

# Migration Issues from the Philippine Perspective<sup>1</sup>

Moctar Matuan

**I**nternal and international migration as a major component of demographic change is a widespread phenomenon in the world today. In urban areas, one can easily detect this trend from the presence of different ethnic groups and the rise of slums and squatter areas, where most of these migrants are concentrated. Since our concern is focused on the ASEAN countries, the meaning of migration is worth reviewing for contextual purposes.

The term migration is used by biologists to refer to the movement of animals to places that offer better living conditions. In sociology and other social science disciplines, the term is usually associated with the change of residence across political boundaries. Thus, the term inter-municipal and inter-provincial were used in studies

---

<sup>1</sup>*Paper read and presented by the author at the Asean Universities Student Leaders Conference (AUSLEA), organized by the University Malaysia Sabah, Kota Kinabalu, Sabah, Malaysia, on May 21-23, 2001*

describing the migration of people crossing municipal and provincial boundaries. But when individuals or groups cross national boundary, the process is referred to as emigration and the participants are called emigrants.

Another notion, which is usually attached to the concept of migration is the intention of the migrant to settle permanently in the receiving community or country. This criterion as proposed by some demographers is not tenable on two grounds: first, it is only the migrant himself who can decide this question, and second, the intention might be there while the migrant is young but it may change in time. This attitudinal change is particularly true when they reach the retirement age of 65 and above. In a study I conducted among my own people, the majority of respondents expressed their desire to spend their retirement age at their hometowns or to be buried, at least, at their home rural village when they die. Even rich Filipinos who have earned their American citizenship prefer to be brought home, as in the recent case of Mr. Eugenio Lopez, Jr.

Because people migrate for varying reasons and intentions, demographers, sociologists and other social scientists have invented “operational” terms to classify or categorize migrants. For instance, we now use the terms:

**Refugees** – for migrants who were forced to leave their country due to persecution and conflict;

**Migrant workers** – for the Overseas Contract Workers (OCW) who stay in the host country for the duration of their contracts;

**Illegal migrants or undocumented migrants** – for those who enter a particular country without permission;

**Settlers** – for migrants who are encouraged and/or forced by their government to settle in the frontiers of their respective countries.

Migrants can also be classified according to the number of moves (change of residence) they make. A person who changes residence once is referred to as primary migrant; those who change twice are called secondary migrants, and those who change residence thrice are called tertiary migrants. Circular migrants, seasonal migrants, return migrants and permanent migrants are just some of the other terms now being used to describe the movements of people.

With this brief introduction, let me now proceed to the main theme of this paper.

### **The Philippine Government Perspectives on Migration**

Similar to its ASEAN neighbors, like Malaysia, Indonesia and Thailand, the Philippines views migration as a mechanism for decongesting heavily populated areas and as a strategy for economic development. Migration was also perceived as a “tool” for promoting unity among its varied ethnic communities through amalgamation. This strategy was introduced and started by the western colonizers. In the Philippines, the Americans started the massive influx of Christian migrants on Mindanao where the Muslims are concentrated. In 1912, the American administration in Manila began its subsidized settlement program on Mindanao, with the resettlement in the Cotabato valley of 100 Visayan families from Cebu. This pilot resettlement project had the specific aim of producing rice. The settlers were provided with initial capital and farm tools on a loan basis, aside from the expected eventual ownership of their homestead lands. (Muslim, 1994, p. 65).

This strategy was later duplicated. Between the year 1913 and 1917, the American government was able to establish a total of seven agricultural colonies to encourage in-migration to Mindanao (Matuan, 1985:93). Six of these agricultural colonies were established in the province of Cotabato and one in the province of Lanao (Pelzer, 1948:129).

The stated purposes of these agricultural colonies were: (a) to increase food production (especially rice); (b) to equalize the

distribution of population in the Philippines; (c) to bring under cultivation extensive public lands; and (d) to afford an opportunity for the colonists to become land proprietors. The other purpose of establishing these colonies was the amalgamation of the Moros (Muslim Filipinos) and Christian into a homogenous Filipino people.

When the power of government was transferred to the hands of the dominant Christian Filipinos in 1935, the policy of sending Christian migrant settlers to Mindanao was vigorously pursued by the succeeding administrations. Several government agencies were created such as: the National Land Settlement Corporation or NLSA (1939-1950), the Land Settlement Development Corporation or LASEDECO (1950-1954), the Economic Development Corporation or EDCOR (1951), and the National Resettlement and Rehabilitation Administration or NARRA (1954). The EDCOR was a short-lived project conceived by then Secretary of Defense Ramon Magsaysay to accommodate captured Huk (a rebel group) members and those who voluntarily returned to the fold of the law. As such, it was managed by the Armed Forces of the Philippines and did open at least six settlement areas on Mindanao.

