WTO Norms on International Migration

Paper Prepared for IOM Workshop on Existing International Migration Law Norms

April 30, 2002

DRAFT

Steve Charnovitz©

In contrast to the Treaty on European Union (art. 3(c)), the World Trade Organization (WTO) does not aspire to the abolition, as between Member states, of obstacles to the free movement of goods, persons, services, or capital. The WTO asserts a much less ambitious goal in its Preamble, namely, "reciprocal and mutually advantageous arrangements directed to the substantial reduction of tariffs and other barriers to trade and to the elimination of discriminatory treatment in international trade relations." In accordance with WTO rules, each member government retains a great deal of latitude to determine how substantially its trade barriers should be reduced and how much market freedom to permit. Nevertheless, it can be said that obstacles to the free movement of goods, persons, services, and capital all come, to some extent, within the current competence of the WTO.

The movement of people is a relatively new concern for the trading system. In the GATT era of 1947–94, almost no attention was paid to workers and professionals. In 1948, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment had included "skills" within the mandate of the prospective International Trade Organization, but the ensuing treaty never went into force, and the topic of skills remained outside the trading system until it was brought back in during the Uruguay Round negotiations.[1]

[1] Article 11.2(a) of the ITO Charter had authorized the Organization, in collaboration with other intergovernmental organizations, to make recommendations for international agreements to assure just and equitable treatment for the enterprise, skills, capital, arts, and technology brought by one Member country to another. An early report of an ITO drafting committee stated that the transit of persons was not within the scope of the Charter, while noting that it may be the concern of another international agency. WTO, GUIDE TO GATT LAW AND PRACTICE, 214 (1995).

Attention to the movement of persons fits comfortably into the equity and efficiency rationales for the trading system. Just as barriers to the transborder movement of goods will reduce economic efficiency, so too will barriers to the movement of labor. For individuals and for the products made by workers, there are numerous border barriers and domestic non-tariff barriers that prevent the operation of an efficient and free market. For example, following the September 11 tragedy, the border between the United States and Canada became harder to cross and this has exacted costs on travelers and shippers. The equity rationale for the WTO also has resonance for the movement of persons. For example, the special and differential treatment norm in the WTO suggests that rich countries should be especially open to imported goods from poor countries in the interest of raising the income of those countries. This same equity norm could be extended to greater openness by industrial countries to foreign individuals from developing countries.

The new WTO trade negotiations launched in November 2001 at Doha will promote further expansion of the current low level of governmental commitments on the movement of natural persons. Some progress is expected in the next few years because this issue is a priority for large U.S. and European corporations, and also for many developing country governments hoping that barriers in industrial countries can be diminished. At this time, it seems unlikely that any of the underlying WTO rules will be changed. Rather, the negotiations will be about the commitments that governments make reciprocally to reduce their national barriers.

The purpose of this paper is to discuss how the trade regime deals with international migration. Part I will review the WTO rules on the movement of natural persons. Part II will look at the actual liberalization agreed to at the WTO. Part III will present proposals for improving the WTO's interface with migration issues.

I. WTO Rules on the Movement of Natural Persons—The Norm and its Gaps

Formally speaking, the WTO does not give individuals a right to live and work in foreign countries. As many treaties do, the WTO protects economic actors indirectly by imposing obligations

on governments as to how they treat such actors. With a few exceptions, those obligations pertain only to *foreign* individuals, not to nationals of the host country. And no individuals can directly enforce such obligations at the WTO.

Nevertheless, in a roundabout way, the WTO does make it easier for individuals to work in foreign countries. The relevant norms are contained in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). GATS Article I recognizes four modes of trade in services.[2] The first mode is when a service supplier in one country provides services to another country (e.g., editing services). The second mode is when a service consumer from one country goes to another country to receive the service (e.g., surgery). The third mode is when a service supplier has a commercial presence in the receiving country (e.g., a bank). The fourth mode is when a natural person, who is a service supplier, has a presence in another country (e.g., a banker).

Mode 4 is the central concern of this paper. In GATS, a natural person (a human) is distinguished from a juridical person (a corporation). The GATS makes it easier for foreigners to work by calling on governments to reduce barriers and improve market access to Mode 4 foreign service suppliers. Although the term "work" is not used, that is what Mode 4 is about because it seeks to enable the individual to trade services for money. One might say that GATS looks at a natural person only as a provider of services, rather than as an individual, but the practical effect can be the same.

