LBRT: This house believes that developed countries should grant amnesty to all illegal immigrants.
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BACKGROUND INFORMATION

“A History of Immigration Policy and Migration Flows”

Pre-World War II Migration Era

1900
New agriculture and transportation technology developed. Migration rates doubled.

1910
At the turn of the 20th century, about 60,000 Mexicans entered the United States per year.

1920
Migration rates continue to increase, doubling again since 1910.

1928
Anti-immigration backlash reaches the U.S.-Mexico Border. 75% decrease in Mexican migration to the U.S.

WWII
U.S. goes to war. Labor shortages are prominent due to the military draft and growing demand for factory workers.

Bracero Program
The Bracero Program begins in 1942.
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Unauthorized Migration Era

“Operation Wetback”
Prompted by the return of American soldiers, the campaign, launched under President Eisenhower, deported over 2 million unauthorized Mexicans.

1953

The Bracero Program
Persuaded by coalitions of worker advocates, President Kennedy ended the Bracero Program.

1964

INA
Immigration and Naturalization Act tried to “modernize” migration policy by emphasizing family connection.

1965

Border Patrol
From 1970-1985 Border Patrol’s presence along the U.S.-Mexico border increased fivefold.

1970

IRCA
Immigration Reform and Control Act passed. It included legalization processes for those who had been in the U.S. since 1982, more border security and new employer sanctions.

1986

5x
1990
Immigration Act of 1990

1996
Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act

2002-06
U.S. passed six immigration enforcement laws, including US PATRIOT ACT and HOMELAND SECURITY ACT

2010
DREAM Act - Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors

2014
President Obama’s Executive Action for Immigration Reform

2012
DACA - Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals

SOURCES:

SOURCE:
https://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/infographic-history-immigration-policy-and-migration-flows
NEW AMERICANS IN CALIFORNIA

27.2% of Californians are foreign born.

50.8% of Californians are Latino or Asian.

45.6% of immigrants in the state are eligible to vote.

28.9% of registered voters are New Americans.

Asian-owned businesses in California have sales and receipts of $181.3 billion.

Latino-owned businesses in California have sales and receipts of $80.3 billion.

Immigrants are 34.6% of the state’s workforce. 9.7% of the workforce is unauthorized.

The purchasing power of California’s Latino population and Asian population, respectively, is $265.2 billion and $171.7 billion.

Californians have 94,979 foreign students who contribute $2.8 billion to the state economy.

32.1% of foreign-born adults have a bachelor’s degree or higher.

90.4% of Californians children with immigrant parents are U.S. citizens.

81% of children with immigrant parents are English proficient.

DID YOU KNOW? California would lose $301.6 billion in economic activity if unauthorized immigrants were removed.

SOURCE: http://www.welcomingmichigan.org/content/learn-more
How do illegal immigrants get into the European Union?
October 30, 2013

The death of more than 300 African migrants in a shipwreck off the Italian island of Lampedusa in early October has shone a spotlight on illegal immigration to Europe.

But although the tragedy at Lampedusa shocked the world, it has done little to dissuade migrants who continue to make the perilous journey across the Mediterranean from northern Africa to European shores.

Frontex, the European Union border agency, says the majority of people residing illegally in the EU arrived by plane with a valid travel visa and simply stayed on after their visa expired.

But Frontex also estimates that at least 72,000 people illegally entered the EU via land and sea routes in 2012 -- and the actual figure may be much higher.

According to Frontex's "Annual Risk Analysis 2013" report, 51% of migrants entering illegally via land and sea took an eastern Mediterranean route, with many crossing into Greece before continuing on to the western Balkans by land or through ferry links to Italy.
While detections of illegal border crossings dropped in the western Mediterranean area between northern Africa and Spain, attempted migrant incursions through the central Mediterranean region -- including Italy -- are up in 2012, according to the report. Many of the migrants are fleeing violence and poverty in places like Syria and Libya.

The deaths of hundreds of migrants in early October has prompted EU leaders to review the bloc's immigration policies.

The EU's commissioner for home affairs, Cecilia Malmstrom, issued a statement in early October calling on European nations to give Frontex the resources to mount "a wide Frontex search and rescue operation in the Mediterranean, from Cyprus to Spain."

The EU also said it is setting up a new border surveillance system and Mediterranean task force to bolster its efforts and will review its asylum immigration policies next summer.

But in the meantime, observers don't expect any let-up in migrant boats attempting to reach the shores of southern Europe.

Explore the breakdown of the routes immigrants are taking into the EU in the infographic above.

BY: CNN Staff

SOURCE:
http://www.cnn.com/2013/10/30/world/eu-immigration-infographic/
5 FACTS ABOUT ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION IN THE U.S.
November 3, 2016

The number of unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. has stabilized in recent years after decades of rapid growth. But the origin countries of unauthorized immigrants have shifted, with the number from Mexico declining since 2009 and the number from elsewhere rising, according to the latest Pew Research Center estimates.

Here are five facts about the unauthorized immigrant population in the U.S.

1 There were 11.1 million unauthorized immigrants in the U.S. in 2014, a total unchanged from 2009 and accounting for 3.5% of the nation’s population. The number of unauthorized immigrants peaked in 2007 at 12.2 million, when this group was 4% of the U.S. population.

2 The U.S. civilian workforce included 8 million unauthorized immigrants in 2014, accounting for 5% of those who were working or were unemployed and looking for work, according to new Pew Research Center estimates. The number was unchanged from 2009 and down slightly from 8.2 million in 2007. The share of unauthorized immigrants in the civilian labor force was down slightly from 2009 (5.2%) and 2007 (5.4%). Compared with their 5% share of the civilian workforce overall, unauthorized immigrants are overrepresented in farming occupations (26%) and construction occupations (15%). In all industries and occupations, though, they are outnumbered by U.S.-born workers.

3 Mexicans made up 52% of all unauthorized immigrants in 2014, though their numbers had been declining in recent years. There were 5.8 million Mexican unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S. that year, down from 6.4 million in 2009, according to the latest Pew Research Center estimates. Meanwhile, the number of unauthorized immigrants from nations other than Mexico grew by 325,000 since 2009, to an estimated 5.3 million in 2014. Populations went up most for unauthorized immigrants from Asia and Central America, but the number also ticked up for those from sub-Saharan Africa. Increases in the number of unauthorized immigrants from other countries mostly offset the decline in the number from Mexico.