From 1939 to 1963, 25 resettlement areas were established on Mindanao, in Sulu and on Palawan, in addition to the existing seven agricultural colonies pioneered by the Americans. All, except one of these 25 resettlement areas, were purposely established in the Muslim areas of Cotabato, Lanao, Palawan, Sulu and Davao.

What was wrong with these resettlement programs was the fact that no parallel programs were initiated to ensure that the Muslims and other indigenous communities in the area would retain their ancestral domains. The process also eventually resulted in the 'minoritization' of the natives in their own homeland.

The other government agencies created to implement resettlement projects from the 1960's and onward were:

1. CNI (Commission on National Integration)
2. SPARE (Special Program of Assistance for Relocation of Evacuees)
3. PANAMIN (Presidential Assistance on National Minorities), and
4. DAR (Department of Agrarian Reform)

Up until now, the Department of Agrarian Reform is implementing minor resettlement projects under the slogan, "land for the landless."

### **On The Issues of Immigration**

In the international scene, the same policy was viewed as our "savior." Aside from the conflicts that engulfed it, its poor economy, rapid population growth, and rising unemployment rate, the country is also highly indebted to foreign lending institutions like the IMF, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and many more. This year alone, the Philippine government is expected to pay 130 billion pesos for the interest of our debt. As of June 2001, the country's foreign debt stood at US\$53.2 billions (de los Santos, 2001, p. 11).

The rebellion waged by the Communist Party of the Philippines and the Moro National Liberation Front contributed to the spiraling of our debt and the exodus of our people into foreign lands. In a conservative estimate released by the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process (PAPP), the grim effects of conflict was portrayed as follows:

. . . from 1973 to 1992, the death toll reached 55,471. About 33,709 have been wounded and 1,822 were missing. Some 1.5 million people have experienced displacement in the course of more than two decades of armed conflict. Damages to crop and property since 1982 has already been estimated at 1.3 billion. Further, the government has to spend billions of pesos in operations to maintain peace and order . . . perhaps, if only half of this amount were spent on development and livelihood

projects, our country would have been in a much better shape. We could have already paid our debts or built more schools and health centers. (OPAPP Leaflet, nd, pp.2-3).

According to the old folks, the value of the Philippine peso and the Malaysian ringgit were the same during the time of President Garcia (1957-1961). Today, a Malaysian ringgit is equivalent to about twelve (12) pesos or more. These figures are simple indicators on how the Philippines has lagged behind in the field of economic development. It can also be an indicator of the difference in the living standard of these two nations. Furthermore, the Philippines is only second to Singapore in terms of population density (229 per sq. km.) and slightly higher in per capita (US\$ 1,050) when compared to Indonesia. Below are the comparative figures of ASEAN countries, which I culled from the Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia. Though some of the figures were based on estimates and the "base year" differs, they can provide a glimpse on the population and economy of these countries.

**Table 1. Comparative Figures on Population Density and Per Capita of ASEAN Countries**

Country	Pop. Density Per sq. km.	Census year/ Year of official estimate	Per capita in US\$	World Bank figure/estimate
1. Brunei	52	1996	17,500	1992-94 prices
2. Indonesia	102	1995	880	1992-94 prices
3. Laos	19	1995	320	1992-94 prices
4. Malaysia	64	1996	3,890	1993-95 prices
5. Myanmar	67	1996	400	1989-90 prices
6. Philippines	229	1995	1,050	1993-95 prices
7. Singapore	4,612	1995	26,730	1993-95 prices
8. Thailand	115	1994	2,740	1993-95 prices
9. Vietnam	223	1995	240	1993-95 prices

The per capita of a country does not provide much information as to how much of the GNP (Gross National Product) goes to the rich or poor sectors of the population. The “poverty threshold” is a more descriptive measure in determining the number and percentage of families whose income cannot provide for the basic needs of four members. In 1997 it was reported that 31.8 percent of the Filipino families fell below the poverty threshold (NSO, 1999).

