



AMERICA LAST:

How the Biden Mass-Amnesty is
Worse than Every Other Amnesty
Attempt in U.S. History

America Last: How the Biden Mass-Amnesty is Worse than Every Other Amnesty Attempt in U.S. History

By Spencer Raley, Madison McQueen, and Jason Pena | February 18, 2021

Amnesty is a legislative act or categorical pardon that applies to a group of people who have violated a certain law and removes all associated penalties. Amnesty differs from a pardon in that it essentially forgets the crime ever happened, whereas a pardon acknowledges that a criminal act took place but forgives the transgression.

The penalties for illegally entering the United States or overstaying a visa are removal from the country and a three or ten-year bar from applying to reenter, depending on how long an illegal alien has resided in the United States. Immigration amnesty occurs when an individual who is subject to deportation is spared from removal, and the three or ten-year bar from re-entry into the U.S. is waived. It can also include full lawful status, citizenship, and/or access to welfare programs.

While there has only been one official amnesty in the history of the United States, there is nearly continual talk of implementing another. These discussions heated up significantly when then-presidential candidate Joe Biden, promised to offer amnesty to more than 14 million illegal aliens should he be elected.¹ The impacts of such an amnesty would be staggering. Listed below are the details of President Biden's proposed amnesty, and how they would place the interests of illegal aliens ahead of American citizens:

The Proposed Biden Amnesty

1. Amnesty would allow for as many as 14.5 million illegal aliens to openly compete for jobs in a sluggish economy.

According to his official platform, President Biden will create "a roadmap to citizenship for nearly 11 million undocumented immigrants." Of course, there are actually more than 14 million illegal aliens in the United States, not 11 million as his administration inaccurately states, so this amnesty will be even bigger than suggested.² The impact of such an amnesty on the economy would be devastating.

The official unemployment rate in the United States as of the end of 2020 was 6.7 percent, meaning more than 12.5 million people were without work.³ That figure alone is an unacceptably high number, but the situation is even worse. The U-6 unemployment rate, which includes those who have given up looking for work or are only working part-time for economic reasons, is 11.7 percent.⁴ Allowing millions of illegal aliens to compete in the job market will make the recovery from the coronavirus pandemic even more sluggish and leave millions of Americans without work who might have otherwise found gainful employment.

2. It would drastically increase the number of immigrants entering the United States in coming years.

Immigration into the United States is already at historically high levels, with more than a million people gaining permanent residency status every year.⁵ However, an amnesty would trigger a massive wave of future immigration as these former illegal aliens would suddenly be able to sponsor their family members to enter the United States. Those migrants could then sponsor their family members, and so on, forming a “chain” of immigration that grows exponentially.

According to the federal government, each immigrant to the United States sponsors an average of 3.45 additional family members for green cards.⁶ There are nearly 13 million adult illegal aliens currently in the country. So, if each of these adults were given lawful status and sponsored green cards for three or four additional family members, that would result in more than 43 million new immigrants eventually entering the country. This would effectively double the number of foreign-born individuals living in the United States. Over time, that number would continue to grow even higher.

3. It would trigger additional illegal immigration.

The promise of amnesty triggers massive waves of illegal immigration, as is evidenced by the massive caravans that formed immediately after President Biden’s election.⁷ These migrants are hoping to take advantage of the promise of amnesty, however history tells us that these caravans will keep coming even if an amnesty is implemented.

After President Ronald Reagan instituted an amnesty for many illegal aliens in 1986, there were approximately 3 million illegal aliens residing in the country by 1990. In the 10 years after this amnesty took effect, that number nearly tripled to just under 9 million illegal aliens.

Prospective illegal aliens know that amnesty is never just an “one-time offer.” So any time an administration shows favor to those who break our immigration laws, millions more will try and illegally enter the country in hopes of benefiting from this favoritism.

4. The costs would be astronomical.

Illegal aliens already cost Americans \$5.85 billion federally and \$2.9 billion at the state level each year in welfare costs alone.⁸ Illegal aliens are already able to legally receive welfare benefits in many states, and tens of thousands more utilize methods of fraud to receive federal welfare benefits.⁹ If an amnesty is passed, millions of illegal aliens would immediately qualify for federal welfare programs.

The average illegal alien household earns \$36,000 per year – far less than what the average household headed by a citizen or lawful migrant earns. This means that most illegal aliens would qualify for state and federal welfare programs if an amnesty is implemented.¹⁰

“The average illegal alien household only earns \$36,000 per year... This means that most illegal aliens would qualify for state and federal welfare programs.”