4 Six states accounted for 59% of unauthorized immigrants in 2014: California, Texas, Florida, New York, New Jersey and Illinois. But some state populations had changed since 2009, despite the stable trend at the national level. From 2009 to 2014, the unauthorized immigrant
population decreased in seven states: Alabama, California, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Nevada and South Carolina. In all of them, the decline was due to a decrease in unauthorized immigrants from Mexico. In six states, the unauthorized immigrant population rose over the same time period: Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Washington. In all of these but Louisiana, the increases were due to growth in unauthorized immigrant populations from nations other than Mexico. In Louisiana, it was an increase in Mexican unauthorized immigrants that drove the overall increase in the number of unauthorized immigrants.

A rising share of unauthorized immigrants have lived in the U.S. for at least a decade. About two-thirds (66%) of adults in 2014 had been in the U.S. at least that long, compared with 41% in 2005. A declining share of unauthorized immigrants have lived in the U.S. for less than five years - 14% of adults in 2014, compared with 31% in 2005. In 2014, unauthorized immigrant adults had lived in the U.S. for a median of 13.6 years, meaning that half had been in the country at least that long. Only 7% of Mexican unauthorized immigrants had been in the U.S. for less than five years in 2014, compared with 22% of those from all other countries.

BY: Jens Manuel Krogstad, Jeffrey Passel and D’Vera Cohn

SOURCE: Pew Research Center
ARTICLE 1 - US EXTENDS AMNESTY TO YOUNG UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS

Trump administration reverses earlier campaign promise to terminate the programme
June 17, 2017

Donald Trump’s administration has extended amnesty to “Dreamers”, or undocumented immigrants who came to the US as small children, reversing an earlier campaign promise to “immediately terminate” the programme.

The Department of Homeland Security announced late on Thursday that any undocumented individuals who had been granted amnesty under Barack Obama’s Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals would be allowed to continue seeking extensions for their existing work permits. The administration said it had no plans to cancel any existing work permits that had already been granted to individuals under the programme.

The announcement grants temporary relief to nearly 800,000 young undocumented individuals who had previously identified themselves as undocumented to the US government. However, it offers no guarantee that the Trump administration will not reverse course down the line.

As part of the announcement, the Trump administration said it had cancelled a separate Obama memo, which had sought to protect from deportation millions of undocumented immigrants who are the parents of either American citizens or permanent residents.

However, that Obama policy, known as the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents, was blocked in the courts from taking effect and was never actually implemented.

On the campaign trail, Mr Trump criticised Mr Obama’s decision to give amnesty to hundreds of thousands of Dreamers, describing the action as “illegal” and vowing to “immediately terminate” it during a campaign event in Phoenix last year.

Since being elected, however, Mr Trump has softened his tone, a sign of the sensitivity surrounding the programme, which affects thousands of high achieving young adults, many of whom have spent their entire school years in the US.
At a press conference in February, Mr Trump suggested he was struggling with the fate of the programme and the children who had been granted amnesty under it. “To me, it is one of the most difficult subjects I have because you have these incredible kids — in many cases, not in all cases…They were brought here in such a way. It’s a very, very, tough subject.”

In an interview with the Associated Press in April, Mr Trump said the administration would not prioritise going after Dreamers. “We are after the criminals,” he told the AP. “That is our policy.”

The announcement to keep DACA in place has been met by criticism from some of Mr Trump’s supporters, including those who hope the administration’s tough border security proposals will curb the problem of illegal immigration in the US.

Jessica Vaughan, director of policy studies at the Center for Immigration Studies, an advocate for curbing illegal immigration, criticised the White House’s decision to keep DACA in place, saying it was “inconsistent with the president’s approach” and kept in place a policy that was “an abuse of [Mr Obama’s] executive authority”.

Immigrant rights groups and Democrats described the DACA announcement as a small victory for Dreamers, many of whom feared they could be deported under Mr Trump’s administration.

“I am cautiously optimistic that the Trump administration has finally, possibly, realised the benevolence of the DACA programme,” said Bennie Thompson, the ranking Democratic congressman on the House Committee on Homeland Security. “These young people are lawful, contributing members of our society and deserve to be able to stay here, their home.”

Still, he noted that many parents of American children would now be living in “more fear than they already face on a daily basis”, amid a greater risk of deportation. The US Immigration and Customs Enforcement has made 38 per cent more arrests this year, compared with last year, the agency’s director said this month.

BY: Courtney Weaver

SOURCE: Financial Times
https://www.ft.com/content/621a626e-52ae-11e7-bfb8-997009366969
Large-scale amnesty programs have allowed millions of illegal immigrants to remain in the United States legally since the 1980s.

While politicians squabble over the definition of the term amnesty and whether it applies to certain proposals, PolitiFact called the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 “the standard” in modern politics.

Here are details about that legislation and other times the United States has granted amnesty to large numbers of illegal immigrants.

The Immigration Reform and Control Act

Also known as the Simpson-Mazzoli Act, this law was signed by President Ronald Reagan and enacted in November 1986. The act granted temporary legal status to any unauthorized immigrants who had been living in the United States continuously since 1982 so long as they paid a $185 fee and could demonstrate they’d shown good moral character, The Washington Post reported. The act made unauthorized immigrants eligible for green cards after 18 months, provided they learned to speak English. The act also took actions that included – for the first time – penalizing businesses that knowingly employed unauthorized immigrants. The act became the largest U.S. legalization program in history, resulting in green cards being awarded to about 2.7 million immigrants – though that left at least 2 million unauthorized immigrants untouched, the Post reported.

Section 245(i)

Congress in 1994 approved what was known as a Section 245(i) amnesty, which was used to pardon about 578,000 eligible illegal aliens who paid fines of $1000 each, according to the Center for Immigration Studies. That amnesty was renewed in 1997 and again in 2000. The latter reinstatement resulted in amnesty for an estimated 900,000 illegal aliens, according to NumbersUSA.

Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act

Congress in 1997 approved the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act. The measure gave legal status to about 1million unauthorized immigrants, mostly from Central America, according to the Center for Immigration Studies. The NACARA specifically granted
amnesty to Nicaraguans and Cubans who had lived in the U.S. since 1995, along with their spouses and unmarried children, so long as they applied by April 1, 2000, said NumbersUSA.

Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act

Congress in 1998 approved the Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act after Haitians became the first group to successfully argue that it would be discriminatory for the U.S. to refuse them the same treatment provided through NACARA, NumbersUSA said. The act is estimated to have added 125,000 Haitian refugees to the U.S. population.

BY: Breana Noble

SOURCE: Newsmax
ARTICLE 3 - THE TRUTH ABOUT UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS AND TAXES
September 12, 2016

Every year, the Social Security Administration collects billions of dollars in taxes that it doesn’t know who paid. Whenever employers send in W-2 forms that have Social Security numbers that don’t match with anyone on record, the agency routes the paperwork to what’s called the Earnings Suspense File, where it sits until people can prove the wages were theirs, allowing them to one day collect retirement benefits.

The Earnings Suspense File now contains Social Security tax forms that date back to 1937 and are linked to the taxes that were paid on nearly $1.3 trillion in wages. Some of the W-2s in it belong to people who got married and never reported changing their name. Others are people who filled out their tax forms incorrectly. As of 2014, efforts to track these taxpayers down allowed the Social Security Administration to match 171 million tax forms to their rightful owners.

But there are still about 340 million unclaimed tax forms recorded in the file, compared to 270 million nearly a decade ago. A good portion of those forms were filed by employers on behalf of some of the most unlikely funders of Social Security: undocumented immigrants. In fact, illegal immigration is considered largely responsible for the mushrooming of the file, with undocumented workers paying billions in taxes for retirement benefits they will likely never receive.

It works like this: Many immigrants who aren’t authorized to work in the United States buy fake Social Security cards and present them to their employers, who either don’t know they are fake or don’t look too closely. When the employer submits a W-2 form and a tax payment on those workers’ behalf to the Social Security Administration, the federal government holds onto those payroll taxes, even if the Social Security number isn’t linked to anyone on file. And then, a large chunk of that money ends up in the Social Security trust funds, from which retirement benefits are doled out to aging Americans.

The Social Security system has grown increasingly reliant on this stream of revenue, particularly as aging Baby Boomers start to retire. Stephen Goss, the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration, estimates that about 18 million immigrants were working with fake or stolen Social Security cards in 2010, and he expects that number to reach 3.4 million by 2040. He calculates that undocumented immigrants paid $13 billion into the retirement trust fund that year, and only got about $1
billion in benefits. “We estimate that earnings by unauthorized immigrants result in a net positive effect on Social Security financial status generally, and that this effect contributed roughly $12 billion to the cash flow of the program for 2010,” Gross concluded in a 2013 review of the impact of undocumented immigrants on Social Security.

Ironically, it was a piece of legislation aimed at curbing the hiring of undocumented immigrants that created this steady source of revenue for the Social Security system. In 1986, the Immigration Reform and Control Act set penalties for employers who knowingly hired undocumented immigrants. It was the first time the federal government had made it a crime to employ undocumented workers. Yet instead of destroying the underground labor market, this new law just made it more sophisticated, producing a thriving market for fake U.S. birth certificates, IDs and social security cards, which undocumented workers presented to their employers when asked for their papers. Undocumented workers started filling out W-2 forms, and the federal government began receiving and holding onto payroll taxes, even though the fake social security numbers didn’t match anyone in the system. The Social Security Administration sends no-match letters to employers to alert them of the problem and urge them to resolve it.

As rhetoric about illegal immigration dominates this election cycle, it’s hard to argue that undocumented immigrants drain the system. It’s true that not all undocumented workers pay federal income and social security taxes; many are still paid in cash and never fill out W-2 forms, so it’s unclear how many of them independently file tax returns as self-employed contractors. The Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, a Washington, D.C., think tank, estimates that about half of undocumented workers in the United States pay income taxes. They also help fund public schools and local government services by paying sales and property taxes like any other resident. This added up to about $10.6 billion in state and local taxes in 2010, according to an analysis by the institute.

And in the past 20 years, the Internal Revenue Service has made it easier for workers to pay taxes if they don’t have a social security number (or a fake one, for that matter). Workers who are paid illegally in cash can still pay their taxes with an Individual Tax Identification Number (ITIN), filing a return just like any other taxpayer; having a history of paying taxes can be an important step in securing legal status. In 2010, about 3 million people paid over $870 million in income taxes using an ITIN, and according to the IRS, ITIN filers pay $9 billion in payroll taxes annually. (The IRS says it does not share ITIN information with immigration authorities.)
Tanya Gonzalez, the executive director of the nonprofit Sacred Heart Center in Richmond, Virginia, organized the first federally-funded, bilingual tax-assistance program in the region, which sits in one of the two states that have seen increases in the number of undocumented immigrants since the recession. She kept hearing that undocumented immigrants in the Richmond area were getting ripped off by tax preparers, and a friend at the IRS told her about the federal grants offered to open free tax-assistance centers in low-income areas.

At Sacred Heart’s tax-assistance site, she has helped hundreds of immigrants apply for a taxpayer identification number, which allows them to file their taxes as contractors. The use of ITIN has grown popular among immigrant workers in Richmond, she says, as many await comprehensive immigration reform. Past legalization efforts have required undocumented immigrants to prove how long they’ve been living in the United States, and to pay the taxes they owe before receiving legal status. “They want to show that they’ve been paying taxes and have their papers in order as much as they can,” says Gonzalez, adding that some people are on payment plans, while others simply can’t afford to pay taxes at all.

One undocumented worker from Central Mexico who gets help with his taxes at Sacred Heart told me that he began paying taxes four years ago, after learning that it might one day help him stay in the United States. (He asked not to be named because of his legal status.) A 31-year-old landscape worker, he moved to Richmond in 1999 and now makes up to $1,700 a month maintaining golf courses seven days a week. Workers at Sacred Heart told him that if he filed taxes with an ITIN, it could help him gain legal status in the United States if Congress passes comprehensive immigration reform. As those efforts remain stalled in Washington, D.C., his wages are recorded into the Earnings Suspense File, and his taxes go into the Social Security trust funds. “So many people say we are here burdening the country, but we are paying their retirements,” he told me. For now, he doesn’t mind supporting the social security system, he says, but hopes one day he can reap the benefits too.

