



### **New Effort to Pass a “Compromise” Immigration Bill Amounts to Amnesty with a Twist**

As pressure mounts on Congress to “get a deal done” on immigration before the end of the current session, pro-amnesty forces appear to be uniting behind what is being billed as a “compromise” between the House’s enforcement-only approach and the Senate’s amnesty bill.

See Page 3

### **Making News: Immigration Crisis Will Not End Until Mexico Changes**

For decades, Mexico’s ruling elite have viewed the United States as a “safety valve” for their unemployed, underemployed and dissatisfied citizens. In an op-ed published in the Riverside (California) *Press-Enterprise*, FAIR’s media director Ira Mehlman, argues that Mexico must do more to put its own house in order, and cease its meddling in U.S. immigration policy.

See Page 5

### **Three Years, Countless Billions, and Homeland Security Still Can’t Spot a False ID**

While the Bush Administration and some in Congress are pushing for amnesty in exchange for a promise to do a better job of controlling America’s borders, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a scathing report about the Department of Homeland Security’s ability to carry out its current responsibilities.

See Page 7

### **Book Review—*In Mortal Danger***

In the preface to his new book, *In Mortal Danger*, (WND Books, 2006) Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colorado) tells readers that he did not come to Washington to become a gadfly. “I ran for office with the intent of being a team player.” Now completing his fourth term in Congress representing suburban Denver, Rep. Tancredo has built a national reputation for putting matters of principle ahead of blind loyalty, particularly when it comes to immigration policy.

See Page 8

### **FAIR’s Director of Special Projects, Jack Martin, Warns Congress Senate Bill Could Have Dire Consequences for U.S. Workers**

Among the expert witnesses who testified before House committees examining the potential impact of the Senate guest worker amnesty bill, S. 2611, was Jack Martin, Special Projects Director of FAIR. Appearing before the House Education and Workforce Committee on July 19, Martin warned enactment of S. 2611 would result in unprecedented numbers of new foreign workers being admitted to the U.S. labor market in the coming years.

See Page 9

## **Around the Country**

Until recently, state and local governments dealt with community complaints about the impact of illegal immigration with the familiar refrain: “It’s not our responsibility.” With the effects of mass illegal immigration ravaging communities from coast to coast, local governments are deciding they can no longer ignore the problem and wait for the federal government to act. Almost weekly, states, counties and cities get aboard the train of jurisdictions deciding to act locally.

See Page 10

## **From the Hill—*Securing our Borders, Eliminate the Incentives* by Congressman Brian Bilbray**

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives have passed two very different plans to address illegal immigration. Congress has spent a tremendous amount of time and energy trying to find common ground that could result in a compromise bill supported by both the House and Senate. Such a resolution is becoming more and more unlikely as the Senate continues to advocate for their “guest-worker” amnesty programs.

See Page 12

## **House Hearings Expose Real Dangers of Senate Amnesty Bill**

When House Speaker Dennis Hastert first announced a series of hearings about the Senate Amnesty Bill, S. 2611, he described them as an opportunity to hear from the American people. The meetings turned out to be official hearings, so the American people are represented there by credentialed experts, and their testimony is devastating.

See Page 13

## **FAIR: More than a Quarter Million Strong Fighting for the Interests of the American Public**

As the national debate over America’s immigration policy has reached a fever pitch during the last year, FAIR’s role as the voice of ordinary Americans has been heard louder than ever.

See Page 15

## **Colorado Adopts Tough New Measures to Deal with Illegal Immigration**

Faced with growing financial burdens and increased crime resulting from large-scale illegal immigration, Colorado decided not to wait for the federal government to address the issue. In what is emerging as a national trend, local governments are taking steps to discourage illegal immigrants from settling within their jurisdictions.

