You can verify it. And it's very troubling, because I don't see that. And in our schools, of course, there's been a growth in the migrant children. But I don't see that. We hear it all the time. You know,

that's a big issue in this country. It's a big issue in California. And we have not agreed on how to deal with it. So it's fair to all.

But I would like, as you go back and report, that we really take a look on how do we return people to the most optimum—women particularly and their children—if return is optimal. So anyway, that's something that we can follow up on.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, Ms. Watson. Ms. Solis.

Ms. SOLIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank the members of the Women's Caucus and women who are here on the dais with us, members of Congress; because I think it really does symbolize that we do care very deeply. This is such a complex issue. I think we're almost talking about two different scenarios. One is what's happening with OSCE, European countries and Central Asia, Russia. And then also what our experience is here domestically.

And there are a little different. And I want to touch and try to get your response from that. I know in the E.U. right now, there are some states or countries that have attempted to implement very specified migration. For example in Spain, they will allow women to come in, low-skilled women, with the idea that they'll go back home, because their children don't come with them. So they are on a restricted kind of a plan.

And I want to know if Dr. Orozco or Dr. Martin, you could touch on, you know, what you've learned from that. There's also this notion about a blue card, which is our equivalent to the H-1B program, which also has other implications. And I would like you to touch base on that. And then also the issue of remittances, the fact that women—I believe I saw an article that staff provided to us. It indicated that overwhelmingly, women from Indonesia, who are migrating or come up to Europe have a higher proportion of sending back remittances. And what impact has that had there? Because sometimes we forget to look on the ledger what the positive consequences are of that sending country. And if you could just touch on those items.

And we could start with Dr. Orozco.

Mr. OROZCO. Thank you. I think in Western Europe, there is a process right now of experimentation by trial and error on migration policy. And Spain has focused, for example, on a particular experience with bilateral migration relationships with Ecuador.

And there, they have the belief, more than the knowledge and the facts, that there is going to be a process of circular migration that will be short term-based, where migrants will come to Spain, and then they will go back. And they figured that one way to do that is by establishing a type of specialized agreement.

I think the evidence shows that the situation is more relative. Migrants in general, regardless of where you're from and where you're going, live on their, what we call, the illusion of impermanence. We all, once you leave your country, you say you're going back tomorrow. But circumstances definitely change those dynamics, those expectations. And as Susan said, you know, if you have family, you are less likely to return back home.

The Western Europe countries are focusing a lot on this issue of circular migration. And they believe that this is, you know, the equivalence of a guest worker program European style; may have

positive implications. And I think it will have positive effects among some, especially developing countries in Europe. But it will also have adverse effects on other migrants that are in high demand—for example, Asians and Africans—but are less prepared for other reasons than migration itself.

Race is one of them. There is definitely not an open, but a passive preference for, Hispanic migrants, and migrants from Latin America than migrants from Africa. We cannot neglect those issues.

When it comes to remittance and gender, there is definitely the case that, depending on where women enter into the labor force, they will be more likely to remit more or less money. For example, Asian women working in the hospitality industry, either as caretakers or in the entertainment industry, are going to be of a higher percentage.

An example is the Dominican women in Switzerland. There are about 60,000 Dominicans in Switzerland. Three-quarters of them are females. And, you know, we don't like to talk about what they do, because you come with normative moral value judgment. But the fact of the matter is that they are there responding to a lower market of entertainment. Many Swiss tourists came to the Dominican Republic. They fell in love with the women. And then we have 60,000 women there.

So in that case, you see higher percent of women remitting. But in other places—for example, we'll see it in the Netherlands—African women, Ghanaians, remit less than their male counterparts. And that's because their access to employment is lower. They are on welfare. The welfare state inhibits you from remitting, because you have lower earnings. So there are variations depending on where you are.

Ms. MARTIN. If I could add, I'm personally very skeptical of large-scale temporary work programs as a solution for a number of reasons. When people are admitted for a temporary purpose into a permanent job, it usually doesn't work. The employer wants the person to remain, once they're trained and operating well. The migrant begins to develop equities, want to stay within the country, develop ties, things of that sort.

I think very targeted programs, seasonal programs, can work, because the term of employment is short-term. The type of employment which has a particular cycle—you know, an 18-month development cycle for a product might work on that. But when you start to rely on temporary worker programs to deal with permanent shortages in your labor market, I think you're in for a recipe for disaster.

