**A. Total Stock (Number) of Migrants, as of 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIGRANTS ABROAD</th>
<th>MIGRANTS IN TAIWAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED STOCK: MIGRANTS OUTSIDE THE COUNTRY</strong></td>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED STOCK: MIGRANTS IN THE COUNTRY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. By visa status</td>
<td>a. By visa status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documented migrant workers*</td>
<td>Documented migrant workers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrants/residents</td>
<td>Emigrants/residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented migrants**</td>
<td>Undocumented migrants**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees***</td>
<td>Refugees***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. By sex</strong></td>
<td><strong>b. By sex</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Top destination</td>
<td>c. Top countries of origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>countries</td>
<td>1. Thailand (98,322)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(thousands)</td>
<td>6. Malaysia (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2. Philippines (95,703)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3. Vietnam (84,185)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4. Indonesia (49,094)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5. Mongolia (79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Non-resident, temporary, or contract workers.
** Includes illegal entrants, overstayed or “jumped” visas, trafficked/smuggled people
*** As defined by the government, or in accordance with the UN refugee convention.

---

**B. Annual Socio-Economic Data and Migration Flow**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population (million; mid-year estimate)</td>
<td>22.89</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population living below the poverty line</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% population living in rural areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic growth: real GDP (%)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>(1.9)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GDP (US$)</td>
<td>26,700</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>17,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GDP; purchasing power parity (US$)</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>34.42</td>
<td>34.88</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>34.49</td>
<td>33.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate: (NT$ per US$; annual ave.)</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International reserves (US$ billion; yearend)</td>
<td>160.00</td>
<td>126.57</td>
<td>111.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign direct investments: actual (US$ billion; yearend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade balance (US$ billion; yearend)</td>
<td>81.640</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign (total) external debt (US$ billion; yearend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign (total) external debt as % of GNP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget balance (US$; yearend)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget deficit as % of GDP</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor force (million)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women as % of labor force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number unemployed (thousand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>329</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate (% of labor force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underemployment rate (% labor force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women unemployment rate (% of labor force)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average income (NT$/month) - urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult literacy rate (% of age 15 &amp; above who can read/write)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult migration rate (net # of migrants per 1,000 popn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net migration rate</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual outflow/deployment of MWs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% women in the annual outflow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual inflow of MWs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% women in the annual inflow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual migrants’ remittance (US$ billion/yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported # of migrant deaths during the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated # deported during the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jailed/detained during the year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS adult prevalence rate (adult PLHA as % of adult popn)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># People living with HIV/AIDS (thousand)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># AIDS deaths during the year (adults+children)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative # HIV/AIDS cases among migrants (living+died)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: CIA World Factbook, UN/IL/UNDP statistical yearbooks/websites.
The period from July 2004 to the end of 2005 was a time of great political turmoil in Taiwan, with ongoing tensions in cross-strait relations. The former ruling Chinese Nationalist Party, the Kuomintang (KMT), and its ally People First Party (PFP) continued to oppose the results of the March 2004 presidential election, where President Chen Shui-bian was re-elected for a further four-year term by a mere 0.2% margin, or 29,518 votes. The opposition parties insisted on a recount, to which the governing Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) agreed. The recount results showed that President Chen Shui-bian won re-election by a margin of 25,563 votes.¹ The KMT and PFP cried foul and filed a suit to the High Court seeking to annul the election outcome.

In November 2004 the Taiwan High Court rejected the opposition’s appeal to have the results of the March 20 presidential election nullified. The opposition parties continued their battle in court but to no avail; in December the High Court threw out their request to invalidate the election. Unsatisfied with the results from the High Court, the KMT and PFP took their case to the Supreme Court. In June 2005 the Supreme Court confirmed the re-election of President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu. After one and a half years of ongoing court battles, the Supreme Court emphatically brought an end to the whole election controversy by rejecting a plea by the opposition parties to void the March 2004 presidential election. A five judge panel said it failed to find electoral flaws serious enough to reverse the election outcome, and according to Taiwan election law, this ruling

¹ This report was contributed by Fr. Peter O’Neill, Hope Workers’ Center.

Political and Economic Update

Thousands of workers join the International Labor Day rally to continue to push for better working conditions in Taiwan.
Another development during the period was the identification of a suspect in the election-eve shooting incident which many believed influenced the election in Chen Shui-bian’s favor. The Criminal Investigation Bureau announced in March 2005 that an unemployed Tainan resident, Chen Yi-hsiung, who committed suicide just days after President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu were shot last March 19, was the “most likely suspect”. The breakthrough was only achieved after family members of the man broke their silence and provided details of his link to the shooting, and it was not until August 2005 that the judicial authorities brought the probe into the election eve shooting to a close by identifying Chen Yi-hsiung as the most likely suspect.

Meanwhile, in the 2004 year-end legislative elections the pan-green parties of the DPP and the Taiwan Solidarity Union (TSU) battled it out with pan-blue opposition parties KMT and PFP. Reversing their narrow defeat in the March presidential election, the opposition parties secured a slim majority in the legislative polls, winning 46.7% of the vote, or 114 seats in the 225-member Legislature. The KMT won 32.8% of the vote and the PFP won 13.9%. The DPP and its ally the TSU won 35.7% and 7.8% of the vote respectively, totaling 43.4% of the vote or 101 seats. In the 2001 legislative elections the pan-green parties won 41.2% of the vote, or 98 seats, and the pan-blue parties won 47.2% of the vote, or 114 seats. As a result of this defeat, President Chen Shui-bian resigned his chairmanship of the governing DPP to take responsibility for the failure of the governing party to secure a majority in the Legislative Yuan elections.

In early 2005, the governing DPP began a staunch election campaign for the May 2005 National Assembly elections as it rallied back from its defeat in the year-end elections. Taiwan voters demonstrated overwhelming approval for a proposed package of major constitutional reforms and gave a vote of confidence to the governing DPP in the elections for a 300 member “ad hoc” National Assembly. The DPP won control over the National Assembly by winning 42.5% of the votes and 127 seats, followed by the KMT with 38.9% of the votes and 117 seats. Voter turnout was low, however; due to torrential rains and lack of familiarity with the election issues and system, only 23.1% of Taiwan’s 16.7 million eligible voters cast their votes.

In June the National Assembly ratified a major package of constitutional amendments that included the permanent abolition of the assembly itself and a halving of the number of seats in the legislature from 225 seats to 113. The package had been approved almost without objection by the Legislative Yuan in August 2004. The constitutional amendments should help ensure that prospective legislatures with less support will no longer be voted into parliament. This will hopefully wean out the “gangster” legislatures, but may also have a negative effect on minority legislatures representing the concerns of minority groups such as environmentalists or indigenous peoples.

Riding on a high, the DPP were quietly confident that they would win a slight majority in the county magistrates and city mayor seats in the December 2005 elections. Unbeknownst to them, however, the abusive living and working conditions imposed on a group of migrant workers in the country would set off a chain of events that would impact the elections. 1,728 Thai migrant workers had been enduring inhumane treatment for nearly a year from their employer, the Kaohsiung Mass Transit Company (KRTC), along with their dormitory management Hua Pan Administration Consultant Co. Ltd. (see more detailed discussion under Human Rights Violations, p.292 below). Six months previously, the Thai workers had sent a letter to the local Kaohsiung City Bureau of Labor Affairs (BLA) outlining all the abuses they were suffering, but received no response from the local government.

On 21 August 2005 the workers refused to continue bearing the abuse; they began
a protest and burnt down their dormitory’s management office. Their protest revealed rampant corruption within government officials and agencies that quickly turned into a scandal. Following the Kaohsiung District Prosecutor’s Office investigation, Chen Che-nan, the national policy adviser to the President and former Presidential Office Deputy Secretary General, along with more than 20 others, were indicted in connection with the Kaohsiung rapid transit scandal. Also indicted were the Vice Transportation and Communications Minister; the former vice chairman of the KRTC; and the former director of Kaohsiung City BLA. As a consequence, in the December county magistrates and city mayor elections the opposition KMT candidates won 14 out of the 23 seats, sending the governing DPP to a crushing defeat. The DPP won only 6 seats. DPP Chairman Su Tseng-chang resigned and apologized to all candidates and supporters of the governing party for its grave defeat.