The economy and living standard of a nation can be influenced by many factors. It may include mismanagement, corruption, spiraling of foreign debts, defective economic policies and even value system. In turn, an inactive or stagnant economy surely leads to a high unemployment rate. In a news report, the former speaker of the House of Representatives indicated that:

. . . of the 6.3 million working age Filipinos between the ages of 20-24, only 3.2 million are employed, meaning more than 50 percent do not have jobs, much higher than the 11.4 percent national unemployment rate as of January this year. Of the 9.3 million Filipinos ages 25-34 only 6.4 million are employed (The Philippine Star, April 22, p. 15).

Whatever factors may have rendered the Philippine economy its present state and the consequences that goes with it, the point that I want to raise is that they serve as a “push factor” for immigration. Just as in the lower forms of animals, man is in search of environment that can provide a better living condition.

Because of these realities, it is not surprising for the country to pursue vigorously the strategy of exporting labor migrants to countries that need them. As acknowledged by then Foreign Affairs Secretary Domingo Siazon, the Philippines is now the world’s largest migrant nation with 5.5 million Filipinos working abroad (Philippine Daily Inquirer, March 30, 2000).

This trend is of course not new as thousands of Filipinos were already immigrating into the United States of America at the start of

the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Aquino, 1980, pp. 81-82). As former colonial master, the U.S. even recruited workers for the sugar and pineapple plantations in Hawaii. As of 1990, the U.S. census reported that 1.4 million of their citizens are of Filipino descent. They are only second to the Chinese Americans that reached 1.6 million. (1999 World Book Encyclopedia).

Emigration from the point of view of the Philippine government is to be encouraged. As stated by former President Marcos:

For us, overseas employment addresses two major problems: unemployment and the balance of payment position. If these problems are met or at least partially solved by contract migration, we also expect an increase in national savings and investment levels. In the long run we also expect that overseas employment will contribute to the acquisition of skills essential to the development of the country's industrial base. (Constantino, 1986, p.67).

Overseas employment did solve the unemployment problem partially. In 1985, it was estimated that over one million Filipino contract workers were fielded in 124 countries. The Philippine Overseas Employment Administration (POEA) revealed that 358,800 Filipinos leave for work abroad each year. Moreover, it is estimated that over one million overseas workers support almost 1/8 or 12.5% of the Philippine population.

The Filipino dependence on overseas employment is growing each year. Below is another table showing the number of deployed migrant workers from 1989 to 1999:

**Table 2. Deployed Overseas Filipino Workers 1989 to 1992<sup>2</sup>**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Land-based</b>	<b>Sea-based</b>
1989	458,626	355,346	103,280
1990	446,095	334,883	111,212
1991	615,019	489,260	125,759
1992	686,461	549,655	136,806
1993	696,630	550,872	145,758
1994	718,407	564,031	154,376
1995	653,574	488,173	165,401
1996	660,122	484,653	175,469
1997	747,696	559,227	188,469
1998	831,643	638,343	193,300
1999	837,020	640,331	196,689

Table 2 only accounts for migrants that were monitored by the government. Not included in these figures were the migrating dependents or relatives petitioned by the Filipino who earned citizenship in other countries. Those illegally recruited and those who voluntarily migrated at their own risk are also not represented in Table 2.

The migrant workers were seen as a source of the much needed dollar for the interest payment of our international debt and dollar reserve of the country. To insure that the government gets its hands on the dollar earning of these workers, President Marcos signed on December 13, 1982 Executive Order No. 857 making it "mandatory" for every Filipino contract worker abroad to remit regularly a portion of his earnings to his beneficiaries through the Philippine banking system. It was even specified in the Order that workers whose employers provide free board and lodging must remit 70 percent of their basic pay, while others can remit 50 percent. Violators were

<sup>2</sup> Source: *Philippine Overseas Employment Administration as published by the National Statistical Coordination Board in their Philippine Statistical Yearbook for 1999.*

threatened with punishment ranging from non-renewal of passports to exclusion from the list of eligible for future overseas employment.