In 2007, the Heritage Foundation estimated that an amnesty would carry a lifetime cost of \$2.6 trillion.¹¹ There are now approximately 3 million more illegal aliens in the United States than there were in 2007, so the price tag of amnesty has only gone up. Such

a cost could cripple the United States economy during a time when tax revenue is down, and costs are up due to the effects of the Coronavirus.

5. It risks launching a new wave of COVID-19 in the United States.

After his election, Joe Biden’s promise of amnesty resulted in a drastic increase of illegal aliens attempting to enter the United States. According to *NBC News*, thousands of prospective illegal aliens in a caravan bound for the United States recently “pushed past Guatemalan authorities and entered Guatemala without showing documentation or negative COVID screenings.”¹² Currently, Central America is one of the worst Coronavirus hotspots in the world.¹³ This is largely due to subpar healthcare, a lack of appropriate testing, and few mitigation efforts being enforced by government officials.

The United States is still struggling to recover from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, and infection rates are just now beginning to decline from record rates.¹⁴

Despite coming from COVID-19 hotspots, essentially none of the migrants flocking to the United States are vaccinated against the Coronavirus, and few in the tightly packed migrant caravans wear masks. These prospective illegal aliens pose a significant health hazard to the United States during a time when the country appears to finally be turning a corner.

6. History tells us the true impacts of mass-amnesty.

Despite these alarming red flags, sometimes history is the best teacher. Over the past 30-plus years, there have been multiple programs instituted that acted as de facto forms of amnesty, even though many were not initially designed as such. What follows are details on each of these programs, and how each one-sided deal has advanced the interests of illegal aliens while placing Americans last.

The Reagan Amnesty

In 1984, President Ronald Reagan said, “I believe in the idea of amnesty for those who have put down roots and who have lived here even though some time back they may have entered illegally.”¹⁵ This led to the passage of the Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA), also known as the “Reagan Amnesty,” two years later.¹⁶

The law was initially sold as a crackdown on illegal immigration, promising tighter security at the southern border and strict penalties for employers who hired illegal aliens. It also included mass amnesty for any illegal immigrant who entered the country before 1982, resulting in nearly 3 million individuals being granted lawful status.

Additionally, those illegal aliens who could prove that they had been residing in the U.S. for a consecutive five years also received residency status, which could then be upgraded to permanent residency after 18 months, and citizenship after another five years. This path to citizenship was not automatic and supposedly contained several conditions: immigrants had to pay application fees, learn to speak English, understand American civics, pass a medical exam, and register for Military Selective Service. Illegal aliens with felony convictions or three or more misdemeanors were ineligible for amnesty. Unfortunately, there was little enforcement that ensured amnesty recipients fulfilled these commitments.

While this “deal” sounded like a good trade-off on the surface, it contained numerous flaws that ultimately made it one of the biggest immigration disasters ever signed into law. Some of those issues are as follows:

1. Congress reneged on their promise to increase border security and crack down on the hiring of illegal aliens.

The Reagan Amnesty required that strict penalties be enforced for anyone who hired illegal aliens. It also required that certain new border security efforts be put into place. However, once the amnesty was enacted, Congress refused to implement these changes. At the time, members of Congress like Sen. Chuck Schumer (D-NY) and the late Sen. John McCain (R-AZ) prevented any real action to combat illegal immigration or the unauthorized hiring of illegal aliens by employers. Political advocacy groups worked diligently to undermine the enforcement of immigration laws.

2. The one-sided deal led to massive amounts of new illegal immigration.

Following the six-month slowdown that occurred after the legislation passed, illegal immigration returned to normal levels, and then quickly climbed to record highs. In fact, in the decade after the amnesty was passed, the estimated illegal alien population in the United States skyrocketed to over 8 million and has since increased to approximately 14.5 million.¹⁷

“Amnesty decays the effectiveness of our immigration system and stimulates contempt for the law on all sides.”

Amnesty decays the effectiveness of our immigration system and stimulates contempt for the law on all sides. Amnestied illegal aliens are not required to go to the back of the line but are granted immediate legalized status. Meanwhile, law-abiding applicants understandably feel that it is unfair that they still must wait in their home countries for years to get permission to come to the United States.

3. It made our mass-immigration problem worse.

Thanks in large part to IRCA, the immigration total for the 1981-1990 decade increased by nearly 3 million compared to the previous decade. Since 1990, annual immigration rates have doubled with more than 1 million immigrants being granted lawful permanent resident status each year.¹⁸ Family chain migration plays a large role in this. As previously mentioned, once former illegal aliens gain lawful status, they can then sponsor their family members to enter the United States. Those migrants can then sponsor their family members, and so on.