Cross-strait relations simmered down temporarily when both sides made a landmark agreement in January to allow the first direct flights between Taiwan and China in more than fifty years. The decision to allow the flights for the Lunar New Year holiday between 29 January and 20 February was reached after weeks of discussion. However, relations reached boiling point not long after; in March, the pan-green parties staged mass rallies in Taipei and Kaohsiung to protest against China’s proposed anti-secession law. The law authorizes an attack if Taiwan moves towards formal independence, while warning other countries not to interfere. Taiwan’s Mainland Affairs Council, which handles the island’s China Policy, says the law gives China’s military “a blank check to invade Taiwan”.5

China’s parliament approved the anti-secession law by a vote of 2,896 to zero, with 2 abstentions, at the closing session of the National People’s Congress on March 14. The new law was immediately criticized. President Chen Shui-bian condemned China’s anti-secession legislation as “a law of non-peace and aggression”, saying it violates the universal beliefs of freedom, democracy and human rights. The US House of Representatives passed a resolution by a vote of 424 to 4 condemning China’s newly enacted anti-secession law that targets Taiwan.6 The European Union warned against “any unilateral action” and said it opposed “any use of force” to resolve the situation.7 On March 25 the President led approximately one million Taiwan citizens through the streets of Taipei in a “March for Democracy and Peace to Protect Taiwan” to protest against the anti-secession law enacted by China.

Despite the hostility, just one month after the enactment of the anti-secession law, KMT Chairman Lien Chan traveled to China to meet with Chinese President Hu Jintao. It was the KMT’s first return to China since its defeat by Mao Zedong’s Communist armies in 1949. Lien’s trip was highly criticized in Taiwan, and ultimately damaged his political career. In August, Taipei Mayor Ma Ying-jeou officially took over the KMT chairmanship from Lien Chan, vowing to reform the party and to tackle the issue of the controversial “ill-gotten” party assets before the 2008 presidential election.8

Taiwan was the world’s 15th largest foreign trader in 2004. Taiwan’s foreign trade totaled USD349.3 billion, marking an annual increase of 26% over 2003. Its exports and imports totaled USD181.4 billion and USD167.9 billion respectively.9 Taiwanese firms produced USD67 billion worth of computer hardware in 2004, a 23% increase over the previous year and the highest in the world. Taiwanese companies are continuing to shift production to China to capitalize on cheap labor and production costs. About 73% of the total value of the output by Taiwanese computer makers in 2004 came from their factories in China.10

In 2004 Taiwan’s economic growth rate reached 5.71%.11 Taiwan’s foreign exchange
reserves reached USD241.73 billion by the end of 2004, the world’s third highest after Japan and China. In 2005 Taiwan’s economic growth rate was 4% due to a fourth-quarter surge in merchandise exports and manufacturing production. There was a 6.3% growth in export of goods and services and a 3.22% growth in imports of goods and services.

Taiwan’s unemployment rate for 2004 was 4.4%, and lowered down to 4.1% in 2005. Approximately 9.786 million people were employed in 2004, up by 213,000 compared with 2003. This was the largest annual growth since 1993 due to a fast recovering industrial sector. There were 454,000 unemployed people for the whole of 2004, down by 49,000 from the previous year – a decrease of 0.55%. As of the end of December 2005, a total of 403,000 people were unemployed.

**Migration Update**

**General Trends**

At the end of December 2004 there were 314,034 documented migrant workers in Taiwan – around 14,000 more than the same time the previous year. There were 16,593 migrant workers in irregular status, almost double that of the previous year. Thai workers continued to comprise the largest group of migrant workers in Taiwan at 105,281; their numbers remained steady from the previous year. Due to the continued ban on Indonesian workers in place since August 2002, the number of Indonesian workers in Taiwan dropped by 51.7%, from 56,437 to 27,281. At the beginning of the year they comprised 40% of the service sector, working as domestic workers (DW) and caregivers (CG), but by the end of the year they made up only 16% of this sector, having been replaced predominantly by Vietnamese workers. The number of Vietnamese workers increased during the year by 36.2% from 57,603 to 90,241. For the first time, the number of Vietnamese workers in the service sector outnumbered those from Indonesia, increasing 44% from 40,397 to 71,783. Filipinos increased by 10.8% from 81,355 to 91,150. Half of these workers were introduced into the service sector to help replace the Indonesian workers.

The number of migrant workers increased further in 2005, particularly irregular migrants. By the end of December 2005, there were 327,396 documented migrant workers in Taiwan, around 13,000 more than the same time the previous year. 60.78% of migrants in Taiwan were female, and 39.22% were male. There were also 21,679 migrant workers in irregular status, an increase of 30.7% from the previous year. The Thai workers remained the largest group of migrant workers despite decreasing in number to 98,322. Filipino workers increased further to 95,703. Vietnamese workers decreased during the year to 84,185, while the number of Indonesian workers shot up by 80% to a total of 49,094. The number of Vietnamese and Indonesian migrant workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 1: FOREIGN CONTRACT WORKERS IN TAIWAN BY CATEGORY AND NATIONALITY AS OF DECEMBER 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filipinos</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employment and Vocational Training Administration CLA
Taiwan Significant Events July 2004 – December 2005

2004

July
(22) Kuomintang (KMT), the former ruling Chinese Nationalist Party, and its ally People First Party (PFP), which lost the March 20 presidential election by a margin of 0.2%, file a suit to the High Court seeking to annul the election outcome.

August
(1) Migrant workers and labor advocates protest in front of the Council of Labor Affairs (CLA) to oppose the CLA’s proposed Financial Management System for all migrant workers.
(9) The CLA announces that it will scrap the proposed Financial Management System.
(11) Labor groups petition the government to delay its labor pension plan, fearing it will lead to older workers being laid off.
(15) Manila Economic and Cultural Office (MECO) announce the implementation of a direct hiring program for Filipino workers, allowing potential Taiwanese employers to recruit Filipinos without going through manpower agencies.
(23) The Legislative Yuan passes a constitutional amendment on halving the number of seats in the legislature from 225 seats to 113.

September
(1) A new CLA regulation requires new hires, employers and brokers to sign affidavits specifying the amount of loans that migrants “borrowed” from their recruiters prior to deployment.
(13) Taiwan again fails to win a seat on the UN, with 93 of 115 countries voting against it.
(24) Migrant workers and labor advocates protest outside the CLA, demanding that the CLA play a more active role in helping migrant workers who sustain occupational injuries to obtain proper treatment and compensation.

October
A group of 14 NGOs and church organizations called the Promotion Alliance for the Household Service Act finalize the Household Service Act to protect the basic human rights of local and foreign household workers, and later demonstrate in front of the Legislative Yuan advocating its passage.

November
(4) The Taiwan High Court rejects the appeal from the opposition to have the results of the March 20 presidential election nullified.
(18) One Thai worker is killed and another injured in an accident at a construction site of the Kaohsiung city’s mass rapid transit project. CLA orders that work at the construction site be suspended for a safety inspection.
(29) The CLA decides to temporarily stop allowing in more Vietnamese workers due to the high ratio of irregular Vietnamese workers.

December
(2) The Legal Aid Foundation (LAF) and church organizations hold a press conference to speak out on the lack of rights protection for migrant workers and foreign spouses.
(11) The opposition KMT and PFP secure a slim majority in the legislative elections.
(14) President Chen Shui-bian resigns his chairmanship of the governing DPP to take responsibility for the failure of the governing party to secure a majority in the Legislative Yuan elections.
(15) To mark International Migrants Day, migrant workers and labor advocates file a petition at the Executive Yuan to abolish the six-year time limit for employing migrant workers. They gathered to fight for three rights: working rights, immigration rights and the right of political participation.
(19) Taiwan signs an MOU with Indonesia on labor management cooperation, including cooperation with Taiwan to prevent Indonesian workers in Taiwan from absconding.
(20) Taiwan lifts the two-year-and-four-month ban on imports of workers from Indonesia after the Indonesian government made efforts to improve that country’s
brokerage system.

**January**

(12) Over 100 Filipino migrant workers stage a protest in front of the CLA demanding the CLA to revise the Employment Service Act to forbid employers and labor brokers from sending them home while engaged in a labor dispute.

(18) Taiwan and China make a landmark agreement to allow the first direct flights between Taiwan and China in more than fifty years for the Lunar New Year holiday.

(26) Migrant workers and labor advocates hold a press conference at the Legislative Yuan to publicize the fact that female migrant workers upon transfer to new employers have been forced to do men's jobs as a result of secret arrangements by labor brokers and labor affairs authorities.

**February**

(24) President Chen Shui-bian and opposition PFP Chairman James Soong hold a summit, to break the ice in inter-party cooperation and reduce the control exercised over the Legislative Yuan by the KMT.

(28) All over Taiwan people gather to mourn the victims of the 228 Incident of 1947. As China moves closer to passing its anti-secession law, local pro-independence activists launch a series of events entitled - “Free Taiwan Global Action” – to express Taiwanese opposition to the proposed law.