See Page 16

## Effort to Pass a "Compromise" Immigration Bill Amounts to Amnesty with a Twist

As pressure mounts on Congress to “get a deal done” on immigration before the end of the current session, pro-amnesty forces appear to be uniting behind what is being billed as a “compromise” between the House’s enforcement-only approach and the Senate’s amnesty bill. The so-called compromise has been floating around Congress for months, but was only formally unveiled in late July by Rep. Mike Pence (R-Ind.) and Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Tex.). Upon close inspection, however, the Pence-Hutchison plan turns out to be just another amnesty stretched out over a somewhat longer timeline, and with a few gimmicks built in so that its sponsors can claim it is not an amnesty.

Perhaps the most telling indication that the Pence-Hutchison plan is another attempt at guest worker amnesty, was the reaction from the White House. President Bush’s unpopular support for guest worker amnesty has caused many legislators within his own party to try to distance themselves from the White House. In an effort to sell Pence-Hutchison as a tough enforcement-first proposal, an anonymous White House source told the Washington Post that the plan is one the president “won’t be crazy about, but I think he would sign it.”

A Capitol Hill press conference by Rep. Pence and Sen. Hutchison was preceded by a public relations offensive designed to sell the plan as a compromise. Even before the details of the proposal were put on paper, the plan was being widely talked-up in the media, especially by those who had endorsed the Senate amnesty bill. Like President Bush, the pro-amnesty media portrayed Pence-Hutchison as a huge concession on the part of those who favor the Senate approach, but that it is the best they can hope for at this juncture.

Before illegal aliens can begin to apply for legalization, the Pence-Hutchison plan calls for the president to “certify” that our borders are under control. Once that vague and subjective standard is met, millions of illegal aliens would become eligible to begin a process that would lead them to citizenship.

In reality, the pro-amnesty forces concede very little with Pence-Hutchison. The timeline for current illegal aliens to receive citizenship is drawn out an extra six years under Pence-Hutchison, but ultimately nearly all of the people living in the U.S. illegally would get full amnesty. In addition, no matter how hard backers of S. 2611 tried to finesse the English language, they could not get around the fact that illegal aliens would not have to leave the country under the bill passed by the Senate. Unlike the Senate-passed guest worker amnesty bill (S. 2611), the so-called compromise bill would require all illegal aliens applying for legalization to physically leave the country on a 72-hour pilgrimage to what are being called “Ellis Island Centers.”

Under the Pence-Hutchinson plan “Ellis Island Centers” would be set up outside the United States. Illegal aliens seeking legal status would have to appear in-person at one of these centers, fill out some paperwork, have a background check, and return to the U.S. with a newly created W visa. The plan calls for the entire process — including the background investigation — to occur within three business days.

In substance, the Pence-Hutchison “compromise” differs very little from the unpopular Senate amnesty plan. To avoid having to call an amnesty an amnesty, Pence-Hutchison adds a three-day road trip so all the people who receive legalization will have technically left the country — even if it was only to pass through a revolving door.

The Pence-Hutchison plan also takes care of employers who want access to cheap foreign labor. Under the plan, up to 200,000 new guest workers a year would be available to employers in this country. The Department of Labor would certify that a labor shortage exists when employers claim that they cannot fill

jobs at the “prevailing wage,” triggering the issuance of additional W visas. The program would essentially serve to cap American wages, as employers would never have to increase salaries above some pre-determined prevailing wage.

The issuance of W visas would also be contracted out to private enterprise under Pence-Hutchison. Job placement services, rather than government agencies would be placed in charge of matching foreign workers with American jobs. The companies would be paid for each worker they placed, thereby creating an economic incentive to fill as many American jobs as possible with foreign workers.

Pence-Hutchison is not a tough enforcement bill by any stretch of the imagination. Comprehensive enforcement, as most Americans understand it, means stemming the influx of new illegal aliens and dramatically reducing the number of illegal aliens residing in the country. Pence-Hutchison actually creates an incentive for people to remain in this country illegally, as those living in the U.S. illegally would be first in line for what amounts to an amnesty.

The so-called “compromise” plan would also create a de facto cap on American wages and eliminate the possibility of upward mobility for most workers in this country. Rather than allowing the free market to determine the wages of workers in this country, employers would have easy access to foreign workers who would be willing to work for less.

