



Senate Passes Guest Worker Amnesty Program in Spite of Overwhelming Public Opposition

The United States Senate, by a 62 to 36 margin, approved a sweeping illegal alien guest worker amnesty bill and a massive immigration increase that could result in 100 million new immigrants in the next 20 years.

See Page 3

Bush Attempts to Convince the Nation He Is Serious About Immigration Enforcement

With a five-and-a-half year track record of neglect when it comes to immigration enforcement, President Bush took to the nation's airwaves in an unprecedented prime time address about immigration policy.

See Page 5

Bush/Senate Immigration Plan Could Lead to More Than 100 Million New Immigrants in 20 Years

No, that is not a typo in the headline. According to Robert Rector, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, enactment of the immigration legislation being considered by the Senate would result in the admission of 103 million new immigrants over the next 20 years.

See Page 6

Around the Country

As Washington continues to ignore the impact of mass illegal immigration, state and local governments continue to assert the need for meaningful immigration enforcement.

See Page 7

American Hispanics Declare: "You Don't Speak for Me!"

Millions of patriotic, law-abiding Americans of Hispanic heritage have taken offense to the protests and boycotts by illegal aliens and their supporters, and their attempt to portray their demands for amnesty as a civil rights issue.

See Page 8

FAIR Presents Case for True Comprehensive Immigration Reform to Nation's Leading Newspaper Editors

In April, FAIR had the unique opportunity to get an editorial board meeting with the editors of every major American newspaper and wire service.

See Page 10

May Day Illegal Alien Boycott Fizzles

Billed as an effort to cripple the U.S. economy, the May 1 boycott by illegal aliens turned out to be more of a media event than an economic disruption.

See Page 11

In Mexico, "A Day Without Gringos"—In California, A Day of Pandering

While illegal aliens in the U.S. were staging what they called “a day without immigrants,” millions in Mexico, including leading politicians, staged what they called “a day without Gringo,” as an expression of solidarity with those demanding amnesty for having violated U.S. immigration laws.

See Page 12

"Standing Firm Against Amnesty" by Congressman John Sullivan

On Wednesday, May 17th, 2006, I led a press conference with other Members of the House to highlight the deficiencies in the immigration reform legislation, which the Senate is currently debating.

See Page 13

Encouraged Reverse Migration

The current dialogue on illegal immigration paints a bleak picture for a real solution to this national crisis. Supporters of amnesty say there are only two options to deal with the 12 million plus illegal aliens already inside the U.S.: mass deportations or amnesty. This straw man argument purposefully ignores the third option — the sensible option: Encouraged Reverse Migration.

See Page 14

New Zogby Poll Shows Americans Overwhelmingly Support Enforcement Over Amnesty

An opinion survey conducted by the Zogby polling organization on behalf of the Center for Immigration Studies shows that by better than a two-to-one ratio, Americans prefer the enforcement approach offered in the immigration bill passed by the House of Representatives last December to the Senate’s guest worker amnesty bill.

See Page 15

Reformer Corner: Connecticut-Based USCFILE Becomes a Powerful Voice for Immigration Enforcement

One of the most active and effective groups in the New England region is United States Citizens for Immigration Law Enforcement (USCFILE). One of USCFILE’s leaders, Elise Marciano, describes how the group came about and how it is working to protect the interests of citizens in this Connecticut town.

See Page 16

Senate Passes Guest Worker Amnesty Program in Spite of Overwhelming Public Opposition

Focus Now Turns to the House to Block Approval in Conference

The United States Senate, by a 62 to 36 margin, approved a sweeping illegal alien guest worker amnesty bill and a massive immigration increase that could result in 100 million new immigrants in the next 20 years. Ignoring overwhelming public opposition to amnesty and warnings that the cost of such a program could run into the hundreds of billions of dollars, the Senate bowed to special interest pressure and approved a measure that, if enacted, would effectively render the United States as the first borderless nation in history.

