



The House Moves First on Guest Worker Amnesty

It had been widely assumed that the Senate would lead the way on this year's version of the guest worker amnesty bill. But, after holding a few hearings, Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) began demanding President Bush and Senate Republicans sign what amounts to a mutually assured destruction agreement before he would even mark-up the bill and send it to the full Senate.
See Page 3

FAIR Hosts Hold Their Feet to the Fire 2007: The Biggest Pro-Immigration Reform Event Ever

Last year, all across the United States, hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens and their supporters took to the streets chanting "Our day has come." A year later, it now looks as though their day has come and gone. In place of foreign flag waving illegal aliens demanding amnesty, the biggest immigration related demonstration in 2007 was assembled by American citizens who want their government to enforce immigration laws and reject guest worker amnesty proposals.
See Page 4

Key Provisions of the STRIVE Act

Like the illegal alien amnesty of 1986, the 2007 version, known as the Security Through Responsible Immigration and Vigorous Economy (STRIVE) Act includes promises of future immigration enforcement in exchange for "earned citizenship" for illegal aliens. Unlike the 1986 amnesty, the STRIVE Act also contains a "new worker program" and increases in government mandated immigration quotas.
See Page 5

Unskilled Labor Shortage is One Problem America Needn't Worry About

A prominent feature of the Flake-Gutierrez STRIVE Act is the annual admission of 600,000 unskilled "guest workers" who will actually remain here permanently. The provision is designed to address the "need" for unskilled labor in the U.S. to do jobs for which there are no U.S. workers available. (The justification, in other words, is that there are not enough U.S. workers who are qualified to do jobs for which no qualifications are necessary!)
See Page 7

FAIR's Jack Martin Testifies as an Expert Witness in Trial of Hazleton Ordinance

The landmark ordinance approved by the city of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, finally had its day in court in March. Nine days to be precise. A challenge to the Hazleton ordinance, which imposes penalties against employers who hire illegal aliens and landlords who rent to them, was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, attracted a string of expert witnesses and national media attention as the case was heard in a federal court in Scranton, Pennsylvania.
See Page 8

Around the Country

See Page 9

Book Review—Demography and Migration: Two Forces That Will Reshape the World

Normally, the book review space in this newsletter is reserved for hyping books that are sure to bring a smile to the faces of immigration reformers. But all of us, from time to time, benefit from having some of our basic assumptions and beliefs challenged. Few people writing today are as challenging or as interesting as Mark Steyn, a Canadian journalist who now calls New Hampshire home.
See Page 10

New Ballot Initiative Planned for Arizona in 2008

It was a grassroots initiative in Arizona in 2004 that put Congress on notice that the public's patience with the status quo on immigration was quickly running out. With the help of a few courageous political leaders in the state of Arizona and national organizations like FAIR, a small group of dedicated immigration reform activists put Proposition 200 on the 2004 ballot and passed it by a convincing margin in spite of being outspent dramatically by an array of pro-illegal alien rights and business interest groups.

See Page 11

From the Hill—Tax Day, Or Immigration Day? By Rep. Steve King

This year, April 17th was not only the deadline for Americans filing their income taxes, it also marked the centennial anniversary of the single busiest day in the history of Ellis Island.

See Page 12

Ten Things Congress Can Do to Deal with Illegal Immigration

President Bush and congressional backers of the guest worker amnesty legislation argue that their proposal is the only practical way of dealing with illegal immigration because, they claim, "You can't deport 12 million people."

See Page 14

Democrats and Republicans Concerned About the Same Thing

Commenting on the key issues for the 2008 elections, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Rahm Emanuel (D-Ill.), who led his party's return to power in 2006, observed, "For Republicans it's immigration; for Democrats it's trade." Actually, mainstream Democratic and Republican voters are concerned about the same thing: policies that are undermining the middle class in America.

See Page 15

FAIR Occupies "MySpace"

No group of Americans will suffer the consequences of this nation's failed immigration policies more than our youth. Current immigration policies — both government mandated immigration and the failure to control illegal immigration — make it less likely that future generations of Americans will enjoy the same quality of life that their parents and grandparents did.