The relevance of GATS to individual workers is somewhat clarified in the GATS Annex on Movement of Natural Persons Supplying Services Under the Agreement ("Annex on Movement"). The term "movement" is not used in the GATS itself, but only in the Annex title. The Annex on Movement states that the GATS "shall not apply to measures affecting natural persons seeking access to the employment market of a [WTO] Member, nor shall it apply to measures regarding citizenship, residence or employment on a permanent basis" (para. 2). While this an enormous exclusion, the exact parameters are not completely clear particularly since the sentence leaves the implication that

[2]GATS, art. I(2).

"employment" on a non-permanent basis is covered. When individual suppliers are self-employed, they are outside of the employment market. When individual suppliers relocate to work for a home-country company at a branch in a foreign country, they can be perceived as working outside the employment market, because they do not place themselves on the market. One unsettled question in WTO services law is whether the GATS Agreement applies to service suppliers who work for *domestic* companies in the host country. For example, foreign nurses and computer technicians may work for local companies. Such workers would appear to be in the employment market and so might not be covered by GATS. The drafters of GATS apparently were unable to resolve this point.

The GATS Annex on Movement also states that GATS shall not prevent governments from applying measures to regulate the entry of natural persons into their territory, or to regulate their "temporary" stay, including those measures necessary to protect the integrity of borders. This provision makes clear that Mode 4 obligations will have a coexistence with immigration provisions. This provision contains a further proviso that the government border measure should not be applied in such a manner as to nullify or impair the benefits accorded in a specific commitment. A footnote to this proviso makes clear that governments may require visas for nationals from some countries and not others.

Unlike some regional trade agreements which have more limited coverage, GATS Mode 4 applies notionally to any service provider, from a business executive to a seasonal farm laborer. Some governments sought a narrower coverage during the Uruguay Round, but the developing countries insisted that GATS should at least provide the possibility of covering construction, tourist, and domestic workers.[3]

The GATS Mode 4 obligations are symmetric to the obligations in the other three modes and will be briefly explained. The GATS contains several core rules which include the most-favored-nation requirement (subject to exemptions), transparency of regulations, and a requirement to enter into

[3] CHRISTOPHER ARUP, THE NEW WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION AGREEMENTS. GLOBALIZING LAW THROUGH SERVICES AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY 125 (2000).

successive rounds of negotiations with a view to achieving higher liberalization.[4] In addition, each government is required to set out in a schedule the extent of its own specific commitments, and is prohibited from maintaining market access restrictions (e.g., an economic needs test for natural persons) that is not on its schedule.[5] In sectors where specific commitments are undertaken, governments are to accord national treatment—meaning that the foreign supplier should be treated no less favorably than the domestic supplier—but governments may inscribe exceptions in their commitments.[6] Similarly, in sectors where specific commitments are undertaken, governments are to ensure that measures of general application are administered in a "reasonable, objective and impartial manner," and shall not apply licensing requirements and technical standards that (a) are not based on objective and transparent criteria, (b) are more burdensome than necessary to ensure the quality of the service, and (c) as a licensing standard would restrict the supply of a service.[7] When government authorization is required for the supply of the service, the competent authorities shall "within a reasonable period of time" inform the applicant of the decision.[8] Another key rule provides that governments shall institute judicial, arbitral, or administrative tribunals that can be invoked by an affected service supplier for a prompt review of administrative decisions.[9] This last two rules are examples of the way that the WTO indirectly accords procedural rights to individuals (although not enforceable by the individual in the WTO).

The GATS rules on the qualifications of professionals have particular relevance for Mode 4. GATS does not require a recognition of equivalent qualifications by foreign professionals. What it does is to encourage governments to recognize the education and experience obtained in foreign

[4]GATS arts. II, III, XIX:1.

[5]Id. arts. XVI, XX.

[6]Id. art. XVII.

[7]Id. art. VI:1, VI:5.

[8]Id. art. VI:3.

