

**FAMILY IMMIGRATION:  
THE LONG WAIT TO IMMIGRATE**

**BY STUART ANDERSON**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Family immigration quotas are inadequate and result in separation and long waits for Americans, lawful permanent residents and close family members. Approximately 4 million people are waiting in family immigration backlogs, according to data obtained from the U.S. Department of State and Department of Homeland Security. The wait time for a U.S. citizen petitioning for a brother or sister from the Philippines exceeds 20 years. A U.S. citizen petitioning for either a married (3<sup>rd</sup> preference) or unmarried (1<sup>st</sup> preference) son or daughter (21 years or older) can expect to wait 6 to 17 years, depending on the country or origin. Research shows legal immigrants experience faster wage growth than natives, are more likely to start businesses and have higher median years of schooling. Raising family immigration quotas would serve both the humanitarian and economic interests of the United States. (The research for this paper was funded by a grant from the Carnegie Corporation of New York.)

**Table 1  
Estimated Wait Times for Family-Sponsored Immigrants**

	<b>China</b>	<b>India</b>	<b>Mexico</b>	<b>Philippines</b>	<b>All Other Countries</b>
<b>Unmarried Adult Children of U.S. Citizens (1<sup>st</sup> Preference) 23,400 a year</b>	6 year wait	6 year wait	17 year wait	16 year wait	6 year wait
<b>Spouses and Minor Children of Permanent Residents (2<sup>nd</sup> Preference – A) 87,934 a year*</b>	4 year wait	4 year wait	6 year wait	4 year wait	4 year wait
<b>Unmarried Adult Children of Permanent Residents (2<sup>nd</sup> Preference - B) 26,266 a year</b>	8 year wait	8 year wait	16 year wait	10 year wait	8 year wait
<b>Married Adult Children of U.S. Citizens (3<sup>rd</sup> Preference) 23,400 a year</b>	9 year wait	9 year wait	16 year wait	17 year wait	9 year wait
<b>Siblings of U.S. Citizens (4<sup>th</sup> Preference) 65,000 a year</b>	10 year wait	10 year wait	14 year wait	20 year wait	10 year wait

Source: U.S. Department of State Visa Bulletin, May 2010; National Foundation for American Policy.

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

**FAMILY IMMIGRATION AND THE LONG WAIT TO IMMIGRATE**

Some of the most contentious immigration policy battles in recent years have been over a concept as old as our nation – families reuniting in America. In 1996 and 2007, Congressional critics unsuccessfully fought to eliminate key family preferences categories and reduce the level of family immigration. While there is interest in Congress to increase family immigration quotas, critics will likely oppose such efforts and seek to restrict the categories in the future.

The wait times for sponsoring a close family member are long, in some cases extremely long. In a November 2009 report, the State Department tabulated more than 3.3 million close relatives of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents on the immigration waiting list who have registered for processing at a U.S. post overseas.<sup>1</sup> (See Table 2.) That does not include individuals waiting inside the United States, such as in a temporary visa status, who would gain a green card via adjustment of status at a U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services office. Counting such individuals as well would likely increase the waiting list to over 4 million.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 2  
Family-Sponsored Immigrants Waiting For Processing Abroad (November 2009)**

<b>Family-Sponsored Preference Categories</b>	<b>Individuals Waiting in Immigration Backlog for Processing at Overseas Post</b>
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Preference – Unmarried Adult Children of U.S. Citizens</b>	245,516
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Preference (2A) – Spouses and Minor Children of Permanent Residents</b>	324,864
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Preference (2B) Unmarried Adult Children of Permanent Residents</b>	517,898
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Preference – Married Adult Children of U.S. Citizens</b>	553,280
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Preference – Siblings of U.S. Citizens</b>	1,727,897
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>3,369,455</b>

Source: “Annual Report of Immigrant Visa Applicants in the Family-sponsored and Employment-based Preferences Registered at the National Visa Center as of November 1, 2009,” U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs. Note: The formal names of the categories cited above utilize “sons and daughters” and “brothers and sisters” in place of “adult children” and “siblings.” A proportion of individuals on the list may be in the United States but have chosen to be processed at an overseas post. There are also several hundred thousand individuals not on this list who will be processed inside the United States via adjustment of status.

