

Mr Tom Fairchild
Parliamentary Assistant
Office of Rt Hon Keith Vaz MP

By email to tom.fairchild@parliament.uk
Cc homeaffcom@parliament.uk

9 December 2013

Dear Mr Fairchild,

Re Letter of 3 December 2013 from Keith Vaz MP in his capacity as Chair of the Home Affairs Select Committee to ILPA re Migration Advisory Committee

Thank you for your email. The timescale presents a hurdle for us so I trust that this letter will serve your purposes.

ILPA does contribute to some calls for evidence by the Migration Advisory Committee. All our responses are on <http://www.ilpa.org.uk/pages/non-parliamentary-briefings-submissions-and-responses.html> - just search on "Migration Advisory Committee" and you will find them. ILPA's responses have been quoted by the Committee in reports various.

The Migration Advisory Committee has also attended meetings ILPA has held with the Home Office, most recently one on investors. We also attend meetings also attended by members of the Migration Advisory Committee.

Very often however the Committee is looking for quantitative evidence from, for example, companies, that ILPA is not in a position to provide. Therefore what we tend to do is to publicise the Committee's calls for evidence to subcommittees various and invite members who wish to do so to work with their clients to respond. Many in the business immigration field do so.

The following comments may be of assistance:

1. We have in our submissions various raised the questions of whether the composition of the Migration Advisory Committee suits its current role. The committee was originally set up to advise on the economics of criteria for the Points-Based System. It is now, as with family immigration, asked to balance social and economic factors, which is a rather different task and would benefit from a wider range of expertise.
2. It is the case that the work of the Migration Advisory Committee is often presented as a recommendation on a particular issue, when the question it was asked was tightly focused and it was not invited to comment on the wider issue at all. This was the case for the question of the earnings to be required of those migrating to join family members. While the reports of the Committee set out clearly the limits of its

remit there is no voice in the political arena to make clear just how limited the remit was when the “recommendation” is publicised.

3. We did indicate that we thought that to ask the Committee to examine whether restrictions should be maintained on Romanians and Bulgarians two years ago was a waste of public money when the Government had already indicated that it would maintain restrictions until the last possible minute.
4. There is a risk that the Committee receives a disproportionate amount of information from global multi-nationals because they have the resources to lobby it. It would be interesting for you to ask for the Committee’s view of this and how they address the balance.

Adrian Berry
Chair ILPA