

International Migration in South-East Asia : the Role of China

Jean Louis Rallu

INED – Institut National d'Etudes Demographiques,
75980 Paris Cedex 20,
France

Paper presented at the IUSSP Conference on Southeast Asia's Population in a Changing Asian Context held at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand, 10-13 June 2002

International Migration in South-East Asia : the Role of China

Jean Louis Rallu

For three decades (1949-1979), China has been a kind of 'sleeping giant' near Southeast Asia. China's population of 1.266 billion at the 2000 census is more than twice as much as 0.522 billion inhabitants in SE Asia. However, until 1979, most of the daily relations between Southeast Asians and Chinese were with Chinese of the diaspora. Under the 'reform era' initiated by Deng Xiao Ping, Chinese economic relations and migrations with the rest of the world have resumed. Suddenly, China entered the scene of a very developed East Asian economy and an already busy SE Asian developing economy. Both China and SE Asia are developing countries with rather similar demographic characteristics, at least with more advanced SE Asian countries, and migration pressure is very high everywhere in the region. International migration in SE Asia is already significant, in the frame of large economic gaps associated with rather different mortality, fertility and natural growth rates. Will China resume its several centuries long expansion to the Southeast and West? At first, the building of the diaspora was mainly a SE Asian phenomenon originating from Southeast China¹. However, SE Asia and China are not a closed world but open to developed East Asian countries: Japan and Korea, and beyond to Western developed countries where Chinese of the diaspora from the late 19th century as well as the 'new migrants' from the 1980s have been heading to.

This paper will address the background of international migration in SE Asia, such as age structure and other factors of migration pressure as well as internal and international migration policies. It will also consider Chinese migration in the context of South East and East Asian international migration.

1- Migration pressure and policies

1.1 - Working age population and labour market

Working age (15-64) population of SE Asia is not projected to decline before 2050 according to World Population Prospects, 2000 Revision (UN 2001), when it will just be about to stabilize (table 1). PR China's working age population is projected to decline temporarily in 2015-2020 and slightly increase in the following years. Actually the 2015-2025 period will see stabilization of China's working age population slightly above 1 billion and decline properly will start from 2025. When we consider receiving countries in SE Asia (Malaysia, Singapore and Thailand) plus Japan and Korea altogether, stabilization of the 15-64 age group occurs in 2015-2020 and decline starts from 2020. These trends imply that both China and Pacific Asian immigration countries altogether

will experience almost simultaneous trends and no LF shortage would affect Pacific Asian receiving countries altogether in the next two decades. Things are different at individual country level. Japan alone is already experiencing a decline in working age population. It will be followed by Korea, Singapore and Macao SAR, from 2020, Hong-Kong SAR from 2025 and Thailand from 2030. Malaysia's working age population is projected to be growing until 2050 like for less developed SE Asian countries: Indonesia, the Philippines, Myanmar, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and East Timor. As regards the region globally, China and Pacific Asia receiving countries would potentially be in a situation of needing surplus work force of less developed SE Asian countries, from 2025.

Despite similar trends, important differences exist in yearly growth rates of the working age population. Rates are much higher in China than in receiving countries, with 1.4% and 0.9% yearly respectively in 2000-2005 and 2005-2010 against 0.4% and 0.3%. Rates will still be 0.5% in China in 2010-2015 when working age population will be stabilizing in receiving countries. Working age population will also decline at a slower pace in China than in receiving countries until 2035; then rates become rather similar. But, in less developed countries globally, rates are even higher than in China, being around 2% in 2000-2010, 1.6% in 2010-2015 and still 1.2% in 2015-2025.

Decline in labour force will occur about 5 years earlier than in working age population, because of decline in LFPR among young adults and elderly. However, it is difficult to project LFPR at ages 65 and over. This age group will include higher proportions of the very old with very low rates, whereas rates are expected to increase for those in their sixties and early seventies in countries where shrinking of LF will be more acute, notably in Japan. And other countries could experience similar trends when they will face similar situations.

Another important aspect of LF change is ageing (Mason and al. 2001). In 2000, most Asian countries had around 15% of their LF aged 50-79 except Japan (35%) and Korea (20%) (table 2). Projections, using ILO rates for 2000 and 2010 and constant rates thereafter, show that the peak of ageing will be in 2025-2035, followed by slight decline and sometimes a new increase, in countries with already several decades of low fertility. The proportion of elderly labour force will be highest in Korea and Japan with 41% of LF aged 50-79 in Japan and 38% in Korea, against only 28% in PR China (30% in Hong Kong SAR) and 27% in Singapore². The peak of LF ageing will be later in Thailand, with a plateau above 31%, from 2035. Malaysia shows constant ageing to 22% in 2030 and 28% in 2050. The proportion of elderly LF in 2050 will be around 28% in all countries under study except Japan (39%), Korea (36%) and Thailand (33%). Most of ageing is due to doubling of the size of elderly LF (except Japan where it is stable) and to a much lesser extent to declines in young LF (aged 20-34). By 2025, those declines will be by 18% in China, 31% in Japan, 22% in Korea and only 5% in Thailand, whereas Malaysia and Singapore, due to immigration for the latter, would still witness increases in youth LF, by respectively 54% and 6%. Declines in the size of young LF mean that, by 2025,

this segment of working population will represent only 26% of LF in Japan and 28% in Korea against 32% in China and Thailand and around 40% in Malaysia and Singapore. Then, countries with the highest declines could have to look for young LF with high technical qualification in other countries of the region. But, the downward trend in young LF is general in developed and emergent Asian economies except Malaysia and less developed countries. As regards ageing of the LF, we see again that trends in China are not much different from those prevalent in Pacific Asian receiving countries altogether. But Japan and Korea experience more rapid ageing of LF.

Similarity of trends hides important differences. To stabilize LF in 2025 at its 2000 level, Japan is the only country to need immigration, to an extent of 8 millions persons. But several countries would need immigration to stabilize LF at ages 20-34: Japan would need 6.7 millions migrants workers, Korea 2.1 millions, Thailand 800,000, Hong Kong SAR 200,000 and China... 60 millions. Moreover, LFPR at young ages will probably further decline.