[9]Id. art. VI:2.

countries and the licenses and certifications granted.[10] In that regard, GATS requires the government (prospectively admitting a foreign professional) to give a foreign government an adequate opportunity to seek the recognition of its education, experience, licenses, and certifications.[11]

The GATS is a complex agreement that contains many other exclusions. One is that governments may carry out international agreements to avoid double taxation even though that would lead to different treatment to nationals from different countries.[12] Another notable exclusion occurs in Article V *bis* (Labor Markets Integration Agreements) which states that the GATS shall not prevent WTO Members from being a party to an agreement establishing full integration of labor markets, provided that the agreement exempts citizens of parties to the agreement from requirements regarding residency and work permits. A footnote explains that typically such agreements provide foreign citizens the right of free entry to the employment market, and include provisions concerning conditions of pay, conditions of employment, and social benefits.[13] The existence of this Article V *bis* is another factor that beclouds the Agreement's application to employment markets. If GATS does not apply to the "employment market" in the first place, then why is this Article needed since it has relevance only to the labor market? Furthermore, is the WTO slipping down the labor policy slope by insisting that recognized agreements have exemptions regarding residency and work permits?

Pursuant to GATS, the governments negotiated an Understanding on Commitments in Financial Services that contains an outline of commitments including one on the "temporary entry of personnel."[14] This provision states that when a foreign financial service supplier establishes a commercial presence in the receiving country, that government shall permit temporary entry of senior management personnel possessing proprietary information. In addition, subject to the availability of

[10]Id. art. VII:1.

[11]Id. art. VII:2.

[12]Id. art. XIV(e).

[13]Id. GATS footnote 2.

[14]Understanding on Commitments in Financial Services, para. 9.

qualified specialists in the receiving country, that government shall permit temporary personnel who are computer specialists, telecommunications specialists, actuaries, or legal specialists.

The GATS is at once a shallow and a potentially deep international agreement. It is shallow because a reluctant government can comply fully with GATS even while totally closing its market to foreign service providers.[15] It is deep in that governments can make legal commitments that will implicate their ability to regulate the domestic market, at least vis-a-vis foreign service suppliers.

In summary, the GATS contains disciplines on how a host country regulates natural persons who are service suppliers from another WTO Member country. The GATS excludes permanent residence and therefore encompasses only a temporary stay, although the terms "permanent" and "temporary" are not defined. Furthermore, the GATS discipline only refers to the receiving country. Nothing is said about disciplines on the sending country. For example, Bangladesh, India, and Indonesia, and Pakistan will often prohibit women from taking jobs abroad as domestic workers. Such restrictions are not covered by GATS. Thus, if the GATS does prescribe a legal norm for migration, it is a very narrow one.

To better describe the Mode 4 norm, and its gaps, one might consider two comparative perspectives. First, how do the Mode 4 obligations compare to the other WTO obligations? Second, how do the Mode 4 obligations fit into the broader international regime on the movement of people?

Consider the WTO obligations on the movement of goods, services, capital, technology, and people:

Government regulations and taxes affecting the entry of foreign *goods* are supervised by an extensive array of disciplines in several WTO agreements including the GATT, the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, and others. These disciplines apply generally to all measures affecting goods, without any need

[15]See Pierre Sauvé, "Open Services Markets Matter," manuscript, at 7.

for filing schedules.[16] For example, under GATT jurisprudence, taxes and regulations cannot be applied in a way to limit equal competitive opportunities for imported products (art. III). Under the SPS Agreement, sanitary measures must be based on scientific principles (art. 2.2). Technical regulations shall not be more trade-restrictive than necessary to fulfill a legitimate objective.

As noted above, the *services* disciplines leave much discretion with governments as to what they want to commit to. In general, however, the first and third modes can extend to ongoing relationships and are not limited to foreign companies. For instance, under Mode 3, a service supplier can have a permanent presence and provide services to anyone in host country. Of all four modes, Mode 4 has the weakest commitments.

For restrictions on *capital* movements, the WTO contains some disciplines and establishes links to the International Monetary Fund.[17]

For *technology*, the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) imposes strong disciplines on the protection of intellectual property, but does not otherwise address restrictions on technology transfer. Thus, it is probably not a WTO violation for a government to prohibit imports of fetal stem cells for research, even if there is no scientific basis for doing so. The TRIPS Agreement also calls for cooperation to prevent international trade in goods infringing intellectual property rights.[18]

Viewed against this backdrop, WTO supervision of national regulation of the movement of people is much weaker than supervision of goods, other services, and technology, and is perhaps on a par with the lenient supervision of national restrictions on capital movements.[19]

---

[16]The one exception is GATT Article II which references each government's own tariff schedules.