It is now up to the House of Representatives to defend the interests of the American people and protect the future of the nation. The House-passed immigration legislation, H.R. 4437, is an enforcement-only bill that differs radically from the Senate's guest worker amnesty bill. The future of U.S. immigration policy — perhaps the future of the nation itself — now hangs in the balance as the two houses of Congress move to a conference committee to try to work out the differences between the two bills. In order for legislation to be sent to the president for his signature, both Houses must approve identical bills.

More than a quarter of the entire Senate has been named to the conference committee, with Majority Leader Bill Frist (R-Tenn.) and Minority Leader Harry Reid (R-Nev.) stacking the deck with pro-amnesty members. A comparable percentage of the House would mean more than a hundred members of that body being named to a conference committee. The White House and the Senate are leaning heavily on Speaker Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) to appoint House conferees who back amnesty. However, many pro-enforcement House members who have pledged to wage a fierce battle to block any compromise that includes amnesty for illegal aliens and increases in overall immigration.

The bill approved by the Senate, S. 2611, includes disastrous amnesty provisions and changes that could result in a quintupling of immigration to the U.S. The so-called compromise bill ostensibly creates different categories of illegal aliens who will be treated differently based on how long they have been able to get away with violating U.S. immigration laws. Those who have been in the country for five years or longer would be eligible to apply for immediate permanent residency. Those who have broken the law for less than five years, but more than two years, would have to leave the country but could return immediately with legitimate visas. Illegal aliens who have been in the country two years or less would be required to leave the country (although there is absolutely no mechanism in the bill to make anyone leave).

In reality, every illegal alien in the country and many more who will be scrambling to get across the border, will qualify for amnesty. Virtually anyone, for a few dollars, can obtain some bogus document proving that they have been here the required five years to qualify for outright amnesty.

During two weeks of Senate debate, almost every amendment to strengthen immigration enforcement or limit amnesty was voted down, while amendments that reward people for having broken the law were passed. Perhaps the most glaring example was the approval of an amendment that will allow illegal aliens to claim Social Security benefits based on payments they made using, false or stolen Social Security numbers.

The magnitude of the disaster that is S. 2611 cannot be overstated. FAIR will devote all of its resources and energies over the next several months to work for the defeat of this sell-out of the American people. We will be working with allies in Congress who are equally determined to stop amnesty, and blanketing the media to inform the American public about the dire consequences of the guest worker amnesty and immigration increase that the Senate has passed.

We will need the active participation of every member of FAIR and every American who cares about the future of their nation. The stakes are so high that we believe that it is incumbent upon every citizen to make their voices heard. If you have not done so already, please go to FAIR's Web site, www.fairus.org, and sign-up for our email Action Alerts. Working together, we can stop the horrendous bill that the Senate has passed from becoming law. Now is not the time to give up hope, but to redouble all of our efforts to preserve a nation and a way of life that we cherish.

Bush Attempts to Convince the Nation He Is Serious About Immigration Enforcement

With a five-and-a-half year track record of neglect when it comes to immigration enforcement, President Bush took to the nation's airwaves in an unprecedented prime time address about immigration policy. The goal of the May 15 Oval Office address was to convince the public that, in spite of years of ignoring rampant illegal immigration, the administration will now make a serious effort to enforce immigration laws.

The centerpiece of the president's address was the announcement that he is authorizing the use of up to 6,000 National Guard troops to assist in controlling America's borders. Details about what specifically the National Guard would be doing remain sketchy, however. The speech was part of the Bush Administration's public relations offensive to sell the president's wildly unpopular plan to provide "a pathway to citizenship" for millions of illegal aliens (read: amnesty), and vastly increase the number of "guest workers" (read: permanent immigrants). In exchange for rewarding millions of illegal aliens and providing American employers with unlimited numbers of low wage foreign workers, President Bush is promising meaningful immigration enforcement, and the May 15 address was intended to show the White House's resolve.

