

Research Package #3

(Junior and Senior High)

Jr. High: "Be It Resolved That We Remove the Points System from our Immigration Rules"

Sr. High: "This House Supports Free Immigration"



**Regional & Provincial Topic (Feb/Mar)
2012-2013**



“There are not enough legal channels open for those who want to migrate and whose labour may be needed”

– Brunson McKinley

“Not a day passes but families are ruthlessly turned out to make room for foreign invaders. The rates are burdened with the education of thousands of foreign children.”

– William Evans Gordon

“TH supports free immigration”

The **Proposition Team** supports the resolution and will say “YES”

The **Opposition Team** opposes the resolution and will say “NO”

Both Proposition and Opposition Teams will try to pick about 3 or 4 good reasons to support their position and try to develop each by going through 4 steps:

1. State your point.
2. Explain your point.
3. Provide evidence in support of your point (give an example).
4. Explain how that evidence proves your point (tie it back to your theme).

Each argument will look like this:

Point #1: _____

Explanation: _____

Example: _____

Tie point to theme: _____

Point #2: _____

Explanation: _____

Example: _____

Tie point to theme: _____

Point #3: _____

Explanation: _____

Example: _____

Tie point to theme: _____

PROPOSITION TEAM

The job of the Proposition in any debate is to persuade the judges that the resolution should be supported. In order to accomplish this, there are a number of steps that the Proposition team must go through.

- 1) Define the resolution (Make sure everyone is clear upon what the Proposition is debating).
- 2) Present criteria (halfway between a model and definition: clearly outline what would constitute free immigration).
- 3) Present arguments in favor of the resolution.
- 4) Refute Opposition attacks on the Proposition case. (Show why the Opposition is wrong and the Opposition is correct).

Owing to time restrictions, the Proposition's duties are normally divided up between the first and second Proposition speakers. It is customary for the first proposition speaker to present two arguments followed by the second speaker who presents the final argument.

AN EXAMPLE OF A PROPOSITION STATEMENT

In the next few decades, many developed nations are anticipating mass demographic challenges as the 'baby-boomers' move into retirement and the younger demographics' population is less than replacement level. This will lead to labour shortages in the workforce and a smaller tax base to support the aging populations social programming needs. By supporting free immigration, this problem may be rectified by increasing the work force size (to replace lost workers) and have a greater tax base.



Here are some arguments that the Proposition can use in developing their case to support free immigration.

- Immigrants bring a plethora of skilled labor, particularly important to fill the labour shortages in the job market.
- Immigrants bring culture and language, which reflect the globalized society. This cultural knowledge adds to the diversity of events, cuisine and products available domestically
- As the 'baby boomers' retire, especially in the next few decades, there will be a gap in the economy that is not currently being replaced by the younger generation. Immigrants will help to fill this void.
- Immigrants increase the population that may be taxed to fulfill the needs of the social welfare state. They also spend capital on domestic goods and services, adding to the health of the economy.
- There is open migration in the EU through the Shengen Agreement, and this has allowed for the free flow of workers between member states, allowing migrant workers to go to where they can find jobs.
- Decreasing **legal** immigration will lead to an increased in **illegal** immigrants, who are then not taxed, and avoid contributing as much to society by trying to protect their illegal status.
- Canada and several other nations such as the USA were built upon the notion of open and free immigration.

OPPOSITION TEAM

The job of the Opposition is to be disagreeable! Whatever the Proposition believes, generally, the Opposition counters. The more you disagree, the better! The Opposition has to convince the judges not to accept the Proposition resolution.

The Proposition wants to convince the judges that their proposal should be adopted.

The Opposition wants to convince you that the Proposition proposal should not be accepted for one or more reasons.

The steps that the Opposition should use are:

- 1) Either agree with the Proposition definition or propose a definition of your own. (Only disagree if absolutely necessary. These make for messy debates.)
- 2) Rebut the Proposition arguments in favor of the resolution.
- 3) Attack the Proposition Model and sometimes propose a counter model
- 4) Present reasons (arguments) to oppose the resolution.
- 5) Refute Proposition attacks on the Opposition case (show why the Proposition is wrong and Opposition is right).

