



**International Convention on the  
Protection of the Rights of  
All Migrant Workers and  
Members of Their Families**

Distr.: General  
28 September 2011  
English  
Original: French

---

**Committee on the Protection of the Rights of All  
Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families  
Fourteenth session**

**Summary record of the 158th meeting**

Held at the Palais Wilson, Geneva, on Tuesday, 5 April 2011, at 10 a.m.

*Chairperson:* Mr. El Jamri

**Contents**

Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 73 of the Convention  
(*continued*)

*Second periodic report of Mexico (continued)*

---

This record is subject to correction.

Corrections should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Editing Unit, room E.4108, Palais des Nations, Geneva.

Any corrections to the records of the public meetings of the Committee at this session will be consolidated in a single corrigendum, to be issued shortly after the end of the session.

*The meeting was called to order at 10 a.m.*

**Consideration of reports submitted by States parties under article 73 of the Convention** (continued)

*Second periodic report of Mexico* (continued) (CMW/C/MEX/2; CMW/C/MEX/Q/2 and Add.1)

1. *At the invitation of the Chairperson, the delegation of Mexico took places at the Committee table.*
2. **The Chairperson** invited the delegation of Mexico to continue replying to the questions asked at the previous meeting.
3. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) emphasized that his country did not deny that difficulties existed, but it was doing its utmost to ensure appropriate respect for migrants' rights by adopting public policies and specific measures, amending the legal framework and strengthening institutions. Mexico, which had drafted a comprehensive national strategy to prevent the kidnapping of migrants, insisted that crimes against migrants were committed by organized criminal groups involved in the trafficking of drugs, arms and persons. In addition, a programme of confidence checks had been implemented, particularly to sanction public officials. The entire public sector was subject to those checks: police officers, public officials at the National Institute for Migration, prosecutors, and even the Ministry of the Interior.
4. In reply to the questions on the protection of human rights, he explained that, following a recommendation by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the National Human Rights Commission, several precautionary measures had been taken to protect migrants from physical harm. Those measures were monitored through constant contact with the supervisory authorities.
5. **Ms. Herrera Rivero** (Mexico) said that the Mexican Government was fighting impunity; complaints against public officials lodged with the National Human Rights Commission had been investigated. They related to ill-treatment and to lack of care not only by public officials at the National Institute for Migration but also by officers of the Federal Police. With regard to offences committed by public officials, prison sentences of between 9 and 135 years had been handed down in cases involving kidnapping and organized crime. Between 2006 and 2011, 966 persons had been arrested for the trafficking of undocumented migrants, and criminal proceedings had been launched in 694 cases involving that crime in 2009. Between 2010 and 2011, 461 cases had been dealt with. The comprehensive national strategy to prevent the kidnapping of migrants had been launched and a specific law on that issue had entered into force the previous February and established, among other provisions, that cases must be fully investigated until they were solved and that the dossier could not simply be closed. Penalties had also been increased. Inter-institutional collaboration had been organized, which had given rise to a framework convention to prevent the kidnapping of migrants. The comprehensive national strategy to prevent the kidnapping of migrants aimed at dismantling organized criminal groups, strengthening the role of municipal, state and federal authorities, encouraging witnesses to come forward and integrating the work of civil society with that of the National Human Rights Commission.
6. In November 2007, a strategy to combat trafficking in persons had been launched under the law relating to inter-institutional collaboration among the three levels of government and the Office of the Special Prosecutor for Crimes of Violence against Women and Trafficking in Persons had been established. Several investigations were under way and convictions had been made at the state and local levels. There was no

jurisdictional dispute between the federal and local authorities, and the State was responsible for handling the cases and punishing perpetrators.

7. Even if a complaint had not been made, an investigation could be launched if the public prosecutor's office was made aware of a case by means of complaints, including anonymous ones, witness statements or information provided by the police or national or international bodies. In addition, measures had been taken to protect migrants: Government actions to prevent sexual violence included the dissemination of brochures and televised messages, and support centres for victims. Civil society helped to provide services for victims, in particular with regard to accommodation for migrants.

8. At the international level, Mexico had worked with 12 Central American countries, including on identification of bodies of murder victims. The networks that had brought those persons into Mexico were being investigated so that those responsible could be prosecuted, even in their countries of origin.

9. **Mr. Rubido García** (Mexico) said that he hoped there would be progress on migrant protection. To that end, the Federal Government needed to work in collaboration with the federated states, in particular Chiapas, which was a gateway to Mexico for migrants from Central America.