FAIR, and many members of Congress who staunchly oppose amnesty for illegal aliens will steadfastly oppose this gimmick-ridden amnesty bill. FAIR has already begun a nationwide campaign through the media and activist networks to inform the American public of the true nature of the Pence-Hutchison ‘compromise’. In the final analysis, the plan would allow tens of millions of illegal aliens to gain amnesty, millions more guest workers come into our labor market, in exchange for an ill-defined set of enforcement measures.

# Making News

## Immigration Crisis Will Not End Until Mexico Changes

For decades, Mexico's ruling elite have viewed the United States as a "safety valve" for their unemployed, underemployed and dissatisfied citizens. In an op-ed published in the Riverside (California) *Press-Enterprise*, FAIR's media director Ira Mehlman, argues that Mexico must do more to put its own house in order, and cease its meddling in U.S. immigration policy. The same sense of empowerment that has driven millions of Mexican and other illegal immigrants onto the streets to demand amnesty and other benefits in this country could better be put to use in Mexico in the cause of real reform in that country.

It's no mystery why an estimated 10 percent of Mexico's population is living in the United States and why, according to polls, another 40 million people in that country would settle here if they could.

Mexico is a nation with a long history of political and economic corruption that has concentrated the considerable wealth of that country in the hands of a privileged few, while the vast majority of its citizens have barely enough to survive.

Political and economic reform is badly needed in Mexico, but it's unlikely to occur as long as the United States continues to provide a convenient safety valve for that country's unemployed, underemployed and impoverished masses.

Why should the oligarchy that controls Mexico reform when it has the ability to send millions of its people to the United States, which provides for those people's social needs, while the expatriate workers pump some \$20 billion per year into the Mexican economy in the form of remittances?

The de facto policy as it now exists obviously serves the immediate interests of the illegal migrants themselves and the interests of the ruling elite in Mexico.

The political and economic benefits that Mexico's ruling elite have enjoyed as a result of being able to send millions of people to the United States have led them to assert a co-equal status with our own government in determining U.S. immigration policies.

President Vicente Fox and others in the Mexican government have repeatedly asserted that U.S. immigration policy is a matter for binational negotiations, not a sovereign matter for this country to determine on its own.

To protect its safety valve, the Mexican government, which is largely indifferent to the needs of its people while they are in Mexico, frequently demands that they receive virtually unlimited access to government-provided services and benefits when they reach the United States.

Making sure that any Mexican who wishes to can live, work and collect benefits in the United States is, seemingly, a higher priority to the government in Mexico City than making sure that every Mexican can live, work and have a decent life in Mexico.

The United States cannot affect the kinds of political, economic and social reforms that are needed in Mexico. Those changes must be made by the Mexican people themselves. In the long-term interest of both nations, the United States needs to make it clear to the millions of Mexican illegal immigrants living in this country, and to the millions more who are contemplating coming here, that the safety valve is closing.

We cannot fix what is ailing Mexico by allowing endless migration, while the conditions that drive migration from Mexico remain unchanged.

Our government must implement and enforce policies that persuade as many illegal immigrants as possible to return home.

Rather than a massive amnesty that will overwhelm this country without doing anything to address the "push" factors that drive people out of Mexico, we must secure our borders, crack down on employers who hire illegal immigrants, and cut off nonessential benefits and services to those who are here illegally.

Change in Mexico must come from within, which means that the people who have been the victims of decades of political and economic corruption must recognize that their road to a better future is through a popular movement for reform in Mexico, not through a trek across the border into the United States.

# Three Years, Countless Billions, and Homeland Security Still Can't Spot a False ID

## GAO Investigators Repeatedly Cross Border from Mexico and Canada Using Counterfeit Documents

While the Bush Administration and some in Congress are pushing for amnesty in exchange for a promise to do a better job of controlling America's borders, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) issued a scathing report about the Department of Homeland Security's ability to carry out its current responsibilities. Between February and June of this year, GAO investigators repeatedly entered the U.S. through nine land ports of entry from Mexico and Canada using counterfeit documents. In not a single instance did border security personnel question the authenticity of the identity documents and in many cases, report investigators, border agents did not even ask for ID.