FAIR and most other critics of the president's guest worker amnesty proposal dismissed the speech as little more than a public relations stunt and a photo opportunity. While including some tougher talk on border enforcement than previously heard from the White House, President Bush offered little in the way of detail or a recognition that immigration enforcement must also include work site and interior enforcement in order to be effective. Predictably, President Bush used the Oval Office address to reassert that America is incapable of controlling its borders and stemming the tide of illegal immigration unless we reward illegal aliens with amnesty and provide "legal channels" for millions more who want to enter.

The President followed up his address to the nation with a visit to the border near Yuma, Arizona a few days later. The Yuma sector of the U.S./Mexico border has become the busiest in terms of illegal entrants, spurred by the belief that an amnesty for illegal aliens is imminent. During his visit to the Arizona border region, President Bush paid lip service to the daily reality of people who live in the region, stating "I understand that illegal immigration is a serious problem" that imposes enormous burdens on local communities and citizens. However, the president went on to call, once again, for amnesty and more guest workers.

Bush/Senate Immigration Plan Could Lead to More Than 100 Million New Immigrants in 20 Years

No, that is not a typo in the headline. According to Robert Rector, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, enactment of the immigration legislation being considered by the Senate would result in the admission of 103 million new immigrants over the next 20 years. To put that figure in perspective, 103 million is nearly the equivalent of the entire population of Mexico, or about one-third the current population of the United States.

Even more astounding, Rector points out that 103 million “is a reasonable estimate of the actual immigration flow under the bill,” but not the maximum increase that could result. The maximum number of people who could legally immigrate to the United States as a result of the Senate bill would be about 200 million, or two-thirds the current population of the U.S.

The combination of outright amnesty for current illegal aliens and the admission of “temporary workers” who in reality would remain permanently, plus a quintupling of legal immigration in the name of “family reunification,” would result in the most massive wave of migration in human history over the next two decades. Not a single congressional supporter of the guest worker amnesty program, nor President Bush, has discussed the long-term implications of the bills they are promoting, or justified the breathtaking increases to the American people.

Rector breaks down the increases that would result from the Senate legislation over the next 20 years:

Legal Immigration Under Current Law	19 million
Direct Amnesty	10 million
Expanded Family Chain Migration	5.1 million
Employment-Based Green Cards	13.5 million
“Guest Worker” Programs	20 million
Spouses and Children of “Guest Workers”	24 million
Spouses and Children of Amnesty Recipients	6 million
Parents of Naturalized Citizens	5 million
TOTAL MILLION	102.6 million

Around the Country

Nevada

As Washington continues to ignore the impact of mass illegal immigration and the Senate debated amnesty for illegal aliens, state and local governments continue to assert the need for meaningful immigration enforcement. At their annual convention, the Nevada Republican Party adopted a strong resolution against amnesty and in favor of immigration enforcement. In an unusual development, when the resolution was brought before convention attendees, it was amended to take an even stronger stance against illegal immigration than the original draft. Stating that, "This is the most important issue facing the country," Ed Lanigar, a candidate for the State Assembly, added a sentence to the resolution that reads, "We oppose granting amnesty for illegal aliens." Sandy Steele, the Washoe County chairwoman, then offered an amendment to include a statement, "We do not support citizenship for children born in the United States to illegal aliens, illegal residents or foreign visitors." This, too, was approved by the convention. An effort to affirm the state party's support for President Bush's immigration plan was rejected.

Pennsylvania

While Pennsylvania's senior Senator, Arlen Specter, was busy promoting a massive illegal alien amnesty, the state's legislature was working to limit benefits to illegal aliens and penalize organizations that assist those in the country unlawfully. In early May, the legislature unanimously approved legislation that would force local governments, nonprofit groups and businesses to repay state grants if any of the money is used to employ illegal immigrants. The legislation might also result in companies paying higher interest rates on state loans if they are discovered employing illegal workers.