10. Organized crime was steadily increasing and the Government had implemented a comprehensive strategy to combat the phenomenon. The results of that strategy could not be assessed in the short term; it was a medium- to long-term approach. The strategy comprised five elements: building the State's crime-fighting capacity; strengthening security and justice; amending the legal framework, which was no longer suited to modern crime; social crime-prevention measures, in particular in the areas of social development, education and health; and collaboration with other countries, especially countries of migrants' origin, transit and destination, to combat crime and trafficking in persons effectively.

11. Regarding the second element, namely the strengthening of security and justice, the National Public Security Council had unanimously adopted a confidence-checking mechanism, which resulted in important qualitative gains. In particular, that mechanism, which had been integrated into the new General Act on the National Public Security System, provided that police officers were required to pass confidence checks within four years of the promulgation of the Act. Breaches of the provisions of the Act could be punished with administrative, pecuniary and even criminal sanctions. Thus, police officers who had not done so could no longer be employed. Public officials at all levels of the Ministry of Public Security were also required to pass the checks.

12. **Mr. Baltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) said that 1,325 complaints had been filed with the National Human Rights Commission and that they had given rise to 81 recommendations. Specific measures had been taken against 168 public officials working in the National Institute for Migration and 33 criminal charges were currently being examined. There was no impunity in Mexico and concrete measures were taken in cases of human rights violations. Well-established objectives and methodologies allowed progress to be evaluated.

13. Migrant holding centres had been established on the basis of specific standards and recommendations of international bodies such as the International Organization for Migration (IOM) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. The centres had been visited by several representatives of Central American Governments and migrants in there could access health care and contact their consulate. Assistance was provided to family members and civil society organizations wishing to visit the centres, and special care was provided for children and crime victims on account of their vulnerability. No humiliation of migrants in holding centres was tolerated; immediate sanctions were

imposed. The Federal Criminal Code and other laws contained clear provisions allowing for more severe sanctions to be applied to any public official who committed a crime against a migrant.

14. **Mr. Yrizar Barbosa** (Mexico), on the subject of human rights defenders, said that Mexico had ratified the American Convention on Human Rights in March 1981 and that it recognized the competence and decisions of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The Inter-American Court and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights were required to take preventive steps and to act when human rights were violated or risked violation. The Unit for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights of the Ministry of the Interior coordinated protection measures in collaboration with other Government bodies, the municipalities and the various states. It determined which measures were required to avoid irreparable damage. He reaffirmed that Mexico was committed to respecting national and international provisions relating to the protection of the human rights of migrants.

15. As to Fr. Solalinde, he had become the standard-bearer for unconditional assistance to migrants travelling to the United States of America. His shelter, “Hermanos en el camino” (Brothers on the road), in Ixtepec provided humanitarian aid to thousands of migrants passing through the city. He performed his work against a background of violence: drug cartels and gangs involved in trafficking in persons and organs were fighting for control over the route taken by the migrants. The violence was so serious that members of the centre had been forced to abandon their humanitarian work in order to denounce human rights violations and work on investigations. As a result, they were constantly harassed and threatened and Fr. Solalinde had even been arrested by the police. However, his work was recognized by the federal and municipal authorities and they were committed to protecting him and other human rights defenders.

16. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) said that Mexico, anxious to protect human rights defenders and to improve the care offered to migrants, had just launched a new cycle of human rights courses for public officials working in the field of migration and, from August, was intending to offer online training courses to ensure that they were accessible to as many people as possible at the federal, state and municipal level.

17. He highlighted the efforts of the National Institute for Migration to have a presence along the routes taken by migrants in the south and north of the country and to strengthen its teams along the northern border. In 2010, Beta Groups, which had been recognized as an example of good practice at the Global Forum on Migration and Development, had provided assistance to more than 200,000 migrants from Mexico and elsewhere.

18. Article 114 of the migration bill, which was currently before Parliament, would be brought into line with article 33 of the Constitution. The Constitution would also be amended to guarantee the right to due process. Article 52 of the bill provided for the creation of a transit visa, without a work permit, that would allow migrants to remain in the country for 180 days. The bill also contained a chapter devoted entirely to the protection that the Mexican Government was required to provide for migrants in transit, particularly if they were members of vulnerable groups, regardless of their migration status.