Stating the obvious, the GAO reported, "This vulnerability potentially allows terrorists and others involved in criminal activity to pass freely into the United States from Canada or Mexico with little or no chance of being detected." The early August release of the GAO's findings coincided with a growing conflict in the Middle East that many security experts warn might trigger new terrorist attacks in the U.S.

The latest GAO investigation was a follow-up to a similar one conducted in 2003 and 2004. Rather than showing improvement in their ability to spot bogus identity documents, DHS's performance actually deteriorated. Some 8,000 documents are deemed acceptable as proof of identity to enter the U.S. But even the most commonly used ones — birth certificates and driver's licenses — were not able to be identified by border agents as counterfeit.

Under legislation approved by Congress after 9/11, all people entering the U.S. by land will have to carry a valid passport by 2007. Lobbyists for some business interests have been pressing Congress to delay implementation of this policy. The GAO's latest investigation indicates that this policy must be implemented on schedule so that all people who enter the U.S. identify themselves using machine readable passports.

Reforming our antiquated documentation system is one of the linchpins of our efforts to protect our national security and control illegal immigration. FAIR has long argued for an overhaul of our vital identity documents for these reasons. Neither employers, nor it seems, well-trained border agents, can easily spot false IDs, nor should they. Adopting commonly used technology, vital identity documents like driver's licenses, Social Security cards and passports could be made electronically verifiable in situations where it is necessary to establish someone's identity. The latest GAO report confirms the need to adopt the type of reforms that FAIR has been advocating for years.

## Book Review

### In Mortal Danger

In the preface to his new book, *In Mortal Danger*, (WND Books, 2006) Rep. Tom Tancredo (R-Colorado) tells readers that he did not come to Washington to become a gadfly. “I ran for office with the intent of being a team player.” Now completing his fourth term in Congress representing suburban Denver, Rep. Tancredo has built a national reputation for putting matters of principle ahead of blind loyalty, particularly when it comes to immigration policy. Faced with the choice between compromising the interests of the nation or compromise his standing in the Republican Party, Rep. Tancredo has gladly chosen the latter.

In *In Mortal Danger* Rep. Tancredo looks at the many ways America’s misguided immigration policies are jeopardizing our national security, national cohesion and our nation’s future as a society built on the foundation of a solid middle class. In an era when other politicians are constrained by political correctness, Rep. Tancredo burnishes his image as a straight shooter by citing the failures of both parties, the greed of American business, and the opportunism of many of today’s immigrants — especially those who have come to this country illegally.

“Too many new immigrants continue to be loyal to their native countries. They desire to maintain their own language, customs, and culture; yet they seek to exploit the success of America while giving back as little as possible in return,” Rep. Tancredo writes. These attitudes on the part of the immigrants is reinforced by a society that asks few sacrifices from those who come here and an education system that not only fails to imbue newcomers with a sense of American identity, but in many cases teaches them a sense of being victims of their adopted land.

The consequences of broken immigration policies and a failure to assimilate immigrants into the cultural and linguistic mainstream are potentially catastrophic in Rep. Tancredo’s opinion. “As long as we continue to have porous borders, the problems associated with mass immigration — threat of terrorist infiltration, loss of American jobs and wage depreciation, urban sprawl and congestion, increased spending for social services and welfare benefits, soaring health care costs, rising costs for incarceration, increased education costs with a resultant decrease in education quality will continue to get much worse and more expensive for the American citizen taxpayer.”

Both parties are to blame for this mess, argues Rep. Tancredo. He accuses both the Republican and Democratic establishment of conspiring to institute immigration policies for their own short-term political gain that directly harm ordinary Americans.

Having burned his bridges long ago with the Bush White House (he is the administration’s least popular Republican and has been declared persona non grata at the White House), Rep. Tancredo accuses the president of being less than honest with the American public in his pursuit of his immigration agenda. “No matter how many ways [President Bush] wants to phrase it, no matter how many times he says he is against amnesty, the truth is, his plan is an amnesty plan.”