To me, what has been the best thing about American immigration over the years is that we have tended to admit people for permanent residence with the idea that they're going to become members of our society. That expectation historically has been from the start. Historically, that a quarter have returned home. That happens. It's their choice. And sometimes it's because they've succeeded. Sometimes it's because they failed on that.

But we organized our immigration program, or we have in the past, around integration of immigrants, around the expectation that they will stay and become Americans. I think we're moving off

of that paradigm. I think the high level of intolerance for illegal migration is undermining that concept. And I think that too great a reliance on temporary worker programs, when people eventually stay in large numbers, means that you're delaying the process of integration. And I think for us as a country, there are some real dangers in doing that.

Ms. SOLIS. I know we didn't touch too much on it. But I know in, for example, Latin America, there are groups here in the states that will send monies back to, say, Mexico or different parts of Latin America. And they set up different programs for health care, for acquisition of property or capital outlay. They purchase buildings and build hospitals and clinics.

And I'd like to know what pattern there is in the OSCE states that participate or countries, and if you could elaborate on that.

Mr. OROZCO. Yes. These are basically the nations that migrants make when they are abroad as an organized group. We call them hometown associations. And they vary from different type of nature. They might be professional-based groups, construction-based associations, for example. In Kurdistan, there are groups of Kurds, construction workers that basically try to collect some money to help the local community which they come from.

But the pattern is similar to Latin America. I think it's less as developed as it is here, partly because here they're seeing more of a longer process. Migration from CIS countries to Russia is relatively new. It's not long-standing.

On the other hand, if you look at Armenia, for example, you do have a large number of associations in Los Angeles, for example. There's a large Armenian community that is organized, not as much as we think it is. But they are raising funds. Predominantly they work on church-related activities, not on other type of development-related philanthropy.

So they exist, and they can be a source of leveraging for cooperation. But I think the most important one is the family-to-family money transfers. That's where the billions of dollars go to.

Ms. MARTIN. Could I add one thing on that? One of the areas where I think the E.U. is a bit ahead of us, in thinking about this connection between migration and development, are policies that they refer to as co-development, where their development agencies work with migrant associations and in trying to do what Manuel was talking about in his testimony—of trying to integrate migration more into development and planning.

They don't do it very well yet. I'm not saying that it's necessarily a perfect system. But I would certainly like to see some type of migration impact statement in all development planning and programming, so that we look at both sides of the development-migration connection. Is the development program dealing with the migration pressures? And is the migration of people being taken into account in how our development programs are being implemented. And their hometown associations, I think, do play a role.

Ms. MOORE. Well, thank you so much, Mr. President.

This has been a very fascinating discussion. And my brain has been sort of buzzing, because I can't decide whether migration is a good thing or a bad thing. I mean, it seems to be the perils in migration for children. Some of the materials and testimony we've

had sort of indicate that when children migrate with women, there are problems with educational opportunity often. Street children—we didn't talk about that specifically. But at the same time, there are remittances that places like Moldova are very, very dependent upon.

I have a lot of questions. But I don't want to hog all the time. But I'm going to start with Dr. Orozco.

Dr. Orozco, you've done a lot of work in your studies on remittances. And so I wanted to know, particularly since women—the migration patterns for women, tend to be East Asia, the Pacific, Europe, and Central Asia and Latin America, perhaps there are a lot of Muslim women who are migrating. I'm wondering how have our post-9/11 anti-money-laundering restrictions—what impact that's had on migrants to remit money.

Mr. OROZCO. Thank you. You know, we work on migration all the time. And we struggle with the issue—the normative aspect of whether migration is good and bad. And we are right at the conclusion that we must look at it from a policy perspective, and a normative perspective. And my analogy is to ask the question whether commuting is good or bad for families and societies. And commuting is a form of migration. You have this mobilization of people through outside of urban areas, for example.

But on the issue of 9/11, I think it has posed a number of challenges, especially for money transfer companies; because the regulatory environment has been more strict on international foreign currency payments, in a way that the banking institutions, that's all the accounts for money transfers to operate on the back-end process have received sometimes not mixed signals, but strong signals from the U.S. government saying that money transfers are to be considered high-risk.

And then if you look at the place where the high risk is located, it's in places, in countries, where there is an ideological U.S. foreign policy component. So you are likely to, for example, scrutinize more the behavior of the Pakistani and Afghani person permitting than a Somali. I mean, the Somalian case that is a sad case of so much discrimination to a large extent of Somalians in the U.S. trying to remit formally through Western Union, for example, is not allowed.

Ms. MOORE. What about in the OSCE area?