**March**

(5) The pan-green parties, the DPP and the TSU stage mass rallies in Taipei and Kaohsiung in protest against China's proposed anti-secession law.

(6) Restrictions over applications for the employment of Indonesian workers are finally lifted.

(14) China's parliament approves the anti-secession law authorizing an attack if Taiwan moves towards formal independence; President Chen Shui-bian is quick to condemn the law.

(19) About 20,000 people join a protest rally led by the KMT demanding the "truth" about the election-eve shooting of President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu.

(25) President Chen Shui-bian leads around one million Taiwan citizens through the streets of Taipei to protest against the anti-secession law.

**April**

(8) President Chen Shui-bian makes his first ever official trip to Europe, attending Pope John Paul II's funeral.

(10) An irregular Vietnamese worker dies after falling from a 15 story construction site and being abandoned by his employer instead of getting treatment at a hospital. The police indict the employer and his brother on charges of leading to an employee's death through abandonment.

(29) KMT Chairman Lien Chan and Chinese President Hu Jintao meet at the Great Hall of the People in Beijing.

**May**

(1) Thousands of teachers, laborers, and disabled persons join the International Labor Day rally.

(12) PFP Chairman James Soong meets with China's leader Hu Jintao; the two warn President Chen Shui-bian to stand by his pledge to prevent military conflict in China.

(14) The DPP gain control over the National Assembly by winning 42.5% of the votes and 127 seats.

(17) Around 650 Chunghwa Telecom department chiefs and managers gather in front of the company's headquarters to stage their first ever strike to protest the company's upcoming privatization scheduled for June.

(20) The Legislative Yuan passes an amendment to the Nationality Law requiring naturalization applicants to take both a Chinese language exam and comprehensive exam. Advocates promoting immigrant rights call the naturalization exams serious discrimination against new immigrants.

**June**

(3) In the US Department of State "Trafficking in Person 2005" report, Taiwan is downgraded to "tier two", stating that
Taiwan is a major importer of women for sexual exploitation. 
(7) The National Assembly ratifies a major package of constitutional amendments that includes the permanent abolition of the assembly itself.
(17) The Supreme Court confirms the re-election of President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu by rejecting an appeal filed by the defeated candidates of the KMT and PFP alliance.

July
(1) The new pension system formally comes into force. The system will force employers to pay at least 6% of their workers' wage into individual portable retirement accounts; the amount will be matched by the workers.
(8) Elmer Fung, a former Taiwanese vice presidential candidate and lawmaker, is convicted of raping his Filipina maid on 23 January 2004 and sentenced to four years in jail.

August
(5) Four Filipino workers are beaten by security guards at a Formosa Plastics Group plant in Mailiao, Yun Lin County, illegally terminated and then forcibly deported to the Philippines via Hong Kong. Flight attendants noticed that two of the workers were severely beaten, and they were sent to a Hong Kong hospital for treatment.
(10) The Chunchuwa Telecom Workers' Union calls off its strike against the company and say it will continue its battle in the courts. The company disregarded the Legislative Yuan's resolution passed in May which supported the union's position for the management to hold off on the privatization plan until regulations over a collective agreement were completed.
(18) Judicial authorities brought the probe into the election-eve shooting incident to a close by identifying Chen Yi-hsiung as the most likely suspect.
(19) Taipei Mayor Ma Ying-jeou officially takes over the KMT chairmanship from Lien Chan.
(21) Over 100 Thai workers employed by the Kaohsiung Rapid Transit Corporation (KRTC) protest against their working and living conditions setting fire to their dormitory's management office. The 1,728 Thai workers employed by KRTC are cramped into an overcrowded dormitory managed by Hua Pan Administration Consultant Co. Ltd. Their story of abuse, and the corruption involved in their case, is broadcast across TV channels throughout Taiwan for months on end. The incident attracts the attention of news media around the world.
(24) Labor advocates protest in front of the CLA demanding council Chairwoman Chen Chu be held to account for the Thai workers' protest.
(25) CLA Chairwoman Chen Chu apologizes for the CLA's poor management and supervision of migrant labor. However, she does not visit the Thai workers until six days after the incident.
(26) President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu say the administration should launch a probe into the maltreatment of the Thai workers and alleged irregularities.
(30) A support group comprised of lawyers and civil groups, is assembled to provide legal assistance to the Thai workers who were involved in the protest in Kaohsiung. They visit Vice Justice Minister Wang Tien-sheng to ask the ministry uphold proper legal procedures in subpoenaing Thai workers linked to the August 21 incident. The group emphasizes that the incident was not a riot but rather a justifiable protest against tyranny and insisted that the workers should not be punished as criminals.

was affected by Taiwan’s lifting of the ban on Indonesian workers (Further discussion on p.301 below).

Between December 2003 and December 2004, the number of migrant workers in the manufacturing sector increased by 3.5% from 162,039 to 167,694. In the service sector, the number of CGs increased by 10.8%, from 115,724 to 128,223, while the number of DWs decreased by 71.4%, from 4,874 to 2,844. This trend may be due in part to the Taiwan government’s strict policies on employing migrant DWs; a DW employer’s monthly government fee is double that of an employer of migrant CGs. To
September
(1) Three Thai manpower brokerage firms and several former Thai labor officials collected kickbacks in sending Thai laborers to Taiwan, an advisor to the Thai parliament’s committee on labor said.
(3) Vice-President Annette Lu, also the director of the Presidential Office Human Rights Advisory Commission, says the commission has formed a task force to monitor the human rights situation of foreign laborers in Taiwan.
(5) CLA Chairwoman Chen Chu resigns, taking responsibility for the “riot” of the Thai KRTC workers. She apologizes to the nation for the harm caused to Taiwan’s human rights image.
(6) Kaohsiung Mayor Chen Chi-mai offers to resign over last month’s “riot” by Thai workers building the city’s MRT system.
(8) Kaohsiung District Court orders the arrest of the general manager of Huapan and his wife on suspicion of taking kickbacks from construction companies. Upon investigation the CLA discovered that Huapan was an illegal brokerage firm.
(12) Premier Frank Hsieh accepts the resignations of CLA Chairwoman Chen Chu and Kaohsiung Mayor Chen Chi-mai “with great reluctance”.
(16) The Supreme Court rejects a plea by the two opposition leaders to void the March 2004 presidential election.

October
(5) Chen Che-nan resigns his post as national policy adviser to the President after prosecutors launch a probe into his alleged role in the Kaohsiung MRT scandal. Chen Min-hsien, a senior adviser to the Presidential Office and former vice president of the KRTC, also tenders his resignation for the same reasons.
(7) Fang Chin-lai, former director of the Kaohsiung City BLA, resigns over his poor supervision of Thai workers working on the city’s MRT project. DPP expels him from the party in November.
(29) The governing DPP expels Chen Che-nan from the party.

November
(9) DPP expels Vice Transportation and Communications Minister Chou Li-liang over alleged irregularities involving the Kaohsiung MRT construction project. The next day Chou resigns his post as Vice Minister.
(21) Chen Che-nan, Chen Min-hsien, Chou Li-liang and Fang Lai-chin, and more than 20 others are indicted by the Kaohsiung District Prosecutors Office in connection with the Kaohsiung rapid transit scandal.

December
(3) KMT candidates win 14 out of the 23 county magistrates and city mayor seats sending the governing DPP to a crushing defeat. DPP Chairman Su Tseng-chang resigns and apologizes for its grave defeat.
(11) Around 500 migrant workers march in a rally in Taipei demanding that the CLA give them better working conditions and employment laws. The rally commemorated International Human Rights Day (December 10) and International Migrant Workers’ Day (December 18).

Sources: Taiwan News, Taipei Times, China Post, Hope Workers’ Center

overcome these difficulties, many employers employ a migrant CG, who ends up taking care of the employer’s sick mother or father as well as the employer’s children. The number of migrant workers based in the construction industry decreased by 13.7%, from 14,117 to 12,184. Migrant fishermen decreased slightly from 3,396 to 3,089.

Between December 2004 and December 2005, the number of migrant workers in the manufacturing sector remained steady, with only a 0.5% decrease from 167,694 to 166,928. In the service sector there was an increase of 11% from 129,608 to 144,015. The number of migrant
workers in the construction industry increased by 9.2% from 12,184 to 13,306. Migrant fishermen increased slightly by 1.9%, from 3,089 to 3,147.