While E.O. 857 was viewed by migrant workers as curtailing their rights on how to spend their income, there were other laws promulgated by the Philippine government for their immediate deployment and protection. Some of the laws I have identified included the following:

- Letter of Instruction No. 1319 – Establishing a One-Stop Documentation and Processing Center for Overseas Workers.
- Executive Order 991 – Governing the Enforcement of Government – Approved Employment Contracts of Filipino Contract Workers Working Overseas.
- Executive Order No. 1022 – Strengthening the Administrative and Operational Capabilities of the Overseas Employment Program.
- Executive Order No. 450 – Lifting the Ban on New Applicants for Licenses to Operate Private Employment Agencies Engaged in Recruitment and Placement of Filipino Workers for Overseas Employment.
- Republic Act No. 7111 – An Act Establishing the Overseas Workers' Investment Fund to Provide Incentives to Overseas Workers, Reduce the Foreign Debt Burden, and for Other Purposes.
- Executive Order No. 195 – Providing a Medical Care Program to Filipino Overseas Contract Workers and Their Dependents and Prescribing the Mechanism Therefore.
- Republic Act No. 8042 – An Act to Institute the Policies of Overseas Employment and Establish a Higher Standard of Protection and Promotion of the Welfare of Migrant Workers,

their families and Overseas Filipinos in Distress, and for Other Purposes.

In its attempt to corner the employment opportunities brought about by the “oil boom” and the massive infrastructure projects launched by the new rich Muslim countries in the Middle East, the Philippine government under Marcos even created “special” offices under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. These offices were: the Office of the Assistant Minister for Islamic Affairs (1976-1982) and the Office of the Middle East and African Affairs (1981-1984).

### **Problems Associated with Out-Migration**

While the government can easily visualize the positive aspects of overseas “contract migration” (i.e., as solution to unemployment problem and as dollar earner), the other side of the issue does not look good. In the process of exporting our human resources, we are also sending out some of our best assets, like engineers, architects, medical doctors and scientists. Most of the contract workers being fielded to foreign lands are at the height of their most productive years. During the third quarter of the 1980’s, Constantino (1988, p. 69) described our migrant workers as young and educated:

. . . seventy percent (70%) of them are between 20 and 35 years old. They are generally better educated: 68% were high school graduates and 32% completed college courses and higher degrees. An overwhelming majority (87%) had from 2 to 10 years previous working experience with 78% being skilled and semi-skilled workers while the rest are in the professional and managerial level.

In another newspaper article, it was reported that in 1985 “almost 60% of Filipinos in the US are university graduates and the majority becomes a permanent loss to us since they go there with the intention of becoming permanent residents and eventually, US citizens” (Bulletin Today, April 20, 1985). These negative effects of out-

migration are known in the literature as “brain drain” and “reverse transfer of technology.”

### **On the Issues of In-Migration**

The entry of immigrants in the country seems to be unproblematic. Although Philippine laws allow and/or in fact encourage the entry of investors, very few foreign nationals are availing of this privilege. As of last year, only 326,580 foreigners appeared in the official records of the Bureau of Immigration (Philippine Daily Inquirer, March 17, 2000). In the case of undocumented foreign nationals, there were random reports of arrests among Chinese from Mainland China and Taiwan. But the number is insignificant compared to arrests in Singapore, Malaysia and even Thailand.

Although some studies indicate that we have a negligible number of illegal immigrants of Indonesian decent in the islands off the coast of Davao and Sarangani, the government is not bothered for reasons that can only be theorized. First, the country has no national identification system. Second, there is the reality that some of the ancestors of these people were already residents in those islands when the boundaries between the ASEAN nations were drawn by the “world powers” or colonizers, and lastly, they were not considered as a “threat” to the national security.

This is similar to the case of the Muslim Filipino migrants to Sabah, Malaysia. Prior to the birth of the modern nation-states in Southeast Asia, some of the forefathers of the Filipino Tausugs, Sama and Badjaos were already residents of the place, as part of the realm of the Sultan of Sulu. Thus, the traditional movement of people from the Sulu archipelago and Sabah for economic and socio-cultural reasons was just part of their normal lives. It was the American colonial government of the Philippines that first attempted to impose restrictions on travel between these places. In a report sent to Washington, George Davis shared with the American authorities the restriction that he imposed on the unequipped ports of Basilan, Paran-Paran, Bongao, Cagayan de Sulu and Puerto Princesa. (Hassan 1978, p.3). To curb

what they termed as “commercial smuggling” the succeeding administrations pursued a similar policy. Because of this restriction, the commercial, social and cultural ties between the peoples were tremendously affected.

On the part of Sabah, I am not sure when it started to impose travel restrictions. As we know:

the state came under British control in 1877 through a private trading syndicate who took on lease from the Sultan of Brunei and Sulu, the present territory. In 1881 the syndicate was granted royal charter as the British North Borneo Company, to administer the territory on behalf of the crown. In 1888, North Borneo was made a British protectorate but the company retained its sovereignty powers until 1946 when the territory was proclaimed as a crown colony. When the independent Federation of Malaysia came into existence on September 16, 1963, British North Borneo renamed Sabah, became a member state. (Microsoft Encarta Encyclopedia 2000).