Owing to time restrictions, the Opposition duties are divided between the first and second opposition speakers.

It is the custom for the First Opposition Speaker to present two arguments and the second opposition speaker to present the final argument. (This is flexible!)

AN EXAMPLE OF AN OPPOSITION STATEMENT

Given the Global Financial Crisis, there is contention over whether nations in crisis should allow more immigrants to enter. As a result of the recession, there are more citizens left unemployed that need the jobs they would otherwise compete with new immigrants for. With unemployment rates not significantly improving in many nations, adding more people to compete for these limited number of jobs only creates more stress for the job market.

Some of the arguments that the Opposition can use in developing their case against free immigration:

- The current points system used in Canada encourages highly skilled, desirable workers to immigrate to Canada. By opening immigration, much less desirable workers could immigrate, and place an unnecessary burden on Canada by requiring education, training, etc to be able to work.
- By allowing free immigration, there is harm for the nation from which the immigrants leave. Those immigrants that do leave are often highly skilled, and present a brain drain as they bring these skills to the new country.
- With more immigrants comes more individuals competing for the already few jobs that are available because of the current economic recession. By further increasing the population, this places a greater unnecessary drain on the welfare state.
- More frequently, new immigrants are failing to assimilate into the culture of the nation they immigrate too. Instead, of being a 'melting-pot,' many immigrants fight against Canadian customs and traditions and isolate themselves.
- The status quo points system in Canada helps the government to ensure services can be adequately maintained at predictable population levels.
- The current status quo allows for adequate screening of immigrants and those truly in need of leaving their nation (religious persecution, civil war, etc) can apply as refugees.

RESEARCH

This Research booklet is not complete. It is only an overview of information and good debaters will use this booklet as a basis for their thinking and move on to other ideas and research. As well, the best foundation for any research into a topic begins with some basic reading on the ideas. Follow this with an interview with someone who is knowledgeable, can suggest ideas and can direct you to other ideas and research. Although you cannot quote this person unless he/she is published in print or on video, a human being can always explain issues better than an article.

Viewpoints; Should Borders be Open?

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/3512992.stm#Khadria>

Brunson McKinley is director general of the International Organization for Migration

The movement of people needs to be better managed. Mobility of persons occurs through choice or necessity. The current global estimate of international migrants is 175 million, some 3% of the world population, and the number is increasing. People migrate, temporarily or permanently, to receive education and training, to perform services, to find employment, to flee life-threatening situations or to provide themselves and their children with hope and opportunity. The movement of people across borders is essential in today's globalised world. International business depends on an international labour force, and the ability of people to move around the world with ease.

Most developed countries face declining birth rates and ageing populations, which can be mitigated by migration. Remittances earned abroad are the principal support to the economies of many developing countries. But much of migration today is unregulated. There are not enough legal channels open for those who want to migrate and whose labour may be needed. Criminal smuggling and trafficking networks are matching up the supply of labour with the demand, mostly in the informal economy. As a result, border controls are evaded, with exploitation and security risks for the individuals and societies involved.

Xenophobia and racism flourish to the detriment of host communities and migrants, particularly when governments are perceived to have lost control of the migration situation. However, when managed effectively migration holds great potential for migrants and for host communities. The ultimate goal is not to obstruct or prevent mobility but to better manage it for the benefit of all.

Professor Binod Khadria is the author of *The Migration of Knowledge Workers*.

The question of whether we should have open borders is more a question about the visas barrier countries use for monitoring the immigration of non-citizens than controlling the emigration of citizens. The movement of goods and people are linked. When people move across borders, goods are produced on location. When not, production is outsourced. The former leads to brain drain from developing countries and the latter to what is known as Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) in developed countries.

The current policy trend of developed host countries is to provide temporary visas with the aim of returning these immigrant workers to their home countries within a few years. This creates a negative effect. First of all it encourages a nomadic lifestyle where families and spouses are directly affected and unable to settle. The higher turnover of immigrants benefits these host countries by correcting their ageing population structures by laying off older workers in favour of cheaper, younger foreign workers, and profiting from the knowledge of younger minds. For the developing home country, on the other hand, temporary migration brings in higher remittances, but with the increased emigration of students much of this would flow back to developed host countries as overseas student fees.