4. It attracted substantial fraud.

President Reagan’s former Attorney General, Edwin Meese II recalls widespread document fraud in the wake of IRCA.¹⁹ The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) estimates that one quarter of the applications were fraudulent.²⁰

5. It endangered national security and enabled terror attacks.

The 1986 amnesty helped enable terrorism in the United States. One of the leaders in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing, Mahmud Abouhalima, was legalized through IRCA by falsely claiming he was a seasonal agricultural worker.²¹ Once receiving amnesty, Abouhalima was able to legally travel outside of the U.S. where he received terrorist training in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Another member of the attack, Mohammed Salameh, applied for amnesty and was denied. However, because Congress reneged on their promise to strengthen removal efforts, he remained in the U.S. and took part in the attack. There is little reason to believe that terrorists wouldn't again take advantage of an amnesty to embed themselves into American society.

“There is little reason to believe that terrorists wouldn't again take advantage of an amnesty to embed themselves into American society”.

6. The cost to taxpayers was astronomical.

Between 1986 and 1997, the cost incurred to grant this amnesty amounted to \$156.7 billion.²² This included the administrative cost of offering legal status and citizenship, as well as welfare assistance programs and services at the federal, state, and local levels. Since illegal aliens incur far more costs than they contribute in taxes, the bulk of this cost was borne by U.S. citizens and those migrants who entered the United States lawfully.

7. It took jobs away from American citizens.

Initially, the 1.66 million legalized workers, 70 percent of them unskilled, displaced an average of 187,000 citizens and settled immigrant workers each year. The cost of public assistance to those displaced workers accumulated to \$9.9 billion between 1996-1997.²³ In essence, legalizing millions of illegal aliens forced hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work and onto our federal and state welfare rolls.

The Reagan Amnesty offers us a clear view of what we can expect if the Biden administration follows through with their threat to the livelihoods of law-abiding American citizens. We can expect potentially millions of jobs held by citizens to be placed at risk during a time when so many are already without gainful employment. We can also anticipate massive waves of new legal and illegal immigration to immediately follow. Finally, it should be expected that the enemies of our country will attempt to use this enticing offer to enter the United States and embed themselves into our society.

The Gang of Eight Failure

The Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 – also known as the “Gang of Eight” bill – was a failed attempt to offer amnesty to potentially millions of illegal aliens, among other measures.²⁴ This so called “Gang of Eight” referred to the four Democrats and four Republicans who originally authored the first draft of the bill. Despite passing the Senate by a vote of 68-32, it was never taken up by the Republican-led House of Representatives and died at the end of the 113th Congress.

This bill was heavily favored toward the wish-list of open-borders proponents. Below is a partial list of the what it included for mass-immigration advocates and what it included for those who prioritize enforcing our immigration laws:

WHAT IT INCLUDED FOR MASS-IMMIGRATION ADVOCATES:

1. A pathway to citizenship for most illegal aliens.
2. A corresponding drastic increase in legal immigration targeted at importing those who are typically most likely to enter the United States in an unlawful manner.

WHAT IS (ALLEGEDLY) INCLUDED FOR IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT ADVOCATES:

1. Much like the aforementioned Reagan Amnesty, this deal was supposed to ensure that employers no longer hire illegal aliens by making the usage of E-Verify mandatory.
2. Improvements in border security, including the hiring of 40,000 new Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents.
3. New visa tracking methods designed to ensure that temporary immigrants and visitors left the United States prior to the expiration of their visas.

“President Biden’s proposed Amnesty is considerably more radical than the Gang of Eight and offers not even a promise of enhanced border security or the implementation of mandatory E-Verify.”

immigration enforcement measures would actually take effect. Rather, it simply relied on a promise made by the bill authors.

Despite the promise of a trade-off, conventional wisdom would suggest that these immigration enforcement measures would never take effect. Once again, consider the Reagan-era amnesty. In that deal, the open-border advocates who helped create the “deal” promised to implement certain immigration enforcement efforts, but completely reneged on those promises as soon as the amnesty took effect. Comparably, the Gang of Eight deal also included no real framework to ensure that the agreed-upon

Additionally, this amnesty would have crippled the U.S. economy. According to the previously cited Heritage Foundation report, the lifetime fiscal deficit of an amnesty like the Gang of Eight would have amounted to an estimated \$2.6 trillion.²⁵ In short, this amnesty would have greatly harmed the American economy, and do nothing for American citizens in return.

President Biden's proposed Amnesty is considerably more radical than the Gang of Eight and offers not even a promise of enhanced border security or the implementation of mandatory E-Verify. His proposal would be even more devastating to the United States.

