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**ABSTRACT**

Jonathan Glennie and David Turton: Any meaningful immigration debate should seek to maximise benefits for countries of origin as well as recipient states

**FULL TEXT**

[*The surge in rightwing representatives*](http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/may/27/europe-leaders-future-left-right-commission-strasbourg) at the European parliament election last week has sent a clear message to governing parties - a significant proportion of citizens across the continent are unhappy with immigration.

But if we are concerned with poverty and development, wealthy western nations should be more, rather than less, generous to potential immigrants and their countries of origin.

There are good reasons for people to be concerned about immigration, including its impact on wages and the cultural makeup of communities. However, the current debate is framed by all sides entirely in terms of what is best for the recipient country. There is seldom a thought for what might be most beneficial for the potential migrants, their families or their countries of origin.

This is understandable, perhaps, given people's mainly parochial concerns. In many ways, it is similar to the way the [*debate on drugs is carried out*](http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/poverty-matters/2010/oct/05/drugs-prohibition-development-issue-legalisation), with the health concerns and social problems of the UK the main determinant of policy, rather than the impact of those possibly devastating policies on drug-producing countries. But although understandable, it is also blinkered, and likely to have negative consequences for people far poorer than the potential host communities.

There are few areas in international development policy where there is almost total agreement among experts. But on the developmental benefits of migration there is agreement - the more migration the better. Dani Rodrik's [*The Globalisation Paradox*](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/03/11/AR2011031106730.html) is particularly convincing on the benefits of labour market liberalisation. Why? Because immigrants benefit from the higher salaries and better health and education in destination countries. And because [*they send their excess earnings back home*](http://www.theguardian.com/global-development/datablog/2013/aug/09/remittances-britain-data) - remittances have transformed the opportunities of millions of poor people in the past two decades.

An [*Overseas Development Institute paper*](http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/8694.pdf) (pdf) published last year summarised studies on the impacts of increased migration on global welfare - the numbers are astronomical and far outweigh the impact of aid, for example.

That said, away from the macroeconomic numbers there are myriad social and economic problems, especially when receiving countries are experiencing periods of recession. Immigrants may face challenges and abuse, while host communities, including previous generations of immigrants, may see increased competition for jobs and pressure on services and housing.

Such challenges require comprehensive national policies and international treaties, enhancing the benefits and minimising disruption and problems, as [*José Antonio Alonso has often argued*](http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/cdp/cdp_background_papers/bp2011_11e.pdf) (pdf). But some of the policies being proposed and implemented do not have the best interests of the poor in mind.

One policy that has become common in many countries is the points system, designed to weed out possible immigrants without the right qualifications to make the required contribution to the host country. It is easy to see why this might be considered a sensible policy for a host country, but it is equally hard to think of a more anti-developmental approach to immigration.

First, it is relatively unskilled and unqualified migrants who have the most to gain from the wage differentials between poor and rich countries. A pro-poverty policy would encourage such migration rather than seek to curtail it. Second, there is the so-called brain drain. A [*significant proportion*](http://ftp.iza.org/dp2440.pdf) (pdf) of people who go to university in some poor countries emigrate - almost half in Haiti, for example, and about a third in Ghana and Mozambique.

When UK politicians praise the African nurses who are helping to sustain the NHS, they should spare a thought for the countries that trained them but who no longer have them doing their vital work, or paying tax where it is most needed. Of course nurses, like anyone else, should have the right to try to further their prospects through seeking employment abroad, and countries of origin can benefit if they return with better skills.

The point is that the immigration policies of recipient countries should seek to maximise the potential benefits these policies can bring to sending countries by, for example, extending and liberalising temporary foreign worker schemes, as advocated 10 years ago by [*Alan Winters and colleagues*](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=443784). Meanwhile, the potential harmful effects of the brain drain on sending countries could be minimised by formal compensatory measures, or by incentivising qualified people to remain in their own countries.

Take the open-border policy of the EU. While political debate focuses uniquely on the impacts of this policy on recipient countries, possible immigrants from far lower-income countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America may be losing out as opportunities are taken by eastern Europeans.

It is understandable yet inevitable that policies will be drawn up with domestic constituencies in mind. This is not an argument for mass immigration - host communities have rights and concerns, and if there are no jobs, homes and legal protections for immigrants, they may be better off staying put.