**Human Rights Violations**

As mentioned above, on 21 August 2005 over 100 Thai workers decided to take matters into their own hands after receiving no action at all from the local Kaohsiung government in response to the inhumane treatment the 1,728 Thai workers were receiving from their employer KRTC and their dormitory management Huapan Manpower. The workers had used correct protocol in informing the local government six months previously, through a written letter to the Kaoshiung City BLA outlining all the abuses they were incurring. In outcry against the apparent indifference to their situation, the workers instigated a protest and burnt down their dormitory’s management office. This protest captured the attention of the international media and was addressed in the 2005 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices released by the US Department of State.

The conditions the workers had endured were grim; they were denied even the most basic of rights to which a human being is entitled. They were forbidden by their employers from drinking, smoking and using mobile phones inside the dormitory grounds, and were even forbidden to use mobile phones outside dormitory grounds. They were forced to do a minimum of 100 overtime hours every month, but only got paid for 46 overtime hours. They were crammed into poorly ventilated and overly crowded dormitories. No private showers were provided. They washed standing around water troughs using ladles. No hot water was provided during the bitterly cold winter. They were given inadequate food. They were frequently fined for violating strict rules set by the dormitory management, including using a mobile phone or riding a bicycle. Moreover, the workers were given tokens instead of money, which could only be used in the company-owned store, which sold its goods at a higher price in order to earn greater profit from the workers. Special public phones were installed so that workers could only use phone cards bought from the store.

The huge broker’s fee also helped spur the workers’ anger. Each worker was charged a placement fee of NTD150,000 (USD4,685) – equivalent to nearly 10 months of their minimum monthly salary. This money was split between the Taiwanese and Thai brokers.

President Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President Annette Lu stated the administration should launch a probe into the maltreatment of the Thai workers and alleged irregularities. Annette Lu pointed out that Taiwan does not show sufficient concern for foreign laborers and that they are heavily discriminated against. As the director of

---

**TABLE 1: NUMBER OF MIGRANT WORKERS IN TAIWAN – 1994- 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec.94</th>
<th>Dec.95</th>
<th>Dec.96</th>
<th>Dec.97</th>
<th>Dec.98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td>38,473</td>
<td>54,647</td>
<td>83,630</td>
<td>100,295</td>
<td>114,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>5,430</td>
<td>10,206</td>
<td>14,648</td>
<td>22,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais</td>
<td>105,152</td>
<td>126,903</td>
<td>141,230</td>
<td>132,717</td>
<td>133,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysians</td>
<td>2,344</td>
<td>2,071</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>151,989</td>
<td>189,051</td>
<td>236,555</td>
<td>248,396</td>
<td>270,620</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Employment and Vocational Training Administration CLA
the Presidential Office Human Rights Advisory Commission, she ordered the commission to form a task force to monitor the human rights situation of foreign laborers in Taiwan. She also formed a legal team of 16 lawyers that will provide free legal assistance to any workers charged for their involvement in the protest on August 21.

The workers’ protest revealed corruption with government officials and agencies. The Kaohsiung District Prosecutor’s Office investigation revealed that Chen Che-nan the national policy adviser to the President and the former Presidential Office Deputy Secretary General, had made pleasure trips to Thailand and South Korea hosted by Huapan management. Three months later, Chen Che-nan, and more than 20 others were indicted by the Prosecutor’s Office in connection with the Kaohsiung rapid transit scandal. Chen Che-nan and two other government officials were expelled from the DPP over alleged irregularities involving the scandal.

The Kaohsiung District Court also ordered the arrest of the general manager of Huapan and his wife on suspicion of taking kickbacks from construction companies and for supplying Thai workers to build the Kaohsiung MRT. Upon investigation the CLA discovered that Huapan was an illegal brokerage firm.

Labor advocates protested in front of the CLA demanding council Chairwoman Chen Chu be held to account for the Thai workers’ protest. They urged the CLA to trace the real cause of the protest and punish KRTC and Huapan Manpower. Two weeks after the protest, CLA Chairwoman Chen Chu resigned, taking responsibility for the “riot”. She apologized to the nation for the harm the “riot” had caused to Taiwan’s human rights image. Kaohsiung Mayor Chen Chi-mai also resigned over the incident.

A support group, comprised of lawyers as well as civil society and church organizations, assembled to provide legal assistance to the Thai workers who were involved in the protest. They visited Vice Justice Minister Wang Tien-sheng to ask the ministry uphold proper legal procedures in subpoenaing Thai workers linked to the August 21 incident. The group emphasized that the incident was not a riot but rather a justifiable protest against tyranny and insisted that the workers should not be punished as criminals.

The workers’ protest has revealed slavery-like conditions in Taiwan. This is a slavery that is institutionalized and legalized through repressive regulations, such as prohibiting migrant workers from forming a union. Fortunately, the uprising raised the public’s awareness of migrant workers’ abuses and of the bribery of government officials. Nonetheless, 14 of the Thai workers were sued by Huapan Manpower for using violence and damaging property. Civil society and church organizations immediately held a press conference where several of the
At the age of 44 Sanan decided to try his luck once again as a migrant worker, having worked as a construction worker in the Middle East two times before. The first two times, migration was a necessity, as the money he was earning as a construction worker at home was not enough to survive. This time he went overseas to try to save enough money to send his daughter to college. He chose to go to Taiwan to work as a construction worker for two years. He was one of many Thai workers working on the construction of an expressway in Taipei City. His first year’s salary went to paying back the money he had borrowed to pay his broker’s fee to obtain the job in Taiwan. In his second year he was able to save money to buy some construction machinery to begin a small business at home.

Life back in Thailand was tough. He was now 50 years old and had endured many years of arduous labor as a migrant worker, but he wanted the best for his children. He decided for the last time to go overseas to work as a migrant worker. He borrowed money to pay the exorbitant broker’s fee of USD3,200 to go to Taiwan to work. Like all migrant workers, he knew he was being cheated by his broker. The Thai government had set the legal broker’s fee at USD1,470, but since the competition to secure a job in Taiwan was so high he had no other choice but to pay.

This time he worked as a construction worker building an expressway tunnel in Taipei. The work was difficult and dangerous. He had only been working for one month when the tunnel collapsed. He was rescued from a deluge of falling rock fragments and rushed to hospital. His life was changed completely; he became paralyzed – a quadriplegic for life, relying on a ventilator for his every breath. Two Taiwanese and two other Thai workers lost their lives in the accident. Another three Taiwanese and two Thai workers were injured in the accident, but none as severely as Sanan.

Sanan’s Thai friend rang his family to inform them of the accident. The family was in shock. Sanan’s son, Nui, rang the Ministry of Labor in Bangkok to inquire after his father. The Thai Labor Office in Taipei sent a letter to the family informing them they will assist the family in negotiations with the company to receive compensation. Two months after the accident the Thai labor office sent a letter to the Thai Ministry of Labor offering NTD1 million (USD31,250) in compensation and cover all Sanan’s medical expenses in Taiwan. The company said they would send half of the money to the family and the other half would be placed in Sanan’s bank account in Taiwan. The money was never sent.

Nui often rang the Thai Ministry of Labor to follow-up on his father’s condition and to inquire about the compensation that had never arrived. The Ministry told him not to worry, that they were pursuing his father’s case. One year later, in sheer desperation, Nui decided to take things into his own hands. He borrowed money from a family friend to buy his ticket for Taiwan. Before leaving he made contact with a village neighbor who was working in Taiwan, named Ban, who was an active member of the Hope Workers’ Center (HWC) Thai education group.

The hospital where Sanan was staying allowed his son to stay with him for two nights only. Ban then took Nui to the HWC where he stayed in the center’s shelter. Akkraphorn, from HWC, accompanied Nui to visit his father, who was lying motionless in bed with a tracheotomy, dependent on a ventilator.

Akkraphorn educated Nui on his father’s rights according to the Taiwan Labor Law and how to negotiate for compensation from his
father’s company. HWC staff was shocked when Nui informed them that the Thai Labor Office in Taipei had negotiated for a meager NTD1 million in compensation for his father’s injuries. It was an obvious sign that the Thai government had either no experience in negotiation strategies or was selling Sanan out to his company. Over a period of nine months, HWC sent three letters to the director of the Thai Labor Office, asking to meet with her; there was no reply. Fortunately, she was eventually replaced by a new director who invited HWC staff to meet with him within his first month in Taiwan.

Within three days of Nui coming to the HWC, the center had promptly arranged the first negotiation meeting with the company to be held at the Thai Labor Office. The director of the office and a representative from the local government’s Bureau of Labor Affairs (BLA) were present at the meeting. The second negotiation meeting was also held at the Thai Labor Office but no one from the office attended the meeting. With the obvious lack of interest from the Thai Labor Office to assist its citizen, the remaining meetings were switched to the BLA.