BY: Alexia Fernandez Campbell

SOURCE: The Atlantic
The next five years will see considerable work for Home Office staff managing our border, immigration and passport systems.

Knowing that change is impending for EU nationals, the UK will see additional applications for visas, citizenship and passports from people already living here or hoping to live here. For example, the complex rules on marriage between EU and non-EU partners will be on the minds of many couples, who may now marry sooner rather than later. This will need additional staff and ongoing policy changes for any unintended consequences as a post-Brexit settlement beds down.

But it’s doubtful the Home Office, even with more staff, will easily cope with the new workload unless a line is drawn on much of the historic caseload, often going back for many years.

There are no official figures on UK illegal migration. Some academic studies estimate there may be as many as 500,000 people while Migration Watch thinks it could be more than 1 million people. I think the latter is more likely and that the number will continue to grow as the total of people overstaying visas, being concealed through ports, entering on forged documents or absconding from contact will exceed the number leaving voluntarily or deported.

Tackling this caseload is massive. Scant resources are rightly focused on higher risk individuals, such as foreign-national offenders who are deported on expiry of their sentence. Over the past six years, the government has made real progress on reducing abuse, including closing the loophole of bogus colleges that saw thousands admitted without really studying. But better control now cannot reverse the fact that the system has been abused and some people are still here after many years. The vast majority of cases of illegal migration are not active and staff resources could not cope if they were.

An appropriate amnesty would make our post-Brexit system manageable, optimise resources to focus on new cases and also strengthen border control around our lengthy coastline. Replacing antiquated systems is also best achieved by closing legacy cases.

As we have seen in the US, this type of amnesty is controversial. Arguments against include that it may send the wrong signal to future
would-be illegal entrants, and regularising through visas many people here may lead to their dependents overseas then applying too, if the rules allow, thus increasing net migration. And where is a line drawn to allow many to remain and the remainder to still face potential deportation?

But the prize of taking a bold step will be considerable. It could shift the public mood, with people here because they are allowed to be here, and would enable the government to tackle higher risk cases and improve its post-Brexit border operations.

An amnesty for appropriate cases would also end uncertainty for many hundreds of thousands of people in limbo, who are neither allowed to stay but likely to never leave or be deported. I believe the public is ready for a mature debate where the outcome is a country that, post-Brexit, is more comfortable about the role of immigration in our economy and society.

BY: Rob Whiteman, Former chief executive, UK Border Agency

SOURCE: The Guardian
Alejandrino Honorato’s introduction to America began with a smuggler who led him across the Rio Grande into the Texas desert. Eventually he was guided to a North Carolina field, where he paid for his passage by picking tobacco. Living illegally in a labor camp, Honorato didn’t know politicians in Washington were deciding his future. It was 1986, and Congress was weighing an amnesty plan to legalize millions of undocumented workers. Unemployment was 7 percent. Some lawmakers warned that a flood of newly legal workers would strain hospitals and schools and overwhelm the economy, driving wages down. “Are we going to cause havoc?” asked Representative Bill McCollum, a Florida Republican, as the House prepared to vote.

The doomsday predictions proved wrong. The bill became law, and almost 3 million illegal immigrants, including Honorato, were granted amnesty. He settled in Apopka, Fla., where he found work in a greenhouse, bought a home, and raised a family. In 1998 he and his brother used their savings to buy a $15,000 tortilla-making machine and opened their first restaurant. Today he is a U.S. citizen and owns two restaurants and a small grocery in central Florida that employ about 60 people. “I’ve helped a lot of people work,” he says through a translator. “If people were legalized, they’d have a chance to open businesses like me.”

Honorato’s experience is worth considering as the White House and Congress debate an even more sweeping amnesty this year. President Obama has made it a priority for his second term, and senators including Democrat Charles Schumer of New York and Republican John McCain of Arizona are drafting legislation that features a path to residency—and perhaps citizenship—for some 11 million undocumented workers.

More than two decades of research show the 1986 law raised wages and helped lift the economy. By 1992 average hourly wages for the millions of formerly undocumented workers had risen 15.1 percent, according to a Department of Labor survey. U.S. wages overall continued to rise, a 2012 study by the Economic Policy Institute in Washington shows, even as the nation entered a recession that lasted from July 1990 to March 1991.
Barriers to upward economic mobility eased as the immigrants found jobs that better matched their skills, notes Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, director of the North American Integration and Development Center at the University of California at Los Angeles. They pursued high school and college degrees and bought homes. “You have a chance to make it, you’re a stakeholder now,” he says. “These people are employed already. It’s not like you’re bringing them in and dumping them onto the labor market.”

Using economic projections from the Congressional Budget Office, Hinojosa-Ojeda calculates that a comprehensive immigration plan this year that includes a way for undocumented workers to gain legal status would increase tax revenue by $4.5 billion or more over three years, and increase gross domestic product by $15 trillion over 10 years. That includes $12 trillion in additional consumption and $256 billion in investment as immigrants buy houses and start businesses. Average wages of low-skill immigrant workers would increase by $4,405 a year for the first three years, he estimates. For skilled workers, wages would rise by more than $6,100 a year.

The newly legal workers could also ease the economic effects of an aging U.S. population. As baby boomers retire and fewer young people start families, the growth of the labor force is slowing. Citing research by the CBO, Matt McDonald, an adviser to McCain’s 2008 presidential campaign and a partner at Hamilton Place Strategies, which advises employers on immigration policy, says the rate of growth in the U.S. workforce is expected to drop to 0.5 percent in the next five years, the lowest in decades. An influx of workers would help to offset those losses, though it’s not clear by how much.