The following figures describe more adequately tensions on labour market in China comparatively to SE Asia. China's working age population is to grow by 12.7 millions yearly between 2000 and 2005 and by 9.0 millions in 2005-2010 and still 5.1 millions in 2010-2015. In the 2015-2025 period, yearly changes will be by a few hundreds of thousands only. In less developed countries globally, growth will be by 6.0 millions in 2000-2010, 5.2 millions in 2010-2015 and 4.4 millions in 2015-2020. Receiving countries altogether also show increases in working age population, but they are negligible with only 1.1, 0.6 and 0.2 million in respectively 2000-2005, 2005-2010 and 2010-2015. However, new jobs needed yearly to reach the levels of LFPR projected by ILO for 2010, and maintain rates thereafter, are a little less than the above figures, with, for China: 8.0 millions in 2000-2005, 6.0 millions in 2005-2010 and 3.2 millions in 2010-2015 millions. In less developed countries, new jobs needed reach 5 millions yearly in 2000-2010, and 4.6 and 3.8 millions in 2010-2015 and 2015-2020 respectively. This is still much higher than projected yearly declines in LF in Japan of 0.3 and 0.5 million in 2005-2010 and 2010-2015, or even declines of young LF in receiving countries of 0.1, 0.6 and 0.5 million from 2000-2005 to 2010-2015. Obviously, crude numbers show aspects that are not revealed by proportions and rates. Migration pressure in China appears clearly, as well as the very limited capacity for receiving countries to absorb it.

1.2. - Sectoral labour markets

Increases and declines in working age population do not necessarily mean labour surpluses and shortages. Labour surpluses/shortages mostly occur in the frame of sectoral labour markets and vary according to the level of economic development. Economies evolve from developing to developed through a four stages pattern: resources based, labour based, capital based and knowledge based (Ohlsson and Vinell 1987). In this process, there is less and less need of unqualified jobs that are often filled by migrant workers. Malaysia and Thailand remain resources and labour based

economies, with large plantation and farm-produce industries, and receive the largest number of migrant workers. Taiwan, Korea, Singapore and Japan become or are already mostly capital and knowledge based economies and need less migrants. For instance, in the next few years, Taiwan will need 196,000 high-tech professionals whereas universities are able to provide only about 150,000 (AMN, 1-15 Nov 2001). The number of migrants needed to fill the gap is rather small in comparison of the stock of more than 300,000 foreign workers currently in Taiwan, more than 100,000 of which being domestic helpers and most of the other being unqualified or semi-qualified construction, harbour or manufacture workers. The origin of these migrants will also be different, a recruitment mission being sent to the USA to find talents. However, sectors like construction, manufacture and domestic services will still hire labour for unqualified and low paid jobs or the 3Ds that are not attractive to locals. Although it will rapidly decline as SE Asian economies evolve to capital and knowledge based, the need for unqualified migrants will remain with a kind of bottom line. At the other end, ageing and shrinking labour force will necessitate increased productivity and immigration of highly qualified workers to be found in countries with surplus labour. Among these countries, only the Philippines already have high rates of secondary and post-secondary education enrollment (table 4). Improvements in education are necessary in less developed and high fertility countries to avoid a shortage in young qualified LF at the regional level in 25 years (the duration of schooling of a generation). These countries cannot expect to rely on emigration and remittances of mostly unqualified workers in 15 or 20 years, when economies of the region will need much less unqualified labour than now. In this regards, it is interesting to note a kind of chain migration already developing: unqualified Burmese construction workers migrate to Thailand, mostly illegally, whereas semi-qualified and qualified Thais workers migrate to Taiwan, Singapore or Malaysia. Return migrants, including second generation migrants, could also fill highly qualified jobs.

Sectoral labour markets cause brain drain. Education of recent immigrants (persons entered in 1987-1990 enumerated in 1990) and occupations of immigrants of the year 2000 in the USA show high qualification of migrants from PR China, comparable with migrants from Hong Kong SAR and Taiwan. PR China immigrants show educational level between Hong-Kong SAR and Taiwan immigrants for BA and above diplomas altogether (table 3). PR China migrants had even the highest proportions of doctorates for both sexes in 1990. But, the proportion of persons with low education is higher among PR China migrants. As regards occupation, PR China migrants have proportions of professional and technicians again between Hong Kong SAR and Taiwan migrants. However, they are less frequently administrative managers, and they include sizeable proportions of agricultural workers and labourers. The high qualification of migrants is mostly a result of selection by immigration services, showing that probabilities of emigration are very different according to education and occupation, at least to enter legally developed Western countries. Most of illegal migrants certainly show low education and fill unqualified jobs in ethnic business or sweatshops such as garments and shoes factories, and restaurants. However, recent illegal migrants to New York area become closer to emigrants as regards educational level (Liang 2000).

In the context of globalization, brain drain has lost part of its meaning. Migrants can have businesses in several countries like it is already famous of the Hong Kong 'astronauts' migration. But, sending countries still need to be attractive for such business to develop, meaning a growing economy is necessary there as well as globally.

1.3. - Migration pressure in PR China

The 1949-1979 period has seen slow urbanization, even declining in 1966-1977, and very little economic development in China. Rapid economic and technical changes following the opening to foreign investments have strongly hit state-owned enterprises and workers. With mostly rural, under-employed and low qualification population, PR China experiences very high migration pressure that cannot be easily absorbed in cities, other countries of the region or in the West.

Beyond the growth of working age population (see above), the main aspects of migration pressure in China are unemployment, rural under-employment and floating population. Official figures of 5.95 millions unemployed in 2000 are for urban areas only (China Statistical Yearbook, 2001). Unemployment is estimated to be about 50 millions, 35 millions from state-owned industrial enterprises and 16 millions from government-controlled collectives (MN, Nov 2001). Moreover, it is estimated that access to WTO will cause several millions of layoffs in state-owned sector. There is also an estimated surplus of 160 millions in agriculture, plus floating population³ of 130 millions, part of which is of urban origin, or altogether 23 per cent of Chinese population.