Rather than just an indictment of the status quo and the people responsible for it, Rep. Tancredo offers a detailed set of proposals for controlling illegal immigration and revamping our legal immigration system. These proposals, though hardly new, constitute a breath of fresh air in Washington, where special interests and special pleading too often trump common sense.

## **FAIR's Director of Special Projects, Jack Martin, Warns Congress Senate Bill Could Have Dire Consequences for U.S. Workers**

Among the expert witnesses who testified before House committees examining the potential impact of the Senate guest worker amnesty bill, S. 2611, was Jack Martin, Special Projects Director of FAIR. Appearing before the House Education and Workforce Committee on July 19, Martin warned enactment of S. 2611 would result in unprecedented numbers of new foreign workers being admitted to the U.S. labor market in the coming years. The result, he predicted, would be further erosion of wages and working conditions for U.S. workers.

Martin noted the admission of foreign nationals eligible to work in the U.S. is already running at record levels. In fiscal year 2004, there were some 1.3 million entries of people eligible to work in this country — about two-and-a-half times the number admitted in 1995. The rapid increase of the past decade, however, would pale in comparison to the increases that would result from enactment of S. 2611. Moreover, these dramatic increases would affect every sector of the U.S. labor market.

In his testimony Martin pointed out that S. 2611 would result in the immediate increase of 200,000 unskilled workers every year. These workers, plus their families, would be eligible to remain in the U.S. for up to six years and, in most cases would eventually become permanent residents. Caps on the admission of skilled workers would also increase immediately by 50,000 a year, but in reality the numbers would be significantly higher. The caps on skilled worker admissions could increase by 20 percent annually — meaning that the numbers could double in less than four years, and increase tenfold within 13 years. S. 2611 also includes a provision that exempts workers with at least a college degree from caps on admissions.

Other loopholes for foreign nationals who have been educated at American universities and from our NAFTA partners would drive the numbers of foreign workers entering the U.S. labor market even higher. Cumulatively, the changes to our immigration laws proposed in S. 2611 could result in an additional 2.8 million legal foreign workers in the U.S. within just six years of enactment.

Martin reaffirmed FAIR's long-standing position that the United States, with a population about to reach 300 million, has an ample supply of workers available within our borders. He urged members of the House to reject a still greater infusion of foreign labor and allow natural labor market forces to set competitive wages and opportunities for training and advancement by American workers. The full text of Martin's testimony can be found at [www.fairus.org](http://www.fairus.org).

Martin's testimony is the second time within a month Congress sought FAIR's input. In June, FAIR's president, Dan Stein, was called upon by the House Administration Committee to testify about the potential for voter fraud by illegal aliens. The recent testimony from Stein and Martin continues a long record of FAIR providing expertise to Congress as it considers critical immigration-related matters, and indicates the strong record that FAIR has established as a recognized voice on behalf of ordinary Americans.

## Around the Country

Until recently, state and local governments dealt with community complaints about the impact of illegal immigration with the familiar refrain: "It's not our responsibility." With the effects of mass illegal immigration ravaging communities from coast to coast, local governments are deciding they can no longer ignore the problem and wait for the federal government to act. Almost weekly, states, counties and cities get aboard the train of jurisdictions deciding to act locally.

### Ohio

In a state that has come to epitomize the political "swing state," Sheriff Richard K. Jones made it clear that illegal aliens are not welcome in Butler County, Ohio. Sheriff Jones sent deputies to work sites to detain suspected illegal aliens and told federal authorities if they want to know where to look for illegal aliens, "I've got some right here in my jail." He has also sent a clear message to local employers, setting up a blog promoting a boycott of businesses that hire illegal aliens. Just in case there are still folks in Butler County who haven't gotten Sheriff Jones' message, there are six billboards around the county that read simply: "Hire an illegal alien break the law!" Increasingly, local officials, like Sheriff Jones, are deciding they are not going to wait for the federal government to do something about illegal immigration and are taking action to make sure their communities are not overrun by mass illegal immigration. The Ohio legislature is expected to consider statewide legislation to crack down on businesses that employ illegal aliens.