Arizona

Over the past several years, Arizona has become ground zero for grassroots activism among citizens demanding immigration enforcement, as the state has reluctantly become the gateway to illegal aliens entering the United States. Arizona's 2004 ballot initiative, Proposition 200, has sparked similar ballot initiatives and local legislation all across the country. State Representative Russell Pearce, one of the authors of Prop. 200, and a long-time ally of FAIR in the effort to enact state level enforcement, is preparing another initiative for the November 2006 ballot. Pearce's proposed ballot measure would include provisions allowing illegal immigrants to be charged with trespassing and denying in-state university tuition to Arizona residents who are in the United States illegally.

California

Local reform groups in San Bernardino have forced a measure to curb illegal immigration onto the local ballot after the mayor and the city council refused to enact measures that would have banned day labor hiring centers and bar illegal aliens from renting apartments in the city. Joseph Turner, an aide to State Assemblyman Ray Haynes, a staunch advocate of immigration enforcement, collected the 3,000 signatures necessary to put these proposals before the voters. City Councilman Neil Derry, who supported instituting restrictions against illegal immigration in the council, states that he believes that when these ideas are put to the voters that they will pass. Similar local efforts to curtail illegal immigration have been instituted in another Southern California city, Costa Mesa.

American Hispanics Declare: "You Don't Speak for Me!"

Millions of patriotic, law-abiding Americans of Hispanic heritage have taken offense to the protests and boycotts by illegal aliens and their supporters, and their attempt to portray their demands for amnesty as a civil rights issue. These same American Hispanics are also disturbed by what they see as distortions by the media. Over and over again, the media have portrayed American Hispanic opinion as monolithically supportive of amnesty for illegal aliens.

The illegal aliens and their supporters have awakened the mainstream American Hispanic population. To represent a more accurate picture of how Americans of Hispanic backgrounds feel about amnesty and immigration, a new group known as You Don't Speak for Me! has emerged to provide a countervailing voice in the debate. This diverse group of native-born and naturalized citizens has risen meteorically in just the first few weeks of its existence.

The coalition, the brainchild of retired Army Colonel Albert Rodriguez, has attracted national and international attention from the media and from citizens of Hispanic heritage all across the country who identify themselves as Americans first. The group's Web site, www.dontspeakforme.org, has received a deluge of visitors in just its first few weeks of operation. Col. Rodriguez and other leaders of You Don't Speak for Me! have also appeared on national television, countless talk radio programs, and in newspaper articles.

You Don't Speak for Me! formed officially on May 1, in response to that day's rallies and boycotts by illegal aliens and their supporters. At a packed news conference at the National Press Club in Washington, D.C., broadcast live on C-SPAN, the leaders of the new organization expressed opposition to amnesty for illegal aliens and voiced support for enforcement of U.S. immigration laws. Col. Rodriguez and other spokespeople also took exception to the perception that rewarding illegal aliens is a way to win American Hispanic votes. Quite the opposite, the You Don't Speak for Me! coalition contends, politicians who support guest worker amnesty programs will be punished by Hispanic voters who see these proposals as a threat to the nation.

The impact of this newly emerging voice of American Hispanic citizens was immediately recognized on Capitol Hill as well. Just two weeks after announcing its formation, You Don't Speak for Me! leaders appeared with nine members of the House of Representatives for a Capitol Hill news conference to urge the Senate to approve an immigration enforcement bill that rejects amnesty and guest workers. Led by Congressman John Sullivan (R-Okla.), 29 House members signed a letter addressed to Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist, calling upon him to act in the national interest and in accordance with the wishes of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

Flanked by members of the House and with the Capitol dome in the background, You Don't Speak for Me! spokespeople told the Capitol Hill press corps that American Hispanics reject demands of illegal aliens and attempts to drive a wedge between their communities and the rest of the American public. In addition to Congressman Sullivan, the other House members who appeared at the Capitol Hill news conference were: Tom Tancredo (R-Colo.), Steve King (R-Iowa), Dana Rohrabacher (R-Calif.), Mike McCaul (R-Tex.), Virginia Brown-Waite (R-Fla.), Ernest Istook (R-Okla.), Virgil Goode (R-Va.), and Patrick McHenry (R-N.C.). A number of other members who also signed the letter to Sen. Frist were unable to attend due to other House business.