See Page 16

On the Campaign Trail

Unlike 2004, immigration policy will likely feature prominently in the 2008 presidential campaign. Candidates from both parties have been volunteering their views on how to deal with America's immigration problems, and when they have not come forward on their own, voters have demanded to know how they would handle the issue.

See Page 17

The House Moves First on Guest Worker Amnesty

It had been widely assumed that the Senate would lead the way on this year's version of the guest worker amnesty bill. After all, the Senate had already passed the McCain-Kennedy guest worker amnesty bill in 2006, and all that was really required was for them to change a few dates and send it back to the floor for a vote in 2007.

But, after holding a few hearings, Judiciary Committee Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) began demanding President Bush and Senate Republicans sign what amounts to a mutually assured destruction agreement before he would even mark-up the bill and send it to the full Senate. The Democratic leadership in the Senate, while supporting a wide ranging amnesty for illegal aliens, is not about to take the heat for a bill that promises to be wildly unpopular with the American public.

Into the vacuum stepped the House's version of the Odd Couple, Representatives Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.) and Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.), who co-authored a companion bill to McCain-Kennedy in 2006. On March 22, their guest worker amnesty bill entitled the Security Through Regularized Immigration and Vigorous Economy (STRIVE) Act of 2007, H.R. 1645, was introduced in the House. Similar to last year's McCain-Kennedy bill, the STRIVE Act would grant amnesty to millions of illegal aliens and admit up to an additional 600,000 unskilled guest workers plus their dependent family members each year.

The STRIVE Act includes a few differences from McCain-Kennedy 2006, including the elimination of the multi-tiered amnesty that distinguished between illegal aliens based on how long they had been living here. Under the new House bill, everyone who settled in the U.S. illegally before June 1, 2006 would qualify for legal guest worker status and could then embark on a pathway to citizenship. Illegal aliens unlucky enough to have arrived after the June 1, 2006 cut-off date or unable to "prove" they were here prior to the cut-off, would be required to leave the country, but could still apply to return as guest workers.

To get around the inconvenient truth of calling the bill an amnesty, the authors have thrown in a gimmick they call the "touch back" provision, which requires most able-bodied illegal aliens to take a trip to the nearest border and then come right back. The complete pointlessness of this provision was acknowledged by Rep. Gutierrez himself when he asked rhetorically, "Is this going to sound somewhat absurd to some people? It certainly will." To date, no one has disagreed with Gutierrez on the last point.

FAIR Hosts Hold Their Feet to the Fire 2007: The Biggest Pro-Immigration Reform Event Ever

Last year, all across the United States, hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens and their supporters took to the streets chanting "Our day has come." A year later, it now looks as though their day has come and gone.

In the place of foreign flag waving illegal aliens demanding amnesty, the biggest immigration related demonstration in 2007 was assembled by American citizens who want their government to enforce immigration laws and reject guest worker amnesty proposals.

During the week of April 22, FAIR, along with San Diego talk radio host Roger Hedgecock (KOGO-AM), hosted Hold Their Feet to the Fire, a multi-faceted demonstration representing the will of an overwhelming majority of Americans.

Hold Their Feet to the Fire 2007 included:

- 34 radio talk show hosts from across the United States originated their broadcasts from FAIR's media headquarters near Capitol Hill. (See list of radio talk shows on page 8) Because several of the radio hosts are nationally syndicated, Hold Their Feet to the Fire reached listeners on 193 radio stations.
- Dozens more joined the national radio campaign from their home studios.
- Hundreds of radio listeners and FAIR members and activists signed up to participate in three days of citizen lobbying.
- Thousands of other FAIR activists lobbied from home calling and sending emails to congressional offices and meeting with congressional staffs in the district offices.
- Participation by dozens of members of Congress.
- A fundraising event for the families of the two Border Patrol officers who are currently serving prison sentences for shooting an illegal alien drug smuggler who attacked them.

The June edition of the FAIR *Immigration Report* will include a detailed report on all aspects of this unprecedented event.

Key Provisions of the STRIVE Act

Like the illegal alien amnesty of 1986, the 2007 version, known as the Security Through Responsible Immigration and Vigorous Economy (STRIVE) Act includes promises of future immigration enforcement in exchange for “earned citizenship” for illegal aliens. Unlike the 1986 amnesty, the STRIVE Act also contains a “new worker program” and increases in government mandated immigration quotas.