1.4. - Migration policies

Various policies greatly limit emigration from China. From 1949, PR China had two types of passports: public passports, issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for official visits abroad, and private passports, issued by Public Security Offices. The latter were restricted to visit relatives abroad or inherit from relatives. Very small numbers of private passports were issued during the Cultural Revolution. After 1979, the number of private passports issued increased to reach 85,000 in 1986. From November 22, 1985, effective from February 1, 1986, a new law was implemented. - The 1986 law sets the conditions for issuing passports: 'taking up permanent residency in a foreign country,... visiting relatives or friends,... inheriting property,... studying... taking up employment,... sightseeing'. Proofs such as invitation letter, permanent residence visa, certificate of enrollment, letter of appointment, or evidence of funds must be presented. Passports are valid for 5 years and can be renewed two times. Thus, they can be used for other reasons than that of their issuance. The 1986 law sets that passport can be nullified if the person is 'repatriated to China after illegally entering or illegally staying in a foreign country', if the bearer participated in illegal business or activities 'harmful to the national security, honor and interests of the People's Republic of China'. - From 1986, the number of passports delivered jumped to reach close to one million in 1995 (Zeng Yi,

Zhang Qinwu 1998). However, despite lack of data for recent years, it is obvious that only a small minority of Chinese owns a passport and is able to go abroad or migrate legally. Traveling or migrating, including illegally, is also hindered by limited access to foreign currency.

Hukou (registration as urban or rural resident, with little possibility of changing residency until recently) also limits internal migration to urban areas from where international migration often starts. But it is, as well as restrictions to get a passport, a cause of illegal migration. Migrants who cannot settle in cities or have a passport can try to leave undocumented.

Hukou and citizenship law could also have some dissuasive effect on emigration abroad. A person leaving permanently has to cancel hukou, only temporarily if stay abroad is not permanent. To return permanently, a Chinese who is permanent resident of a foreign country, must apply to a Chinese Embassy or to the Public Security Office. To be allowed to work, he must also apply to the Labour Office. Chinese law does not recognize dual nationality, but a former Chinese national can renounce foreign citizenship and become again a Chinese citizen.

Restrictions on issuance of passports and hukou are inherited from the pre-reform era. In the frame of access to WTO, China is implementing unrestricted passport delivery from 2005 and easier resident registration in small and medium cities has already been tested. New reforms of hukou enable non-urban residents, who have a legal and static dwelling place, a stable occupation and source of income, to apply for permanent residence in the cities and towns where they work and live (Xinhua 08/27/2001). This would give them access to housing, medical, education and employment benefits that are denied to floating population. This new policy aims at localizing people administratively. It also catches up with the delay in urbanisation inherited from the pre-reform era. Rural migrants in cities enjoy higher way of life and contribute to develop consumer market. Experiments of new registration have been conducted in various provinces with large success. In five years from 1996, 105 small cities and towns in Zhejiang absorbed more than 400,000 rural residents with the population of more than 80 of the chosen cities being doubled (MN Nov. 2001). However, access to big cities is still limited to higher technical workers with senior professional titles. Black market permits to live in large cities such as Beijing are sold at around 12,000 US\$, but cost is much less for smaller cities.

The recent change in registration system would enable China to absorb 7 to 8 millions rural surplus laborers each year (MN Nov. 2001), making it between 16 and 18 years to absorb the floating population and still more to absorb the rural labour surplus if they choose to migrate to cities. Easier access to urban residency in small cities could reduce undocumented international migration, the cost of which will become comparatively greater and remain associated with high risks, like being enslaved for years, see reprisals on family, being jailed or even die. According to migration theory, short

distance movements often precede long distance migration and internal often precedes international migration. Inter-provincial migration has actually been increasing relatively to intra-provincial migration from 1987 (Liang 2001). However, people of the floating population rarely have passports and qualification to apply for visas to developed countries. But they can migrate as illegals and a very small proportion of the floating population actually does it. For qualified migrants, changes in registration will make return migration easier and changes in labour policy that can be expected after access to WTO would also make easier to set up a business in China.

In a global view of its migration policies, China does not seem to bother about large emigration that could be qualified as brain drain. It seems that China is using its emigrants like a kind of new diaspora, providing access to modern technology and global markets. At the same time, there is a beginning of concern to attract highly qualified return migrants, mostly in developed coastal cities like Shanghai or Guangzhou.

Given the growth of working age population, unemployment, under-employment and floating population, migration can only very marginally ease tensions on China's labour market. A country with a large population like China cannot rely on migrants' remittances to fuel economic development⁴. Poor performances of the Philippines or Indonesia actually show that this is not the way. Moreover, as regards China, the high cost of illegal migration paid to snakeheads takes a toll on remittances. China will witness various phases of migration transition simultaneously, with the last phase: return migration, previously experienced by Korea and Taiwan, already occurring in coastal cities when, at the same time, the North and West will still be emigration regions. Thus, the question is: will development of the East provide enough jobs for Western and Northern migrants? The Eastern provinces are certainly the market to look at to absorb Chinese labour surplus, a task that would be impossible for Pacific Asian countries, despite important labour shortages in Japan in the next decades.

2 - Pacific Asia migration

This section will consider Chinese migration in the context of Pacific Asian migration. Trends in working age population do not fully reflect the actual situation of migration in SE Asia. Significant flows affect many countries that cannot be predicted by population pressure alone.

2.1. – Migration situation in SE and East Asia

Countries of the Pacific coast of Asia separate between developed/developing and immigration/emigration countries. The former include Japan and a city state: Singapore – formerly a British colony, Hong-Kong SAR, was another kind of developed city state⁵ (table 4). They are mostly immigration countries. Korea and Taiwan, with GDP/capita

close to 10,000 US\$, are mainly immigration countries although they are still subject to emigration. Two emerging countries with GDP/capita of 2,000 to 4,000 US\$: Malaysia and Thailand, see the highest immigration flows as well as significant emigration of nationals, whereas the Philippines and Indonesia see the highest outflows. It is noticeable that emigration from the latter two countries is not mostly oriented toward SE Asia and even not Pacific Asia, particularly for the Philippines. Myanmar appears to have similar GDP/capita with Indonesia and is mostly an emigration country rather exclusively oriented to neighbouring Thailand. Lower end countries, with GDP/capita below 500 US\$, consist of former French Indochina. Viet Nam and Cambodia experienced significant refugee migration following wars. PR China ranks between Indonesia and the Philippines for GDP/capita and has returned to its historical characteristics of emigration country from 1979.