[17]See GATT art. XV; Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures, Annex, para. 2(b); GATS arts. XI, XII. GATS schedules can also include provisions on monetary remittances.

[18]TRIPS art. 69.

[19]One analyst suggests that the actual commitments for capital mobility in GATS are greater than for labor mobility. Rupa Chanda, "Movement of Natural Persons and Trade in Services: Liberalising Temporary Movement of Labour under the GATS," Indian Council for Research on International Economic Relations, Working Paper No. 51, Nov. 1999, at 34.

As compared to other services, the disciplines on Mode 4 restrictions are shallower because they apply only to temporary movements. Furthermore, as will be discussed below, the national GATS schedules typically impose pre-employment requirements and other contractual conditions on individuals that severely hamper market access. By contrast, a service supplier that is a juridical person (e.g., a bank) will be far freer to seek new business than will a Mode 4 migrant on her own.

Another way of assessing GATS Mode 4 is to see where it fits into the international regime on the movement of persons across borders. That might be divided into permanent movement and temporary movement. The WTO putatively has no role in permanent movement. For temporary transborder movement, the main categories are refugees, transit, tourism, family visits, educational and cultural exchanges, and work. The WTO is only interested in the last category, work, and within that only services work. The work must be as an independent service provider or in a non-domestic company, and within that narrow purview, governments only have commitments for sectors as agreed to in national schedules.[20] Thus, across the whole spectrum of issues regarding the movement of people that could be the subject of international law, WTO law covers only a very narrow band.

That said, it should be noted that much of the spectrum is bereft of any international law, and so the GATS Mode 4 span is significant. Furthermore, Mode 4 has growing economic significance, and the WTO disciplines are likely to get deeper as governments make more commitments in successive rounds. Therefore, looking ahead, GATS Mode 4 may become an important part of international migration law.

II. Survey of the Actual Mode 4 Commitments

Part II of this paper looks briefly at what governments have agreed to do in GATS Mode 4 negotiations. As noted above, the GATS is a bottom-up regime and so the amount of market accessibility depends on each government's schedule. Unfortunately, as Julia Nielson of the OECD has

---

[20]This sentence assumes that Mode 4 does not apply to employment in host country companies.

noted, "Even by the modest standards of Uruguay Round liberalisation on trade in services, little was achieved on Mode 4."[21] In some instances, however, actual regulatory regimes may be more liberal than a government has committed to.

The existing Mode 4 commitments are heavily tilted toward high-skill persons.[22] About 42 percent of the horizontal commitments (i.e., applying to all sectors) relate to intra-company transferees. Another 28 percent relate to executives, managers, and specialists. Another 13 percent are visitors for sales negotiations and ten percent are other business visitors. The remaining seven percent are independent contractors and others. The trend in national schedules is to allow executives to stay for two to five years, while business visitors are limited to 90 days. A five-year stay would seem to be tantamount to migration, or at least temporary migration.

Only about 17 percent of the commitments apply to low-skilled personnel, and these are often limited by an economic needs test that excludes the alien if it has not been shown that no qualified domestic workers are available. Even when such a "need" exists, the paperwork involved can be a significant barrier. It is interesting to note that the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) eliminates labor market certifications for the temporary entry of listed categories of workers, including traders and investors, intra-company transferees, business visitors, and qualified professionals defined through education or experience.[23]

As Allison M. Young has observed, "the tension between [national] trade officials and immigration and labor market development officials . . . is played out in the schedules."[24] GATS schedules show that numerous additional restrictions are commonly imposed. The most common

---

[21]OECD, Working Party of the Trade Committee, "Service Providers on the Move: A Closer Look at Labour Mobility and the GATS," TD/TC/WTP(2001)26/FINAL ("Nielson Paper"), at 5 (20 Feb. 2002).

[22]WTO Council for Trade in Services, Presence of Natural Persons (Mode 4), Background Note by the Secretariat, S/C/W/75 (8 Dec. 1998), Table 9. These figures are updated in WTO Secretariat, "GATS, Mode 4 and the Pattern of Commitments," at 4 (11 April 2002).

[23]NAFTA art. 1603.