After six very intense negotiating meetings over a period of three months the company finally settled on NTD3.2 million (USD100,000) in compensation, which included the maximum compensation of NTD633,600 (USD19,800) coming from Sanan’s labor insurance. The company also agreed to continue to cover all Sanan’s medical expenses until he returned home, including his transportation to his home province in northern Thailand.

With the assistance of HWC, Nui and his father were able to receive both personal and professional care. The NTD3.2 million in compensation far exceeds the dismal NTD1 million that the Thai Labor Office had accepted for Sanan. Nui accompanied his father back to Thailand where their family was reunited again. Nui is now the primary caretaker of his father during the day. Sanan’s wife takes care of him during the night after she has spent a long day of hard work in the family rice field. Sanan’s daughter is now in her second year of college studying business management.

The HWC continues to assist many migrant workers who are victims of occupational accidents to obtain compensation from their employers. We constantly lobby the government to implement safe working conditions in the workplace. The only change the government has made is to introduce a new regulation whereby if migrant workers report an occupational accident to the government the government must send an inspector to the company.

Local workers rightfully shun the 3D jobs – dirty, difficult and dangerous – that migrant workers are forced to do. In order to save on costs to remain competitive in a free trade, liberalized economy, the government allows companies to have migrant workers as up to 30% of their workforce. Local workers are too expensive. Cheap migrant labor, at half the price of local labor, provides greater profits. Despite the fact that one of President Chen’s election policies two years ago was to protect the job opportunities of local workers by having a sealing quota of 300,000 migrant workers, as of the end of May 2006 there were nearly 334,000 migrant workers in Taiwan.

Sanan’s accident was tragic but avoidable. Until the Taiwan government implements stringent health and safety regulations in the workplace it cannot brag about being a government that protects the rights of its workers – both local and migrant. Sanan and his family have paid the price of a government that protects the interests of big business and rapid progress at the expense of the lives of its workers, in particular the migrant workers.
accused Thai workers spoke to the media for the first time. As a result, Huapan dropped its suit. Four of the Thai workers were also charged by the Prosecutor’s Office with damaging private property. Their case is still pending in court. The Thai government has provided two local lawyers and two Thai lawyers to assist the workers.

In another grave instance of abuse, on 18 May 2005 four Vietnamese migrant workers accused their Taiwanese broker and his father of sexually abusing or raping them before sending them to their employers. The Prosecutor’s Office of Tainan District Court launched an investigation into the matter. The four victims sought the assistance of the Legal Aid Foundation (LAF). Two of the victims said they were pressured by an official at the Vietnam Economic and Cultural Office in Taipei to drop their lawsuit. The LAF said they had also received pressure from the Vietnamese office not to help the victims. This case may only be part of a more widespread problem; the LAF said that after the case was made public, seven more victims contacted them for help.

On 2 August 2005, four Filipino workers were beaten by security guards of the Formosa Plastics Groups factory in Mailiao, Yunlin County. They were beaten because they had participated in a strike on 14 and 15 July staged by hundreds of Filipino workers to protest against the horrid conditions at the factory. The migrant workers were exploited, with deductions from their salary totaling half their monthly pay. The workers’ accommodations were dirty and had no dining area, leaving the workers no choice but to eat outside. They were forced to leave Taiwan on the same day they were assaulted, along with 12 other workers. Their Cathay Pacific flight transited through Hong Kong, and when flight attendants noticed that two of the workers were severely beaten, they were sent to a Hong Kong hospital for treatment. One of the workers returned to Taiwan to pursue his case in court.

Only after protests were held by civil society organizations did the CLA investigate the case. According to the CLA, the beatings occurred when the workers were on the way to the airport. Therefore, it is difficult to find out how the incident happened and who should be held responsible. The CLA took no action against Formosa Plastics.

**Placement Fees and Broker’s Service Fees**

The exorbitant placement fees and broker fees continue to keep migrant workers in debt, placing immense pressure on them to push their bodies to the limit with excessive amounts of overtime whenever they have the chance in order to pay off the debt. The Thai workers’ protest in Kaohsiung and the scandals that continue to plague the ruling DPP party highlight yet again the endemic corruption in the Taiwan brokers system.

In November 2001 the CLA introduced a new regulation on broker fees. It suggests that labor sending governments limit their placement fees to a maximum of one month’s salary: NTD15,840. Taiwan brokers may collect the following service and transportation fees from migrant workers: 1st year – NTD1,800 per month; 2nd year – NTD1,700 per month; 3rd year – NTD1,500 per month. This totals NTD60,000 for a three year contract.

In actual fact, despite government limitations, migrant workers are paying much more for their placement fees. The Philippine government’s placement fee policy is one month’s salary plus processing fees totaling approximately NTD28,000. Nevertheless, Filipino factory workers still report paying between NTD40,000 to NTD60,000 for placement fees, while household workers (including both DWs and CGs) pay between NTD34,000 to NTD67,000. Similarly, the Thai government has a placement fee policy of NTD46,000 (THB56,000), but Thai workers are actually paying NTD100,000 to NTD150,000. The Thai workers in Kaohsiung paid between NTD100,000 to NTD125,000. Thai household workers pay between NTD80,000 to NTD150,000.

In order to have the ban on Indonesian
workers lifted, the Indonesian government came to an agreement with the CLA that all Indonesian workers will pay a placement fee of one month’s salary plus processing fees totalling NTD49,787. In practice however, it’s a different story. Factory workers, for example, are supposed to pay NTD19,231 before leaving Indonesia, with the remaining NTD30,556 paid in salary deductions of NTD3,055.60 per month for 10 months. Despite this, Indonesian factory workers report that they actually pay around NTD100,000 to NTD120,000 in Indonesia, and upon their arrival in Taiwan have an extra NTD3,500 per month deducted from their salary for 10 months.

Information collected by Hope Workers’ Center from Indonesian household workers shows how workers end up paying more than the regulated amount of placement fee. Prior to leaving Indonesia, workers sign a “Salary, Fees and Declaration Form”, which details all the expenses the worker agrees to pay while working in Taiwan. Those who pay NTD11,538 before leaving Indonesia end up paying a total of NTD67,803. Where does the extra NTD18,016 (NTD67,803 – NTD49,787) come from? The remaining NTD38,249 (NTD49,787 – NTD11,538) is generally taken as a loan from the China Trust Indonesia bank. The bank administration fee is NTD4,000; on top of that, the workers pay 19% interest totaling NTD10,041. (NTD10,041 is 19% of NTD52,847 but where does this figure come from?) The workers also have to pay a bank management fee of NTD265 per month, which is deducted from their salary for 15 months. Altogether they are paying NTD70,545 for their

Thai workers hold a press conference regarding the abuses in their workplace. Kaoshiung City, Taiwan, August 2005.
placement fee, which is an extra NTD20,758 on top of the regulated placement fee. In actual fact, then, Indonesian household workers are paying NTD20,000 in Indonesia in addition to all the deductions in Taiwan.

Indonesian household workers also have NTD2,000 per month deducted from their pay for 15 months as a “security bond”. This adds up to quite a substantial fee, yet the nature of the bond is unclear: what kind of security is it, and is the security meant for the worker or the employer? This money is not returned to migrant workers if they become undocumented. One of the reasons why the CLA put a ban on Indonesian migrant workers in August 2002 was the security bond, but despite this, nothing has changed. Moreover, even if workers have the financial ability, the Indonesian government does not permit them to pay their placement fee in full. They must take out a loan from the China Trust Indonesia bank. From this, it appears that the government is linked with the China Trust Indonesia bank, which is earning thousands of dollars off the backs of the Indonesian workers.

The Vietnamese government still has no policy on placement fees. Vietnamese factory workers report paying between NTD90,000 – NTD150,000 for their placement fee, which they have to pay in cash. Some of the workers have to pay an extra USD1,700 to the broker at the airport upon arrival in Taiwan. Household workers pay between NTD16,000 to NTD32,000 to their agency in Vietnam. After arriving in Taiwan they are forced to sign an agreement that in their first year, their monthly salary will be only NTD5,600. The remainder of their salary, generally around NTD8,000 per month, goes to their broker. (This would be more if the worker does overtime on Sundays.) In their second year, in addition to the broker service fee of NTD1,700/month, they give their broker an extra NTD5,300/month; in their third year they pay an extra NTD4,000/month. Over a three year period, these illegal broker’s fee deductions total NTD186,000.16

Besides these huge placement fees, Vietnamese workers are the only migrant workers who have to pay tax to their government while working in Taiwan. If it is stated in their “Fees and Salary Declaration Form”, then they need to pay the 8% tax to their government. They also have to pay to their government a USD500 security bond.