Development levels and migration patterns of Pacific Asian countries have taken shape from the 1970s and have not much changed after the Asian crisis. However, GDP/capita declined more or less markedly in all countries, except China and lower end countries after 1998. Economic development and migration situation appear grossly to follow advances in demographic transition, with higher GDP countries being those with most ancient fertility decline and current lowest fertility. However, some lower end countries: Viet Nam and Indonesia, have achieved considerable fertility decline whereas Malaysia keeps higher fertility than Thailand and a few other countries with lower GDP, including China.

International migration in Pacific Asia is remarkable by very large flows in two areas: between Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia and the Philippines, and along the Thailand-Myanmar border. These flows include large proportions of illegals from Indonesia and the Philippines to Malaysia and from Myanmar to Thailand. Comparatively to the pressure on labour markets due to working age population growth in China and less developed countries (see above), numbers of migrants in Japan and Korea, as well as other immigration countries, remain small. The increase of SE and East Asian migrants by 570,000 from 1980 in Japan remains very moderate in comparison of both migration pressure in the region and the size of the Japanese population. Chinese make 60 per cent of the increase and, from 1995, they show the highest growth of all foreigners in Japan. Korea has 250,000 registered immigrants and about 220,000 illegals. They are mostly from China, including a large proportion of ethnic Korean, notably among overstayers. Singapore controls immigration through strict policies including special favorable schemes for Malays and highly skilled technicians and professionals. However, there is a large increase in the non-resident population (+630,000 from 1980) that does not much consists of nationals of Pr China. Migrant workers in Taiwan number above 300,000 and 96 per cent are Thais, Indonesians or Filipinos. In the region globally, a large proportion of migrants are illegals, mostly overstayers, but illegal entries, for which there is no reliable estimate, are also frequent. They come mostly from medium low GDP/capita labour surplus countries: the Philippines, Indonesia, Myanmar

and China, but are directed to various countries, the most affected being Thailand and Malaysia.

2.2 - Guest workers policies

The main pattern of international migration in the region is labour (or guest workers) migration, in the frame of labour contracts with employers through private agencies, more directly supervised by governments since the Asian crisis and under pressure of humanitarian NGOs. Japan and Korea have implemented 'trainees' programs that cost less to employers than migrants, but trainees tend to leave the companies they were assigned to for working for better wages as illegal workers. Singapore has the most elaborated labour migration policy, with levies and quotas of foreign LF by industry groups, laws to protect migrants and sanctions on employers. Recently, Singapore raised the minimum wage level to qualify for employment pass from 2,000 to 2,500 S\$, to be sure that only highly qualified workers can work in Singapore (AMN 10. 2001). Malaysia, Taiwan and Thailand, mostly after the Asia Crisis, have implemented similar policies but less elaborated and with much less rigour than Singapore – Thailand started registration with fees on foreign workers in September-October 2001.

Changes after the Asian crisis, show the role of migrants on labour markets. Fines on both illegals and employers of illegals increased. Cracks on illegals were followed by repatriation of hundreds of thousands from Malaysia and Thailand. Quotas were to be lowered and levies raised. But rapidly, employers asked for easier access to immigrant workers, needing cheap labour to keep their companies afloat. Many exemptions: stable quotas and reduction of levies, were granted to various corporations in Malaysia and Thailand, and also on a regional basis for the latter. These attempts to replace illegal migrants by legal migrants with work contracts, controlling immigration and access to labour market, and trying to reduce unemployment by substituting laid-off locals to migrants workers have only been partly successful, and Malaysia and Thailand are still largely affected by illegal immigration. Despite the increasing risk of sanctions, employers still hire illegals, the cost of which is much lower than that of documented migrants or locals. After 1998, Japan and Korea experienced reduced need of trainees, declining entries of documented migrants and less overstayers. Numbers of undocumented migrants also declined. However, trends are back on the rise from 2000.

Despite looming declines in LF, no country in the region is willing to implement schemes of permanent family migration: access to citizenship or even permanent residence is almost impossible, except in Singapore and for highly qualified workers only. However, policies are developed to educate migrants' children in Japan and Korea; this may be a beginning of family migration policy. Taiwan Council of Labour Affairs also extended work permits from three to six years for highly qualified technicians; it also suggested that migrants could marry during their employment and pregnancy would no longer be a reason to send migrants home. In February 2002, the Ministry of the Interior said it would establish a new committee to help foreigners gain permanent residency more easily. These changes are first approach to long term migration. Employers need more

and more workers with some qualification and understand that formation of migrant workers has a cost and that there are benefits in keeping workers. Governments should also understand that social integration of foreigners is easier with permanent migrants.

2.3. – Chinese migration in Asia and beyond

From data in annex, it appears that, for the 1980-2000 period, more than one million Chinese entered Pacific Asian countries, mostly Japan (350,000), Korea (160,000), Taiwan (100,000), Thailand (150,000) and the Philippines (150,000), plus a few tens of thousands in Singapore. The total of one million being reached assuming very low numbers of migrants who did not enter through ports. But, SE Asian countries are mostly transit countries for illegals on their way to the West and illegals in transit are evasive. It is sure, however, that many illegals move through the Kunming-Chiangmai highway, across the Strait of Taiwan, through the Korean peninsula and the Sea of Japan. Thailand is more and more concerned by arrivals of illegals and report, as well as Myanmar and Cambodia, immigration of Chinese who come to open smaller or larger businesses. Although small numbers, this migration is very visible. But illegal arrivals of labourers represent more significant numbers. Altogether, Chinese migrants in Pacific Asia are probably less than a quarter of Chinese emigration since 1980, that we estimate between four and five millions worldwide (Rallu forthcoming), showing that developed Western countries have been the main destination of Chinese emigration in the last two decades. From late 20th century, China has become the first or second origin of migrants in Canada, the USA (second after Mexico), Australia, New Zealand, and several European countries, whereas it is not among the first origins of migrants to the main immigration countries in SE Asia: Malaysia and Singapore, but is probably the second origin in Thailand. It has also become the first origin of migrants in Japan and Korea that are to be included with developed countries. A reason for moderate emigration from China to Pacific Asia is that there is not much interest from Chinese to be guest workers in the region, except to Japan and Singapore, and Korea for ethnic Koreans. Moreover, some countries, like Malaysia, restrict occupations available for Chinese migrants who are not eligible to be domestic helpers. However, Chinese migration to Thailand and SE Asia could increase, in the form of illegal migration of labourers and small businessmen migration, on the model of Chinese migration to Russian Far East and cities along the China-Russian border, already estimated at 1 million a few years ago (Won 1994).