In an attempt to placate an American public that has no confidence in government promises to enforce immigration rules, the bill calls for the president to “certify” that illegal immigration is under control before the amnesty and guest worker provisions can be implemented. It is worth noting that the current president has never really believed that illegal immigration was much of a problem to begin with, so it probably won’t take much to convince him that the problem has been solved.

Border Enforcement

- Increases Border Patrol, port of entry inspection, and ICE investigation manpower.
- Strengthens border infrastructure.
- Creates a criminal penalty for evading border inspection.
- Authorizes the collection of biometric data on border-crossers.
- Requires the government to work with Mexico to address border security, human and drug trafficking, gang activity and violence against women.

Interior Enforcement

- Increases penalties for gang violence, failure to depart and alien smuggling.
- Increases criminal penalties for employing illegal aliens.
- Increases detention space.
- Increases penalties for document fraud.
- Reaffirms policies authorizing the enforcement of criminal immigration laws by local police.

Employment Verification

- Mandates creation and phased-in implementation of an electronic or telephonic work eligibility verification system.
- Creates criminal penalties for falsely attesting to work eligibility.
- Creates penalties for employers who do not comply and bars them from government contracts.

All of the enforcement provisions contained in the STRIVE Act are recommendations FAIR has been endorsing for years. Most have already been authorized by acts of Congress, but either not funded, endlessly delayed, or ignored entirely by the government. Thus, until proven otherwise, it must be assumed that the enforcement provisions of the STRIVE Act would be treated similarly.

New Worker Program

- Creates guest worker program allowing the importation of up to 600,000 unskilled guest workers (not including dependent family members).
- Requires that employers "attempt to hire U.S. workers" before applying for new guest workers.
- Provides guest workers "an opportunity to apply for permanent resident status."
- Requires Homeland Security to create a tamper-resistant guest worker ID document.

"Earned Citizenship" (or, in plain English, amnesty)

- Requires applicants to establish presence in the U.S. prior to June 1, 2006 and "attest" to continuous employment since that date.
- Requires applicants to undergo criminal background checks.
- Requires applicants to pay a \$500 application fee and a \$1,500 fine and pay taxes while legally working.
- Requires applicants to "touch" the border and reenter with the same "conditional nonimmigrant" status given upon application.

Other Provisions

- Incorporates the DREAM Act and AgJobs amnesties for illegal alien students and farm workers.
- Exempts immediate family members of U.S. citizens from counting under the annual immigration cap.
- More than doubles employment-based immigration from 140,000 to 290,000 annually.
- Exempts immigrants with "advanced skills" from annual visa caps.
- Increases annual H-1B visa quota from 65,000 to 115,000 with a 20% escalator clause that permits the visas to climb to 180,000.

Unskilled Labor Shortage is One Problem America Needn't Worry About

A prominent feature of the Flake-Gutierrez STRIVE Act is the annual admission of 600,000 unskilled "guest workers" who will actually remain here permanently. The provision is designed to address the "need" for unskilled labor in the U.S. to do jobs for which there are no U.S. workers available. (The justification, in other words, is that there are not enough U.S. workers who are qualified to do jobs for which no qualifications are necessary!)

According to a March report by the State Education Agency, a quasi-official office of the U.S. Department of Education, 21 percent of the adult population of the United States is functionally illiterate. Of all the potential resource shortages this country needs to be addressing, unskilled labor would seem to be the very least of our worries.

FAIR's Jack Martin Testifies as an Expert Witness in Trial of Hazleton Ordinance

The landmark ordinance approved by the city of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, finally had its day in court in March. Nine days to be precise. A challenge to the Hazleton ordinance, which imposes penalties against employers who hire illegal aliens and landlords who rent to them, was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund, attracted a string of expert witnesses and national media attention as the case was heard in a federal court in Scranton, Pennsylvania. The trial ended on March 22, and awaits a ruling by Judge James Munley.