### Florida

In another key political battleground state, the town of Palm Bay, Florida, instituted tough new measures to fine employers who hire illegal aliens. By a 4 to 1 vote on August 3, the city council decided they had had enough of illegal aliens loitering on street corners waiting to be hired by a local business or resident seeking an illegal day laborer. When threatened with a law suit by illegal alien advocacy groups, Councilman Ed Geier was defiant, "Go ahead, sue us. You know why? When we win it will become binding throughout the U.S. This will be a model." In addition to Palm Bay, FAIR and local activist groups have been working to institute local enforcement policies in other Florida communities. Director of FAIR's Immigration Reform Law Institute, Michael Hethmon is currently pursuing a precedent-setting case involving an illegal alien day labor center in Jupiter.

### New York

Controversy about the impact of day laborers first erupted in New York in the Long Island town of Farmingville in Suffolk County. Farmingville was one of the first communities in the country where FAIR actively helped local residents organize to fight the proliferation of illegal aliens and day laborers in their town. The county's executive, Steve Levy (D), has responded to growing community outrage over mass illegal immigration by having police and other agencies strictly enforce housing codes and other measures designed to curtail the ability of illegal aliens to live in the county. Under a law being proposed by Levy, all companies doing business with the county would be required to prove their employees are legal U.S. residents. "It's just unfair that one set of employers gets a leg up on those who try to play by the rules," Levy said.

## **Arizona**

Phoenix businessman Randy Pullen, one of the leaders of the Proposition 200 effort that was approved by Arizona voters in 2004 has collected enough signatures to put an immigration enforcement measure on the ballot in Phoenix this November. The local ballot initiative would ask Phoenix voters to approve greater cooperation between local law enforcement and federal immigration authorities. If approved, all local government personnel, including police, will be required to cooperate and share information with federal immigration authorities. It would also require the Phoenix Police Department to designate officers to be trained in identifying, apprehending and detaining suspected illegal aliens.

## **North Carolina**

Concerned because their state's lax driver's license standards were a magnet for illegal aliens from all over the country, the North Carolina legislature took steps in late July to tighten requirements for obtaining one. Under a "technical corrections" bill approved by the North Carolina General Assembly, all license applicants must provide a valid Social Security number. Phil Berger, the Republican minority leader of the State Senate, called the measure "an important improvement," but noted that the state has already placed thousands of valid licenses in the hands of people who are in the country illegally. Ending the issuance of driver's licenses to illegal aliens is an important victory for an active and growing immigration reform network in North Carolina. FAIR congratulates groups like NC LISTEN ([www.NCListen.com](http://www.NCListen.com)) which worked hard to achieve this important victory for immigration reform.

# From the Hill

## Securing Our Borders, Eliminate the Incentives

by Rep. Brian Bilbray

The United States Senate and the House of Representatives have passed two very different plans to address illegal immigration. Congress has spent a tremendous amount of time and energy trying to find common ground that could result in a compromise bill supported by both the House and Senate. Such a resolution is becoming more and more unlikely as the Senate continues to advocate for their “guest-worker” amnesty programs.

Our goal in Congress is not to obstruct illegal immigration legislation, but rather focus on initiatives that will secure our borders, add resources to the Border Patrol, increase interior enforcement and enforce the law on employers who knowingly hire illegal immigrants. You simply cannot reward the behavior of illegal immigrants with jobs or citizenship.

The truth is the Reid-Kennedy Senate bill does more to invite illegal immigration than prevent it. The Senate’s proposal guarantees Social Security benefits to illegal immigrants retroactive to the time they were in the country illegally. It allows illegal immigrants to pay in-state tuition at state colleges and universities. It also fails to adequately address employers who hire illegal immigrants.

Another reality is that we are not equipped to handle the fallout produced from the Senate’s amnesty plan. Our border resources are already stretched too thin as illegal immigrants are consistently caught and released on a daily basis. Just imagine the influx of illegal immigrants we can expect if amnesty provisions are adopted. The effect such a policy would have on our public safety would be significant.