Optimistic forecasts like these have made the current debate far less contentious than the last one. Economists at the libertarian Cato Institute and the liberal Center for American Progress are in rare agreement that legalization makes economic sense—though with U.S. unemployment at 7.7 percent and more than 12 million Americans out of work, politicians are careful to avoid the loaded word “amnesty.” The current term of art used by Republican Senator Marco Rubio of Florida and others pressing for reform is “earned residency.”

One of the unsettled questions in the immigration debate, especially among Republicans, is whether amnesty should eventually lead to citizenship. While Rubio, McCain, Lindsey Graham of South Carolina, and other influential Republican senators have endorsed a reform package that includes a chance at citizenship, Florida Governor Jeb Bush came out against it in his new book on immigration: “...those who violated the laws can remain, but cannot obtain the cherished fruits of
after criticism from Rubio and others, Bush quickly reversed himself, saying he was “in sync” with the senators.

Even some groups that lobby for tougher border controls have softened their resistance to amnesty for undocumented workers living in the U.S. Steven Camarota, director of research for one such group, the Center for Immigration Studies, concedes there isn’t a strong economic argument against letting them stay. Instead, his group is urging lawmakers to include more border security in the immigration bill to keep new illegal immigrants from coming to take the place of those granted amnesty. In a $13 trillion economy with a labor force of about 155 million, he says, the downside of legalizing immigrants who are already working here “is so small in most ways it’s almost not worth thinking about.”

For Rodolfo Cardenas and his wife, amnesty was anything but small. They applied for and got legal status in 1987 after overstaying their student visas. Living in Boulder, Colo., with their small son, they relied on help from their parents in Venezuela. Cardenas now hosts a radio talk show; his wife is a teacher. Their son also received amnesty. In 2007, Rudy Cardenas won a spot on American Idol and made it to the semifinals. “The 1986 law changed our lives,” Rodolfo Cardenas says. “It’s a story of success that only happens here in this country.”

BY: Lorraine Woellert

SOURCE: Bloomberg
Leaders in Congress have called for greater enforcement of U.S. immigration law, while President Barack Obama continues to call for legalization of millions of illegal immigrants. Deportations, particularly interior enforcement, have decreased dramatically under President Obama, who has made clear his support for granting legal status to those who are in the country unlawfully. Recent press reports indicate that the President is inclined to issue a memo like the Department of Homeland Security’s June 15, 2012, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) memo for a large subset of the illegal immigrant population, perhaps up to 5 million. That would be a mistake for three primary reasons: It is unjust, it is costly, and it will not work to stop illegal immigration.

President Barack Obama is considering using prosecutorial discretion to effectively legalize millions of illegal immigrants. Doing so would be unjust and costly and would encourage more illegal immigration. Congress should discourage the Administration from considering this divisive and unproductive step, which would only make it more difficult to implement suitable, feasible, and just immigration reforms and more robust and effective border security.

Background

Current U.S. law, written and passed by Congress and signed by the President, makes it unlawful for foreign nationals to enter or stay in the country without authorization. Despite this clear provision of law, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) estimated that about 11.4 million people lived in the United States without authorization in January 2012. Deportations, particularly interior enforcement, have decreased dramatically under President Obama, and he has made clear his support for granting legal status to those who are in the country unlawfully.

The Department of Homeland Security issued the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) memorandum on June 15, 2012. DACA purported to set prosecutorial priorities and grant relief to each individual who (1) came to the U.S. under the age of 16; (2) continuously resided in the U.S. for at least five years before the date of the memo; (3) is currently in school, has graduated from high school, has a GED, or is an honorably discharged veteran; (4) has not been convicted of a
felony, significant misdemeanor, or multiple misdemeanors or otherwise poses a threat; and (5) is not above the age of 30.

In early 2013, debate began on a comprehensive immigration bill that would include an amnesty for most of the unlawful immigrant population. The U.S. Senate passed the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act (S. 744) in June 2013. In January 2014, the leadership of the House of Representatives issued “principles” for immigration reform that included a general legalization much like S. 744.

Since the issuance of the DACA memo and during debate over a larger amnesty, the number of people unlawfully crossing the U.S. border has increased significantly. Many are turning themselves in, believing that they could qualify for deferred action even though the memorandum requires continuous residence since at least June 15, 2007. Even if they do not qualify for DACA, lax enforcement in general means that most illegal immigrants will not be deported once they enter the interior of the U.S. President Obama and some in Congress sought to advance a comprehensive bill, but momentum for such a measure has collapsed, in part as a result of the massive influx of illegal immigrants crossing the southern border of the United States.

Leaders in Congress have called for greater enforcement of the law, while President Obama continues to call for legalization. Recent press reports indicate that he is inclined to issue a memo like DACA for a large subset of the illegal immigrant population, perhaps up to 5 million. That would be a mistake for three primary reasons: It is unjust, it is costly, and it will not work to stop illegal immigration. Before addressing these concerns, it is important to consider why we have immigration laws.

Why Do We Have Immigration Laws?

America has always welcomed immigrants. In fact, the Declaration of Independence took note of King George III’s abuse in the form of “obstructing the laws for Naturalization of Foreigners [and] refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither.” Immigration can help a nation economically and socially, as it has the United States. As President Ronald Reagan said:

The magnet that draws [immigrants] is freedom and the beacon that guides them is hope. America offers liberty for all, encourages hope for betterment, and nurtures great expectations. In this free land a person can realize his dreams—going as far as talent and drive can carry him. In
return America asks each of us to do our best, to work hard, to respect the law, to cherish human rights, and to strive for the common good.

A sovereign country is fully entitled and wise to determine who can and cannot enter or stay in the country. Open borders are particularly unwise because of the threat of global terrorism. There are reports that recent illegal migrants across the U.S. southern border have included individuals from countries on the terrorist watch list, such as Yemen.

Unlimited immigration is also a concern in a constitutional republic like the United States that is ultimately governed by the people. America’s newest arrivals, particularly those who become citizens, must be instructed in our democratic customs, which make America an exceptional nation. Of particular importance are the rule of law, private property rights, freedom from corruption, free markets, tolerance, and equality under the law. In other words, immigration should be at a pace to allow beneficial assimilation. No matter what one believes about the level of immigration, it should be a matter of debate among the people and decided by our elected representatives.