FAIR has been intimately involved in the Hazleton case right from the very start. As Mayor Lou Barletta began to grapple with the enormous financial burdens and increased crime associated with illegal aliens residing in Hazleton, FAIR and the Immigration Reform Law Institute (IRLI) worked closely with Hazleton officials to craft the ordinance and to defend it against legal challenges in court. Kris Kobach, IRLI Senior Counsel, served as lead counsel for the city of Hazleton, presenting the opening and closing statements and examining and cross-examining expert witnesses for both the plaintiffs and the defense.

Kobach was assisted by Michael Hethmon, General Counsel of IRLI, who prepared the major memorandum of law regarding the constitutionality of the Hazleton ordinance. Hethmon had worked closely with Hazleton officials, proposing technical amendments to ensure that the ordinance was constitutionally sound. The Hazleton ordinance, like many similar local laws being adopted by cities all across the country, does not directly regulate immigration — a matter over which the federal government has exclusive authority — but rather regulates how local businesses and landlords operate.

Among the expert witnesses who testified during the nine-day trial was Jack Martin, director of special projects for FAIR. Martin's testimony focused on the local costs associated with illegal immigration and the compelling interests that local governments have in adopting local measures to discourage illegal immigration.

It is widely assumed that whichever way Judge Munley rules on this case, the decision will be appealed to a higher court and may ultimately wind up before the U.S. Supreme Court. FAIR and IRLI remain dedicated to defending the right of local governments to protect themselves against the impact of mass illegal immigration and will work with Hazleton as the case makes its way through the legal system.

Around the Country

New Jersey

The city of Morristown has joined a growing list of cities around the nation seeking federal 287(g) training for local police to help deal with a growing illegal immigration crisis. After working with FAIR's field staff, New Jersey Citizens for Immigration Control turned out in force for a hearing before the Morristown city council when it considered a motion to request 287(g) training. The proposal, which has the support of Mayor Donald Cresitello, was approved 6-1 by the council. Responding to the usual charges of the illegal alien advocacy network, which brought in people to oppose the plan, Cresitello stated, "Maybe some of these people who live outside the community, if they had to have people invading their homes and passing out drunk and disorderly on their lawns, they might feel the same way those residents of Morristown do who are subjected to those kinds of conditions."

Pennsylvania

The efforts begun by Mayor Lou Barletta in Hazleton are reverberating throughout the state. State Rep. Daryl Metcalfe has introduced five bills in the Pennsylvania legislature aimed at discouraging illegal aliens from residing anywhere in the state. Metcalfe's legislation calls for a cut-off of non-emergency benefits and services to illegal aliens; repeal of business licenses for employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens; and authorizes state police to enforce immigration law violations and report suspected illegal aliens to federal authorities. Pennsylvania joins a growing list of states considering statewide plans to confront illegal immigration.

Missouri

In the last edition of the newsletter we reported on legislation in Missouri to ban illegal aliens from admission to public universities. In March, the Missouri legislature followed up with a measure authorizing federal 287(g) training for state police officers and requiring that they inquire about immigration status whenever making an arrest. With Joyce Mucci, FAIR's new Southern regional field representative based in Kansas City, Missouri continues to be a center for grassroots immigration reform efforts.

Idaho

With bipartisan support, the Idaho State Senate approved a measure in March that would bar illegal aliens from receiving non-emergency benefits and services. The bill was approved by a vote of 29-6 and will now go to the State House for consideration. Under the legislation, applicants for state-funded benefits would need to produce a driver's license or passport combined with a valid Social Security number to prove that they are legal U.S. residents.

Book Review

Demography and Migration: Two Forces That Will Reshape the World

Normally, the book review space in this newsletter is reserved for hyping books that are sure to bring a smile to the faces of immigration reformers. But all of us, from time to time, benefit from having some of our basic assumptions and beliefs challenged. Few people writing today are as challenging or as interesting as Mark Steyn, a Canadian journalist who now calls New Hampshire home.

Steyn's cheerfully entitled new book, *America Alone: The End of the World as We Know It* (Regnery Press, 2006), argues that the current wave of global migration poses an existential threat to Western civilization. As a matter of fact, he has already written off Europe as a goner, with his native Canada not far behind. European societies, with their anemic native birth rates and their addiction to cradle-to-grave government security, have entered into an irrevocable Faustian bargain with large numbers of Islamic immigrants who have poured into the continent over the past 40 years.