The solution lies in countries like India seeking foreign investment for the education and health sectors, with the objective of raising the productivity of labour in India, so that if the top 10% of the workforce emigrates it will not affect the overall GDP of the country.

Jagdish Bhagwati is Professor of Economics at Columbia University, New York.

There would be virtually no distinction between the case for free migration and the case for free trade if global efficiency was our reason for choosing a proper migration policy. But we typically bring in "communitarian" arguments to moderate or limit the flows of people across our borders. I do not think we are in a position to contemplate free migration for that reason.

But we can be more progressive and liberal than we have been. Where we used to consider the right to exclude as the flip side of sovereignty, we have increasingly come to accept certain restraints on the ability of nation states to exclude. And even on the rights of aliens, even when they are illegal, we have been moving ever so slowly towards recognizing restraints on treating them as having no rights.

I have also long believed that the time has finally come to move towards creating a proper world body to deal with migration. Such an institution would steer us - the way the International Labour Organization has done since 1919 - towards an acceptance of some core values in the treatment of workers, in the direction of an expanding set of norms that assure a wider acceptance of the basic rights of aliens at the door and in our midst.

Dr PN Govender is president of the South African Medical Association.

While I endorse a doctor's right of free movement, I cannot endorse mass migration for personal reasons alone. South Africa loses almost 50% of its qualified doctors annually to Canada, the UK and Australia. There is a steady demand for South African health professionals overseas. The state needs to offer more incentives for them to stay. The laws and regulations governing medical services here are centrist and collectivist by design, so much so that doctors in state services have to enter a central bargaining chamber to fight for their piece of the health budget with porters and cleaners.

Doctors will settle for lesser wages here than they can obtain overseas if their service is respected, and their working conditions are conducive. Medicine is a larger calling and doctors cannot be expected to migrate following richer pastures for personal or material gain alone. There is a moral obligation to provide this essential service in one's own country.

Sir Andrew Green is chairman of MigrationWatch UK.

No. This proposition is both unrealistic and impractical. For a start, we do not now have free movement of goods. We are moving towards the free movement of industrial goods between certain groups of countries. But there is not free movement of agricultural goods (or of textiles) as the Common Agricultural Policy eloquently testifies.

The reason is clear. The industrialized countries of Europe wish to preserve key elements of their economy which are of great importance to their social structures. This consideration applies still more strongly to the movement of people. People are not packing cases. They have continuing needs for health, education, housing and transport.

As the economist Milton Friedman put it: "You cannot have both open borders and a welfare system." Given the huge disparities of wealth, open borders would lead to massive flows of people from the third world to the industrialized world until conditions there approximated to their home countries. This would be a recipe for chaos and would be entirely unacceptable to the inhabitants of the industrialized world.

Mary Harney is the Irish Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Enterprise, Trade and Employment.

The free movement of persons is a fundamental freedom guaranteed by European Union law and is a mark of European citizenship. The current debate on this issue is taking place in the context of the accession to the Union of 10 new member states with effect from 1 May this year. The process of accession allows member states a period of adjustment, ranging up to five years, to accommodate

disturbances to their labour markets. In some circumstances this period can be extended by a further two years, but only with the approval of the EU Commission.

It is important that such controls are applied in an open and transparent way so that all of Europe's citizens understand what is required of them when moving from one member state to another after 1 May. Interim controls that are applied are transitional in nature and do not undermine the fundamental freedom of persons to move between member states. Ireland will not apply interim controls on access to work and will allow full access to its labour market from 1 May. We look forward to welcoming workers from the accession countries after that date.

Mark Krikorian is executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies, Washington DC.

No. Borders are essential to nationhood. They are the line between "us" and "them". Without 'them' there can be no 'us', precluding the possibility of social solidarity. Aristotle wrote that each virtue has two corresponding vices, one marked by an excess of the characteristic related to the virtue, the other by an insufficiency. Denunciations of xenophobia or chauvinism are appropriately widespread, but an open borders policy is a function of the other vice, insufficient national feeling. The analogy to common ownership of property is compelling: if everyone owns everything, the experience of socialist societies shows us that no one is responsible for anything. Likewise, if all men have an equal claim to my affections, without regard to borders, then no man is my brother.