On the Philippine side, what we know is that the laws as well as their implementation to curtail trade and travel relations between Sabah and Sulu archipelago group of islands remained futile. The fact remains that the people, especially the Muslims, retain their economic, social and cultural relations. The number of Filipino migrants in Sabah reached its highest peak in the 1970's when an estimated three hundred thousand Filipino Muslims emigrated as a result of the conflict in the Southern Philippines. Even with the present massive crackdown on illegal emigrants by the state authorities of Sabah, the process seems to be unabated.

Because the immigration to Sabah is a one-way process (i.e., from the Philippines to that direction), greater concern is being felt by the receiving country. In the Philippines, our Immigration Act, which was enacted in 1940 by the Commonwealth Government, was amended only once by Republic Act No. 503. Presumably, the reason for the apparent low-level concern is the absence of a “threat” from the entry

of illegal emigrants.

The reasons for Filipino emigration to foreign lands were already described in the preceding pages of this paper. We also noted the historical, commercial and socio-cultural ties that bind the 'Sabahan' and the people of the Sulu archipelago. Furthermore, we need to acknowledge that as Muslims, their concept of an islamic "ummah" (universal community), transcends racial and national boundaries. This historical episode was an irritant in the diplomatic ties of the two countries in the past (Agoncillo, 1990, p.541). Similar irritants probably exist in the Borneo land border of Malaysia and Indonesia, and between Malaysia and Thailand in the case of the Pattani Muslims in Southern Thailand.

From available literature on the issue, it is quite safe to conclude that poor ASEAN countries like the Philippines are out-migration areas, while the rich or developed countries in the region like Singapore, Malaysia and Brunei serve as magnets to prospective immigrants. The advent of illegal recruitment and the smuggling of immigrants into these countries are merely signs of the desperate desire of the poor to change their living condition. This fact also leads to the exploitation of illegal immigrants, especially women and children. In one of the newspaper items that I read on this concern, Mr. Ralph Boyce, US Deputy Assistant Secretary for East Asia and the Pacific, was quoted as saying that:

Human trafficking was the third largest source of profits for organized crime, next to guns and drugs. Its global turnover was estimated at \$6 billion. US officials estimate that there are more than one million women and children bought and sold around the world every year about 250,000 women and children from Southeast Asia and 150,000 to 200,000 from Russia were being trafficked annually. They are bought and sold in Europe for \$15,000 to \$30,000.

In spite of these ugly images of immigration, scholars can always delineate advantages and disadvantages in any given situation.

Even our religions teach that many things were created with opposites like: day and night, male and female, joy and sorrow, life and death and many more. On the issue of migration, both the sending and receiving countries may air their specific positive and/or negative comments on these demographic changes. Sending countries usually emphasize the benefits to be derived while the receiving countries emphasize the problems associated with the process.

Some of the identified gains achieved by the sending countries as experienced by the Philippines include employment and as a source of the much needed dollars for its BOP (Balance of Payment). On the negative side, the process was draining the “cream” of our human resources. We also suffer from the reality that the government spent for the education of these emigrants, whose productive years and talents will only be used by foreign employing countries. One study has estimated that the Philippines spent US\$61.3 millions for the education of 3,068 engineers and scientists who emigrated to the United States in 1971-72 (Constantino, 1988, p. 70).

On the side of the receiving countries, they enjoy bigger profits as a result of cheap labor provided by both legal and illegal immigrants and by not spending for the education of their immigrant labor force. On the negative side, the immigrants were perceived as a threat to national security, or a source of crime, drug trafficking and prostitution. While there is truth in these concerns, we must acknowledge that crime, drugs and prostitution are not the monopoly of any country. It is a worldwide phenomenon, which must be addressed collectively.

If one asked sociologists about the problem, he would be surprised to hear that “deviance” represented by those who violate certain laws has a function in society. Without deviance, one can just imagine how a society can become static. Without law-breakers, our society will not be needing the services of the lawyers, policemen, judges, jail guards and many more. Without burglars, no one would care to invent padlocks, safe boxes and warning devices. Many countries have to revise their immigration and deportation laws due to the deviant activities of illegal recruiters, illegal immigrants and even

the behavior of some of their own citizens.