"Eutopians," as he describes them, will enjoy a few more years of 35-hour work weeks, eight-week paid vacations, government health plans, bloated pensions, and their disdain for America. But, in the end — and the end is not far off — the cradle of Western civilization will be inherited by people and a culture that is the antithesis of everything that post-War Europe has come to symbolize, because the Europeans have produced few heirs of their own.

That is where many of the founders of the modern American immigration reform movement are likely to take issue with Steyn. Steyn presents a far more intelligent and less dogmatic view of population growth than the late Julian Simon. While not going as far as Simon and declaring there are no natural limits (or drawbacks) to population growth, Steyn does not see population increases as inherently bad. Whereas Simon found no downside to immigration, Steyn finds it a very worrisome, but an unavoidable consequence of societies that fall below replacement level fertility but are unwilling to sacrifice any of the social benefits that come with fewer working people supporting more retirees.

What distinguishes America is that even absent immigration, we are maintaining replacement level fertility, and have not fallen into the total dependency trap of the welfare state (although we are headed in that direction he warns). Though Steyn does not specifically tackle U.S. immigration policies, the Faustian bargain that it has become for Europe should stand as a stark warning to us as well.

America Alone both reinforces and challenges many of the core assumptions of the immigration reform movement and, as such, is an important read for anyone who is interested in this issue.

New Ballot Initiative Planned for Arizona in 2008

It was a grassroots initiative in Arizona in 2004 that put Congress on notice that the public's patience with the status quo on immigration was quickly running out. With the help of a few courageous political leaders in the state of Arizona and national organizations like FAIR, a small group of dedicated immigration reform activists put Proposition 200 on the 2004 ballot and passed it by a convincing margin in spite of being outspent dramatically by an array of pro-illegal alien rights and business interest groups. Since passage of Prop. 200, local efforts to deal with the problems associated with illegal immigration have emerged in communities across the country.

Although Prop. 200 was approved by the voters, it was largely ignored by Gov. Janet Napolitano who refused to fully implement the clear will of the voters to take steps to enforce Arizona laws against illegal immigration. So, in 2008, a stronger and more seasoned grassroots coalition, with the support of some political leaders, has decided to let the voters speak again.

At a March 27 news conference in Phoenix, a coalition of local immigration reform activists and politicians announced an effort to put two measures on the 2008 ballot. Among the prominent Arizona leaders behind the effort are State Rep. Russell Pearce and Don Goldwater. These local groups and politicians were joined by representatives from FAIR and You Don't Speak for Me!, a national coalition of American Hispanics who support enforcement of U.S. immigration laws and oppose amnesty for illegal aliens.

The twin ballot measures are aimed at forcing the hand of the Arizona legislature and Gov. Napolitano. One initiative, Support Legal Arizona Workers, would establish a state employer sanctions policy, allowing local government to penalize employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens. An employer sanctions bill passed by the Arizona legislature in 2006 was vetoed by the governor. The second measure, Support Our Law Enforcement, would require state police to enforce immigration laws when they have evidence that they are dealing with illegal aliens.

The shift in the immigration reform effort away from Washington and to the local communities where the impact of mass illegal immigration is most directly felt has been one of the most encouraging developments in the past few years and has been a priority of FAIR's growing national field effort. In addition to working with activists in Arizona, FAIR's national field program works with activists in dozens of states to promote and enforce local laws and policies that discourage illegal immigration. In addition to creating real changes in states and cities where these measures are enacted, they build pressure on politicians in Washington to enforce immigration laws at the national level.

FAIR has materials developed to support those interested in organizing immigration reform action locally. Contact the FAIR office for more information.

From the Hill

Tax Day, Or Immigration Day?

by Rep. Steve King

This year, April 17th was not only the deadline for Americans filing their income taxes, it also marked the centennial anniversary of the single busiest day in the history of Ellis Island.