In comparison to the previous year’s figures, Filipinos are paying NTD15,000 to NTD20,000 less in placement fees, while Thai workers are paying NTD40,000 to NTD50,000 less than the year before. Indonesian factory workers are paying an extra NTD15,000 to NTD35,000, while Indonesian household workers are once again being deducted the security bond. Vietnamese factory workers are paying the same amount of placement fees as the previous year, while household workers are paying an extra NTD30,000 to NTD45,000.

Migrant Workers in Irregular Status
The government of Taiwan keeps close track of statistics regarding the number of absconding workers, as it generally adheres to a migration management approach. Statistics on absconding workers can then be used to put pressure on sending country governments such as Vietnam, who have imposed penalties on returning migrant workers found to have absconded while abroad. As of December 2004, 16,593 migrant workers absconded from their legal jobs. This amounts to a percentage of 5.28% of the total number of migrant workers, an increase of 85.60% compared to the November 2003 figure of 8,940. Of these, 12,251 (73.83%) were female and 4,342 (26.17%) were male. Indonesian workers had the highest escape ratio at 13.14% (3,584 workers); while that of Vietnamese workers was 9.58% (8,647 workers). The escape ratio for Filipino and Thai workers was lower, with the Filipino workers’ ratio at 2.67% (2,432 workers) and the Thai workers’ ratio at 1.83% (1,928 workers).17

The number of absconding employees increased further during 2005; as of December 2005, 21,679
TABLE 2: NUMBER OF CONTRACT WORKERS WHO RAN AWAY FROM THEIR EMPLOYERS IN TAIWAN AS OF DECEMBER 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Ratio*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipinos</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2,912</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesians</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thais</td>
<td>2,609</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>12,079</td>
<td>2,419</td>
<td>9,660</td>
<td>14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,679</td>
<td>5,496</td>
<td>16,183</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of the number of workers in Taiwan.
Source: National Police Administration of the Interior

Beginning in July 2005, the Hope Workers’ Center (HWC) began a one year research on migrant workers in irregular status. 100 migrant workers each from the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam, and 118 migrant workers from Indonesia, took part in the survey. Of the 418 workers who answered the questionnaire, 52.87% were male and 47.13% were female. Before their status became irregular, 39.23% of those surveyed had been factory workers; 20.10% were DWs; 18.18% were CGs; 8.13% were construction workers; 5.74% were fishermen; and 8.62% did other work.

While in irregular status, of the various types of jobs the migrant workers performed, the most common job was factory work, at 29.73%. The next largest category was construction work – 26.58%, followed by domestic work – 17.79% and caregivers – 12.61%. Other work included farming (2.70%) and restaurant work (1.35%). When comparing the jobs the workers held while in legal status to their work in irregular status, there was a drop of 9.50% in factory work and 7.88% in household service work; meanwhile, there was an increase of 18.45% in construction work. Although construction work is very dangerous and difficult, it attracts many workers in irregular status because it can pay as high as NTD1,000 per day. None of the workers chose jobs as fishermen while in irregular status.

35.65% of the workers said the main reason they entered into irregular status was because their take home salary was so low after all the deductions for brokers fees, food and board.
tax and forced savings. 83.49% of the workers reported that they received less than NTD15,000 in cash each month. Of these, 25.84% of the workers got less than NTD5,000, while 32.78% received less than NTD10,000. Another reason why workers may abscond from their original workplace is because they find their jobs to be extremely difficult – 17.22% of the workers surveyed said they entered the irregular state for this reason. According to the workers, advantages of being in irregular status include: they can earn more money (61.01%); can have as many jobs as they wish (37.32%); can choose they own employer (36.36%); can go anywhere more freely (20.34%). 67.22% of the workers said they received in cash more than NTD15,000 per month while working in irregular status compared to only 16.51% while in legal status.

79.90% of the workers stated that one problem with irregular status is the fear of being arrested by the police. Some of the other difficulties stated by survey respondents included: they can’t make complaints for fear of being reported to the police (36.36%); they had no support from their employer in case of emergency or health risks (29.19%); they were not allowed to go out (22.01%); underpayment or no salary (16.99%).

**Foreign Wives**
The phenomenon of international marriages has been growing in Taiwan, with increasing numbers of Taiwanese men marrying foreign brides, particularly from mainland China, Vietnam, Thailand, Indonesia and Cambodia. According to official statistics, as of the end of December 2004 the number of foreign wives residing in Taiwan, including those from China, Hong Kong and Macau, totaled 338,000.19 Moreover, the Cabinet-level Directorate General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics (DGBAS) measured a jump of 54.5% in 2004 of children born to mixed marriages receiving primary and secondary education in Taiwan.20 According to DGBAS figures, one out of every 4.9 marriages in Taiwan from January to May 2005 was an international marriage. During the same period one out of every 5.5 divorces was from an international marriage.21

Thousands of these women who enter Taiwan through marriage are trafficked, while others are voluntarily entering into fake marriages for purposes of obtaining a work visa. It can be extremely difficult for the government to objectively determine whether a marriage is “fake”, and they may rely on stereotypes and racial profiling in the process of their attempts to detect fake marriages during the interview process. The brokerage system which arranges the marriages is rife with abuse and the women are extremely vulnerable throughout the process. The brokers in the sending countries work together with brokers in Taiwan to arrange for young women to “marry” Taiwanese men. The men travel abroad and meet their brides to be for the first time. After the wedding the couple goes to the Taiwan Economic and Cultural Office (TECO – the Taiwan government representative office) for an interview and applies for a visa for the bride. When the visa is issued, the woman flies to Taiwan. After arriving in Taiwan they begin working. Many of the women pay huge amounts of money to the brokers through salary deductions. This is to pay back the broker for arranging these fake marriages. The women are completely controlled by the brokers. In some circumstances the women are sold to the brokers by their families so that their families can earn money from the brokers. These women often come from very poor families in the villages. Once they arrive in Taiwan and begin work the brokers take the women’s money through salary deductions.

**Thai Women**
There are three different scenarios as to how the Thai women enter Taiwan.22 In the first scenario, the women have made contact with a broker in Taiwan who can help them return on a fake marriage. They pay
around THB300,000 (USD11,300) to the Thai broker in cash. (In comparison, Thai migrant workers are presently paying THB150,000 for a two-year contract which can be renewed for a third year, even though the Thai government’s legal placement fee is capped at THB56,000.) The women generally save money for this fee while working in Taiwan for 3 to 6 years. (Migrant workers can only work in Taiwan for a maximum of 6 years, at which time they must leave and are not allowed to return as migrant workers.) After arriving in Taiwan they can find their own job. Despite the “marriage”, however, they still can only stay in Taiwan for 4 to 5 years, because after this period of time their Taiwanese “husband” usually does not renew their Alien Resident Certificate (ARC) and they must return to Thailand.

In the second scenario, the women may not know anything about Taiwan. The Thai broker arranges for them to “marry” a Taiwanese man. The broker generally charges a fee of around THB300,000, but in this scenario, the women won’t have to start paying off the money until they begin work in Taiwan. They may not pay any money to the broker before leaving Thailand. They are told that they can choose any kind of work when they arrive in Taiwan, and that their monthly salary will be NTD25,000 (USD753), although actually migrant workers receive the monthly minimum wage which is NTD15,840, or USD477. Despite the prior agreement in Thailand, upon arriving in Taiwan they may be told by the Taiwan broker that their broker’s fee is a much higher amount such as NTD800,000 (USD24,100) or even NTD1 million (USD30,120). This is equivalent to three years’ salary.

Some women are told by their broker that they must work in a Thai restaurant for three to four months while waiting for their ARC, when in actual fact it only takes one week to process. After receiving their ARC, many may begin working at a Thai massage parlor, which have become very popular and numerous in Taiwan. The women usually begin work each day at 6:00 p.m. and finish at around 6:00 a.m. Customers pay approximately NTD1,200 (USD36) for a two-hour massage. Only NTD200 (USD6) of this money goes to the Thai woman. They often serve an average of five to six customers each evening. In the case of most women, what they earn is given to the broker to pay their broker’s fee. After three years, they can start keeping their own salary. A number of Thai women work in karaoke bars.

Although originally told they could choose their work, many women are actually forced into prostitution, with their “husbands” acting as their pimps. Before arriving in Taiwan, these women are not aware that they will be forced into prostitution.

The situation above is in contrast to the third scenario through which Thai women use marriage to enter Taiwan. In this case, the women work in the sex industry in Thailand, and know they are coming to Taiwan to work as prostitutes. Similar to the second scenario, the broker tells them that the fee is THB300,000 (USD11,300), which they’ll pay off in Taiwan. Upon arrival, they can be charged as much as NTD1 million (USD30,120). Unlike the other workers, however, sex workers receive a very high salary and can pay this off in three months.