19. In 2010, more than 2 million persons had entered Mexican territory over the southern border. In 2000, to make it easier to visit family members, particularly indigenous persons living within a 100-kilometre radius of the Mexico-Guatemala border, the Mexican Government had introduced the local visitor migration category, which allowed visitors to enter Mexican territory for 72 hours. Mexico was endeavouring to extend the measure to the entire southern border area. There were currently 10 entry points along that border and the intention was to create 3 more, in collaboration with the Guatemalan Government.

20. Several indicators existed in Mexico for evaluating public policies, in particular in the area of respect for the human rights of Mexican nationals and of migrants living in border areas. Inter-institutional coordination was also subject to evaluation. The results of those evaluations were submitted to the President of the Republic and to Congress.

21. **Ms. Casiano** (Mexico) said that the rights of migrants to social security were covered under the first article of the Constitution. In terms of health, migrants working in the informal sector had access to the People's Health Insurance Scheme, which insured them for medicines and health care. Education was free in Mexico, regardless of status under migration legislation. Bilateral agreements on social security existed with Canada and Spain. The Institute for Mexicans Living Abroad, a tripartite public body (State, workers and employers) whose purpose was to provide health- and social security-related services to Mexicans abroad, was responsible for the payment of benefits. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs had also created a programme called "Ventanilla de salud" (health windows), which allowed migrants to obtain information on health and to access treatment under agreements with local health-care centres.

22. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) said that foreign nationals working in Mexico had the same rights of access to education as Mexicans. More and more children were being born to immigrants on Mexican territory and were therefore given Mexican nationality; as such, they received free health care.

23. **Mr. Alday González** (Mexico) said that the foreign policy of Mexico, 12 million of whose nationals were living in the United States, focused on the protection of its citizens abroad and the protection of human rights. He explained that 6.5 million Mexican immigrants had had their status regularized and that approximately 50 Mexican consulates existed in the United States, which placed huge demands on the State in terms of human and budgetary resources. Requests for services, which had increased by 16 per cent between 2009 and 2010, were varied, and had produced highly satisfactory results. The assistance provided by consulates included repatriation; assistance to women and children who had been victims of domestic violence; legal assistance by recognized solicitors for miscarriages of justice, issues arising from Arizona Senate Bill 1070 (SB 1070) and sentences involving capital punishment; the dissemination of information on the repercussions of SB 1070; and the issuance of documents, such as identity and civil status documents and consular identification cards, which were a valuable tool for keeping track of Mexican nationals in the United States and enabling them to open a bank account, obtain a driving licence, and so on.

24. According to the principle of *jus sanguinis*, all children born abroad to Mexican parents had the right to Mexican nationality. The Institute for Mexicans Living Abroad was another cog in the mechanism; it included a council made up of representatives of Mexican communities abroad, who were consulted during the drafting of programmes for migrants in the areas of health, housing, education, sport, financial education, culture, etc. The Mexican Government was working to reduce the high transfer fees paid by migrants sending money through private intermediary organizations, and the consular identification cards, which allowed holders to open a bank account, was part of its strategy. Migrants could also invest all or part of the funds they sent to Mexico in infrastructure projects through a programme called "Tres por uno" (Three for one): for each United States dollar invested by the migrant, the Federal Government and the migrant's municipality of origin each contributed another dollar. Agreements had been concluded between Mexico and the United States in 2009 with a view to improving the conditions of expulsion of undocumented migrants, especially unaccompanied minors, who were no longer detained but were handed straight over to the Mexican authorities before being repatriated, and pregnant women or women with children, who were issued with electronic bracelets.

25. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) said that the Government had intended the new migration bill to ensure that migrants in Mexico were accorded the same treatment that it would like to see accorded to its nationals living in the United States. Mexico was working with two other Central American countries to implement a comprehensive migrant-location system based on the exchange of information within the consular system.

26. **The Chairperson** asked how the State party perceived the difficulties that it encountered in the implementation of certain provisions, what their scope was and in which order of priority it was intending to tackle them. One example of its difficulties was the Beta Groups, some of which had allegedly been infiltrated by members of criminal organizations, and the refusal of some registrars to register the birth of migrants' children born in Mexico. Observing that the State party had several separate migration policies, he wondered when it intended to integrate them into a coherent and comprehensive policy that would be more clearer and easier to evaluate, thereby enhancing the implementation of the Convention.