On April 17th, 1907 a total of 11,747 legal immigrants were processed through Ellis Island's Great Hall in the New York Harbor. That number is twice the size of Santa Anna's invading army who overran Texan defenders at the Alamo. In the present day, that is roughly equal to the average night of illegal crossings over the Mexican border.

Ellis Island is a place of significant historical value, not only for America, but for my family in particular. My grandmother entered the United States through Ellis Island on March 26, 1894. I admire my ancestors, who respected the laws of the country they hoped to call home, and entered the United States legally.

In fact, Ellis Island, has come to represent everything our current immigration law, and proposed amnesty bills, are not. Even on its most frenzied day of processing new immigrants back in 1907, compared to 2007, Ellis Island was a portrait of order, rule of law, and competent federal management.

As Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration in the House of Representatives, I participated in a field hearing at Ellis Island the last week of March. Right in the midst of this National Park, my subcommittee colleagues and I heard from seven witnesses on the future of immigration in America.

Unfortunately, the meaningful and striking architecture of Ellis Island's Great Hall could not cover up the distressing testimony we heard. Most witnesses attempted to defend proposed amnesty laws, but one after the other threw up their hands when I asked fundamental questions.

Igor Timofeyev of the Department of Homeland Security, representing the position of the White House, could not define amnesty. I brought up the Administration's proposed substitution of a \$2,000 fine for the penalty of deportation for unlawful entry into the United States. But once I asked him at what amount the fine represented amnesty, Timofeyev responded, "I can't answer that sir."

Next, Border Patrol Chief David Aguilar could not defend the proposed legalization of undocumented illegal aliens. It seems reasonable to ask why America would be safer if we would legalize undocumented aliens, as pro-guest worker advocates claim. But when I asked how enacting such a policy would reduce the amount of contraband and the number of terrorists in this country, Aguilar answered with candor, "I don't know."

Even an academic expert capitulated when I confronted his claim that amnesty proposals would provide sustainable retirement income for our workforce. Dr. Dowell Meyers is a Professor of Urban Planning and Demography at the University of Southern California, where he is Director of the Population Dynamics Research Group. I asked him who pays for the retirement of the millions of immigrants whom he would bring into the country to work and to fund the retirement of the Baby Boomers. He could not answer. So then I asked him

what would be the optimum age demographic for a self sustaining nation. And again, like the other witnesses, Dr. Meyer's answered, "I don't know."

Dr. Siciliano, a professor of economics at the University of California made the argument that immigrants (including illegal immigrants) always produce economic growth. But according to a Heritage Foundation study, high school dropouts who are heads of households cost the taxpayers \$22,449 more per year than they pay in taxes. Most illegal immigrants are dropouts resulting in a per head of household cost to the taxpayers of \$1.1 million. I asked Dr. Siciliano, "Obviously they are not always a net gain to our economy so where is the point of diminishing returns?" Dr. Siciliano answered, you guessed it, "I don't know."

We should celebrate the history of Ellis Island, but also recognize the contrast it represents to our nation's current and proposed immigration failures. And certainly, "I don't know" is a recipe for an economic, demographic, and cultural disaster of colossal proportions. When we are confronted with "experts" who "don't know" we should fall back on our own common sense and enforce existing laws because we do know what is best for middle class America.

U.S. Congressman Steve King represents the 5th Congressional District of Iowa, and is Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security and International Law of the House Judiciary Committee. You can write Congressman King at 1609 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 or call his district office at 712-325-1404.

Ten Things Congress Can Do to Deal with Illegal Immigration

President Bush and congressional backers of the guest worker amnesty legislation argue that their proposal is the only practical way of dealing with illegal immigration because, they claim, "You can't deport 12 million people."

Aside from the fact that no one is seriously suggesting deporting 12 million illegal aliens, FAIR has produced a list of ten policy reforms that would result in millions of illegal aliens leaving on their own:

- 1.** Implement a mandatory electronic worker verification system.
- 2.** Make the Social Security card a verifiable ID and require the Social Security Administration to inform Homeland Security when no-match letters are issued.
- 3.** Authorize the IRS to prosecute employers and illegal workers who provide fraudulent tax information.
- 4.** Eliminate business tax deductions for wages employers pay to illegal aliens.
- 5.** Increase civil and criminal penalties for employers convicted of hiring illegal aliens.
- 6.** Bar work performed illegally from counting toward eligibility for Social Security benefits.
- 7.** Increase manpower and technology for securing U.S. borders and ports of entry.
- 8.** Expand local-federal immigration law enforcement cooperation.
- 9.** Eliminate birthright citizenship for the children of illegal aliens.
- 10.** Eliminate non-emergency state and local benefits and services for illegal aliens.