FAIR has been working closely with You Don't Speak for Me! and is excited about the emergence of a strong American Hispanic voice in the debate. True immigration reform that focuses on strong enforcement and protection of the interests of U.S. citizens is a cause shared by Americans of all backgrounds. With a true coalition of diverse groups of Americans, it will be increasingly difficult for illegal alien advocates to divide people along ethnic and racial lines.

FAIR Presents Case for True Immigration Reform to Nation's Leading Newspaper Editors

Every day, dozens of advocacy groups seek what are known as editorial board meetings with the top editors and executives of newspapers around the country. These sit-downs are an opportunity for groups to present ideas for coverage of the issues that they are concerned about — and they are generally difficult to get, especially with the editorial boards of the leading newspapers.

In April, FAIR had the unique opportunity to get an editorial board meeting with the editors of every major American newspaper and wire service. During this year's annual convention of the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE), held in Seattle, FAIR was invited to present the case for comprehensive immigration reform and enforcement. At a luncheon event, FAIR's media director, Ira Mehlman, appeared with former Clinton Administration INS Commissioner Doris Meissner and Hector Figueroa of the pro-illegal alien Service Employees International Union (SEIU).

During the 90-minute lunch meeting, Mehlman had an opportunity to lay out in detail to the editors, FAIR's ideas for an effective immigration enforcement strategy and raise concerns about how a proposed illegal alien amnesty would affect homeland security, American workers, and strain local resources in the editors' home communities. Each panelist made a 15-minute presentation to the audience of about 500 editors, followed by 45 minutes of questions and answers.

The opportunity to make a presentation at the ASNE convention is a testament to how important the immigration issue has become nationally, and to FAIR's reputation as the preeminent immigration reform organization in the country. FAIR's daily contact with journalists all across the country, and our strong reputation for providing cogent arguments and strong research, afforded FAIR this highly coveted invitation to speak to the nation's top print journalists.

The ability to educate the American public about the dangers of unchecked immigration would not be possible without access to the media, and FAIR has worked hard to develop strong relationships that allow us to reach millions of Americans every day.

May Day Illegal Alien Boycott Fizzles

Lots of Hype, Little Economic Impact

Billed as an effort to cripple the U.S. economy, the May 1 boycott by illegal aliens turned out to be more of a media event than an economic disruption. Organizers of the May 1 protests had hoped to prove to the American public that the U.S. economy would collapse without millions of illegal aliens showing up for work or spending money. The goal was to inflict harm to the U.S. economy and threaten further disruptions if every illegal alien in the United States is not granted amnesty.

The nationwide day of protest drew extensive media coverage, but its impact on the economy was negligible. Its impact on American public opinion, however, had precisely the opposite effect as organizers of the boycott had hoped. Just as demonstrations around the country in March and April, the May Day protests further galvanized American public opinion in opposition to amnesty for illegal aliens. Hard-working, law-abiding Americans were incensed at the sight of hundreds of thousands of immigration lawbreakers demanding rights and privileges to which they are not entitled, and perceived threats to cripple the economy as a form of extortion. Rather than an outpouring of support for the illegal aliens, congressional offices reported that they were flooded with angry calls from constituents who demanded that Congress do something to enforce U.S. immigration laws.

Organizers of the May Day protests and boycotts made a concerted effort to avoid some of the negative public reaction to earlier protests. In the weeks leading up to the event, organizers and Spanish-language media exhorted illegal aliens and their supporters to wave American flags. Earlier demonstrations had featured a sea of Mexican and other flags — and when the Stars and Stripes did make an appearance, it was generally being flown upside down as a sign of disrespect. In spite of effort to demonstrate the illegal aliens' allegiance to this country, most Americans dismissed it as a public relations gesture.