Even in a purely economic sense, the idea of open borders is a pernicious one. Free movement of people is different from the free movement of goods because people are not goods. When we import a plastic toy from Malaysia, we import only the labour used to make it. When we import Malaysians, we import complete human beings, with all their dreams and preferences, their strengths and weaknesses. In short, we change our society in a way that the free movement of goods cannot. Such change may or may not be a good idea, but it is not comparable in any way to the trade in goods.

Hector Flores is president of League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC)

The Hispanic community by and large supports increased immigration, but with proper controls. Hispanics make up the largest minority group in the US and are projected to number almost a quarter of the population by 2050. Crossing borders for a new life in the US is in principle a win-win situation for immigrants. For them it is an opportunity to earn good money, and the US benefits from their labour.

While proper border controls are certainly necessary, Western countries need to address the fact that proper immigration laws would reduce the number of people crossing these borders illegally. President Bush's recent guest worker program provides immigrants with the chance to work legally for a fixed period, but it does not allow for them to become permanent residents. Immigration laws should be put in place that allow for immigrants to come and find employment permanently. This would be preferable to the de facto system now in place, where people are entering the country illegally.

Good Things and Small Packages

<http://www.economist.com/node/21555584?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e>

WHEN her father died, Claire came on her own from Jamaica, aged 12, to join her older half-sister. She misbehaved and the sister kicked her out. The Home Office revoked her authorization to stay, telling her to go back to the Caribbean; Claire, then 15, absconded instead. A few years later, pregnant and on the streets, she turned to the network of charities that look after the destitute in Birmingham, especially the Children's Society. After over a year moving between night shelters and temporary rooms, she now has "discretionary leave" to remain with her children. This entitles her to housing and income support, but she will have to reapply before long.

Irregular migrants have long been a neuralgic issue in Britain. Under the previous Labour government a backlog in processing asylum claims increased public unease. Numbers fell when the backlog was slashed and immigration policy toughened, but less dramatic forms of overstaying—by visitors or the

growing number of foreign students—mean the total may still be near 600,000. And asylum-seeker numbers are creeping up again.

Undocumented children get little attention, aside from the few who arrive clinging to the bottom of a lorry or are trafficked for exploitation as winkle-pickers or sex-workers. But there are a lot of them—some 120,000 in Britain, or one in 100 children, according to a new study by Oxford University's Centre for Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS). They are a far higher proportion of the undocumented population than in America or Canada, say, where birth generally secures citizenship; in Britain the parents' immigration status usually defines their offspring's, though a British-born child can apply for citizenship after ten years. Undocumented youngsters lie at the intersection of three official priorities: to protect children, to discourage illegal immigration and to economize on public services. These interests are colliding.

The good news for the children of irregular immigrants is that the law is increasingly on their side. Two years ago a court slapped down Birmingham City Council for refusing support to an undocumented mother and child “by reference to the even more pressing claims of others on the budget”. The trend of English jurisprudence these days is to weight the claims of children and families a bit more heavily than immigration enforcement, says Dave Stamp, manager of ASIRT, a legal charity based in the city. A bombshell decision by the European Court of Justice last year looks likely to extend their rights further.

The bad news is that the political and fiscal environment is growing inhospitable. The Conservatives are determined to cut net migration, and irregular migrants are a tempting target. With budgets squeezed, the local authorities whose responsibility it is to look after children in need are not always quick to do so, or to make sure that housing officers, family doctors and others know they are supposed to as well. Cuts in legal aid from next year will make it harder to get redress.

There are three big concerns, of which sheer destitution is the first. Local authorities will give children who arrive on their own, or are cared for by single parents, some sort of housing and financial support. The sums are usually less than mainstream benefits, though, and cannot be topped up legally by working. Trying to become legal is a long, expensive process.

Education is another problem that may be growing. Children are entitled to state schooling until they are 16 (indeed, parents are obliged to see that they are educated, even if they have no money for lunch and are not eligible for free school meals). But nursery places are expensive and hard to find, so children pitch up in reception lagging their peers. And thanks to a recent change universities will charge students of uncertain immigration status the much higher fees levied on foreign students. Nor are the irregular entitled to student loans.