The Recurring DREAM Act Proposal

In 2001, U.S. Senators Dick Durbin (D-IL.) and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) proposed the Development, Relief and Education of Alien Minors (DREAM) Act.²⁶ This legislation aimed to provide a pathway to legal status and eventually citizenship for illegal aliens who were brought to the United States by their parents as minors.

While this bill, and other iterations of it, have failed to become law, it continues to be proposed on a regular basis. And, while states cannot offer legal status to illegal aliens, this has not stopped a number of them from passing modified versions of the bill that offer access to welfare programs and in-state tuition.

The DREAM Act prioritizes the needs of illegal aliens and their children over the needs of citizens, especially college-aged Americans. Additionally, it is extremely unfair to those lawful migrants who entered the United States the correct way but are still required to pay out-of-state tuition rates and may not qualify for all welfare programs.

Take the state of Texas, for example. Between the years of 2000 and 2015, the average cost of tuition grew by more than 350 percent while state-issued education grant amounts only grew by about 210 percent. This led to education grants only covering about 50 percent of tuition and fees in 2015, when they covered nearly 90 percent in the year 2000.²⁷ One of the primary reasons for this growing disparity is that the state of Texas passed their own version of the DREAM Act in 2001, which offered in-state tuition to illegal aliens and their children, as well as access to some educational grant programs. Between the year 2000 and 2003, the number of new education grant applications in the state skyrocketed by more than 10,000 new applications per year. Prior to 2001, the rate increased by less than 1,000 new applicants per year.²⁸ Thanks to the DREAM Act, Texas college students now receive far less vital aid than was available to them previously.

Other states have faced similar experiences after passing comparable versions of the DREAM Act, and there is no reason to expect any better results should such legislation be passed at the federal level or included in an amnesty package.

The DACA “Amnesty”

In June 2012, President Obama created the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program by executive action.²⁹ The intent of DACA was originally to provide certain illegal aliens who arrived in the country before the age of 16 temporary, renewable protection from deportation. The program also offers the chance to apply for a two-year renewable deferral and a temporary work permit.

In order to qualify for DACA, an illegal alien must meet the following qualifications:³⁰

- Under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012.
- Entered the United States prior to their 16th birthday.
- At least 15 years old.
- Continuously resided in the United States since June 15, 2007, up to the present time.
- No previous felony convictions, significant misdemeanors, three or more other misdemeanors, and must not pose a threat to national security or public safety.
- If the recipient is an adult, they must have obtained, at a minimum, the equivalent of a high school diploma or have honorably served in the U.S. armed forces. This requirement was nearly always waived by the Obama administration.

The DACA program at its inception was largely unpopular with the American people, and by President Obama’s own admission, illegally enacted.³¹ In September 2017, former Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the federal government planned to phase out the program over a period of two years.³² Since then, constant litigation has kept the program alive for the time being.

DACA is not an actual amnesty in the strict definition of the word as it does not confer legal status. However, it is commonly regarded as a form of amnesty since it provides certain illegal aliens with protection from deportation, and activist judges have blocked the federal government from phasing out the program. Furthermore, in 2017, some open borders advocates in Congress proposed an amnesty specifically for the beneficiaries of the DACA program.³³ This proposal never came to fruition.

More recently, then president-elect Joe Biden promised to offer DACA recipients lawful status and a quick path to citizenship as a part of his proposed mass-amnesty.³⁴ These efforts serve as evidence that open borders advocates see DACA as a permanent offer to illegal aliens instead of a temporary deferral of deportation as it was originally intended.

Below are the primary problems with the DACA program:

1. DACA is unconstitutional.

President Obama essentially rewrote immigration law without congressional consent. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution grants Congress exclusive control over creating our nation's immigration laws.³⁵ The President can only create immigration policies in areas specifically designated to the Executive branch by Congress.

Ironically, one year before President Obama instituted DACA he acknowledged that the idea was unconstitutional. *“With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through executive order, that's just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has passed. ... for me to simply, through executive order, ignore those congressional mandates would not conform with my appropriate role as President.”*³⁶

2. The overwhelming majority of DACA recipients are in their 20s and 30s.

DACA beneficiaries are often referred to as “children” in order to paint them in a more sympathetic light. Illegal aliens are eligible for DACA if they were under the age of 31 as of June 15, 2012. The ages of DACA recipients range from 15-36, and the average DACA recipient is 23 years old.³⁷ As of 2017, 64 percent of DACA applicants were past high school age.³⁸ Furthermore, many recipients weren't “brought” to the United States by anyone. Rather, they entered the country by themselves as older teenagers. Clearly DACA is not simply about protecting children, as the vast majority of recipients are actually full-grown adults.