Consider that on a typical day, the men and women of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection process more than one million passengers and pedestrians and nearly 70,000 truck, rail, and sea containers. They seize more than 5,000 pounds of narcotics, intercept 206 fraudulent documents, safeguard more than 100,000 miles of border and shoreline, and manage 317 ports of entry with only 11,300 Border Patrol agents.

Their already difficult job will not be made any easier if we reward more than 12 million illegal immigrants with citizenship. Congress has supported a similar remedy before with disastrous results. In 1986, the Simpson-Mazzoli Immigration Reform Control Act granted amnesty to more than 3 million illegal immigrants. A decade later, the illegal immigration rate in the United States had tripled and has resulted in the problems we have today.

The solution to illegal immigration is not amnesty. It is not so-called earned citizenship proposals supported by the Senate or an amnesty proposal dressed-up as a “guest-worker” program. Rewarding illegal behavior is unacceptable. Creating incentives for illegal activity is intolerable. If the past has taught us anything, it’s that amnesty is not an option. If voters have told us anything, it’s that they want secure borders and do not want citizenship sold to illegal immigrants.

At the end of the day, there are two choices we can make. One choice leads to amnesty and the re-living of past mistakes. The other will eliminate illegal immigration incentives; strengthen border security and use 21st century technology to create a tamper-proof Social Security card so that employers have the tools they need to verify worker eligibility. The growing illegal immigration problem demands a new approach. We must enforce our existing laws, strengthen document security, secure our borders and finally, punish employers who hire illegal immigrants.

# House Hearings Expose Real Dangers of Senate Amnesty Bill

## Experts Label S. 2611 "Irresponsible at Best"

When House Speaker Dennis Hastert first announced a series of hearings about the Senate Amnesty Bill, S. 2611, he described them as an opportunity to hear from the American people. The meetings turned out to be official hearings, so the American people are represented there by credentialed experts, and their testimony is devastating.

The formal hearings also bring to light the potentially disastrous consequences of S. 2611 that the Senate chose to ignore as it moved ahead with a massive guest worker amnesty. Independent experts who have examined the Senate bill closely testified that it would be an economic, social and national security disaster.

At a hearing in Washington, D.C., on July 27 before the Subcommittee on Immigration, Claims and Border Security, Michael Maxwell, the former director of the Office of Security and Investigations for the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS), described the Senate bill as a "national security nightmare." "Asking USCIS to implement a proposal as sweeping as S. 2611 without first addressing the existing national security vulnerabilities in our immigration system would be irresponsible, at best, and could actually facilitate ongoing criminal enterprises," Maxwell told the committee.

Maxwell argued that the USCIS could not carry out an amnesty program that could include 10 to 20 million people in the time frame prescribed in S. 2611. "I would go one step further and suggest that USCIS could never implement S. 2611 without fully compromising national security. The entire underlying immigration system is simply too flawed," Maxwell stated.

Maxwell went on to describe a litany of other problems that currently exist within the immigration bureau ranging from mismanagement, incompetence to outright fraud. Even without a massive amnesty to administer, Maxwell contends that the current state of affairs within USCIS poses a glaring threat to our national security.

A week later, at a field hearing in San Diego, the committee heard testimony from Robert Rector, a senior research fellow at the Heritage Foundation, who described S. 2611 as a fiscal and social nightmare. S. 2611, Rector testified, "would prove the largest expansion of government welfare in 35 years. The overall governmental costs of the amnesty provisions alone...are likely to reach \$50 billion per year."

The welfare burdens would only be the tip of the iceberg, Rector went on to tell the House members. S. 2611 "would more than double the future rate of legal immigration" and would result in the admission of more than 60 million new immigrants in the next 20 years. "Much of this massive flow of new immigrants would be low-skilled, imposing large net costs on U.S. taxpayers."

Rector rebutted contentions of illegal alien amnesty advocates that legalizing millions of people would be fiscally sound. By his estimates, the average amnestied alien would pay an additional \$3,000 a year in taxes, but these additional contributions would be more than offset by their eligibility for federal programs. "[F]ederal benefits and social services would increase \$8000," Rector said. Because the majority of current illegal aliens lack education and job skills, there would be little chance of them becoming financially independent. Worse, trends among second and third generation Latino immigrants, indicate that our current immigration policies are creating a large and intractable poverty class in the U.S.