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

In general, a U.S. citizen can sponsor for permanent residence a spouse, child, parent or sibling. A lawful permanent resident (green card holder) can sponsor a spouse or child. The wait times and quotas vary for the categories, with the application of per-country limits creating much longer waits in some preference categories for nationals of Mexico and the Philippines.

An “immediate relative” of a U.S. citizen can immigrate to America without being subjected to an annual quota. This is important, since it is the relatively low quotas in the family and employer-sponsored preference categories that lead to waits of often many years for would-be immigrants. While there is no numerical limit in the immediate relative category, processing would still normally takes several months.

The three primary immediate relatives included in the category are:

- Spouses of U.S. citizens;
- Unmarried children of a U.S. citizen. The child must be under 21 years old. An adopted child must be younger than 16 years old;<sup>3</sup> and
- Parents of U.S. citizens, if the petitioning citizen is at least 21 years old.<sup>4</sup>

## **FAMILY-SPONSORED PREFERENCE CATEGORIES AND ESTIMATED WAIT TIMES**

Under the law, a minimum of 226,000 immigrants are allowed to become permanent residents each year under the family-sponsored preferences.<sup>5</sup> There are also per country limits on the number of individuals from one country who can obtain a green card in these preference categories each year.<sup>6</sup>

Below are the descriptions of the four family-sponsored preferences as detailed in the monthly visa bulletin:

“**First** – Unmarried Sons and Daughters of Citizens: 23,400 a year.

“**Second** – Spouses and Children, and Unmarried Sons and Daughters of Permanent Residents: 114,200 A. Spouses and Children: 77% of the overall second preference limitation, of which 75% are exempt from the per-country limit; B. Unmarried Sons and Daughters (21 years of age or older): 23% of the overall second preference limitation.

“**Third** – Married Sons and Daughters of Citizens: 23,400.

“**Fourth** – Brothers and Sisters of Adult Citizens: 65,000.”<sup>7</sup>

Enormous backlogs and waiting times plague the family immigration preference categories. For example, the wait time for a U.S. citizen petitioning for a brother or sister from the Philippines exceeds 20 years. This is based on the State Department Visa Bulletin, where, as of May 2010, it stated the U.S. government would only process applications filed prior to December 8, 1987 for siblings from the Philippines. In other words, American citizens with brothers or sisters in that country who filed while Ronald Reagan was still president of the United States and

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

before the Berlin Wall fell are still waiting for their relatives to join them. For siblings from countries other than Mexico and the Philippines the wait times are closer to 10 years.<sup>8</sup>

The expected waiting times are quite long for other family categories as well. A U.S. citizen petitioning for either a married (3<sup>rd</sup> preference) or unmarried (1<sup>st</sup> preference) son or daughter (21 years or older) from Mexico can expect to wait about 17 years.<sup>9</sup> There is a similar wait time for married sons and daughters from the Philippines. The wait is an estimated 6 years for U.S. citizens with unmarried sons and daughters in other countries.<sup>10</sup>

The spouses and children of lawful permanent residents (green card holders) also experience long waits for legal immigration. In the second preference (2A), the wait time is estimated to be about 4 years, with longer waits for Mexicans. The wait for unmarried sons and daughters of lawful permanent residents (2B) is about 9 years for all countries except Mexico, which has a 16 year wait, and the Philippines, where the wait is approximately 10 years.<sup>11</sup>

## **THE PROCESS**

“Family reunification has long been an important concept in immigration law,” notes attorney Susan Fortino-Brown. “However, helping clients immigrate based on a family relationship can be difficult and complex. Detailed attention to definitions, deadlines, and the interplay of numerous provisions is more important now than ever.”<sup>12</sup>

Form I-130 is the alien relative petition that is sent to U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) for approval. Among other things, it must establish a family relationship exists between the U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident filing the petition and the alien relative, also known as the beneficiary. If the relative is in the United States the processing will take place at USCIS, with the relative hoping to obtain approval of an adjustment of status application (I-485). If the relative is abroad, then a U.S. consulate will process that individual’s application. There is also a “self-petition” process for widows, widowers, battered spouses and battered children, whereby they can apply or complete the immigration process without the involvement of a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident sponsor.