Democrats and Republicans Concerned About the Same Thing

Commenting on the key issues for the 2008 elections, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Rahm Emanuel (D-Ill.), who led his party's return to power in 2006, observed, "For Republicans it's immigration; for Democrats it's trade." Actually, mainstream Democratic and Republican voters are concerned about the same thing: policies that are undermining the middle class in America. Whether American workers are losing their jobs because a worker from another country has come here to take it, or whether American companies are shipping their jobs to low wage workers in other countries, is of little concern to working Americans. They just want political leaders of both parties to protect American workers.

FAIR Occupies “MySpace”

No group of Americans will suffer the consequences of this nation’s failed immigration policies more than our youth. Current immigration policies — both government mandated immigration and the failure to control illegal immigration — make it less likely that future generations of Americans will enjoy the same quality of life that their parents and grandparents did.

FAIR has long recognized the need to reach younger Americans with our message of immigration reform. As everyone knows, technology has changed the way younger people receive and absorb information. To reach the younger generation, FAIR is now on MySpace, the interactive web site that allows users to share information and opinions, www.myspace.com/fairimmigration.

We know that it is important to cultivate and attract younger people to the immigration reform movement and we are working actively to develop outreach efforts aimed at this important demographic group. New technologies provide us with new tools to reach targeted groups, like youth, with messages that are designed to address their unique concerns.

On the Campaign Trail

Unlike 2004, immigration policy will likely feature prominently in the 2008 presidential campaign. Candidates from both parties have been volunteering their views on how to deal with America's immigration problems, and when they have not come forward on their own, voters have demanded to know how they would handle the issue.

FAIR does not endorse or oppose candidates for political office. However, we will bring you news from the campaign trail that will allow you to make an informed decision based on the candidates' views on an issue that is important to you.

The Republicans

Kansas **Senator Sam Brownback**, who supported the McCain-Kennedy bill in 2006, and who a decade earlier as a member of the House spearheaded an effort to kill real reform of our legal immigration policies, appears to be softening his stance on amnesty and guest workers. At a campaign event in Des Moines, Iowa, Brownback was peppered with questions by unhappy voters about his immigration stance. In an effort to change the subject, Brownback finally asked the gathering, "Any other topic people want to talk about?"

Arizona **Senator John McCain**, who is the chief architect of the 2006 guest worker amnesty proposal along with Senator Edward Kennedy, appears to be becoming less intractable in his views about the matter. Much of McCain's sudden flexibility on the issue may stem from his plummeting poll numbers, partially attributable to his identification with an illegal alien amnesty. Speaking to voters in Iowa, McCain noted, "What I've tried to point out is we couldn't pass [the McCain-Kennedy amnesty bill]...So we have to change the legislation so we can pass it."

Former Massachusetts **Governor Mitt Romney** took his attack against an illegal amnesty to Sen. McCain's home turf. Speaking in Arizona, Romney charged that McCain's legislation would create a "virtual amnesty." Romney was less specific about what he would do. He called for a registration of illegal aliens living in the country, "then we could decide how to proceed with each individual." At a later campaign stop in Iowa, Romney did endorse a plan to turn the foreign student visa program into a permanent immigration program, advocating that anyone who attends a U.S. university be given the opportunity to remain permanently.

The Democrats

With most of the leading Democratic candidates keeping their heads low, New Mexico **Governor Bill Richardson** is looking for support from the open borders wing of the party. At a campaign appearance in Austin, Texas, Richardson declared his opposition to the border security fence. "The wall should be torn down," said Richardson, neglecting the obvious fact that it hasn't even been built yet. Instead, Richardson supports economic development in Mexico and Latin America, doubling the manpower of the Border Patrol and investing in technology to detect illegal entry across the border.