3. Less than half of DACA recipients have a high school education, and many don't speak English at all.

Pro-DACA amnesty groups also depict DACA beneficiaries as a group more accomplished than they really are. Despite being a requirement for the program, only 49 percent of DACA beneficiaries have a high school education. This is largely due to the fact that the Obama administration routinely waived the education requirement of the program. Furthermore, an investigation by CIS revealed that approximately 24 percent of the DACA eligible population can be categorized as functionally illiterate in English, and 46 percent have only basic English skills.³⁹

4. The costs of DACA applications are footed by legal immigrants.

Since 2015, the cost of adjudicating DACA applications totaled \$316.5 million.⁴⁰ DACA applicants are only required to pay for fingerprints and work permits, which subsequently lead to legal immigrants covering the

“Since 2015, the cost of adjudicating DACA applications totaled \$316.5 million.”

additional fees when paying for their own applications.⁴¹ Another consequence of DACA is that it leads to legal immigrants waiting longer for their applications to be adjudicated due to the prioritization of DACA recipients.

5. Many DACA recipients are criminals.

United States Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) released a report in November 2019 which provided an update on the arrests and convictions of DACA applicants.⁴² Of the 756,166 aliens who were approved for DACA, 79,398 (10.4 percent) had at least one prior arrest. Of that total, 15,903 were arrested again at some point after their DACA applications were approved. Some of the charges included DUI, theft, assault, burglary, sexual assault, and even murder.

Clearly, a criminal element exists within a sizable proportion of the DACA community that has not only victimized innocent Americans and lawful migrants, but also costs taxpayers large sums of money every year. It makes no sense to provide deportation protection to any alien who commits a crime, no matter when they originally entered the country. DACA has done just that for tens of thousands of criminals and continues to do so.

6. The review process for applicants is woefully inadequate.

Documents obtained by Judicial Watch uncovered that the original vetting process for DACA applicants was intentionally “lean and light” in order to rubberstamp as many application approvals as possible.⁴³ In the first few years of the program’s existence, approval rates were almost 100 percent, with only those who had very substantial criminal histories in the United States being rejected. The shockingly low standards required to qualify for the DACA program should cause serious concern in every American.

7. DACA encourages more illegal immigration.

Amnesties guarantee future illegal immigration. The Reagan Amnesty of 1986 contributed to one of the greatest waves of illegal immigration in our nation’s history. “Soft amnesties” such as DACA are no different. After enacting DACA, additional waves of illegal immigrants flocked to the United States. The same should be expected any time benefits or lawful/protective status are offered to those who violate our immigration laws. Because why should anyone go through the process of entering the country legally if there are no consequences for jumping the line and entering unlawfully?

Treating TPS Like Amnesty

Much like DACA, Temporary Protected Status (TPS) is not an amnesty by the strict legal sense of the word. Rather, it is (supposed to be) a temporary deferral of removal due to extenuating circumstances in a person or demographic's home country. This temporary status can stem from one of the following: ongoing armed conflict (such as civil war), an environmental disaster (such as an earthquake or hurricane), an epidemic, or any other extraordinary and temporary conditions.⁴⁴ Both lawful migrants with expiring visas and illegal aliens may apply for TPS status.

The key word in this designation is "temporary." Even though recipients can work in the U.S. and apply for a travel authorization, this status is subject to revocation at any time. It is not designed as an avenue for migrants to resettle in the United States and does not lead to any form of lawful or permanent immigration status (except when special measures are passed).

Currently, individuals in the United States from 10 countries qualify for TPS.⁴⁵ However, this number could potentially increase significantly if new TPS designations are approved.

On December 7, 2020, the "Hong Kong People's Freedom and Choice Act of 2020" (H.R.8428) was passed by voice vote in the House of Representatives.⁴⁶ If enacted into law, this bill would grant TPS to any long-time resident of Hong Kong who "holds no right to citizenship in any country or jurisdiction other than the PRC, Hong Kong, or Macau..." This poses a massive security risk to the United States.⁴⁷ The Chinese Communist Party would undoubtedly use this as an avenue to insert its own spies and agents of influence into the country⁴⁸.

TPS is a generous humanitarian effort that the United States offers to help provide relief to those non-permanent immigrants in the country who would suffer significant hardship should they return to their home country. However, the program is regularly abused and is plagued by significant problems, including:

1. Temporary status is often anything but temporary.

Presidents in both parties routinely rubber-stamp the continuation of TPS status, regardless of whether conditions have improved in the designated countries. There has rarely been a termination of TPS status. Instead, it is rolled over every 18 months.