Administrative Amnesty Is Unjust

The United States currently admits about 1 million legal permanent immigrants every year, more than any other nation in the world.

The level of legal immigration is a topic of worthy debate. One recent Reuters poll finds that only 16 percent of Americans want increased immigration. In any event, the level of immigration should be determined democratically through our elected representatives, particularly Congress, which has authority to “establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization.” The President disregarded the separation of powers in the DHS’s inappropriate DACA memorandum, and any further legalization would raise even more serious concerns. It is unjust for the President to override the people’s determination (expressed through Congress) of how many people are welcome as residents of the United States.

President Thomas Jefferson wrote, “Born in other countries, yet believing you could be happy in this, our laws acknowledge, as they should do, your right to join us in society, conforming...to our established rules.” Such positive support for legal immigration—including insistence that it be done through proper channels—has been the hallmark of our nation’s immigration policy.

A just government applies the law equally as much as is possible, with special exceptions made only rarely and for extraordinary
circumstances. Presidential nullification of our immigration laws for entire classes of people—for millions of people who deliberately violated our laws—is unjust. It involves arbitrary and unequal application of congressionally enacted immigration law. By so doing, it fundamentally runs counter to the rule of law, which lies at the core of our constitutional republic.

Such presidential nullification of established immigration law is unjust to those who decided not to come to the United States because they would be doing so without authorization. Millions of people would fit into this category in Mexico alone. Granting amnesty for another class of people who violated our laws treats those who respect our laws with contempt.

It is also unjust to the millions of Americans and resident legal immigrants who followed the rules. Many had to follow our sometimes lengthy process as relatives or spouses of those here legally. Others simply wanted to come to study or work in the United States and followed the rules to do so legally. Granting blanket amnesty to those who neglected to follow our law is a slap in the face to those who are following the rules.

Moreover, it is more difficult to apprehend dangerous criminals at the border if the Border Patrol has to deal with an increasing number of illegal immigrants crossing the border. That will increase the cost and/or decrease the effectiveness of protecting the American people—an unjust result.

Refusing to uphold the law equally by making special exceptions for favored groups fits the pattern of unfairness emanating from Washington. Citizens and lawful residents in the states (especially border states) bear the brunt of the irresponsible federal abdication of immigration law, while those who are favored by Washington reap windfalls not due to them under the law and normal democratic process.

Administrative Amnesty Is Costly

S. 744 would have legalized unlawful immigrants if they met certain conditions, such as continuous residence in the United States for a period of time and undergoing background checks. Such policies, however, wrongly presume that the DHS has the capability to process additional cases. For example, when DACA was implemented, background checks were supposed to be run on each applicant. The DHS, however, abandoned rigorous checks and opted for minimal, “lean and lite” background checks as it was overwhelmed by applications or
simply decided to ignore such requirements. Furthermore, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services has struggled to replace its existing paper-based application system with a web-based one, and S. 744 would make the system worse by requiring the DHS to accept paper-based application for years to come.

Given the government’s past difficulties with immigration enrollment programs and an existing backlog of at least 4.3 million people waiting for green cards, an administrative amnesty of up to 5 million individuals would have significant costs and cause major difficulties. At least some of the costs could be offset with fees (DACA imposed a fee of nearly $400).

An amnesty-today policy would encourage more illegal immigrants to come in hopes of a future amnesty. The cost of the policy is therefore larger than just the administrative cost. From an economic theory standpoint, illegal immigration may seem beneficial because labor is being used more productively, but many costs are associated with unlawful immigrants. As Nobel prize-winning economist Milton Friedman put it, free immigration to jobs is one thing, but free immigration to welfare is quite another. Illegal immigrants who reside in the United States pay some taxes but consume more in government benefits, such as education.

An amnesty policy will be costly to taxpayers at the local, state, and federal levels. An administrative amnesty would be the latest example of Washington benefiting some (illegal immigrants) at the cost of others (lawful residents).

Administrative Amnesty Won’t Work

Just as talk of amnesty and the issuance of DACA encouraged more border crossings, an expanded administrative amnesty will encourage even more unlawful immigration in the years ahead. In 1986, Congress passed and the President signed a general amnesty of an estimated 3 million unlawful immigrants. Today, more than 11 million unlawful immigrants reside in the United States. Sponsors of the legislation promised that the amnesty would be “a one-time only” measure and was being done in exchange for a secure border and interior enforcement measures. Yet nearly three decades later, the promised enforcement and border security are lackluster, and amnesty is being pursued again.

If President Obama pursues an administrative amnesty of millions of people, potential future illegal immigrants might think (wrongly) that they could qualify under this grant of amnesty or (rightly) that another
amnesty is likely in the future if they can avoid deportation in the meantime. The end result will be more illegal immigrants crossing our borders.

What the U.S. Should Do

The President should not pursue an unpopular, polarizing administrative amnesty that is unfair, is costly, and will encourage more illegal immigration. If the President does pursue administrative amnesty, Congress should consider:

- Limiting funds. Congress could pass legislation forbidding the use of funds (and fees) to implement the new amnesty order and any further determinations under DACA. (The House has passed such a limitation but the Senate has not.)

- Passing a sense of Congress resolution. Congress could pass a resolution that expresses its sense that the administrative amnesty can be reversed and that any information gleaned from participants could be used in future deportation proceedings.

Congress should send a clear signal that reforms without Congress are a disservice to the nation.

BY: Derrick Morgan and David Inserra
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ARTICLE 7 - 12 REASONS WHY AMNESTY WILL HURT LOW-INCOME WORKERS

Why President Obama's immigration policy undermines his focus on inequality

December 15, 2013

At the Center for American Progress, President Obama unveiled his administration’s plans for tackling economic inequality during the last three years in the Oval Office. The President referred to it as the “defying challenge of our time”

The President cited the economic inequality’s causes as a combination of problems cited by both liberals and conservatives. While Obama used usual tropes about weakened trade unions and trickle-down economics, he also referred to other factors often cited the absence of church and community groups, a higher percentage of single parent-households, and drug addiction as other factors which contribute to income inequality.