A sponsor must file an Affidavit of Support that shows the petitioner, or another individual willing to accept liability, can provide financial assistance to the family member. Under the law, the sponsor must show he or she can support the individual at 125 percent of the poverty level based on family size.<sup>13</sup>

## **KEY ISSUES AND CONTROVERSIES SURROUNDING FAMILY IMMIGRATION**

In 2007, as part of a deal to appeal to critics who argued Congress should not reward *illegal* immigrants, the U.S. Senate came close to changing immigration law to prohibit Americans from sponsoring their own children or other close family members for *legal* immigration. Simply put, Sen. Jon Kyl (R-AZ) wanted something in exchange for agreeing to support the legalization of several million illegal immigrants and that “something” was eliminating the family categories that allowed U.S. citizens to petition for their adult children and siblings for immigration.

The policy rationale offered for eliminating family immigration categories in 1996 and 2007 fails to hold up under scrutiny, appearing more contrived than substantive. For example, some have argued that the wait times in some of the family categories are so long that it gives people “false hope.” But this argument strikes one as crying “crocodile tears” for those waiting in line. The fact that long waits exist in some categories simply means that Congress has not raised the limits to correspond with the demand. The solution is not to eliminate categories and thereby guarantee Americans in the future could never reunite with certain loved ones. The more rational approach is to raise the quotas, as the Senate did in its immigration bill passed in 2006. If one argues that long waits encourage individuals to jump ahead in line, then destroying all hope of immigrating legally would provide even more incentive for people to come to the United States and stay illegally. It makes little policy sense to decry illegal immigration by arguing people should immigrate legally and at the same time to eliminate the country’s most viable options for legal immigration.

### **THE MYTH OF “CHAIN MIGRATION”**

One argument made for eliminating family categories is it would reduce something called “chain migration.” However, “chain migration” is a meaningless and contrived term that seeks to put a negative light on a phenomenon that has taken place throughout the history of the country – some family members come to America and succeed, and then sponsor other family members.

The following example illustrates the myth of “chain migration.” In 2010, an immigrant, who arrived 6 years before and has now become a U.S. citizen decides to sponsor a sibling for immigration. With a 10-year wait (or 14 to 20 years for Mexicans and Filipinos), that means 16 years would pass between the arrival of the first and second immigrant. It would then take the second immigrant 6 years to become a citizen and, if he or she then sponsors an unmarried adult child, it would take an additional 6 to 16 years for that “third” immigrant to arrive (depending on the country). So under this “chain migration,” the time between the arrival of the first immigrant and the third immigrant would be between 28 and 48 years, depending on the country of origin. This is not the continuous “onslaught” that critics have sought to conjure up when discussing this issue. Moreover, all of the immigrants in this example would immigrate under the legal quotas established by Congress.

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

While it is true approximately 65 percent of U.S. legal immigration in 2008 was family-based, more than half of family immigration was actually the spouses and minor children of U.S. citizens, categories no one has proposed eliminating. Of total U.S. legal immigration in 2008, married and unmarried adult children of U.S. citizens accounted for only about 2 percent each; siblings of U.S. citizens accounted for only 6 percent.<sup>14</sup> Eliminating these categories would produce only a small drop in overall legal immigration and lead to great personal hardship for tens of thousands of Americans and their loved ones.