Let me conclude this paper by saying that for as long as the economy of a country cannot provide a decent living for its citizens, its people will continue to emigrate to countries that can provide this basic need. The Philippine educational system should be reviewed as it produces hundreds of thousands of graduates each year for jobs not yet provided by its economy. There must be an end to the rebellion of its people through dialogue and mediation, a reduction in its population growth rate and finally a solution to its spiraling international debt.

The IMF and World Bank were created in 1944 supposedly to stabilize and strengthen the economy of its member countries. But since its inception, how many developing countries were able to take off on their "economic development" and how many became richer and poorer? I have no statistics on this but what I know is the Philippine experience. It was the time of President Diosdado Macapagal (1961-1965) when the Philippine Government was first convinced to secure a loan from these institutions with the condition to devalue its currency from 2 pesos to 1 US dollar to nearly 4 pesos to US\$1. From there on, our currency continued to decline (50 pesos to a US dollar at present) and our debt has risen to US\$53.2 billion as of June 2001. With the current rate of interest, we are expected to spend 40 centavos out of every peso collected by the government to pay for the interest alone. With this indebtedness, the economic future is blurred for countries like the Philippines. Unless some changes are introduced in the present "world order," the developing countries will remain "neo-colonies" of the west, through the IMF-World Bank setup.

If nothing is permanent in this world except "change," it is worth exploring to propose some changes in the United Nations setup, policies and directions. This is where regional organizations like the ASEAN can lend a helping hand.

This is not to say, however, that once we provide solutions to problems now "pushing" the people to leave their respective countries, migration as a major component of demographic change would cease

to operate. With the advent of modern communication and transportation facilities, people will remain mobile, subject to the regulations to be imposed by the concerned countries and the international community. As noted by Sharia'ti (184, p. 44):

. . . migration is an infinitely glorious principle for it has been the primary factor in the rise of civilization throughout history. All the twenty-seven civilizations that we know of in history have been born of a migration that preceded them. Conversely, it is also true that there is no case on record in which a primitive tribe has become civilized and created an advance culture without first moving from its homeland and migrating. . .

## REFERENCES CITED

- Agoncillo, T. A. (1990). *History of the Filipino People*. (8<sup>th</sup> edition). Quezon City: Garotech Publishing.
- Algar, H. (1984). *Translation from the Persian text of the lectures of Ali Shari'ati on the Sociology of Islam* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). Berkeley, Mizan Press.
- Aquino, B. (1980). Filipino workers in Hawaii, in *Filipinas: A Journal of Philippine Studies*. 1 (1).
- Constantino, L. (1988). Overseas Workers, in *Issues Without Tears*. (Vol. V). Quezon City, Kerrel Inc.
- Constantino, L. (1988). Questioning IMF Loans, in *Issues Without Tears*. (Vol. V). Quezon City: Kerrel Inc.
- de los Santos, R. (March 3, 2001). Stop debt interest payment to offset budget deficit. *The Philippine Star*.
- Hassan, A. (1978). Characteristics of backdoor migrants to Sabah, Malaysia from the Philippines: The case of two island communities of Tawi-Tawi. Unpublished research report undertaken through an award from SEAPRAP.
- Muslim, M. (1994). *The Moro armed struggle in the Philippines: the non-violent autonomy alternative*. Marawi City: MSU Press and Information Office.
- Matuan, M. (1985). The Maranao migrants in Metro Manila. *Dansalan Quarterly*. 6 (2). 89-157.
- National Statistical Coordination Board (1999). *Philippine Statistical Yearbook 1999*. Makati City: NSDB.

National Statistics Office. (1999). *The Philippines in Figures 1999*. Manila: NSO.

Office of the Presidential Adviser on the Peace Process. (n.d.). *Some questions and answers: towards a just comprehensive and lasting peace*.

Pelzer, K. (1948). *Pioneer Settlement in the Asiatic tropics: Studies in land utilization and agricultural colonization in Southeast Asia*. American Geographical Society Special Publication No. 29. New York: American Geographical Society.

Filipinos in the US better educated. (April 20, 1985) *Bulletin Today*.

Illegal Chinese. (March 17, 2000). *Philippine Daily Inquirer*.

RP: World's largest migrant nation. (March 30, 2000). *Philippine Daily Inquirer*.

Unemployed youth increasing in the Philippines. (April 20, 2000). *The Philippine Star*.