For example, approximately 260,000 Salvadorans have enjoyed 'temporary' protection since 2001, after a series of earthquakes devastated El Salvador. DHS announced in January 2018 that the TPS for Salvadorans would end September 2019.⁴⁹ However, activist judges were able to temporarily block this effort, even though they had no legal basis to do so.⁵⁰

Furthermore, in June of 2019, Democrats in the House of Representatives opposed President Trump's attempts to end TPS designation by passing the American Dream and Promise Act, which would amnesty TPS recipients and make it harder for future presidents to end TPS designation for countries.⁵¹ This bill was never taken up in the Senate.

These actions serve as further evidence that open borders advocates don't consider TPS "temporary" at all. Rather, they view it as a form of amnesty.

2. TPS creates a worsened humanitarian crisis at our border.

The very prospect of receiving TPS is a magnet for illegal immigration. Much like amnesty or DACA, the promise of TPS creates a pull effect for illegal immigration from the country potentially receiving the protective status. The possibility of receiving this status and work authorization, without any real risk of deportation, is an incentive for migrants to illegally enter the United States.

3. There is no real enforcement mechanism to ensure that migrants leave the United States when TPS is ended.

The ending of TPS for a country eliminates removal protections, but it does not ensure that those who no longer fall under this designation leave the country. Furthermore, after the few times a TPS program has ended, most recipients received green cards.⁵² This once again nullifies the intended "temporary" intention of TPS.

TPS is in dire need of reform. What began as an honorable humanitarian program has morphed into de facto amnesty. To return this program back to its intended purpose, it should be altered to establish clear expiration dates, along with mechanisms which ensure that recipients do not stay beyond the end of their designation.

Conclusion

Clearly, none of the full, partial, or quasi-amnesties previously implemented in the United States offered any long-term positive impacts. On the contrary, all of them cost American taxpayers billions of dollars, and many protected dangerous criminals and even terrorists from deportation.

President Biden has promised to propose an amnesty that would potentially offer legal status to more than 14 million illegal aliens. And so far, his administration has not called for this proposal to exclude those who have little to offer the country from an economic standpoint, and he plans to include criminal aliens in the amnesty as well. So, whether someone's "only offense" is residing in the country illegally, or if they are a hardened criminal, President Biden wants to offer them amnesty and, eventually, citizenship.

This proposed mass-amnesty would offer legal status to everyone covered by the programs discussed in this report, including:

- Those who lack the ability to speak and/or understand English.
- Individuals who are likely to become a “public charge” and rely on public assistance programs.
- Criminal aliens with convictions ranging anywhere from minor misdemeanors to significant felonies such as drug and human trafficking – or even murder.
- Foreign nationals who may pose a national security threat.

A mass amnesty would irreversibly alter the fundamental social construct of the United States. It would allow the illegal aliens of yesterday to determine the legal immigrants of tomorrow by permitting them to sponsor more than 40 million family members to eventually enter the country.⁵³ There is no measure by which such an action would serve the interests of American citizens.

“A mass amnesty would irreversibly alter the fundamental social construct of the United States by allowing the illegal aliens of yesterday to determine the legal immigrants of tomorrow.”

If President Biden truly cares for those he swore an oath to protect, he will scrap all talk of amnesty and instead focus on representing the interests of American citizens who continue to struggle during one of the most challenging times this country has ever faced.