Adding fuel to the public's anger over the demands of illegal aliens and their supporters was the release of an alternative Spanish-language version of the national anthem, called Hymno Nuestro. This alternative anthem received widespread airplay on Spanish-language radio stations, which touted it as the anthem of the illegal aliens seeking amnesty. In this new version, the patriotic sentiments of Francis Scott Key, written as this nation struggled for its survival during the War of 1812, are replaced by the laments of the illegal aliens. "These kids have no parents 'cause of all these mean laws, Let's not start a war with all these hard workers they can't help where they were born."

Rather than causing massive disruptions in places like Los Angeles, site of the largest illegal alien demonstration in the country, residents were treated to a day without traffic jams of the city's freeways, while kids who normally spend their days in overcrowded classrooms got a sense of what their schools would be like without hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens. Many local residents felt that instead of "a day with (illegal) immigrants," they would like to see it made permanent.

While hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens took the day off in order to demonstrate to the rest of us their impact on the economy, American taxpayers enjoyed no similar respite. Providing benefits and services to illegal aliens and their families costs state and local taxpayers about \$100 million a day. Unfortunately while pro-amnesty activists were staging "a day without (illegal) immigrants," American taxpayers did not have the opportunity to enjoy "a day without paying for illegal immigrants."

In Mexico, "A Day Without Gringos", In California, A Day of Pandering

While illegal aliens in the U.S. were staging what they called "a day without immigrants," millions in Mexico, including leading politicians, staged what they called "a day without Gringo," as an expression of solidarity with those demanding amnesty for having violated U.S. immigration laws.

All across Mexico, consumers were encouraged to avoid purchasing U.S.-made products and services. Highly visible U.S.-based companies like McDonald's and Wal-Mart (a company that has brazenly ignored laws against hiring illegal aliens) were targeted by organizers. Along the U.S.-Mexico border, activists attempted to block traffic headed north, hoping to do their part to damage U.S. economic interests.

Politicians in Mexico hailed the May Day protests and boycott as the beginning of a new trans-border Latino movement, in which they will exert power in both Mexico and the U.S. "This is a great revolution of the bronze race, the brown race," declared Marti Batres, leader of the Democratic Revolution Party at a rally in Mexico City. "Our nation goes beyond the [Rio Grande]," he said, asserting that the process of reconquering the American Southwest is underway.

In California, where boycott organizers had hoped to inflict the greatest economic damage, many local politicians responded with complete predictability: they pandered to those who were threatening the state. In Los Angeles, Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, who had initially said he would not attend the downtown rally, showed up to lend his support to the illegal aliens and their demands for amnesty and other benefits.

In Sacramento, dozens of state lawmakers literally walked off the job themselves in solidarity with the illegal aliens (although, unlike most of the illegal aliens who did not get paid for the day, members of the California legislature did not forego a day's pay or any of the other perks of office). In an unprecedented action, the California State Senate, by a 24 to 13 vote, approved a resolution expressing their support for what was effectively an attempt to hold the state's economy hostage. State Senator Gil Cedillo, who has been on a crusade to give driver's licenses to illegal aliens, told the illegal aliens that "we are a nation of ever-changing laws," and encouraged lawbreakers to help retroactively change the laws they had violated.

From the Hill:

Standing Firm Against Amnesty

by Congressman John Sullivan

In December 2005, the House of Representatives passed the Border Protection, Antiterrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act, which contains strong provisions to increase security along our nation's borders, strengthens enforcement of our interior immigration laws, and contains no amnesty provisions for those who are here illegally.

On Wednesday, May 17th, 2006, I led a press conference with other Members of the House to highlight the deficiencies in the immigration reform legislation, which the Senate is currently debating. Joining us was the coalition "You Don't Speak for Me!" This group is comprised of legal immigrants to the U.S., including Hispanic-Americans, who are opposed to granting amnesty to the 12 to 20 million immigrants who are in the U.S. illegally. We emphasized the need for enforcement of our border and interior immigration laws first, before an amnesty or guest worker program is considered. In addition, we discussed a letter I sent to Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist. The letter highlighted a recent Zogby International poll, which showed that Americans prefer the House's border enforcement legislation two to one, including 53 percent of Hispanic-Americans, over the Senate's amnesty bill.