[24]Allison M. Young, "Where Next for Labor Mobility Under GATS?, in GATS 2000. NEW DIRECTIONS IN SERVICES TRADE LIBERALIZATION 184, 187 (Pierre Sauvé & Robert M. Stern eds., 2000).

restriction is “pre-employment” meaning that persons must already be employed by the company in the host country that they will be working with. Furthermore, Mode 4 entry and the corresponding work permit are normally confined to one sector or to one employer, and workers cannot freely move to another position or relocate geographically.[25] Some governments require that foreign workers be paid the prevailing wage.[26] Some governments have reserved the right to suspend commitments in the event of a labor-management dispute.[27] Some governments forbid temporary migrants from purchasing real estate. Some governments mandate that specialists train local staff. Together, these limitations undermine the significance of Mode 4 commitments.

III. Proposals for Improving the WTO Norm and its Implementation

Part III looks at ideas for WTO action to liberalize national barriers to the movement of natural persons. The most obvious idea is that governments should make greater commitments in the new WTO round. Inspiration can be drawn from the labor mobility provisions in regional trade agreements, which in many instances, go beyond the GATS.[28] Part III will not delve into WTO negotiation strategies, but rather will discuss some key areas for new international cooperation.

One idea making progress is the “GATS visa” tailored for service professionals temporarily working outside of their own country.[29] This would be a national visa which a participating government would issue according to prescribed criteria. Because only a narrow range of individuals would qualify, the screening procedures could be separated from normal visa decisions. With streamlined administrative procedures, the visa could be provided within a few weeks. Ideally, such a GATS visa

[25]Chanda, supra note 19, at 18, 32.

[26]Nielson Paper, supra note 21, para. 25;

[27]WTO Background Note, supra note 22, para. 45.

[28]See Julia Nielson, “Current Regimes for Temporary Movement of Service Providers,” Paper Presented at the Joint WTO-World Bank Symposium on Movement of Persons (Mode 4) Under GATS, April 2002.

[29]Nielson Paper, supra note 21, at 48 (Box 6).

could be granted to qualified individuals without discrimination according to the nationality of the applicant.

Another topic that is being discussed in GATS negotiations is the economic needs test. A minimal action would be to increase transparency of how these tests are implemented.[30] A more important action would be to harmonize the tests so that government decisions are easily reviewable. Ideally, such tests would be banned as inconsistent with the spirit of the WTO. After all, governments cannot refuse to import foreign goods on the grounds that they are not needed because domestic substitutes are available. Similarly, the TRIPS Agreement does not permit a government to refuse to award a patent or copyright on the grounds that the local economy does not need it.

Greater recognition of foreign licenses is another possible outcome of the Doha trade round. Already, the GATS calls for cooperation between WTO Members and relevant international and nongovernmental organizations toward the adoption of common international standards for recognition and for the practice of services trades and professions.[31] Yet little progress has occurred so far.

WTO negotiators may also consider ways to improve the mobility of Mode 4 service providers in receiving countries. At present, visas and work permits are used to control where service providers can operate. Entry and residency are often pre-conditioned on working for a particular company. Such restrictions make no sense in a dynamic world economy and are a good example of how the WTO treats people less favorably than products. Under GATT rules, the exporter of a product does not have to name in advance the final consumer in the country of import.

Prevailing wage requirements are another barrier to trade in services. They are in effect a "social clause" for the receiving country motivated by the idea of taking wages out of competition. If a foreign service provider demands equal pay, then she should be able to do so. But it is unfortunate that WTO Members continue to reserve the right to prevent an alien provider from working for a legal

[30]Mark Hatcher, "Mode 4 Trade - The Protagonists' View," Paper Presented at the Joint WTO-World Bank Symposium on Movement of Persons (Mode 4) Under GATS, April 2002.

[31]GATS art. VII:5.

wage that is less than the prevailing wage. On goods, the WTO norm is importation without quantitative restriction, and then an equal opportunity to compete on price against domestically-produced goods in the receiving country. Yet on people, the WTO norm is to thwart competition.