The only time the majority of the women see their “husbands” is when they go to the police station each year to renew their ARC.

**Indonesian women**
The majority of Indonesian women who enter Taiwan through fake marriages have worked in Taiwan before as migrant workers. They are told by their broker that when they attend the interview at the TECO office in Jakarta, they are to say that they met their husband in Taiwan. Indonesian brokers usually charge around NTD100,000 (USD3,012). In Indonesia, they are told that their monthly salary will be between NTD20,000 to NTD25,000 (USD602 to USD753). These women are very
vulnerable, however, and many of these promises are often broken. Some don’t receive any salary, while others have to give their wages to their husband. As with women of other nationalities, some are forced into prostitution with their husband as their pimp. The majority of the women do not live with their “husbands”. For some of the women, once they have given birth to a son, their husbands dump them. When the husbands do not extend their ARC they become undocumented. Upon arrest, they are sent to the Detention Center in Taipei and then deported.

**Vietnamese women**

The majority of Vietnamese women (about 80%) believe they are entering Taiwan through legal marriages (rather than using the marriage system merely to obtain a work visa). They go through a broker to arrange the marriage. The Taiwanese man generally gives the Taiwan broker around NTD200,000 (USD6,024). USD1,000 of this money is given by the broker to the Vietnamese woman’s family, which constitutes approximately two years’ salary in Vietnam. The broker’s fee includes a return airfare to Vietnam for the man; a one-way ticket to Taiwan for the prospective wife; language studies for the wife, etc. When the man arrives in Vietnam, he is taken by the broker to a hotel to meet about 100 Vietnamese women. Generally, the women are in their early 20s. The man chooses one of the women and then takes her on a one-week vacation in Vietnam. If the man is happy with her, they become married.

Many of the Taiwanese men don’t want their Vietnamese wives to work. They want them to have children and to look after the house. After three years of marriage, the wife can apply for her
Taiwan Identification (ID) Card. After another year she receives her “Green Card”. After a further year she finally receives her ID Card. In practice, however, many of the Vietnamese women run away from their husbands to find a job. If they have not already obtained their ID card, they can be arrested by the police and deported.

There are also some Vietnamese women, about 20%, who enter the country through fake marriages solely to work in Taiwan. They pay to the broker USD10,000 in cash. Before coming to Taiwan they are told they will work in their husband’s factory, a factory of their husband’s friend, or that they will find their own job. Their monthly salary is usually about NTD30,000 (USD904). Unfortunately, this plan does not always work out as the women hope; many of the women who live in southern Taiwan are forced into prostitution by their husbands. Their husbands become their pimps. Taiwan does not offer substantial protection for trafficking victims such as these; in June 2005, Taiwan was downgraded from “tier one” to “tier two” by the US Department of State’s Trafficking in Persons Report. The main reason for Taiwan being downgraded in the report is that the country is severely short of protection laws for victims of sex trafficking.

As many Vietnamese women entering Taiwan are sold into prostitution not long after they are ‘married’ and become legal Taiwan residents, the Vietnamese government has moved to take punitive action. In March 2005, Vietnamese Prime Minister Phan Van Khai signed a circular ordering several ministries and state bodies to severely punish brokers organizing contracts between Vietnamese women and foreigners seeking brides in the country. Vietnamese government officials have admitted they are aware that Vietnamese women are being trafficked for forced marriages.

Due to the increasing number of international marriages, and its intersection with trafficking or visa fraud, the Taiwan government has also been introducing new regulations to try to screen marriages. The Taiwan government imposed a new regulation that Vietnamese women planning to marry Taiwanese men are required to undergo individual interviews. Since that time, the number of Vietnamese women marrying Taiwan nationals declined by 70% to 3,461 in the first 11 months of 2005, down from 12,202 in 2004. The figure had averaged 12,000 annually between 2000 and 2004, since the Taiwan government withdrew the individual interview regulation in 1999, allowing Vietnamese women to be interviewed in groups.

The Taiwan government also examined its Nationality Law regarding citizenship. In June 2005 the Ministry of the Interior’s amendment to the Nationality Law was passed by the Legislative Council. The new amendment requires applicants for Taiwan citizenship to pass a Chinese language test and a comprehensive test covering social and legal issues, as well as other requirements. The requirement to pass the test will reduce the chances of new immigrants becoming Taiwan citizens and enjoying equal rights. On July 6, 2005 NGOs supported new immigrants in their demonstration outside the Executive Council, calling on the government to postpone the implementation of amendments to the Nationality Law.

The Taiwan government continues to discriminate against Chinese spouses. These spouses can only obtain identification (ID) cards after eight years of residence in Taiwan, while the required period for other foreign spouses is four years. Chinese spouses must reside in Taiwan for more than two years before they can obtain a work permit, while foreign spouses of other nationalities can obtain a work permit after residing in Taiwan for 6 months. Moreover, the Taiwan government has a policy of not issuing ID cards to childless Chinese widows or widowers of Taiwan nationals. The government forces such people to return to mainland China. Meanwhile, all foreign spouses of Taiwan nationals can only join the National Health Insurance program four
months after their arrival in Taiwan.

On November 5, 2004 rights activists held a press conference to denounce a series of advertising techniques practiced by marriage brokers and to demand that the government institute laws to prevent improper advertisement and inhumane treatment of foreign women. Phrases such as “one-year guarantee” and “guaranteed virgin” appear in some of the advertisements. The NGOs also appealed to the government for more protective laws, demanding a stop to the abuse which foreign wives may face.

According to a study by the Ministry of the Interior, 85% of foreign wives who are victims of domestic violence do not report it to authorities because they are unaware of the resources available to them. Those who did seek help turned to their neighbors, friends, co-workers or church communities. In 2003 the total number of foreign wives who had reported domestic violence against them was 921. In the first 10 months of 2004, the number had risen to 1,085.

**Responses**

**NGO Campaigns**

On 27 July 27, 2004 the CLA released its Monetary Flow Management System Draft (“System”) after negotiations among brokers, banks, employers and governments, but without any participation or consultation of the migrant workers themselves. The new System would require migrant workers in Taiwan to open accounts only at selected banks, in order to facilitate control of the workers’ “money flow”. According to the CLA’s proposal, any migrant worker intending to legally work in Taiwan must open an account at a selected bank before they come to Taiwan. Their employers will then remit their wages into those accounts every month after deducting broker’s fees and other necessary expenditures. In addition, migrant workers would be forced to save NTD36,000 annually to cover costs for medical treatment, funeral expenses, and repatriation.

In response, local labor groups and NGOs protested against the System in front of the CLA. The Catholic NGOs in Taiwan sent a statement to the CLA saying the proposed System is an unacceptable intrusion on the rights of migrant workers to receive and control their own salary. Migrant workers must be free to use the wages they earn in any way they choose. The System is also an instrument intended to benefit the banks and the Taiwan economy more than the migrant workers. Responding to pressure from activist groups, on 1 August, 2004 the CLA announced a temporary postponement of the System. With ongoing pressure, the System was never introduced.

During 2005, the Promotion Alliance for the Household Services Act (PAHSA) lobbied legislators to sign on the Household Services Act (“Act”) for discussion in parliament. In October 2004, after eighteen months of discussion and research, PAHSA drafted its final version of the Act, which aims to protect the rights and welfare of the 300,000 local and migrant DWs and CGs. (As of December 2005 there were 144,015 migrant household workers.) PAHSA is an alliance of ten migrant advocacy NGOs. On 12 October, 2004 PAHSA members demonstrated in front of the Legislative Yuan advocating passage of the Household Services Act. They displayed the signatures of more than 10,000 migrant DWs and CGs working in Taiwan to show support they have received for the legislation.

On 24 September, 2004, NGOs and migrant workers gathered together to protest outside the CLA, demanding that the CLA play a more active role to help migrant workers who are victims of occupational accidents obtain proper treatment and compensation. Some employers in Taiwan try to repatriate injured workers as quickly as possible both because they can no longer work and to avoid paying any compensation. The NGOs made five requests of the CLA: “that the CLA take part in unsolved
disputes between injured foreign workers and employers; that injured foreign workers not be repatriated before compensation is settled; that employers’ permit to hire foreign workers be canceled if the employer does not settle cases of occupational injuries; that foreign workers who are injured on the job receive the same level of compensation as local workers; and that injured foreign workers be included in the government’s official statistical data reports.”