Yet if the decay of social cohesion and economic inequality are devastating America, then one of his principal policy ambitions, immigration reform, which includes amnesty and an increased chain migration of 33 million new immigrants over the next decade, will only further devastate low-income Americans in a multiple of ways.

Reduce social capital

President Obama cites social capital as an essential element in the fight against income inequality. According to Harvard Professor Robert Putnam’s landmark work Bowling Alone; ethnic diversity decreases trust, community activism, charity, and quality of life. The arrival of 33 million new people, mostly from the third world, will lead to further civic decay.

It will cost trillions, depleting resources.

According to The Heritage Foundation’s Robert Rector, the cost for amnesty is at least $6.3 trillion. Most of this cost is absorbed in Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, education, welfare benefits, and social services like police
There will be an increase in ethnic politics

Tribal politics and group rights are contrary to individual rights and become political norms during times of mass immigration. This works both ways as native Americans and new immigrants feel isolated when race, class, values, ethnicity and language become fodder for political machines – see the Irish vote in Massachusetts in the 1930’s or the Italian vote in New York City during the same time.

Displacement of low-income neighborhoods

Low-income city neighborhoods are the first to experience mass influxes of new immigrants. The transition of a neighborhood’s culture, ethnic breakdown, language, and religion causes massive displacement amongst low-income families who move from neighborhoods they’ve lived in for generations. The displacement has not only leads to white-flight to the suburbs, but also black flight in places like Los Angeles and Houston.

Amnesty will depress wages

The majority of the 33 million new immigrants that would benefit from amnesty would be low-skilled labor. The Congressional Budget Office stated that wages would decrease over ten years. Mass immigration is already hurting many low-skilled laborers, The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights stated that both legal and illegal immigration accounts for forty percent of the 18-point percent decline for African American employment levels.

Employment will decrease amongst low-skill domestic labor

The addition of 33 million new permanent job seekers would increase the already strained native work force. According to the Center for Immigration Studies, “the native-born population increased by 16.4 million from 2000 to 2013, yet the number of natives actually holding a job was 1.3 million lower in 2013 than 2000.” The CBO has also stated that low-skilled labor would see their jobs decimated by amnesty.

There will be another wave of illegal immigration

In 1986, Ronald Reagan passed the last amnesty bill. The million expected new immigrants grew to three million. A new amnesty will have the same results. The CBO has stated that illegal immigration would continue at 75% the rate even after the Rubio-Schumer
Immigration Reform. In twenty years’ time, we will expect another amnesty bill.

Mass immigration and amnesty will lead to greater class division

The Obama election was unquestionably a referendum about the class divide- Does the 47% ring a bell? President Obama and Democrats milked the grievance of the working-poor and scapegoated wealth producing Americans. That class divide will increase exorbitantly as 33 million new, low-income immigrants become new voters. According to an ImpreMedia/Latino Decisions super-majority of Hispanics, most new immigrants support raising taxes on the wealthy.

The gap between the rich and the poor will increase

Since the 1960’s, America has been importing poverty as their central immigration policy. Amnesty and immigration reform will only increase America’s adoption of the world’s poor. According to The Heritage Foundation’s 2006 study, 1/3 of all immigrants live in families that the head of the household lacks a high school education, first-generation immigrants comprise 25% of America’s poor but only 16% the population. Using those standards amnesty would increase first generation immigrants to 40% of the nation’s poor.

Amnesty will exacerbate racial/cultural divisions

Cultural diversity is a two way street, it can lead to many benefits but can also lead to violence when a massive change in demographics takes place. People can harbor ill will to a new immigrant group that are culturally isolated – Koreans and Orthodox Jews were victims of two different riots in the 1990’s. Hispanic and Black gang warfare is also well noted in Los Angeles.

Entitlement costs and eventually taxes will increase

Currently the average household without a High School diploma uses $46,582 while paying only $11,469 in taxes. This is the case for the overwhelming majority of new immigrants, illegal aliens, and benefits of mass amnesty. Large entitlement programs would also suffer from this tax gap, including Medicare, Medicaid, and Obamacare.

The existing school system will be overloaded

Despite having some of the best schools in the world, America also grapples with massive over-crowding in the inner cities as well as a large language barrier in some heavy immigrant areas. The importation
of millions of new children would require billions in new spending to increase classroom sizes, which would take years to complete and the children currently in schools will be lost in the meantime.
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ARTICLE 8 – TIME TO END DACA
The program is illegal, overbroad, and the first step toward a full amnesty.
August 3, 2017

One of President Trump’s signature campaign promises was to end Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), a controversial program created by the Obama administration in 2012 that granted work permits, identity documents, and relief from deportation to approximately 800,000 illegal immigrants who arrived as youths. More than six months into Trump’s term, however, DACA is still alive, and his administration appears divided over how to proceed. It is time to stop wavering. The president should end a program that is illegal, overbroad, and likely to lead to a more extensive amnesty.

The most obvious problem with DACA is that it is illegal. By unilaterally issuing work permits and deportation relief to a large class of illegal immigrants, President Obama effectively rewrote immigration law. Take it from a knowledgeable source:

*With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that’s just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. . . . The executive branch’s job is to enforce and implement those laws. . . . There are enough laws on the books by Congress that are very clear in terms of how we have to enforce our immigration system that for me to simply through executive order ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.*

That statement comes from President Obama himself, one year before he reversed course and instituted DACA. His new justification was that the executive branch would merely be exercising “prosecutorial discretion” in whom it chooses to deport, but — as Obama himself had said — there must be limits to such discretion. Imagine that President Trump becomes frustrated that Congress will not lower the corporate income tax. In response to congressional inaction, could Trump simply announce that the IRS will no longer punish corporations for tax evasion?

The second problem with DACA is that it harms working-class voters, the very people who put Trump over the top. The employment situation for those without a college education continues to look bleak. We can see this clearly if we ignore the official unemployment rate, which includes only people who report they have actively looked for a job in
the prior four weeks. In the first quarter of this year, only 62 percent of young native-born Americans (18 to 29) without a college degree were working, which means that 38 percent were not employed. While these figures include those in school, this was also the case in 2000, when 70 percent of these young, less-skilled workers had a job. The bottom line is that the young and less educated work much less than they used to. These are the workers most likely to compete with DACA recipients armed with their newly issued work permits.