References

- ¹ “The Biden Plan for Securing Our Values as a Nations of Immigrants,” Joe Biden for President: Official Campaign, Accessed February 8, 2021, <https://joebiden.com/immigration/>.
- ² Spencer Raley, Madison McQueen, and Jason Pena, “2020 Update: How many Illegal Aliens Live in the United States?,” Federation for American Immigration Reform, December 2020, <https://www.fairus.org/issue/illegal-immigration/2020-how-many-illegal-aliens-us>.
- ³ Bureau of Labor of Statistics, “Alternative Measures of Labor Underutilization,” last modified February 5, 2021, <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empst.t15.htm>.
- ⁴ Ibid
- ⁵ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, “Table 1. Person Obtaining Lawful Permanent Resident Status: Fiscal Years 1820 to 2019,” Accessed February 8, 2021, <https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2019/table1>.
- ⁶ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, “We Need to End Unchecked Chain Migration and Eliminate the Reckless Visa Lottery to Secure the Nation and Protect the American Worker,” February 15, 2018, <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2018/02/15/we-need-end-unchecked-chain-migration-and-eliminate-reckless-visa-lottery-secure>.
- ⁷ Tom Phillips, “Migrant Caravan Trekking North to US Border Clashes with Guatemalan Troops,” *The Guardian*, January 17, 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/17/migrant-caravan-trekking-north-us-border-clash-guatemala-troops>.
- ⁸ Matt O’Brien and Spencer Raley, “The Fiscal Burden of Illegal Immigration on United States Taxpayers,” Federation for American Immigration Reform, September 2017, <https://www.fairus.org/issue/publications-resources/fiscal-burden-illegal-immigration-united-states-taxpayers>.
- ⁹ Ibid
- ¹⁰ Ibid
- ¹¹ Robert Rector, “Amnesty Will Cost U.S. Taxpayers at Least \$2.6 Trillion,” The Heritage Foundation, June 2007, <https://www.heritage.org/immigration/report/amnesty-will-cost-us-taxpayers-least-26-trillion>.
- ¹² Julia Ainsley, “Incoming Biden Administration to Migrant Caravan: Don’t Come, You Won’t Get in Immediately,” *NBC News*, January 17, 2021, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/immigration/incoming-biden-administration-migrant-caravan-don-t-come-you-won-n1254550>.
- ¹³ The Lancet, “COVID-19 in Latin America: A Humanitarian Crisis,” *The Lancet*, November 7, 2020, [https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736\(20\)32328-X/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(20)32328-X/fulltext).
- ¹⁴ Mandy Brown et al. “Encouraging Indicators Are Everywhere, But Deaths Remain High: This Week in COVID-19 Data, Jan 21,” The COVID Tracking Project, January 2021, <https://covidtracking.com/analysis-updates/encouraging-indicators-are-everywhere-but-deaths-remain-high-this-week-in-covid-19-data-jan-21>.
- ¹⁵ NPR Staff, “A Reagan Legacy: Amnesty For Illegal Immigrants,” *NPR*, July 4, 2010, <https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128303672>.
- ¹⁶ “S. 1200 (99th): Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986,” Govtrack, Accessed February 8, 2021, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/99/s1200/summary#libraryofcongress>.
- ¹⁷ Spencer Raley, Madison McQueen, and Jason Pena, “2020 Update: How many Illegal Aliens Live in the United States?,” Federation for American Immigration Reform, December 2020, <https://www.fairus.org/issue/illegal-immigration/2020-how-many-illegal-aliens-us>.
- ¹⁸ Annual average immigration calculated using LPRS data from 2010-2019. <https://www.dhs.gov/immigration-statistics/yearbook/2019/table1>

-
- ¹⁹ Edwin Meese III, "An Amnesty by Any Other Name...", *The New York Times*, May 24, 2006, <https://www.nytimes.com/2006/05/24/opinion/24meese.html>.
- ²⁰ Steven A. Camarota, "Analysis of the Senate Amnesty Plan," (testimony, Washington DC, July 18, 2006), Center for Immigration Studies, <https://cis.org/Testimony/Analysis-Senate-Amnesty-Plan>.
- ²¹ Ibid
- ²² David Simcox, "The Cost of the IRCA Amnesty After 10 Years," Center for Immigration Studies, May 1997, <https://cis.org/Report/Cost-IRCA-Amnesty-After-10-Years>.
- ²³ Ibid
- ²⁴ "S.744 – Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act," Congress.Gov, Accessed February 8, 2021, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/744/titles>.
- ²⁵ Ibid Heritage Amnesty Report
- ²⁶ "S. 1291 (107th): Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act," Govtrack, Accessed February 8, 2021, <https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/107/s1291/text/is>.
- ²⁷ Matthew Watkins, "As Texas Higher Ed Tuition Rises, Financial Aid is Covering Less and Less," *The Texas Tribune*, March 17, 2017, <https://www.texastribune.org/2017/03/17/texas-financial-aid-becomes-less-ambitious-while-number-needy-students/>
- ²⁸ Ibid
- ²⁹ Barack Obama, "Remarks by the President on Immigration." (speech, Washington, DC, June 15, 2012), The White House, <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2012/06/15/remarks-president-immigration#>.
- ³⁰ U.S. Department of Homeland Security, "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals: Who Can Be Considered?" August 15, 2012, <https://www.dhs.gov/blog/2012/08/15/deferred-action-childhood-arrivals-who-can-be-considered>.
- ³¹ Hans A. von Spakovsky, "DACA is Unconstitutional, as Obama Admitted," The Heritage Foundation, September 8, 2017, <https://www.heritage.org/immigration/commentary/daca-unconstitutional-obama-admitted>.
- ³² Jeff Sessions, "Attorney General Sessions Delivers Remarks on DACA." (speech, Washington, DC, September 5, 2017), The United States Department of Justice, <https://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/attorney-general-sessions-delivers-remarks-daca>.
- ³³ Elizabeth Jacobs, "S. 1615 – Dream Act of 2017," Federation for American Immigration Reform, December 11, 2017, <https://www.fairus.org/legislation/federal-legislation/s1615-dream-act-2017>.
- ³⁴ "The Biden Plan for Securing Our Values as a Nation of Immigrants," Joe Biden for President: Official Campaign, Accessed January 21, 2021, <https://joebiden.com/immigration/>.
- ³⁵ "Browse the Constitution Annotated," Constitution Annotated, Accessed January 21, 2021, <https://constitution.congress.gov/browse/article-1/section-8/>.
- ³⁶ Steven A. Camarota, "Time to End DACA," Center for Immigration Studies, August 3, 2017, <https://cis.org/Oped/Time-End-DACA>.
- ³⁷ Paul Bedard, "Feds: 'Dreamers' Post-College Age, 94% from Latin America," *Washington Examiner*, September 26, 2017, <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/tag/donald-trump?source=%2Ffeds-most-dreamers-post-college-age-94-from-latin-america%2Farticle%2F2635615>.
- ³⁸ "Sixty-Four Percent of DACA Applicants Past High-School Age," Federation for American Immigration Reform, August 2016, [https://www.fairus.org/sites/default/files/2017-08/64 Percent DACA Applicants Past High School Age.pdf](https://www.fairus.org/sites/default/files/2017-08/64%20Percent%20DACA%20Applicants%20Past%20High%20School%20Age.pdf).
- ³⁹ Jason Richwine, "Immigrant Literacy," Center for Immigration Studies, June 21, 2017, <https://cis.org/Immigrant-Literacy-Self-Assessment-vs-Reality>.