The Senate is currently debating their version of immigration reform legislation, the Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act (CIRA), which would provide amnesty to the 12 to 20 million illegal aliens who are currently in the United States. If passed, this legislation would change the face of America as we know it today. Consider these staggering statistics, from a recent report by Robert Rector of The Heritage Foundation, on how the Senate's legislation would change our society. The Senate's legislation would allow an estimated 103 million people to immigrate to the U.S. — legally — over the next 20 years. This is one-third of the current population of the U.S. In contrast to this dramatic number, current law allows for only 19 million legal immigrants to enter the U.S. over the next 20 years. By granting amnesty to those who are already here illegally, which the Senate plan does for 85 percent of the nation's current illegal aliens, the long-term cost of government benefits could be \$30 billion per year or more. This would be the largest expansion of the welfare state in 35 years.

I welcome those who wish to come to our country to pursue the American dream through legal measures. America is a nation built by immigrants, who are vital to our culture and society. However, those who have broken the law and are here illegally should not be rewarded with a continued stay in the U.S. and citizenship.

In light of strong voter attitudes against the Senate approach toward immigration reform, the time has come for the Senate to act on wide-ranging immigration enforcement legislation and reject calls to grant amnesty for those who are already here illegally. Our country desperately needs secure borders and an immigration enforcement plan.

You may write Congressman John Sullivan, 114 Cannon Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515; or send a fax to his district office, 918-749-0781; or call 918-749-0014.

Encouraged Reverse Migration

A Sensible Seven-Step Strategy for Promoting the Outbound Flow of Illegal Immigration

The current dialogue on illegal immigration paints a bleak picture for a real solution to this national crisis. Supporters of amnesty say there are only two options to deal with the 12 million plus illegal aliens already inside the U.S.: mass deportations or amnesty. This straw man argument purposefully ignores the third option — the sensible option: Encouraged Reverse Migration.

The following is an outline of a seven-step strategy that, when combined with current deportation efforts will cause the attrition (self-deportation) of the majority of those here illegally and greatly restrict the inbound illegal flow. We believe Encouraged Reverse Migration is the most viable strategy available to the U.S. government and one that will work over a short time horizon.

Step 1 Secure the Borders

Step 2 Apply Strong and Serious Worksite Enforcement

Step 3 Eliminate Document Fraud

Step 4 Reform the Unwitting Accomplices: the SSA and IRS

Step 5 Encourage State and Local Law Enforcement Authorities to Enforce Immigration Laws

Step 6 Eliminate State and Local Benefits

Step 7 Give DHS and DOJ Resources Necessary to do the job; improve efficiency (remember national security is riding on this too!)

A complete version of the Backgrounder is available for download [here](#).

New Zogby Poll Shows Americans Overwhelmingly Support Enforcement Over Amnesty

An opinion survey conducted by the Zogby polling organization on behalf of the Center for Immigration Studies shows that by better than a two-to-one ratio, Americans prefer the enforcement approach offered in the immigration bill passed by the House of Representatives last December to the Senate's guest worker amnesty bill. The poll, conducted in late April amidst a heated national and congressional debate about immigration policy, found that 64 percent of Americans favor legislation that includes enforcement measures only, while only 30 percent would approve of a bill that includes amnesty and new guest worker programs.

Public support for the House enforcement-only approach cut across all political, racial and ethnic groups. While President Bush has actively promoted an illegal alien amnesty and massive increases in guest workers (who, in reality, will not be guests but permanent residents), 81 percent of Republican voters disagree, as do 57 percent of registered Democrats, 72 percent of independents, and even 53 percent of registered Hispanic voters.