Destinations of Chinese migration show that wage levels and way of life are considerable pull factors that attract Chinese migrants to developed countries. Chinese mostly migrate to countries with the highest wages: the USA and Japan. Illegals also try to reach these countries where higher wages make it easier to pay for the cost of being smuggled. Other countries like Australia, Europe and Canada are sometimes only transit countries to the two most favoured destinations. Asian migration has always shown strong attraction to North America and most Asian countries have the highest number of their overseas population there. This is the case of the Philippines, Taiwan, Hong Kong,

Korea, Viet Nam, Cambodia, and now China, as regards the 'new migrants', excluding the old diaspora. As such, recent Chinese migration follows the paths of diaspora, with increasingly American, South Pacific and European destinations in late 19th century and early 20th century. Actually, it is not conceivable for migrants to be satisfied with lower economic success than that of members of the diaspora in Western countries who now enjoy the best way of life on the planet.

When Korea and Taiwan became more developed, emigration declined and return migration started to increase. Hong Kong's astronaut migration is another form of migration in the frame of global markets. These movements are already starting for China. Of course, these movements are minor flows in comparison with current emigration. Nevertheless, the size of Chinese emigration since 1980 remains moderate, but it has been constantly increasing and now reaches significant numbers yearly. The current situation of limited outflows from China rests on social and political stability, the continuation of economic development and liberalization of economy in China. It also rests on migration policies in developed countries. Limited access to the West could make migrants change their destination to neighbouring Asian countries, if development and higher wages make them attractive.

Conclusion

For the next two decades, Pacific Asian receiving countries altogether show very limited declines in LF – either in total LF in Japan or soon in young LF in other receiving countries. These declines are not and will not be, in the near future, comparable with increases in China and less developed SE Asian countries. Moreover, China currently has huge labour surplus, resulting in tremendous emigration pressure. But, after 2025, China too will see declining LF and could receive surplus labour from SE Asia. It is difficult to know what will be the situation of labour markets in 20 years, but, most probably, economic development should have reduced the need of unqualified jobs that support large migration flows.

In the long term, return migration and multi-local businesses should profoundly change the meaning of migration and related phenomena such as brain drain, labour or family migration, maybe even citizenship in the frame of frequent dual or multi-nationality individuals. The question being: how shall we accommodate of the numerous poors if education has not made them employable on future labour markets.

Chinese migration, as it has been from 1980 on the Asian scene as well as elsewhere in the world, appears to be similar to Asian migration, with the largest number of migrants settling in developed countries in and mostly outside of Asia. Migration policies and attractiveness of economies are strong determinants of destinations of Asian migrants.

China, due to the size of its population, cannot expect emigration to neighbouring countries, as well as to Western developed countries, to be a solution to its problems. As

long as stability and liberalization of economy will prevail in China, the solution to China's surplus LF will be in economic development in China. In the frame of globalisation however, migration of highly qualified professionals enable China to access higher technical knowledge and speed its development. Secondary flows of illegal labourers and smaller businessmen to neighbouring countries could further develop. The Asian crisis has shown that migration, including illegal migration, can decline when there is a lack of employment opportunities. Migration policies are also a factor influencing the size and directions of migration. Changes in policies regarding passports and hukou, after access of China to WTO, should also ease development and not be a cause of uncontrolled emigration. Migration policies of receiving countries will also play a role in the direction of migration.

Bibliography:

AMN (Asian Migration News), on line information bulletin of Scalabrini Migration Center, Quezon City, Philippines, <http://www.scalabrini.org/~smc>.

Giese, K. (1997) A Preliminary study of irregular migration from mainland China to Taiwan, in Th. Scharping (ed.), Floating population and migration in China, the impact of economic Reforms, Mitteilungen des Instituts für Asienkunde, Hamburg, pp.

He Xiuming (1997) China's labor export to Asia and Pacific regions, Feasibility and guideline in policies. Population and Economics 3. pp.

Hugo, G. (1998) The Demographic Underpinning of Current and Future International Migration in Asia. Asian and Pacific Migration Journal, 7:1, 1-25.

Jin Feng De (2000) The Chinese Economy under the Coexistence of High Growth and High Unemployment. Journal of Asian-Pacific Studies, 6, mars 2000.

Kwon Tai Hwan (1997) International Migration of Koreans and the Korean Community in China. Korea Journal of Population and Development, 26:1, 1-18.

Liang Zai (2001) The age of migration in China. Population and Development Review, 27:3, pp. 499-524.

Liang Zai (2000) Demography of Illicit Emigration from China : A Sending Country's Perspective. Sociological Forum.

Ma Zhongdong, Tsang Yuk Ching (2000) Immigration transition in Hong Kong in the 1990s, in Kimura M., Hayase Y. (eds.), International Migration and Human Resources Development in the APEC Member Economies, Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO, Chiba, Japan.

Mason, A. Sang-Hyop Lee, and Russo, G. (2001) Population Momentum and Population Ageing in Asia and Near-East Countries East-West Center Working Papers, Population Series 107.

MN, Migration News, on line information letter of University of California Davis, <http://migration.ucdavis.edu>.

NBS (National Bureau of Statistics). (2001) China Statistical Yearbook. China Statistics Press, Beijing.