**ALREADY HIGH LEVELS OF EDUCATION FOR LEGAL IMMIGRANTS**

Some have argued a rationale for establishing a point system in place of family categories is to improve the skill level of immigrants. In reality, the typical legal immigrant already has a *higher* skill level than the typical native, so upon examination the basic rationale falls apart for eliminating family categories.

- The New Immigrant Survey, which examines only legal immigrants finds: "The median years of schooling for the legal immigrants, 13 years, is a full one year higher than that of the U.S. native-born."<sup>15</sup>
- The Pew Hispanic Center reports: "By 2004, all groups of legal immigrants in the country for less than 10 years are more likely to have a college degree than natives . . ."<sup>16</sup>
- The Pew Hispanic Center also reports that the average family income for a naturalized U.S. citizen in the country more than 10 years in 2003 was more than \$10,000 a year higher than a native (\$56,500 vs. \$45,900).<sup>17</sup>
- Writing in the May 1999 *American Economic Review*, economists Harriet Duleep, then a senior research associate at the Urban Institute, and Mark Regets, a senior analyst at the National Science Foundation, found that the gap in earnings between new immigrants and natives largely disappears after 10 years in the United States, with immigrant wage growth faster than native (6.7 percent vs. 4.4 percent).<sup>18</sup>

Simply put, while the policy of eliminating family categories would cause real pain for families, it would create little or no net benefit with regards to its stated purpose.

A number of past reports focusing on the skill levels of immigrants have used Census data that included many illegal immigrants. Two of the studies cited above differentiate between legal and illegal immigrants and show "low education" level among legal immigrants is not a problem. Legal immigrants do congregate at the top and bottom of the education scale, but less so than Census data imply. Besides, economists agree that immigrants increase America's labor productivity most when they fill niches at the top and bottom.

## **ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF FAMILY IMMIGRATION**

Family immigration provides important economic benefits, particularly in fostering entrepreneurship, while also promoting the type of family cohesiveness that political office seekers tell voters is vital to the nation's future. "A large majority of immigrant-owned businesses in the United States are individual proprietorships relying heavily on family labor," testified University of South Carolina Professor Jimmy M. Sanders before the Senate Immigration Subcommittee. "Our experiences in the field suggest that the family is often the main social organization supporting the establishment and operation of a small business." Sanders notes: "The family can provide important resources to members who pursue self-employment. Revision of Federal law in the mid-1960's to allow large increases in immigration from non-Western European societies and to give priority to family reunification increased family-based immigration and contributed to a virtual renaissance of small business culture in the United States. By contrast, labor migration that involves single sojourners who leave their families behind and work temporarily in the United States has produced far less self-employment."<sup>19</sup>

Family members immigrating to support other family members in caring for children and helping to run family-owned businesses are likely to benefit the United States economically. In New York City during the 1990s, the number of immigrant self-employed increased by 53 percent, while native-born self-employed declined by 7 percent, according to the Center for an Urban Future.<sup>20</sup>

The Kauffman Foundation's Index of Entrepreneurial Activity has found immigrants are more likely than natives to start businesses. In fact, the Foundation's research has found the "gap in the entrepreneurial activity rate between immigrants and natives is large." According to an April 2009 report, "For immigrants, 530 out of 100,000 people start a business each month, compared to 280 out of 100,000 native-born people."

The study also found, "Overall, immigrants have much higher low- and medium-income-potential entrepreneurship rates than the native-born. But, immigrants also are more likely to start high-income-potential types of businesses."<sup>21</sup>

John Tu, President and CEO of Kingston Technology, based in Fountain Valley, California, immigrated to America from Taiwan after being sponsored by his sister. He built up his computer memory company with fellow Taiwanese immigrant David Sun. When Tu sold the company for \$1 billion he did something almost unheard in the annals of business: He gave \$100 million of the sale's proceeds to his American employees – about \$100,000 to \$300,000 for each worker. This decision changed the lives of those working at Kingston, allowing many to fund dreams for themselves and their children. Kingston employee Gary McDonald said, "Kingston's success came from a philosophy of treating employees, suppliers, and customers like family, this being based upon the Asian family values of trust, loyalty, and mutual support practiced by John and David."<sup>22</sup>

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

Jerry Yang, co-founder of Yahoo!, came to this country at the age of 10. “Yahoo! Would not be an American company today if the United States had not welcomed my family and me almost 30 years ago,” said Yang.