27. **Mr. Tall** asked for clarification on the planned amendments to article 33 of the Constitution, particularly with regard to the provisions relating to immediate expulsion, which should be brought into line with the right to effective remedy. He requested information on the measures taken by the State party to accede to the International Labour Organization (ILO) Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (No. 97), and the ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (No. 143), and on the results of consultations on that subject. He regretted the lack of information on the follow-up given to complaints related to the organized trafficking of persons, of which more and more were submitted every year. He would like to know how many, at least in percentage terms, were thrown out and how many ended up in court. Recalling the statement made in 2008 regarding complaints received by the National Human Rights Commission of ill-treatment by public officials in holding centres, he wished to know the number or percentage of those complaints that had been followed up and had given rise to judicial proceedings.

28. Tens of thousands of migrants had been repatriated and there was a memorandum of understanding between Mexico and several Central American States that aimed to ensure that migrants were repatriated in a manner that respected their dignity. However, it was not known whether those repatriations were isolated cases or concerned groups of individuals and whether they were voluntary or involuntary. He would also like further information on the repatriation procedure and on the text of the migration bill and its compatibility with the Convention, and on the training of judges and magistrates with regard to the rights of migrant workers. Turning to violence against migrants by police officers, he would like figures on investigations and prosecutions. Lastly, he wondered whether migrants in holding centres were systematically informed of their rights, and which migrants were eligible for the regularization programme for 2008–2011.

29. **Mr. Taghizadet** requested more detailed information on the confidence checks to which State officials who came into contact with migrants would be subject. In particular, he wanted to know whether the expenses they claimed in the exercise of their functions were scrutinized and what proportion had failed the check. He would also like to know whether there were enough public officials to analyse the statistics on the flow of migrants and whether Mexico, together with its neighbouring States, was complying with the provisions of the Convention on different aspects of the migration issue.

30. **Ms. Dicko** expressed her concern with regard to seasonal workers. In the south of the country they did not seem to enjoy decent working conditions and were apparently victims of discrimination on many levels. She would like further information on the measures taken to remedy that situation. She was also concerned at the high number (more

than 2,000) of migrants who had lost their lives at borders between 2005 and 2009. What happened to the bodies of those migrants? Did their families receive any compensation?

31. **Mr. Sevim** asked whether the provisions of article 76 of the Convention were duly applied in Mexico.

32. **Mr. Carrión-Mena** (Country Rapporteur) asked for information on the right to vote for Mexicans abroad. In addition, he wanted to know how many requests for asylum were submitted in Mexico, how they were dealt with, and what initiatives Mexico took to promote the Convention, both nationally and abroad.

33. **Ms. Poussi Konsimbo**, recalling that the Committee had adopted a general comment at its previous session on the situation of migrants employed as domestic workers, who accounted for a substantial proportion of migrant workers, asked whether Mexican consulates abroad took any measures to ensure respect for the rights of those workers, for example by providing them with information or training. She would further like to know whether domestic migrant workers employed in Mexico enjoyed decent conditions.

34. **Mr. Ibarra González** observed that the seasonal workers who arrived in Mexico, mostly from Guatemala and usually to assist with harvesting, made a considerable economic contribution and that an agreement should therefore be concluded between the Mexican border states and their neighbouring countries, in particular Guatemala, to ensure their well-being. Such an agreement could not but be advantageous for the parties concerned.

35. **Ms. Cubias Medina** said she believed that the activities of organized criminal groups received more attention than the Government's initiatives. Given the extent of migration in Mexico, she wondered whether consideration had been given to a comprehensive migration policy that would coordinate the measures taken in the field of migration at all levels, and whether it would be possible to implement such a policy in the long term. She wished to know how much time migrants spent in holding centres and in what conditions. In addition, she would like further information on the sexual violence that female migrants "accepted" as the "price they had to pay".

36. **Ms. Miller-Stennett** asked whether any new measures had been taken to protect human rights defenders.

37. **Mr. Brillantes**, referring to recent events in the Arab countries and Japan, asked whether Mexico had established any emergency strategies for repatriating its nationals if they were in difficulty abroad.

38. **Mr. Muñoz** (Mexico) recalled that during the session that had been held with NGOs and institutions of the United Nations system in order to prepare for the consideration of the current periodic report, a large amount of information had been sent to the Committee on the many issues faced by Mexico. He underlined the five major challenges that the country had to overcome: the fight against criminal organizations that attacked migrants; migrants' access to justice; the effective functioning of detention centres for migrants; the training and accountability of those who came in contact with migrants through their work; and the effective implementation of the provisions of the Convention. The main issue requiring consideration was linked to the need to draft a comprehensive migration policy.

39. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) said that some key figures would provide an overview of the scope of migration flows and the challenges that arose from them. Mexico had 64 airports and 65 ports; 54 entry points existed in the north and south of the country and 13 new points had been opened at the borders with Guatemala and Belize. In 2010, more than 9 million arrivals had been recorded at airports and 28,000 border worker passes had been issued. The situation of 19,000 persons, mostly originating from Central America, had recently been legalized and approximately 150,000 migrants were still undocumented.

The Senate had already approved the text of the new migration bill and the Chamber of Deputies was due to follow suit shortly. After that, the law would be quickly enacted and Mexico would then have the means to implement its international obligations under the Convention.

40. It should be noted that foreigners in general could be subject to expulsions; they did not just affect migrants. Article 33 of the Constitution was a relic that had not been applied for over 20 years. At the current time, expulsion proceedings had to be preceded by a hearing and a fair trial. With regard to the registration of the birth of migrants' children, collaboration had started with an NGO in order to train officials responsible for civil status registers so that they would take migrants' rights into account, in accordance with the Constitution. In addition, cooperation had been established with several states, including Chiapas, to provide training to the relevant officials. Under the new bill, registrars could not refuse tasks for which they were responsible, including the registration of births.

41. Mexico took all of the recommendations of the National Human Rights Commission into consideration and implemented them. The repatriation of Central American nationals was one of the main activities of the National Institute for Migration and in 2010, 63,300 individuals had been repatriated, the majority of them from El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Nicaragua. More than 50,000 of them had returned to their country of origin under the existing memorandum of understanding, which covered relations with the migration authorities in the countries in question. The judges who presided over cases involving migrants received appropriate training. Confidence checks were obligatory for all public officials, regardless of their level. Of the 5,000 people working at the National Institute for Migration, 25 per cent had already undergone the check. It should be noted that the confidence check had no political implications and that any public officials who refused to take it would be obliged to resign. With regard to article 76 of the Convention, Mexico recognized the competence of the Committee on Migrant Workers, in the same way as all the committees created under other human rights instruments to which it was a party.

42. **Ms. Martínez Yáñez** (Mexico) explained that the Population Act and the migration bill made a distinction between political asylum and refugee status. Political asylum was granted to foreigners whose lives and freedom were threatened. The Population Act and its implementing regulations established that Mexican embassies could admit political asylum-seekers and that the Mexican Government was responsible for the safety of asylum-seekers and their transfer to Mexico. Any foreigner who obtained asylum was entitled to family reunification for their partner and children. The new Act on Refugee Status and Complementary Protection contained a broader definition of the term "refugee" than that in the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, as it covered gender-related persecution as well as complementary protection. The new migration bill would allow refugees, stateless persons and those who had been granted political asylum to remain permanently in Mexico.

43. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) recalled that capacity-building was provided for solicitors and public officials with regard to the international commitments made by Mexico. Documents with information in several languages on subjects such as rights and guarantees of due process were distributed to migrants in holding centres. Consulates in the southern Mexican states were in contact with migrants in holding centres and with their families and could assist them with certain procedures, such as applying for refugee status.

44. Close collaboration with counterparts in the region and with IOM helped face the challenges posed by the arrival of increasing numbers of migrants and the issues involved in identifying them by nationality. The legal maximum stay in a holding centre was 90 days. No exception was made to that time limit, even if assistance to return to the country of origin was to be provided with IOM support or if the foreign national had filed an administrative appeal or an application for refugee status.



45. **Mr. Negrín Muñoz** (Mexico) explained that ratification of the ILO Convention on migrant workers (No. 97) (Revised) and the Convention on migrant workers (No. 143) (Supplementary Provisions) had been discussed during consultations with agencies and that the draft migration bill provided a new framework for that discussion. The Mexican Government regularly informed ILO of the status of its legislation and of its relevant practices.

46. **Mr. Alday González** (Mexico) said that the Mexican consulates provided legal assistance to migrants in the form of advice, for example on labour law (in particular for migrant domestic workers), and carried out awareness-raising activities on current legislation.

47. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) explained that the majority of frontier workers were men. The regularization programme existed for those workers, very few of whom were domestic workers and who were mainly from El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. He emphasized that the draft migration bill would reduce the maximum length of a stay in a holding centre to 60 days.

48. **Mr. Navarrete Gutiérrez** (Mexico) said that the National Institute for Women had published guides promoting the rights of domestic migrant workers.