Ohlsson, L. and Vinell, L. (1987) Tillvaxstens drivkrafter – en studie av industriens framtidsvillkor. Stockholm: Sveriges industriforbund.

Osaki, K. (2000) International Migration in Eastern and South-eastern Asia : A Regional Overview, in M. Kimura and Y. Hayase (eds.), International Migration and Human Resources Development in the APEC Member Economies, Institute of Developing Economies, JETRO, Chiba, Japan.

Passel, J. S. (1999) Undocumented Immigration to the United States; Numbers, Trends, and Characteristics, in David W. Haines and Karen E. Rosenblum (eds.), Illegal Immigration in America: A Reference Handbook, Greenwood Press, Westport, Connecticut, pp. 27-111.

Project Group on New Emigrants from Shanghai. (1997) A study of New Emigrants from Shanghai. Chinese Journal of Population Science, 9 :4, pp. 289-298.

Rallu, J.L. (2001) Migration trends in the Asia Pacific and the Asian Crisis, in Edstrom B. (ed.), Interdependence in the Asia Pacific. Sweedish Institute of International Affairs and Center for Pacific Asia Studies, Stockholm University.

Rallu, J.L. (forthcoming) Ouverture, migration internationale et développement en Chine, in Attané, I. (ed.), La Chine au seuil du XXIème siècle, questions de population, questions de société, INED-PUF, Paris.

UN (2001), World Population Prospects: the 2000 Revision. Population Division, United Nations, New York.

Won Bae Kim, 1994, Sino-Russian Relations and Chinese Workers in the Russian Far East : A Porous Border. East West Center, Reprint Series, Population Series N° 310.

Zeng Yi and Zhang Qinwu. (1998) Conditions in China influencing Outmigration, in Laquian E. and al. (eds.), The Silent Debate : Asian Immigration and Racism in Canada, Institute of Asian Research, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, pp. 75-84.

Annex : Chinese migrants in main immigration countries

Japan - In Japan, Chinese citizens registered by Ministry of Justice increased from 52,896 in 1980 to 335,575 (including Taiwan) at the end of 2000 (Japan Statistical Yearbook). In 1980, they consisted mainly of persons arrived around WW2 and their children, but increase from 1980 is mainly due to 'new migrants'. Chinese overstayers were estimated to be 42,139 (including 9,243 from Taiwan) at the end of 1999. Japan also witnesses many illegal arrivals by boat for which there is no reliable

estimate. Altogether, we can estimate to at least 350,000 the increase in number of Chinese immigrants in Japan from 1980.

Korea - In 2001, Korea had 250,000 registered migrants and about 220,000 illegals. In 1998, according to data of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Chinese were the largest foreign citizens population in the Republic of Korea with 84,600 legal migrants and 52,700 illegals (an increase by more than 100% from 1995), most of them overstayers. Moreover, Korea is also a transit country to Japan and many illegals enter by boat. Many Chinese nationals are ethnic Koreans. Data for 1994 show arrivals of 9,017 Chinese and 6,832 ethnic Korean Chinese for legal arrivals and estimates of resp. 2,056 and 17,093 among illegals (APMJ 1995, 4:4, 579-84).

Singapore –. Singaporean residents born in China, Hong Kong or Taiwan enumerated in Singapore declined from 188,627 in 1980 to 149,969 in 1990, and increased to 163,041 in 2000. Decline in 1980-1990 was due to deaths among a mostly elderly population of Chinese of the diaspora. At adult ages (20-45), there was an increase by 9,500, but figures for 1990 are for “residents” only, whereas figures for 1980 include 5,851 non-residents of all ages⁶, some of them may have become resident inbetween. Overall increase of 13,072 between 1990 and 2000 may include a large proportion of Hong-Kong-born population migrating in the early 1990s. However, census data on non-residents have not been published after 1980 and data on foreign labour force are classified. Non-resident population increased from 132,000 in 1980 to 311,000 in 1990 and 755,000 in 2000. Most of it consists of Malays, Indonesians and South Asians.

Taiwan - From 1987 Taiwanese can visit and invest in China, leading to increased relations across the Strait. No figure on mainland migrants is available for Taiwan. It is estimated to be around 80,000 in later half of 2000 (AMN 11.2000), mostly spouses of Taiwanese and students. 38,000 mainland illegals were arrested between 1987 and 1999, with 6,000 in 1993 and then declining to below 2000 in 1995 (Tsay 2000); 98% of arrested people were from Fujian and had very low education with only 28.4% having 1st cycle of secondary courses level and 6.7% 2nd cycle. This author also estimates at 12,000 the number of mainland illegals. Taiwan recently increased quota from 3600 to 9500 for mainland wives of Taiwanese; of 59,185 who have applied to stay in the country, only 16,620 had been approved (AMN 11.30.2001). Taiwan also hosts about 100 mainland high technology professionals and is extending work contracts and making this immigration easier (relaxed restrictions and shorter waiting period for visas). Labour is cheaper in mainland than in Taiwan and Taiwanese firms tend to delocalise rather than import workers. However, migrants are needed for sectors that cannot delocalise (construction, harbour works, services). Taiwan finds them in Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia and is trying to extend recruitment to Cambodia, Myanmar and as far as South Asia. However, Taiwan is attractive to mainland workers by much higher wages. Taiwan can also be a transit country for undocumented migrants trying to reach Japan and Western developed countries.

From 1987 to 1996, Taiwan received 17,200 Hong Kong migrants, 89% took citizenship, and 7,800 Macao migrants (Tsay, 2000).

South East Asia - Immigration services of the Philippines reported 137,000 Chinese nationals in 2000 (AMN, 2000) and police arrests frequently illegals. The Ministry of Internal Affairs of Thailand reported 226,000 Chinese nationals in 1998, but part of them would be ancient migrants. Illegals were estimated at over 100,000 before the Asian crisis, but illegals in transit are evasive and difficult to estimate. Many illegal arrivals would occur through the Kunming-Chiang Mai road, via Laos and the new bridge on Mekong.