In addition to economic benefits, it is important to remember that family immigration has always been the foundation of America’s immigration system. It is part of the country’s tradition going back from the Mayflower through Ellis Island and to the present day. The historical records at Ellis Island make clear that most immigration prior to the 1920s was family-based, and such unification never entirely lost its role.

A report of the House Judiciary Committee on the 1959 legislation states, “The recognized principle of avoiding separation of families could be furthered if certain categories of such relatives were reclassified in the various preference portions of the immigration quotas.” Joyce Vialet of the Congressional Research Service analyzed the 1965 Immigration Act and concluded, “In response to the demand for admission of family members, Congress enacted a series of amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA), beginning in 1957, which gave increasing priority to family relationship. The family preference categories included in the 1965 Act evolved directly from this series of amendments. Arguably, the 1965 Act represented an acceptance of the status quo rather than a shift to a new policy of favoring family members.”<sup>23</sup>

## **PROBLEMS WITH A POINT SYSTEM**

In place of certain family categories, in 2007, President Bush dropped his support for family immigration as part of a deal with some Republican Senators who sought to eliminate certain family immigration categories. In order not to appear hostile towards immigrants, the proposal was couched in the form of instituting a Canadian-style point system. Such a point system would have worked by establishing a “score” and assigning admission “points” for age, education level and other characteristics for those immigrants who seek entry. Only those who achieved the score could immigrate.

The proposal in the U.S. Senate in 2007 to establish a point system was a Trojan horse designed to reduce family immigration. It was not intended to help employers. Not only did employer groups oppose establishing a point system but such a system would have prevented companies from sponsoring individual employees.

The 2007 Senate legislation displayed a lack of understanding of the overall immigration system. If it became law, the per country limit retained in the bill would have allowed almost anyone with a college degree born in a small country to gain admission to the United States over people with a master’s degrees or higher born in large population countries such as China or India. That is because no matter how many “points” individuals from China or India earned, the overall per country limit for those countries would have limited how many Chinese or Indians



*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

could immigrate each year under that system. At the same time, someone from Ghana, Syria or Bulgaria would need a comparatively low point total to qualify for entry because those countries would never reach the per country limit. In many ways, the proposal was little more than a glorified “Diversity” visa, an immigration category many of these same Members of Congress have criticized.

A point system would transfer power from Congress to federal bureaucrats at the expense of individuals, families and employers. “A point system has many imperfections,” concedes point system advocate George Borjas, an economist at Harvard University. “A few hapless government bureaucrats have to sit down and decide which characteristics will enter the admissions formula, which occupations are the ones that are most beneficial, which age groups are to be favored, how many points to grant each desired characteristic and so on.”<sup>24</sup> (One should note a similar problem with removing authority from Congress and empowering bureaucrats in a “commission” to regulate the number of foreign professionals and lesser-skilled workers permitted into the United States each year.)<sup>25</sup>

After noting that the list of occupations, each assigned points, takes up 10 pages in the Canadian system, Borjas writes, “Most of these decisions are bound to be arbitrary and clearly stretch the ability of bureaucrats to determine labor market needs well beyond their limit.”<sup>26</sup> But bureaucrats are not well suited at all to handle labor market decisions on behalf of employers. Moreover, no government test can ever measure life's most important intangibles: drive, individual initiative and a commitment to family.

Borjas concedes that keeping out Mexicans is a likely end product of a point system. “Most likely,” he writes, that under a point system, “the predominance of Mexican immigrants and of immigrants from some other developing countries will decline substantially.”<sup>27</sup> Whether or not the intended goal of proponents of a point system is to prevent immigration from Mexico and Central America it is the most likely outcome.