The testimonies of Maxwell and Rector provide compelling arguments for the types of legal immigration reforms that FAIR continues to promote. Recognizing that family chain migration created by our legal

immigration policies are leading to unmanageable numbers and a mismatch between the skills of immigrants and the needs of the country, FAIR advocates a moratorium on new immigration applications under the current failed system. While much of the focus has been on illegal immigration, FAIR is continuing to work for an overhaul of our legal immigration process.

While the public has not been afforded the opportunity to testify before formal congressional hearings around the country, immigration reform activists have responded to notifications from FAIR and packed the hearing rooms. Often by ratios of better than ten-to-one, immigration enforcement advocates have outnumbered amnesty supporters at the field hearings. The lopsided support for immigration enforcement is expressed through signs, tee-shirts, and media interviews.

While the voice of the common American citizen is not being put into Congressional record, individual members of Congress are getting an earful from constituents during the August recess. FAIR's Field Directors, working closely with activists all across the country, are continuing to organize mass visits to members of Congress's district offices while they are home for the summer. Just because they are on vacation, doesn't mean Americans have to give them any rest.

## **FAIR: More Than a Quarter Million Strong Fighting for the Interests of the American Public**

As the national debate over America's immigration policy has reached a fever pitch during the last year, FAIR's role as the voice of ordinary Americans has been heard louder than ever. With the Bush Administration and many in Congress trying to force a massive guest worker amnesty program on an unwilling public, FAIR — we are proud to say — is receiving an enormous vote of confidence from people all across the country. As of July, FAIR's members and supporters now number 253,000 people and our ranks are growing every day.

To all of our members and supporters around the country we say, "Thank you!" We know we must earn your trust and support every day, and we endeavor to do exactly that. FAIR is dedicated to fighting for the interests of the American people in Washington, DC and around the country. Last year we reaffirmed our mission by publishing *Seven Principles of True Comprehensive Reform*. Those are the principles that guide us as we work for true comprehensive immigration reform on Capitol Hill, at the state and local level, and through the media.

We still have a long way to go to achieve the kind of meaningful immigration reform that serves our national interest and the overwhelming majority of Americans support. Our adversaries are well organized and well financed. As our membership and our resources grow, we have an unprecedented opportunity to stand toe-to-toe with them.

Today 253,000; tomorrow, who knows?

## Colorado Adopts Tough New Measures to Deal With Illegal Immigration

Faced with growing financial burdens and increased crime resulting from large-scale illegal immigration, Colorado decided not to wait for the federal government to address the issue. In what is emerging as a national trend, local governments are taking steps to discourage illegal immigrants from settling within their jurisdictions.

Two years ago, voters in Arizona attempted to shield themselves from the impact of the federal government's failure to control illegal immigration by approving Proposition 200 — a ballot measure that restricted illegal aliens' access to most government services and benefits. (Though passed by the voters, the governor and attorney general are refusing to fully implement the measure. Their actions are being challenged in court by FAIR's Immigration Reform Law Institute and other immigration reform activists.) Earlier this year, the Georgia legislature approved a similar set of restrictions that were endorsed and signed by Gov. Sonny Perdue.

The Colorado measure, House Bill 1023, makes illegal aliens ineligible for most state benefits and services and holds businesses in the state responsible for verifying the legal status of the people they employ. The bill enjoyed bipartisan support, having been introduced by the Democratic Speaker of the House Andrew Romanoff and enthusiastically signed by Republican Governor Bill Owens. At a July 31 signing ceremony, Gov. Owens declared, "In a remarkably short period of time, Colorado has moved into the forefront of immigration reform."

Under the new Colorado policy, people who apply for a state benefit would have to sign an affidavit declaring that they are legal residents and produce documentation to back it up. State social services departments would then be required to verify this information using the federal Systematic Alien Verification for Entitlements (SAVE) data base.