USA – PR China-born population enumerated in the US between 1980 census and March 1998 CPS increased from 286,000 to 941,000 (947,000 in March 2001 CPS), or an intake of 655,000. This figure should be compared to only 431,800 immigrants whose last residence was in PR China for the period 1980-1998. Immigrants from Hong Kong and Taiwan numbered resp. 186,900 and 231,100 for the same period (against 122,700 Hong-Kong-born and 208,700 Taiwan-born). Totals for PR China, Hong-Kong SAR and Taiwan are 922,900 for birthplace against 849,800 for last residence; the difference is partly due to arrivals from other countries in the frame of step by step migration. Students and other non-immigrant visas account for significant numbers of Chinese migrants. It is not easy to cumulate these visas, because migrants can change their status. A rapid estimate would put it at between 200,000 and 300,000 Chinese citizens. China is not among the 10 first providers of illegals to the USA and there would be less than 30,000 illegal Chinese in country. The reason is that Chinese rarely overstay but rather enter without inspection. Other estimates are 124,000 in 1995 (Passel 1999) but they may be incomplete, being based on people reporting in the CPS. It is, for the least, strange to see that estimates of China-born population in CPS has been almost stable from 1997, whenever around 40,000 have entered yearly from 1995 according to INS data. Probably more than 1 million Chinese entered the USA in 1980-2000.

Canada – Canada mostly witnessed immigration from Hong-Kong with 356,300 immigrants in 1982-1998 against only 144,800 from PR China and 84,000 from Taiwan. China is first origin of migrants to Canada since 1998.

Australia – Australia also mostly received Chinese from Hong-Kong, with 116,500 settlers against 36,200 from PR China and 22,200 from Taiwan in 1982-1998. In addition, 37,600 students in country at the time of Tian'an men events were granted permanent residence.

Western Europe - Countries of 'Espace Economique Europeen' would have witnessed arrival of about 160,000 Chinese citizens between 1985 and 1998 (from

estimates of foreign residents in 1985 and 1998 and naturalizations in the period) (Rallu 2002), but it is often estimated that there are at least 2 illegals for 1 legal.

Eastern Europe – 27,000 Chinese entered Hungary in 1991, after a visa waiver from 1989 that was lifted a few years later. 5,000 Chinese remained in Hungary in 1999 and also 5,000 in Check Republic in 2000. Serbia would host more than 50,000 Chinese in 2000, following easy access to tourist visas for Chinese after the war in Kosovo.

These figures do not include migrants to Russia and former USSR Republics for which no estimate is available. A conservative estimate of Chinese in Russia for 1992 was 1 million, of which 200,000 in Russian Far-East (Won 1994).

¹ Historically, Chinese of the diaspora mostly originated from Southeast coastal province from Zhejiang to Hainan, and more specifically ethnic Cantonese, Hakkas, Kokkien and Teochiu from Guangdong and Fujian (Pan, 1999)¹.

² The proportion of elderly LF could be a little inflated because we use the LFPR at ages 65 and over (see text).

³ Rural migrants to urban areas who did not modify their residency 'hukou'.

⁴ The most visible effect of emigration, not to be confused with remittances, is certainly the large properties built by people smugglers in various cities in Fijian.

⁵ Brunei Darussalam shows GDP/capita in the range of developed countries and is an immigration country, but, due to its small size, it does not play a significant role in Asian migration.

⁶ In 1980, among 17,137 Singaporean non-citizens born in China, Hong Kong or Taiwan, only 3,455 were nationals of China, Hong-Kong or Taiwan, 3,705 were Malay citizens, 186 Indonesian citizens, 657 citizens of other Asian countries, 1,752 citizens of European countries and 144 American or Canadian citizens, (7,600 did not report citizenship). This shows that China-born migrants did many stops in various countries where they acquired citizenship.

Table 1. Changes in working age population (15-64) in Asia

Period	China	HK SAR	Japan	Korea	Malaysia	Singapore	Thailand	Receiving countries ^a	SE Asia
change (in thousands)									
2000/2005	63318	352	-1705	932	1492	292	2910	3921	34532
2005/2010	44942	320	-2942	991	1892	257	2654	2851	34095
2010/2015	25422	150	-4177	463	1603	80	2595	564	30640
2015/2020	-1266	23	-2852	-61	1331	-79	1759	98	24791
2020/2025	2787	-97	-1892	-1075	1070	-184	808	-1273	19053
2025/2030	-12074	-131	-2602	-1364	839	-213	-60	-3400	15355
2030/2035	-33423	-46	-3613	-1399	807	-180	-482	-4867	11442
2035/2040	-33071	-53	-4828	-1468	790	-83	-565	-6155	8555
2040/2045	-16485	-31	-3594	-955	630	-27	-702	-4647	4561
2045/2050	-18995	-4	-2582	-813	329	-56	-737	-3859	844
Rates of change (per cent)									
2000/2005	1.4	1.4	-0.4	0.5	2.1	2.0	1.3	0.4	2.0
2005/2010	0.9	1.2	-0.7	0.6	2.4	1.6	1.1	0.3	1.8
2010/2015	0.5	0.5	-1.0	0.3	1.8	0.5	1.1	0.1	1.5
2015/2020	0.0	0.1	-0.7	0.0	1.4	-0.5	0.7	0.0	1.1
2020/2025	0.1	-0.3	-0.5	-0.6	1.0	-1.1	0.3	-0.1	0.8
2025/2030	-0.2	-0.5	-0.7	-0.8	0.8	-1.4	0.0	-0.4	0.6
2030/2035	-0.7	-0.2	-1.0	-0.8	0.7	-1.2	-0.2	-0.5	0.5
2035/2040	-0.7	-0.2	-1.5	-0.9	0.7	-0.6	-0.2	-0.7	0.3
2040/2045	-0.4	-0.1	-1.2	-0.6	0.5	-0.2	-0.3	-0.5	0.2
2045/2050	-0.4	0.0	-0.9	-0.6	0.3	-0.4	-0.3	-0.5	0.0

a) Japan, Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand

Source World Population Prospects, 2000 revision, medium estimates, UN 2001.

