

**Question for written answer E-006320/2018
to the Commission**

Rule 130

Dominique Martin (ENF)

Subject: Sweden: non-invited immigration from outside Europe creates an estimated net annual social cost of 1.5% to 2% GDP.

'In recent years, there has been a tendency [...] to inordinately exaggerate the role of immigration for historical economic development [...] without any figures'.¹ Indeed, the Commission is claiming that while the influx of social migrants is expensive in the short term, it is beneficial in the mid to long terms.² The few studies carried out on the matter, however, show the exact opposite.^{3,4,5}

'Although foreign-born make up a higher proportion of working-age people, the dependency ratio is higher than among native-born, simply because many of them of working age do not work.'⁶

'As the immigrants' employment situation weakened, [...] in the 1990s, the net revenue turned into a net cost, i.e., an income redistribution from natives to immigrants. By the mid/late 1990s, the net annual cost for natives was 1.5 to 2 percent [of GDP].'⁷

Why does Commissioner Avramopoulos want to accommodate 50 million immigrants by 2060?⁸

¹ Tino Sanandaji, Swedes and immigration: end of homogeneity?, September 2018
http://www.fondapol.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/130-SUEDE-IMMIGRATION_GB_I_2018-08-28_web.pdf

² Commission reply (30.5.2018) to a question from Dominique Martin, 'IMF estimate that the cost per job found for an immigrant or refugee is EUR 30 000 in Sweden' http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/E-8-2018-001150-ASW_EN.html

³ Refugee immigration and public finances in Sweden / Joakim Ruist, Economics and Law at University of Gothenburg, February 2015. In Sweden, the impact of immigration from different non-EU countries varies: 'We see [...] 3.2% of [refugees] from [non-EU] Eastern Europe receiving social assistance [compared] to 40.2% of those from Somalia.' [...] only 3.4% of total revenues are from refugees. On the other hand, refugees are over-represented as receivers of public transfers and public consumption. The most striking case is that of social assistance, where the refugee population receives a full 55% of total spending.' [...] the net redistribution to the refugee population is about 80% due to lower per-capita revenues from refugees, and only to about 20% due to higher per-capita spending.'
https://gupea.ub.gu.se/bitstream/2077/38323/1/gupea_2077_38323_1.pdf

⁴ It is worth noting that, in the UK, 'EEA immigrants contributed 10% more than natives (in relative terms), and non-EEA immigrant contributions were almost 9% lower,' according to Christian Dustmann and Tommaso Frattini, The fiscal effects of immigration to the UK <http://www.cream-migration.org/files/FiscalEJ.pdf>

⁵ Tino Sanandaji, Swedes and immigration: end of homogeneity?

⁶ Tino Sanandaji, Swedes and immigration: end of homogeneity?, p. 24

⁷ Tino Sanandaji, Swedes and immigration: end of homogeneity?, pp. 30-31

⁸ Statement made on 8 June 2015