One should note that the Canadian point system is designed with a different purpose in mind. Given its relatively small population, Canada needs to attract immigrants to the country. In the United States, attracting skilled immigration is not a problem. The American problem is straightforward – Congress has failed to increase the quotas for H-1B temporary visas and employment-based green cards.

Research by economists Harriet Orcutt Duleep and Mark Regets questions the alleged economic benefit of eliminating family categories in favor of admitting individuals under a Canadian-style point system. Duleep and Regets found while family-based immigrants have lower earnings upon entering the United States, they experience higher earnings growth than employment-based immigrants. “This result . . . challenges assumptions

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

about the presumed productivity gains that would be achieved if the United States were to increase employment-based immigrant admissions at the expense of family-based admissions.”<sup>28</sup>

The research found immigrants admitted via family categories “catch up” to those admitted for employment purposes within 11 to 18 years, according to the estimates.<sup>29</sup> Duleep and Regets believe the faster earnings growth for family-based immigrants may be associated with “increased investment in human capital” by such immigrants. Overall, the economists believe the research raises many questions about the presumed advantages of a point system to admit immigrants. Duleep and Regets conclude, “From a policy perspective, this finding, in tandem with previous research showing no clear-cut labor market effects of the Canadian admission system, suggests that any efforts to increase skills-based U.S. immigration at the expense of family-based immigration should be preceded by a lot more thought and research.”<sup>30</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Family immigration quotas are inadequate and result in needless separation and long waits for Americans, lawful permanent residents and their close family members. Eliminating family categories, as some have proposed in the past, would go against America’s heritage and lead to false distinctions about the value of different family members. One way to look at this issue is to put it at the personal level. Most Americans – and Members of Congress – would agree they would have a difficult time welcoming the immigration of their 19-year-old son, while barring the door to their 22-year-old daughter.

If Congress wants to increase the number of skilled immigrants in the country, the best way is through the existing set of temporary visas and the employment-based immigration system, not through reducing family immigration. Denying U.S. citizens the ability to sponsor adult children, parents or siblings is unnecessary and politically divisive. The bill the Senate passed in 2006 raised quotas for both family and employment-based immigrants and Congress can do so again.

America’s legal immigration system is complex. It suffers from long waits due to inadequate annual quotas for both family and employer-sponsored immigration. Raising those quotas would serve both the humanitarian and economic interests of the United States.

**END NOTES**

<sup>1</sup> “Annual Report of Immigrant Visa Applicants in the Family-sponsored and Employment-based Preferences Registered at the National Visa Center as of November 1, 2009,” U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs, Immigrant Visa Statistics, November 2009.

<sup>2</sup> One can estimate the additional individuals not counted in the State Department document by examining the proportion of individuals in each family preference category who are listed as adjustments, rather than “new arrivals,” in Table 7 of the *2008 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*.

<sup>3</sup> Susan Fortino-Brown, “Family-Sponsored Immigration, in *Navigating the Fundamentals of Immigration Law: Guidance and Tips for Successful Practice, 2007-08 Edition*, ed., Grace E. Akers, (Washington, DC: American Immigration Lawyers Association, 2007), 315. She notes, “If the child is a natural sibling of a child who has been adopted under the age of 16, the older sibling may immigrate through adoption by the same parents before the age of 18.”

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, 311.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, 311. In theory, this number could be higher if the number of immediate relatives admitted in the prior fiscal year is below 254,000.

<sup>6</sup> “Section 202 [of the Immigration and Nationality Act] prescribes that the per-country limit for preference immigrants is set at 7% of the total annual family-sponsored and employment-based preference limits,” notes the State Department. May 2010 State Department Visa Bulletin.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* Under the law, if numbers are not needed in the fourth preference, they are added to the first preference. The third and fourth preference could also receive additional numbers if the categories above them are not fully utilized. Since all the categories are oversubscribed this part of the law does not have a practical impact on the annual flow.