Another difficult issue will be to solve the unfairness to foreign workers when they have to pay social insurance taxes to the receiving country even though they will not receive any benefits. In many instances, this amounts to double taxation because the foreign worker is already paying social taxes in his home country.[32] As noted above, the GATS permits governments to undertake international accords to prevent double taxation (art. XIV(e), but has no norm requiring such fundamental fairness to the foreigner. This would be a good topic for cooperation between the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the WTO, but so far the WTO has resisted undertaking any cooperation with the ILO. The ILO first addressed the problem of the transferability and totalisation of social insurance as early as 1935 with the Convention concerning the Establishment of an International Scheme for the Maintenance of Rights under Invalidity, Old-Age and Widows' and Orphans' Insurance (No. 48). More recently, the ILO has legislated a framework Convention concerning the Establishment of an International System for the Maintenance of Rights in Social Security (No. 157).

Promoting Cooperation

The issues in GATS Mode 4 are difficult as they lie at the intersection of trade, labor, and public safety policies. If greater progress is to be made, governments will need to provide assistance to each other in identifying new practices that work well. The GATS calls for technical assistance *to* developing countries,[33] but not in the reverse direction and not among industrial countries. The GATS also provides for consultation and cooperation with other international organizations concerned with services, but only a few organizations (such as the International Telecommunications Union) are invited to meetings of the WTO Council for Trade in Services. That parochialism should end: When

[32]Chanda, supra note 19, at 21, 42–43.

[33]GATS art. XXV:2 (Technical Cooperation). See also art. IV (Increasing Participation of Developing Countries).

the Council considers issues regarding natural persons, it should invite the ILO, the International Organization for Migration (IOM), and the U.N. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization to attend.

Because of the importance of the movement of natural persons to economic development, the IOM and the ILO should also be invited to meetings of the WTO Committee on Trade and Development. The U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) already have observer status, and organizations concerned with migration and labor are at least as relevant as UNEP and WIPO.

The WTO also needs to increase its cooperation with nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and the private sector, many of whom are deeply interested in Mode 4 movements. At present, NGOs, including business NGOs, are not permitted to be observers in GATS entities. In April 2002, the WTO and World Bank joined together a hosting a symposium on Movement of Persons Under GATS. This was a positive step.

The WTO competence over the temporary movement of individuals has its challenges, but it also provides an opportunity for the WTO to adopt a more "people-centered"[34] approach to trade and development. Rather than limiting GATS commitments to obligations between WTO Members, the WTO should rewrite the rules so that governments acknowledge obligations to service suppliers in their juridical and natural embodiments. If the GATS was more widely perceived as international law that can help workers, then the GATS might enjoy greater support from the public. At present, the movement of natural persons is discussed in the WTO mainly as a services modality, rather than in the broader context of allowing workers to gain work opportunities and experience.

The WTO should also be looking for ways to better link the trade regime to the human rights and worker rights regimes. Trafficking in women and children obviously falls under the rubric of transborder services, and yet the WTO is not even considering the adoption of cooperation to combat

[34]See United Nations, Monterrey Consensus, para. 8 (30 Jan. 2002).

such trafficking. Under the TRIPS Agreement, governments agree to cooperate with a view to eliminating international trade in goods infringing intellectual property rights (art. 69). Shouldn't governments make a parallel commitment in the GATS Agreement to eliminate international trade in services infringing basic human rights?

Finally, the broad competence of GATS over services has led to the question of how the WTO should include worker agency services in schedules. As Professor David Richardson has explained, labor unions provide such services and can create countervailing market power to any anti-competitive market power of firms.[35] Richardson proposes that the WTO begin steps toward a market-supportive worker agency agreement at the WTO. At the recent WTO-World Bank Symposium, a representative of Public Services International also called attention to the need for "GATS workers" to enjoy the fundamental worker rights declared by the ILO.[36] Such ideas will merit attention in promoting the Doha Development Agenda.

[35]J. David Richardson, "Narrow New Issues as a Natural Way Forward for the WTO," Institute for International Economics, 2001.

[36]Mike Waghorne, Paper Presented at the Joint WTO-World Bank Symposium on Movement of Persons (Mode 4) Under GATS, April 2002.

International Agreements

Convention concerning the Establishment of an International Scheme for the Maintenance of Rights under Invalidity, Old-Age and Widows' and Orphans' Insurance (No. 48), 22 June 1935.

Convention concerning the Establishment of an International System for the Maintenance of Rights in Social Security (No. 157), 21 June 1982.

Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, 15 April 1994.

North American Free Trade Agreement, 17 December 1992.