Among native-born black Americans with this level of education, only 58 percent are working. Rates of work are near historic lows for teenagers and for the less-educated generally. At the start of 2017, in total more than 33 million adult natives under age 65 without a college degree were not working. There is no shortage of less-educated workers in the United States.

One might argue that many DACA recipients were already working, so it’s better if they have work permits. But giving work permits to illegal immigrants makes it possible for them to seek employment in almost any job, so the competition with less-educated natives will hit occupations that until now were mostly unaffected. Security jobs are a good example. The lobbies of all large offices and apartment buildings in America have security guards who at a minimum take the names of visitors and call police if there is a problem. These are $12- to $20-an-hour jobs that often come with benefits and that can pay even more depending on the security level. In cities across America, many of these workers are African-American men. Illegal immigrants typically cannot get such jobs because they require valid Social Security numbers and IDs and the ability to pass a background check. But with DACA, they now have these things. Long-haul truck driving, package delivery, and jobs that require workers to be bonded also often demand these documents. These jobs pay at the higher end of what those with modest levels of formal education typically earn.

In addition, some states are allowing DACA recipients to receive professional licenses such as those for contractors. And of course it seems like only a matter of time before states open government jobs to those covered by the program.

Putting aside its legality and the impact on less-educated Americans, the program itself is deeply flawed even on its own terms. When President Obama first announced DACA, he portrayed recipients as de facto American citizens. “They are Americans in their heart, in their minds, in every single way but one: on paper.” He went on to describe them as brought here before they could even understand the word
illegal, raised in the U.S. from a young age, steeped in American culture, now facing “deportation to a country that [they] know nothing about.”

Some DACA recipients do fit this sympathetic description, but the program applies to a much broader group of illegal immigrants. Based on the age and residency requirements, a 15-year-old can travel to the U.S. illegally, stay for five years, and then receive a work permit at the age of 20. Contrary to media portrayals, applicants need not identify as Americans or demonstrate any affinity for American culture. For example, travel to and from their native countries does not invalidate applicants’ five-year period of “continuous” U.S. residence, as long as the trips are “brief, casual, and innocent.” Furthermore, applicants are not required to speak English. In fact, there is space on the DACA application itself to note the assistance of a translator. “Deportation to a country that [they] know nothing about” is quite a stretch when some applicants can arrive as teenagers, make trips to their home countries, and speak and read English so poorly that they need a translator.

Other requirements imposed on DACA applicants turn out to be weak sauce. President Obama implied that applicants must be “willing to go to college,” but the program requires only a high-school diploma, and even that requirement is waived for those who are simply enrolled in some kind of educational program. This is close to no education standard at all, as 92 percent of U.S.-born 20-year-olds had a high-school diploma or the equivalent in 2012. Similarly, forget zero tolerance for crime. DACA applicants may be convicted of up to two “non-significant” misdemeanors before they are deemed threats to public safety. After detaining a DACA recipient suspected of gang ties, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) acknowledged earlier this year that it has had to revoke the status of over 1,500 DACA recipients owing to a criminal conviction or gang affiliation. How many other criminals have slipped through the department’s vetting procedure?

DHS could tell us how many DACA recipients had short tenures in the U.S., or traveled back to their home countries, or required a translator, or committed crimes. My colleagues at the Center for Immigration Studies have been eager for that data, but so far DHS has offered only the simplest demographic breakdowns by variables such as gender and city of residence.

In the meantime, we are left to use Census data to make educated guesses about which respondents are illegal immigrants eligible for DACA. Researchers Donald Kerwin and Robert Warren at the Center for Migration Studies, which is generally pro-immigration, did just that, and although they put a positive spin on the numbers, it is clear that camera-ready DREAMer activists are not representative of all DACA
beneficiaries. Of those who are likely eligible for DACA, 15 percent have been residents for less than 10 years, 25 percent admit they speak English less than “very well,” and a majority have no more than a high-school diploma.

Even those numbers could exaggerate the level of assimilation. As mentioned above, a high-school diploma has become so commonplace among today’s youth (due in large part to watered-down standards) that it is no longer a strong indicator of skills. Similarly, CIS research has shown that immigrants tend to overstate their English ability. When Hispanic immigrants, who make up some 80 to 90 percent of DACA recipients, recently took an objective test of English literacy, 44 percent of those who said they speak English “well” or “very well” actually scored “below basic” — a level sometimes described as functional illiteracy. Based on test-takers with the required age and residency, I estimate that perhaps 24 percent of the DACA-eligible population fall into the functionally illiterate category and another 46 percent have only “basic” English ability.

Put simply, DACA is not a program that carefully considers the humanitarian case for individual applicants. It is a blunt instrument that protects some who can be described as sympathetic youth as well as a less sympathetic group who are more akin to ordinary illegal immigrants. And that’s probably by design. For the leadership of the Democratic party, DACA is but a first step toward legalizing the entire illegal population. After the 2014 midterm election, the Obama administration added Deferred Action for Parents of Americans (DAPA), since stalled by the courts, that would have covered illegal immigrants who had children while in the U.S. During the 2016 election, both Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders went farther still, promising to protect all illegal immigrants who are not violent criminals. Their proposal, which we might call DANF (Deferred Action for Non-Felons), is the logical endpoint of the path that DACA began. And it may not even be the ultimate endpoint, as groups such as the National Day Laborer Organizing Network are against deporting felons.

Like any debater who faces constant questions from his opponent about the hard cases, immigration restrictionists are confronted with DACA not as a small exception but as a means to undermine their entire position. The only way some kind of DACA-like amnesty should even be considered by Congress is in the context of reducing overall immigration levels, perhaps attached to the Reforming American Immigration for Strong Employment (RAISE) Act, introduced in revised form yesterday by Senators Tom Cotton and David Perdue.
The White House will soon be afforded a great opportunity to get out from under the program. Ten states have indicated they will add DACA to an existing federal lawsuit dealing with DAPA if the program is not ended by September 5. If the administration chooses not to defend DACA in court, then the program may simply die a quiet legal death. But there is no need to wait; the president should take this opportunity and honor his campaign pledge to end the program.
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