On 12 January, 2005 over 100 Filipina migrant workers supported by the Taiwan International Workers’ Association (TIWA), staged a protest outside the CLA demanding protection from being deported before their management-labor dispute was settled. Their electronics company had gone bankrupt at the end of December 2004, still owing the workers three months’ of unpaid salaries as well as severance pay. The workers were given permission by the CLA to transfer to new employers, but their unscrupulous brokers arranged for them to be transferred to work at steel mills, furnace plants, cement plants or heavy machinery factories. These jobs entailed heavy labor, to which many of the workers were not accustomed. A large number of the female workers were repatriated back to the Philippines when they either could not do the men’s jobs or their new employers refused to have them. Some employers accepted the female workers without intending to employ them for long – once the new employers were allotted the migrant workers’ quotas they could bring in male migrant workers instead. On 26 January, TIWA organized a press conference at the Legislative Council to publicize these human rights abuses of female migrant workers. In addition, some actions were taken on individual cases. The HWC lobbied the case of a Filipina migrant worker who was transferred to a factory to do men’s work. However, there was a middle aged Taiwanese lady who had working in the same factory for many years doing the men’s work. According to CLA law at that time, female migrant workers could not be transferred to a factory where they would be doing men’s work, if there were no other female workers already in the factory doing such work. Despite this, after three months of researching the case the CLA gave permission for the Filipina to be transferred to a new factory.

On 11 December, 2005, PAHSA members organized a migrant workers’ “Anti-Slave-System” rally in Taipei to commemorate International Human Rights Day and International Migrants Day. The rally was also timed to coincide with the opening rally in Hong Kong to oppose the WTO, particularly GATS Mode 4. Due to inclement weather, however, only 500 migrant workers joined the rally. The migrant workers raised five demands at the march: abolish the labor brokerage system and implement a country-to-country direct hiring program; give migrants the freedom to transfer between employers; eliminate the 6 year time limit; include DWs and CGs under the Labor Standards Law, or enact the Household Services Act; and allow migrants to form unions.

New CLA Regulations
With the signing of a MOU in December 2004, Taiwan decided to resume the introduction of workers from Indonesia, lifting the ban it had put in place since August 2002. At that time, the government said it was imposing the ban because of the high number of irregular Indonesian workers, as well as the high placement fees for Indonesian workers. Another incident which may have influenced the decision, however, was because the Indonesian government had refused to give the President of Taiwan a visa to visit Indonesia. Upon lifting the ban, the CLA stated that the Indonesian government had improved the country’s brokerage treatment of Indonesians coming to work in Taiwan; the two governments also agreed to set up a channel for direct employment to reduce Indonesian workers’ financial burden to unscrupulous brokers. The
Indonesian government had scrapped the safety deposit requirement of NTD3,000 per month for each worker, and the brokerage fee had been reduced from NTD90,000-NTD100,000 down to NTD66,000. There were also fewer incidents of Indonesian workers escaping from their employers. Despite this, it was not until early March 2005 that restrictions over applications for the employment of Indonesian workers were finally lifted. During this two and a half year time period the number of Indonesian women who were trafficked into Taiwan increased dramatically. The number has now begun to decrease.

As a result of the case of the 100 Filipina migrant workers discussed above, the CLA introduced a new regulation whereby female migrant workers cannot be transferred to do men’s work if there are no other female workers in the factory doing the men’s work. Following the individual Filipina’s case, the CLA expanded the regulation to provide that female migrant workers cannot be transferred to do men’s work even if there is already a local female worker doing the men’s work. On 1 January, 2006 the CLA also changed its regulation applicable to all transferring migrant workers; instead of only two chances to transfer to a new employer, they now have three chances to transfer.

The CLA introduced a new regulation on the right to transfer for migrant workers who are victims of sexual or physical abuse. In July 2005 the HWC sheltered a Vietnamese caregiver who had been raped by her Taiwanese employer. She was given permission by the CLA to transfer to a new employer, but after using the regulatory two chances to transfer, she still could not find a new employer as a caregiver. After the HWC lobbied the CLA, she was given permission to be transferred to a factory. The HWC also assisted two other caregivers who were rape victims to be transferred to factories. On 1 January, 2006 the CLA introduced a new regulation whereby migrant DWs and CGs who are victims of sexual or physical abuse can be transferred to work in a factory, and there are no limits on their number of chances to transfer.

As of 1 September, 2004 the CLA imposed a new regulation requiring migrant workers who are new hires, employers and brokers to sign affidavits specifying the amount of loans that migrants “borrowed” from their placement agencies prior to deployment. This “Salaries, Fees and Declaration Form” is also to state the migrant worker’s monthly salary and monthly broker’s service fee. Despite the good intentions behind the new regulation, it has not significantly prevented agencies from continuing to overcharge migrant workers for their placement fees.

The HWC lobbied a case of two Filipinos who were given permission by the CLA to transfer to a new job when their company went bankrupt. At the Employment Service Center their broker said they would be transferred to work as electricians in a car factory. They agreed to the transfer and signed the transfer document that was written in Chinese. Instead, however, they were taken to work in a furnace factory. After many months of lobbying the CLA, the CLA introduced a new regulation whereby all transfer documents at Employment Service Centers must be translated into the migrant worker’s mother tongue, and must include a job description of the new work. Despite the new regulation, the CLA did not give permission for these two workers to be transferred to a new employer. Because their work was too difficult and dangerous they chose to return to the Philippines, but their struggle to protect their rights has benefited the thousands of migrant workers who are transferred to new employers each year.

In January 2005, the CLA lowered its criteria for deciding when a death or a physical breakdown has come about as a result of overwork. The decision will no longer be based solely on work hours; other occupational factors will also be included when judging such a case. These other occupational factors
include irregular work times and work patterns; abnormally long working hours; work based on shifts; nighttime work and highly intensive work over long periods of time.

From 1 January, 2006 the CLA allowed an extra 10,000 migrant workers to come to Taiwan to do jobs classified as “difficult and dangerous”, often referred to by NGOs as “3D” jobs. After one year, the CLA plans to increase this quota by another 10,000. Despite the rising quotas, the government still wants to promote the employment of local workers rather than migrants. As an incentive to encourage employers to employ unemployed local workers for “difficult and dangerous” jobs, the CLA is promoting a policy whereby if an employer employs a local worker for more than 6 months in such a job, the government will pay NTD5,000 per month per worker for one year. There is currently a shortage of around 39,000 or more workers in 3D jobs, with approximately 202,000 local workers holding “difficult and dangerous” positions.29

As of October 2005 the CLA will no longer use the Barthel Index, an assessment tool used to determine whether a patient qualifies for employment of a migrant caregiver. Previously, patients had to be extremely incapacitated to hire a migrant caregiver; often, however, doctors were persuaded by the families to forge certificates proving such incapacitation. Under the new system, a certificate from the medical authorities will be the main criterion for future applications. Thus, in addition to the medical certificate, medical and social welfare staff will visit the patient in their home to also determine whether the patient is qualified to hire a migrant caregiver. This was not a part of previous regulations. The CLA hopes that with more relaxed restrictions, local families will no longer have to persuade doctors to forge patients’ medical reports so the family could hire a migrant caregiver. If no local caregiver applies for a caretaker position after the job has been advertised for two weeks, the CLA will then make the vacancies open to migrant workers. The government will give NTD5,000 per month for a maximum of one year to a family that employs a local caregiver.30 From 1 January, 2006 a family that has a member needing 24 hour care can employ a migrant caregiver.

**Legal Aid Foundation**

In July 2004 the government gave a NTD950 million budget to the newly founded Legal Aid Foundation (LAF) to help disadvantaged persons to litigate. Within one year, the LAF established 19 chapters. The LAF has the resources of over 1,900 lawyers, a fact that showed that nearly 40% of all lawyers in practice were willing to contribute their time to help economically disadvantaged persons to file legal proceedings. The LAF pays the lawyer half of the legal fees set at NTD30,000 and the other half is pro bono. The lawyers provide all legal counsel for the workers both prior to and during court proceedings. The LAF has assisted thousands of migrant workers with their legal proceedings filed against their employer or broker.

**Endnotes**

16. All figures come from the HWC case documentation.
The following information comes from the Thai women themselves, as told to a Thai social worker at the Catholic Hope Workers’ Center (HWC) who assists Thai women who have been trafficked into Taiwan.

The following information comes from the Indonesian women themselves. The Indonesian social worker at the HWC has assisted Indonesian women who have been trafficked into Taiwan. Every week at the Taipei Detention Center, there are an average 10 new cases of Indonesian women who have been trafficked into Taiwan.

The following information comes from the Vietnamese women themselves. The Vietnamese social worker at the HWC has assisted Vietnamese women who have been trafficked into Taiwan and arrested by the police, while they’re held at the Taipei Detention Center.
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