A final worry is health care. Migrants are eligible for primary and emergency care, and for secondary treatment that cannot be delayed (though they may be charged for it). Most children are registered with a family doctor, but Fizza Qureshi, who runs Project London for Doctors of the World, a charity, says this is getting harder as practice managers insist on proof of status first. Mothers often do not receive antenatal or postnatal care. Some think the NHS reforms disbanding the primary-care trusts charged with seeing that migrants find GPs will make matters worse.

All this should worry even die-hard anti-immigration Tories, argues Nando Sigona of COMPAS. Many, perhaps most, irregular children will gain British nationality in time. What happens to them in their early years will affect how useful and productive they are as citizens. The better their start, the better the outcome for all.

How many is too many?

<http://www.economist.com/blogs/blighty/2012/09/population?zid=309&ah=80dcf288b8561b012f603b9fd9577f0e>

THE row over immigration roars away. Today it moved from the streets of North London outside London Metropolitan University, which was stripped on August 29th of the right to admit non-EU foreign students because it had failed to make sure they were all legitimate, to the floor of the House of Commons. The debate was on a motion urging the government to “take all necessary steps to get immigration down to a level that will stabilize population as close to the present level as possible and, certainly, well below 70m”.

In October 2011 the ONS projected that Britain's population would hit 73.2 million by 2035, mostly because of the direct and indirect effects of immigration. Migration Watch, a group that campaigns for tighter immigration controls, launched an e-petition worded as above, telling the government to get a grip. It picked up over 140,000 signatures, enough to prompt a parliamentary debate. Nicholas Soames, the Conservative MP for Mid Sussex, and Frank Field, the Labour MP for Birkenhead, and colleagues tabled the motion, and Mark Harper, named immigration minister in this week’s reshuffle, took an active part in the debate.

The arguments were familiar: runaway immigration, overstretched public services and an overcrowded scepter isle v the economic and social benefits of immigration, the need to attract the brightest and the best, and incidentally how useful it would be if young workers were available to pay for the pensions and health care of an ageing indigenous populace. The [Migration Observatory at Oxford University](#) provided a useful and detailed primer, pointing out that the reductions in immigration required to keep the population under 70m are far greater than those needed to hit the government’s elusive target of reducing net migration to the “tens of thousands” by 2015. Although the public is famously in favour of cutting immigration in general, people aren’t so keen on keeping out legitimate students, it pointed out, though they make up by far the biggest chunk of the immigration over which the government has control (ie, people from outside the EU). What sorts of trade-offs would be needed to achieve that goal? And what is so sacrosanct about 70m anyway?

What was striking in the debate, which seemed to feature a lot of Scottish accents regardless of constituencies, is how varied attitudes to immigration are around the UK. Scotland is surprisingly positive. Perfectly ordinary Glaswegians not so long ago told me they welcomed Somali asylum-seekers (not everyone’s favorite neighbors): “We’re a’ Jock Tamson’s bairns.” I’m sure Scots have heard that ad nauseam, but it was a new one to me—“We’re all the same at heart.”

Of course, Scotland has traditionally been a country of net out-migration, with more people leaving to live in London, Toronto, Jakarta, wherever, than were coming in. The Scots’ enthusiasm for in-migration must in part reflect that fact. But the situation is changing, according to figures from the General Register Office for Scotland. These migration statistics may be just as unreliable as the rest of Britain’s, but they do show an interesting pattern. Over the past eight years, and peaking in the most recent year for which figures are available (2010-11), Scotland has seen annual net gains overall. But whereas immigrants from elsewhere in the UK (many of them students) have been falling of late, inflows from overseas have been rising (with a slight stumble in 2010-11). Emigration by both groups has tailed off.

Will this changing pattern of immigration in time change Scottish perceptions as to just who is and who isn’t a bairn of Jock Tamson? Maybe not. In the meantime, there are plenty of reasons to distrust the attempt to use immigration policy to achieve an arbitrary population cap, and one of them is that an awful lot of people in Britain don’t, in fact, want to.