Mr. OROZCO. The OSCE area, the patterning of the risk layer is not as high as it is here. On the other hand, even though I'm critical of the U.S. government issuing risk, I think in this country, anti-money-laundering regulatory environments are very primitive, very poor. And compliance doesn't exist.

For example, many of these countries don't even have laws for anti-money laundering. If you talk to the banks paying remittances, they have no idea how to identify what constitutes a suspicious activity. They tell you well, it is under \$3,000. We flag the transaction. But you can buy an AK-47 for \$50.

Ms. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. OROZCO. So it's an issue that you have to look at outside of whether it is Muslim or not descended, because that actually can bias your perspective. That can be Manuel Orozco sending remittances from Moscow. I mean, I can be doing some criminal activity

and not flag. So that issue is important to look into. It pertains to gender. The reality is that, if there are restrictions, women will be as likely as men to resort to informal networks. And informal networks are strong in all of these regions, partly because the infrastructure is poor, because also the regulatory environment only allows banks to pay remittances.

And for a country like Azerbaijan—60 percent of the country is poor and rural. And you only have banks that do not go to rural areas. Same thing with Moldova: a very good banking system, but the savings and investing associations that operate in Moldova in rural areas do not have the possibility to pay from it. So that encourages informality. And that's an issue that we need to pay attention.

Ms. MOORE. Just to follow up with one more question, Mr. Chairman.

I'm looking at a data from the World Bank research programs. And I just am amazed by their research about the migration flows, Dr. Martin and Dr. Orozco. It says the gender composition of migration flows to the main destination countries in the north. And they differ by region. Flows from Africa, South Asia and the Middle East tend to be male, while flows from East Asia and the Pacific, Europe, Central Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean tend to be female.

Do we know why that is? And where are they going? It didn't really say where they were going. But do we know why that is?

Ms. MARTIN. Usually migration occurs through family and labor recruiter networks. And employment is gendered. So if you have organizations that are recruiting workers for construction and bringing them to Germany, when Berlin was being reconstructed, they're going to be male. And likely, they're going to be looking for where those migration patterns are.

On the other hand, if you're looking for domestic workers or looking for nurses, you're going to go to the Philippines. And it's going to be female. So in the Philippines, 70 percent of those who migrate from the Philippines are female.

Much of the migration now, unfortunately, is illegal. And so it's more likely to be men who will initially take that risk in terms of migration. Even across the border with Mexico, if you look at apprehension figures, those who cross between ports of entry, through the desert or the mountains, are overwhelmingly male. Those who try to use fraudulent documents coming through ports of entry are predominantly female.

So you do get variations even from the same country in terms of what type of work they're coming for; but also what the possible modes of migration are.

Ms. MOORE. Just in terms of the United States, there seems to be some suggestion that male migrants to the United States are more successful in labor force participation and integration than females are; and that there are more catastrophic problems for women who come to the United States.

Ms. MARTIN. I would certainly not characterize it in that way. I think because a lot of our migration is initially still male migration coming in because there are needs in the job market, the men may

tend to have higher employment rates and higher labor participation rates. They're actually higher in many cases than natives are.

The women are still more likely to be following to join often coming from countries where there isn't a high level of female labor force participation. And so their labor force rates are going to be lower. Actually once in the labor force, very often their employment rates are higher than men, because they're able to get jobs. But the chances are they're not going to look for them unless it's absolutely essential in terms of the family household strategy. So I don't think that female migration poses an economic harm to the United States.

Mr. HASTINGS. Thank you, all. Dr. Martin and Dr. Orozco, thank you very much for your emphasizing the particularly complex issue in the OSCE's sphere as well as more directly related to our country. Regrettably, this institution deals with the societal emotions. And the manifestation of that comes out in a way that I think causes us not to be able to do the things that are vital in policy that we should be doing. And I appreciate very much that both of you have given us some policy direction that is valuable.

I don't have a question. But I would only add one or two anecdotes. And then I'll say to you, Dr. Orozco that I listened very carefully, as I did to Dr. Martin and my colleagues. And I find it interesting that you got through this whole one hour and a half without saying Kosovo or Bosnia.

And when you speak in terms of Central Asia, you did point to, and it's correct, where we have some direct policy relationships and/or diplomatic relationships, we tend to highlight and gather data and publicize that data. But there are two countries in Central Asia that have the exact same migration issues that their neighbors do—Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. And they are all, in many respects interrelated, because the transient points, the transmigration, all of those things happen.