The significance of the Zogby poll is that it refutes numerous "push polls" that have been conducted over the past several months, designed to create the appearance that Americans support "a pathway to citizenship" for millions of illegal aliens. President Bush and other amnesty supporters have actively engaged in an effort to convince the American public that the only options for dealing with the illegal immigration crisis are mass legalization or mass deportation. In an April speech in Orange County, California, President Bush justified amnesty as the only practical solution because, in his words, "we cannot deport 12 million people. It's just not practical."

President Bush's contention is a political straw man, as proved by the Zogby poll. When provided realistic enforcement alternatives to amnesty, the American public overwhelmingly supports a comprehensive strategy that includes deportation, but also enhanced border enforcement, work site enforcement, secure work authorization documents, limiting access by illegal aliens to non-essential benefits and services, and greater involvement by state and local law enforcement. These strategies compose the core of H. R. 4437, the legislation approved by the House.

FAIR has prepared a seven-point strategy called Encouraged Reverse Migration that lays out in detail how a rational enforcement approach would result in millions of illegal aliens getting discouraged and leaving on their own.

Among the key findings of the Zogby poll are:

- 74 percent of Americans believe that there is an ample supply of workers in this country, versus just 15 percent who believe that more foreign labor is needed.
- Only 19 percent of Americans believe that the government has made a serious effort to combat illegal immigration.
- 73 percent of Americans have little or no confidence in the government's ability to screen out terrorists and criminals if an illegal alien amnesty is enacted
- While the Senate and the Bush Administration are calling for large increases in immigration, only 2 percent of Americans support any increases at all.

Connecticut-Based USCFILE Becomes a Powerful Voice for Immigration Enforcement

Almost every month, the list of local grassroots immigration reform groups working with FAIR grows longer. FAIR's eastern regional field representative Sandra Gunn has spent a good deal of time in recent months in the New England states, as an influx of illegal aliens has spurred a response from the community. One of the most active and effective groups in the region is United States Citizens for Immigration Law Enforcement (USCFILE). One of USCFILE's leaders, Elise Marciano, describes how the group came about and how it is working to protect the interests of citizens in this Connecticut town:

USCFILE was formed in response to citizen's concern over illegal immigration and the effect it was having on the community. Day laborers loitering in city parks and jumping into cars driven by housewives and full of kids raised an alarm that something was wrong. Overpopulated houses with cars parked all over the yard raised concerns over safety and zoning regulations.

Over the following summer, residential areas were afflicted with volleyball games held until early morning hours five nights a week, with the streets blocked by the cars of spectators. Admission was charged and food and drink were sold. One immigrant had even built a concrete stadium in the backyard.

Instead of just complaining about the impact of 15,000 illegal aliens living in the town, USCFILE is taking action. We have supported Mayor Mark Boughton in his attempts to pressure the legislators in Washington, D.C. to enforce immigration laws. He has formed a group called UNIT, Unified Neighborhood Inspection Team, to seek out and close illegal apartments and prostitution houses in Danbury. We encourage our members to call and report any suspicious homes in their neighborhood. We have urged the Mayor to take action against employers that hire illegals. The Mayor did ask for State Police to be deputized as Immigration Enforcement Agents, but the request was turned down by the Connecticut Department of Public Safety.

We started a petition drive in October 2005 to protect our borders, enforce our laws and to refuse amnesty for illegal aliens and had no trouble collecting over 2,000 signatures to give to our federal representatives and senators. Many legal immigrants were happy to sign. USCFILE has met with two area congressional representatives, Nancy Johnson and Christopher Shays, and expects to meet soon with U.S. Senator Joe Lieberman. These forums allow members of the community to drive home the importance of real enforcement and comprehensive immigration reform to the people who make the laws.

Members have written several letters to our local newspaper and all are encouraged to write as much as possible. Many other residents in the area have also written to express their opposition to illegal immigration, Congress's lack of attention to the problem and the plight of their community. Members also have been on TV and radio talk shows to discuss the problems created by illegal aliens.

Visit USCFILE on the web at www.uscfile.org.