⁴⁰ Jessica M. Vaughan, “DACA Applicants Cost Legal Immigrants \$316.5 Million Since 2015,” Center for Immigration Studies, October 8, 2018, <https://cis.org/Vaughan/DACA-Applications-Cost-Legal-Immigrants-3165-Million-2015>.

⁴¹ Ibid

⁴² U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, “DACA Requestors with IDENT Response (2019 Update),” October 2019, https://www.uscis.gov/sites/default/files/document/data/DACA_Requestors_IDENT_Nov._2019.pdf.

⁴³ Judicial Watch, “DACA Investigation,” May 13, 2013, <https://www.judicialwatch.org/investigative-bulletin/daca-investigation/>.

⁴⁴ Federal Register, “Extension and Redesignation of Temporary Protected Status,” January 2015, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/01/05/2014-30871/extension-and-redesignation-of-the-syrian-arab-republic-for-temporary-protected-status#h-8>.

⁴⁵ Congressional Research Service, “Temporary Protected Status: Overview and Current Issues,” October 2020, <https://fas.org/sqp/crs/homesec/RS20844.pdf>.

⁴⁶ “Hong Kong People’s Freedom and Choice Act of 2020 (2020 – H.R. 8428),” Congress.Gov, Accessed January 12, 2021, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-bill/8428/all-actions?overview=closed#tabs>.

⁴⁷ Preston Huennekens, “Ted Cruz Blocks Hong Kong Immigration Bill That Jeopardizes National Security,” ImmigrationReform.com, December 21, 2020, <https://www.immigrationreform.com/2020/12/21/ted-cruz-blocks-bad-hong-kong-bill-immigrationreform-com/>.

⁴⁸ Stuart Anderson, “Ted Cruz Blocks Bill, Claims Hong Kong Refugees Could Be Spies,” December 20, 2020, *Forbes*, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/stuartanderson/2020/12/20/ted-cruz-blocks-bill-claims-hong-kong-refugees-could-be-spies/?sh=210abd3712c6>.

⁴⁹ Federation for American Immigration Reform, “FAIR Applauds Decision by DHS Secretary Nielsen to End Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Salvadorans,” January 8, 2018, <https://www.fairus.org/press-releases/fair-applauds-decision-dhs-secretary-nielsen-end-temporary-protected-status-tps>.

⁵⁰ Federal Register, “Extension and Redesignation of Temporary Protected Status,” January 2015, <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2015/01/05/2014-30871/extension-and-redesignation-of-the-syrian-arab-republic-for-temporary-protected-status#h-8>.

⁵¹ Dara Lind, “House Democrats Introduce Bill to Offer 2.5 Million Immigrants Chance at Permanent Status,” May 12, 2019, *Vox*, <https://www.vox.com/2019/3/12/18261574/dream-act-daca-tps-democrats-bill>.

⁵² Mark Krikorian, “No Alien Left Behind,” Center for Immigration Studies, May 29, 2007, <https://cis.org/No-Alien-Left-Behind>.

⁵³ Ibid FAIR “By the Numbers”