Table 2. Aging of labour force in East and South East Asia

Period	China	HK SAR	Japan	Korea	Malaysia	Singapore	Thailand	Receiving countries ^a	SE Asia
Proportion of LF aged 20-34 (per cent)									
2000	43.4	39.2	31.8	39.6	43.4	38.6	42.1	36.7	43.5
2005	37.8	36.9	30.9	36.4	43.7	33.6	39.2	35.1	42.3
2010	35.7	34.5	27.9	32.2	43.1	32.5	36.5	32.4	41.0
2015	35.5	32.4	25.8	30.0	43.4	35.8	33.7	30.5	39.4
2020	35.0	30.9	24.7	28.2	42.2	38.3	32.4	29.5	37.5
2025	32.2	30.4	24.6	28.1	41.3	38.2	31.9	29.4	35.5
2030	31.4	30.9	25.4	27.5	38.4	33.9	31.6	29.2	33.6
2035	31.8	31.8	25.7	27.5	36.1	30.8	30.3	28.7	32.3
2040	32.8	32.9	25.7	27.8	34.5	31.0	29.4	28.4	31.5
2045	32.9	33.7	25.5	28.4	33.8	34.0	29.3	28.4	31.3
2050	32.2	34.2	25.6	29.5	34.1	37.5	29.6	28.9	31.1
Proportion of LF aged 50-79 (per cent)									
2000	14.7	16.0	34.7	20.2	14.9	14.5	15.6	25.6	16.2
2005	17.2	19.0	35.5	21.7	16.3	18.7	17.7	26.6	17.2
2010	18.5	23.0	34.4	25.9	17.7	23.0	20.3	27.4	18.7
2015	21.1	26.7	34.3	29.8	18.9	25.9	23.3	28.8	20.6
2020	24.9	28.0	36.0	32.8	19.6	27.0	26.1	30.8	22.7
2025	27.5	29.1	39.6	35.7	20.4	26.4	28.2	33.3	24.7
2030	26.9	30.0	41.2	37.1	21.6	24.9	30.0	34.6	26.6
2035	26.5	30.4	41.3	38.1	23.5	24.5	31.2	35.2	28.5
2040	28.3	29.7	40.4	37.2	24.6	25.4	31.6	34.8	30.2
2045	28.9	28.6	39.3	37.1	27.0	28.2	31.7	34.7	31.6
2050	28.5	27.6	39.2	36.3	28.3	28.5	32.5	34.8	32.4

Source: author's calculation from, Population: World Population Prospects, 2000 revision, medium estimates, UN 2001; LFPR: Economically Active Population 1950-2010, ILO, 2000

a) Japan, Korea, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand

Table 3. Educational level and occupation of recent immigrants : people entered 1987-1990 (1990 census) and immigrants in year 2000.

education	M	F	M	F	M	F	occupations	M+F	M+F	M+F
<5th grade	9.2	15.3	3.9	6.5	0.9	4.0	prof tech	37.6	30.1	50.0
5-8 grade	8.2	9.6	6.2	7.9	1.1	3.1	adm managers	13.2	30.6	22.4
9-12 gr no dipl	10.4	12.4	15.1	15.1	1.9	4.2	Sales	2.5	7.2	8.8
high sch graduate	12.7	16.8	21.4	26.4	8.1	12.8	adm support	6.9	13.6	11.9
college no degree	8.3	7.8	12.1	15.2	8.2	10.4	precis craft w	0.8	2.0	0.5
ass degree occ	2.1	2.8	4.0	3.2	2.8	5.0	op laborer	12.1	5.6	0.9
ass degree acad	1.9	2.5	1.8	3.3	2.8	7.1	farm forestr.	20.6	0.1	0.5
B degree	21.7	21.1	18.8	15.5	36.3	36.3	Service	6.2	10.7	4.9
M degree	17.7	7.9	12.4	5.1	32.2	15.3	total occ	100.0	100.0	100.0
Prof sch degree	3.3	2.7	1.7	1.4	2.9	1.3				
Doctorate	4.6	1.1	2.5	0.3	2.8	0.6	total occ	32.9	36.6	33.7
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	no occ	67.1	63.4	66.3
BA +	47.2	32.9	35.4	22.4	74.2	53.4	total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Sources: for education, 1990 census of USA, Bureau of Census; for occupations, INS yearbook 2000.

Table 4. Demo-economic characteristics of some East and Southeast Asian countries

countries	Population	density	annual	Pop 2025	GDP/cap \$	urban	dependency	TFR	% 2ary school enrll.	
	mid 2001		growth			pop.			M	F
	(millions)	Inh./sq.k.	%	(millions)		%	%			
Brunei D.	0.3	60	2.3	0.5	15,055	67	54.1	2.7	71	82
Cambodia	13.1	74	2.5	22.3	238	16	87.5	4.0	30	18
China	1,273.3	134	0.8	1,470.8	798	36	46.4	1.8	72	65
HK SAR	6.9	6,557	1.1	8.4	23,579	100	36.9	1.0	71	76
Macao SAR	0.4	24,858	1.0	0.6		99	41.7	1.2	66	76
Indonesia	206.1	112	1.3	272.9	674	39	55.2	2.7	55	48
Japan	127.1	336	0.2	123.8	34,276	79	46.8	1.3	99	100
Korea	48.8	480	0.8	52.1	8,871	82	38.7	1.5	100	100
Lao R.	5.4	23	2.3	8.7	285	17	86.0	5.4	34	23
Malaysia	22.7	71	2.0	31.3	3,613	57	61.9	3.2	58	66
Myanmar	47.8	71	1.3	60.2	730	27	60.5	3.3	29	30
Philippines	77.2	257	1.9	107.1	1,032	47	69.7	3.5	71	75
Sgp	4.1	6,088	3.2	8.0	22,072	100	41.0	1.6	70	77
Taiwan	22.5	628	0.8	25.3	13,235	77	42.2	1.7		
Thailand	62.4	123	1.0	77.5	2,000	30	46.8	1.8	38	37
Viet Nam	78.7	238	1.3	105.5	373	24	63.2	2.3	44	41

Source: Population Reference Bureau (2002); population 2025, dependency: UN World Population Prospects 2000 revision (medium estimates); Statistical Yearbook of the Republic of China, 2001.