<sup>8</sup> Wait times for newly sponsored family immigrants are estimated based on an examination of the cut-off dates listed in the May 2010 State Department Visa Bulletin.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> State Department Visa Bulletin. The spouses and minor and adult children of Permanent Residents category is 114,200 annually “plus the number (if any) by which the worldwide family preference level exceeds 226,000.” 75%

*Family Immigration: The Long Wait to Immigrate*

of spouses and minor children of lawful permanent residents are exempt from the per-country limit. Wait times are approximate as of May 2010.

<sup>12</sup> Fortino-Brown, 309.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 326.

<sup>14</sup> *2008 Yearbook of Immigration Statistics*, Office of Immigration Statistics, Table 6.

<sup>15</sup> As cited in Stuart Anderson, "Muddles Masses," *Reason*, February 2000.

<sup>16</sup> Jeffrey S. Passel, *Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics*, (Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center, June 14, 2005), 24. Passel points out that this is the case "notwithstanding the continued over-representation of legal immigrants at low levels of education."

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>18</sup> Harriet Orcutt Duleep and Mark C. Regets, "Immigrants and Human-Capital Investment," *American Economic Review* (May 1999).

<sup>19</sup> Testimony of Jimy M. Sanders before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Immigration, "Immigrant Entrepreneurs, Job Creation, and the American Dream," April 15, 1997.

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan Bowles, *A World of Opportunity* (New York, NY: Center for an Urban Future, February 2007), 7.

<sup>21</sup> Robert W. Fairlie, *Kauffman Index of Entrepreneurial Activity, 1996-2008*, (Kansas City, MO: Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation, April 2009), 11-13.

<sup>22</sup> Testimony of Gary D. MacDonald, Kingston Technology, at hearing on "Immigrant Entrepreneurs, Job Creation, and the American Dream," Senate Immigration Subcommittee, April 15, 1997.

<sup>23</sup> As cited in Anderson, "Muddles Masses."

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *A Commission to Regulate Immigration? A Bad Idea Whose Time Should Not Come* (Arlington, VA: National Foundation for American Policy, May 2009).

<sup>26</sup> Anderson, "Muddled Masses."

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*; George J. Borjas, *Heaven's Door*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).

<sup>28</sup> Harriet Orcutt Duleep and Mark C. Regets, "Admission Criteria and Immigrant Earnings Profiles," *International Migration Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2. (Summer, 1996), 571.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 586.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, 586.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Stuart Anderson is Executive Director of the National Foundation for American Policy, a non-profit, non-partisan public policy research organization in Arlington, Va. Stuart served as Executive Associate Commissioner for Policy and Planning and Counselor to the Commissioner at the Immigration and Naturalization Service from August 2001 to January 2003. He spent four and a half years on Capitol Hill on the Senate Immigration Subcommittee, first for Senator Spencer Abraham and then as Staff Director of the subcommittee for Senator Sam Brownback. Prior to that, Stuart was Director of Trade and Immigration Studies at the Cato Institute in Washington, D.C., where he produced reports on the military contributions of immigrants and the role of immigrants in high technology. He has an M.A. from Georgetown University and a B.A. in Political Science from Drew University. Stuart has published articles in the *Wall Street Journal*, *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, and other publications.

## ABOUT THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR AMERICAN POLICY

Established in the Fall 2003, the National Foundation for American Policy (NFAP) is a 501(c)(3) non-profit, non-partisan public policy research organization based in Arlington, Virginia focusing on trade, immigration and related issues. The Advisory Board members include Columbia University economist Jagdish Bhagwati, Ohio University economist Richard Vedder, former INS Commissioner James Ziglar and other prominent individuals. Over the past 24 months, NFAP's research has been written about in the *Wall Street Journal*, the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and other major media outlets. The organization's reports can be found at [www.nfap.com](http://www.nfap.com).