But as with the drugs debate, as with ***climate change*** and energy consumption, as with cheap clothes, so with immigration: the way rich country policies affect others far away should be taken into account more fully as those policies are devised and implemented.

*David Turton is senior research fellow at African studies centre and former director at Refugee Studies Centre, University of Oxford*
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PM says Tories being beaten into third is not the result Ukip had hoped for as Labour cruise to victory in Greater Manchester vote

**FULL TEXT**

Ukip did not make the breakthrough it hoped for in the Wythenshawe and Sale East b-election even though the Conservatives were pushed into third place, David Cameron has suggested.

The prime minister said he was not particularly surprised that Labour took the seat easily and brushed off the embarrassment of being beaten by the UK Independence party, arguing that byelections are a vehicle for protest votes.

Labour's Mike Kane sailed to victory with 55% of the vote on a turnout of 28% which was depressed by the weather and expectations of an easy win for the party.

The Tory candidate, 26-year-old vicar Daniel Critchlow, received just 14% of the vote, while Ukip's John Bickley achieved almost 18% - five times more than the party's share in 2010.

Speaking on ITV, Cameron said: "Well obviously, the Wythenshawe byelection, which is a very safe Labour seat, there was never much doubt about the result. When people know there's a byelection, they know the government isn't going to change, that obviously messages and signals are sent and protests are made and government should always listen to those things and I always do.

He added: "Obviously one would prefer to come second rather than third but I don't think this is a particularly surprising result in Labour holding this seat - and as I say, byelections are an opportunity when people send messages and make protests and all the rest of it, and obviously I listen to those very carefully. But I don't think it was the kind of breakthrough that people were talking about."

The result was even more damaging for the Liberal Democrats, who lost their deposit for the eighth time in a contest this parliament.

Tim Farron, the party president, said it was understandable that the party has "done well in the places of strength" but "extraordinarily badly" where it does not have a stronghold.

The byelection had been triggered by the death on 7 January of Labour MP Paul Goggins, 60, who had won the seat in four successive general elections.

Big hitters including Ed Miliband and Tory transport secretary Patrick McLoughlin have visited the constituency, with Labour sending a series of shadow ministers to drum up support.

The seat is mostly made up of the inter-war council estate of Wythenshawe, built to house the overspill population of Manchester and one of the largest council estates in the country. To the west is the more affluent suburb of Sale.

In 2010, Labour held the seat with a majority of 7,575, or 44.1% of the vote.

The Tories came second on 25%, Liberal Democrats third on 22% and Ukip polled 3.45%.

Nigel Farage, the Ukip leader, protested at the way in which postal ballots had been sent out within three days of the election being called. He said: "I have been on benders for longer than the opening of the nominations and the start of the postal ballots. This has been a farce."

Lucy Powell, the Labour MP for Manchester Central, accused him of sour grapes, saying that Farage had "predicted they might win 30% of the vote and they are very disappointed that Labour has increased its share of the vote. As a result Ukip want to turn this into a debate about process and tactics. Our vote has come out firmly and strongly."

Graham Brady, Conservative MP for Altrincham and Sale and chairman of the backbench 1922 committee, said: "It would be a mistake to read too much into a byelection with a 28% turnout." He said he was "psychologically unchallenged by the result".

Ukip will be pleased at coming second, garnering both Tory and Lib Dem votes, and will hope the result confirms it can supplant the Lib Dems as the main challenger to Labour in the north.

The result represents the sixth time Ukip has come second in a byelection since 2010, a considerable achievement for a party that would have seen a second place in a parliamentary byelection as an extraordinary achievement only four years ago.

Its second place share of the vote has varied from 11.8% in Middlesborough in November 2012 to 27.8% in Eastleigh last year. Ukip will also see the result as a good platform to do well in the European and local elections in May.

Yet Ukip will be privately disappointed that the result cannot be presented as confirming it represents a lethal threat to Labour in its traditional citadels, just as it threatens the Conservatives in the south.

It also suggests it is still some way from being able to win a parliamentary seat.

Ukip believes the speed with which Labour called the byelection, and the way in which Labour's superior organisation managed to capitalise on a largely postal vote, left the party with little freedom to build the momentum critical for a byelection surprise.

Farage had claimed Labour had fought a dirty byelection using bully boy tactics. His hopes of building any momentum were also thwarted by the media focus on the storms with political discussion shifting to ***climate change***, and away from its strongest issues such as immigration, welfare and the EU.
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