49. **Mr. Negrín Muñoz** (Mexico) said that Mexico still had a long way to go with regard to the protection of women against sexual violence and the prevention of such violence against female migrants. He applauded the programme established by the State of Chiapas in that regard.

50. **Ms. Hernández Fitzner** (Mexico) said that female migrants were vulnerable to the actions of criminal groups while on their journey. The decrease in violence on migration routes between 2007 and 2011 had been the result of the implementation of special arrangements and the creation of links between the actions of the authorities and civil society. In the State of Chiapas, efforts to improve access to justice, dismantle criminal groups and protect migrants had led to a decrease in sexual violence. It was important not to be cowed by local criminal groups and organized crime and not to reduce the resources or number of shelters for victims of sexual violence, 60 per cent of whom decided to return to their country of origin and 40 per cent to remain in the State of Chiapas, particularly because they had children there.

51. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) supported Mr. Ibarra González's comments on the agreement that should be concluded between Guatemala and Mexico to improve the situation of migrant workers, who for the most part were Guatemalan and mostly in the State of Chiapas, and to ensure respect for their rights.

52. **Ms. Flores Casiano** (Mexico) said that an agreement signed with Canada allowed workers to be selected prior to recruitment and included provisions related to retirement benefits, which migrant workers could receive once they had worked for eight months. A similar agreement had been signed with Spain.

53. **Ms. Hernández Fitzner** (Mexico) explained that the situation of migrant workers, the vast majority of them were from Guatemala, had improved in recent years in the State of Chiapas. The recognition of migrants' rights and of the important role played by temporary migration had made a considerable contribution to the economic development of Chiapas, and the state was aware that it had to ensure the protection of those workers. In Chiapas, there was now a ministry of labour and branches of the Office for the Defence of Workers. In addition, migrant children had access to education, and all migrants had access to health care. The presence of international organizations was the best way of ensuring the implementation of a public human rights defence policy.

54. **Mr. Negrín Muñoz** (Mexico) said that the Mexican delegation would make detailed information on the protection measures for human rights defenders available to the Committee.

55. **Mr. Rubido García** (Mexico) explained that the aim of the confidence checks was to determine whether people had the necessary qualities for a post, assess their integrity and establish that they were not suffering from any addiction. A complaint received by the National Human Rights Commission could give rise to a recommendation, conciliation or a decision of non-violation of human rights. Any closed case could be reopened, if necessary. Since December 2006, recommendations had been given for 23 of the approximately 4,500 complaints received. Only one of those recommendations had related to migration.

56. **Mr. Tinajero Esquivel** (Mexico) said that two trials held in 2006 and 2007 had helped to identify the main difficulties related to voting by Mexicans abroad, namely the sheer scale of the diaspora and the need for the poll to be conducted impartially. Citizen turnout would determine the success of the presidential elections in 2012, for which the Federal Electoral Institute was carrying out an awareness-raising campaign.

57. **Mr. Beltrán del Río Madrid** (Mexico) thanked the Committee and reasserted the strong commitment of Mexico, at all levels of the Government, to respecting human rights and the rights of migrants. He reiterated that Mexico wished to be informed of best practices in other countries, particularly Ecuador and Guatemala.

58. **Mr. Carrión-Mena** (Country Rapporteur) thanked the delegation and congratulated it on its size and composition. He paid tribute to Mexico for its pioneering role in good migration management and for its political will to ensure respect for the provisions of the Convention. Mexico, which had carried out many original and interesting initiatives, should nevertheless strengthen coordination among the various levels of authority, eliminate corruption, and combat organized crime. In conclusion, he reaffirmed the Committee's commitment to Mexico.

59. **The Chairperson**, commending the work done by Mexico, said that it should now aim towards an integrated migration policy in order to increase the visibility of its actions. While he welcomed the dynamism of Mexican migration policy, he recalled that it should be linked to other sectors. Further, the regional dimension of migration should be strengthened, as it was not an issue that could be dealt with in an isolated manner. Despite the many provisions that it had already adopted, Mexico had many more challenges to overcome, such as implementation of its migration policy. He encouraged Mexico to continue its work in that regard and recalled that the Committee, the United Nations system and NGOs were available to assist it. Emphasizing that the increase in trafficking was taking place alongside the increase in migration, he urged Mexico to continue ensuring respect for the rights of migrant workers and to participate in the process of implementing international provisions aimed at making migration safer.

*The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.*