One other thing that I regret, but I believe both of you would know. And that is that our colleague, Chris Smith, the ranking member of the commission, couldn't be with us. Like Ms. Solis, I'm really proud of the fact that, in the parliamentary assembly, she is my special representative on migration. And Congressman Smith is the special representative on human trafficking and has spent a substantial amount of his time and career in dealing with that subject and does have a wealth of information. And I just would point to that.

Another thing is both of you got through this without saying Canada. And here again, you know, when we focus about migration and immigration into the United States part of the OSCE sphere, we tend to leave our northern neighbors off to the side, who have an immensely complex immigration and migration and border security issues of similar import to our own.

Many of the remedies that you offer should, and rightly are, based in world organizations—the WTO, the World Bank, the United Nations and all of those areas. Unfortunately, what doesn't happen in something this complex is it cannot be reduced to a bumper sticker. And it's hard to put it in one or two pages. And once you get the kind of data that you all have collected in your careers, regrettably, even when it is sent to our offices, even when

we have immense staff and diverse staff and staff who are directly interested, it becomes absolutely too much information for us to digest and to come forward with meaningful policy.

If we do not, the level of intolerance that is developing in the OSCE sphere and in the United States of America specifically is going to have a devastating impact on us.

One anecdote that substantiates what you said, Dr. Martin, about temporary employment circumstance: We find businesses, multi-national corporations, U.S. corporations, specifically interested in H1-B visas and bringing in highly skilled and technical work. An example took place in the congressional district that I serve. The Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton participated in bringing 19 math teachers from the Asian continent to St. Lucie and Martin Counties to teach an underserved area. One of the things that needs to happen is we need to get on the same page in many of these instances but certainly the coordination of federal agencies.

On a given day, the homeland security people just decided they were going to pick up all 19 of those people. And it was in the middle of the school year. As a matter of fact, it was two months ago. They were going to pick them up and send them home. I read about it in the newspaper. And so I got my office involved and the people at Florida Atlantic University. And of course, over time, the exception was made.

But just think about the impact of that. Here we have the 19 math teachers. Obviously, we don't have enough math teachers. I might add every last one of them was extremely popular with the students and doing extraordinary work and what have you. All of them had been vetted—no relationship to terrorism or anything like that. And yet, they were talking about sending them home.

So we need to be very careful. And you all have so much information. I hope my colleagues way beyond the commission, but in the other committee will spend that kind of time. And I'm especially indebted to Ms. Solis for her extra effort. And even though we didn't have a large attendance, we did have a large attendance of members. And it manifests their interest. And that's largely attributable to the extraordinary work she did in recruiting them to come here for this important hearing.

One other thing that I've complained about, the commission itself is not a congressional committee. So matters like the Congress Daily and the Congressional Quarterly and The Hill and Roll Call, they will report the hearings that we have that are important like this.

But I happened to note yesterday, of all the things I read, I turned to the Congressional Quarterly. And I was interested. And Fred and others on the staff will know that I reached out to the editors and told them we have some pretty significant hearings over here. And a lot of folks would like to know what we are doing.

But I picked up the Congressional Quarterly and, without going through the front of it, I just turned. I said I'll bet you it's in here, but it's in the back. It's the back page. OK? So that's how important some others attach not only to this hearing, but others that we have had as well.

What you've had to say here today in this limited period of time is something that would be very beneficial if the 435 policy makers and the five delegates that I work with and certainly everybody in the United States Senate—if they were to hear it and understand how you approach it with the calm, professional, empirical backup of the things you're saying, then we'd get rid of some of the myth, we get rid of some of the anecdotal information that is exclusive only to that individual and not to the masses, we'd get rid of some of the stereotypes. And guess what? We might fool around and get ourselves some kind of comprehensive immigration policy. Thank you, all, so very much.

Ms. MARTIN. Thank you.

Mr. OROZCO. Thank you.

This is an official publication of the  
**Commission on Security and  
Cooperation in Europe.**

★ ★ ★

This publication is intended to document  
developments and trends in participating  
States of the Organization for Security  
and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

★ ★ ★

All Commission publications may be freely  
reproduced, in any form, with appropriate  
credit. The Commission encourages  
the widest possible dissemination  
of its publications.

★ ★ ★

**<http://www.csce.gov>      @HelsinkiComm**

The Commission's Web site provides  
access to the latest press releases  
and reports, as well as hearings and  
briefings. Using the Commission's electronic  
subscription service, readers are able  
to receive press releases, articles,  
and other materials by topic or countries  
of particular interest.

Please subscribe today.