

Roy Beck, Washington editor of *THE SOCIAL CONTRACT*, has been reporting on population and the environment since 1969. His coverage of immigration recently was featured in *The Atlantic Monthly*, *National Review* and *New York Newsday*. His "*Debater's Handbook*" on population and immigration is due for release this fall.

# Who in Congress Is Responsible for U.S. Population Growth?

## And Who Is Addressing Americans' Wish to Slow It Down?

By Roy Beck

The majority of members of Congress continue to guard federal policies that force rapid population growth in the United States, according to a survey by *THE SOCIAL CONTRACT*. The lawmakers' insistence on — or acquiescence in — the domestic increase contrasts with the leadership U.S. officials are giving for the UN Population Conference in Cairo this fall, where there will be discussions about the importance of stabilizing the global population.

Senators and representatives, by and large, find environmental and economic sense in the idea that impoverished countries, and the world, would benefit from halting further population growth. But the legislators deny such stabilization to their own citizens by requiring the admission of nearly a million immigrants a year. (That is a level more than triple the traditional average between 1820 and 1965.)

Americans, by a ratio of 7 to 1, feel the country already is suffering from overpopulation, according to a 1992 Roper poll. Since 1976, the majority of Americans have told pollsters they wanted immigration reduced. Two-thirds now say cut or halt further in-migration, while one-third want ALL immigration stopped.

But the Congress in 1994 is continuing its two-decade program of massive immigration-induced growth, adding at least 150-160 million more people to U.S. communities over the next 56 years.

### Increased Congestion A Creation of Congress

Many commentators have come to accept as inevitable the relentless growth of U.S. population and the populace's attendant need for frenetic adaptations. But the scenario of an ever-more-

densely-inhabited America is solely a creation of Congress. Because Americans long have had replacement-level fertility, Congress could set the nation on the road to stabilization tomorrow with the simple passage of a single immigration bill with low enough numbers.

As of July 15, *THE SOCIAL CONTRACT* found members of Congress divided into three main groups based on their approach to the government's population-growth policies:

- **(1) Full guardians of population growth:** 317 Representatives and 80 Senators have not signed onto any legislation that would significantly curb rapid population growth. Some are assertive pushers of the growth; most allow the growth through their inaction, often unaware of the population sprawl they are creating.
- **(2) Guardians of population growth, slightly reduced:** 26 Representatives and 15 Senators have signed onto bills that would halt most illegal immigration but which would protect most legal immigration and most projected population growth. (Illegal aliens account for only about a quarter of all permanently-settling immigrants.)
- **(3) Supporters of stabilization:** 92 Representatives and 5 Senators have signed onto immigration-reduction bills that would greatly slow U.S. population growth and allow stabilization only late in the next century.

Each lawmaker is placed on one of the five scenario charts accompanying this article. Placement is based on the legislator's current action on immigration numbers. The population growth

## Scenario A1: A Future of Unending and Increasing Congestion

# 150-160 million more Americans (1994-2050)

## 1st-Tier Guardians of Rapid Population Growth (Immigration Allowed at Quadruple Historic Level)

<b>AL</b> Sen. Heflin (D) 5. Cramer (D) 7. Hilliard (D)	2. Thornton (D) 3. Hutchinson (R) 4. Dickey (R)	22. Huffington (R) 26. Berman (D) * 28. Dreier (R) 29. Waxman (D) 30. Becerra (D) 31. Martinez (D) 32. Dixon (D) 33. Roybal-Allard (D) 34. Torres (D) 35. Waters (D) 36. Harman (D) 37. Tucker (D) 38. Horn (R) * 40. Lewis (R) 42. Brown (D) 49. Schenk (D) 50. Filner (D)	2. Skaggs (D) 3. McInnis (R) 4. Allard (R)	4. Fowler (R) 5. Thurman (D) 7. Mica (R) * 9. Bilirakas (R) * 10. Young (R) 11. Gibbons (D) 15. Bacchus (D) 17. Meek (D) 18. Ros-Lehtinen (R) 19. Johnston (D) 20. Deutsch (D) 21. Diaz-Balart (R) 23. Hastings (D)
<b>AK</b> Sen. Murkowski (R) Sen. Stevens (R)	<b>CA</b> Sen. Boxer (D) 1. Hamburg (D) 3. Fazio (D) 5. Matsui (D) 6. Woolsey (D) 7. Miller (D) 8. Pelosi (D) 9. Dellums (D) 12. Lantos (D) 13. Stark (D) 14. Eshoo (D) 15. Mineta (D) 16. Edwards (D) 17. Farr (D) 18. Condit (D) 20. Dooley (D)	<b>CT</b> Sen. Dodd (D) Sen. Lieberman (D) 1. Kennelly (D) 2. Gejdenson (D) 3. DeLauro (D) 5. Franks (R) 6. Johnson (R)	<b>DE</b> Sen. Biden (D) 1. Castle (R)	<b>GA</b> Sen. Nunn (D) Sen. Coverdell (R) 2. Bishop (D) 5. Lewis (D) 10. Johnson (D) 11. McKinney (D)
<b>AZ</b> Sen. DeConcini (D) Sen. McCain (R) 1. Coppersmith (D) 2. Pastor (D) 4. Kyl (R) 5. Kolbe (R) 6. English (D)	<b>CO</b> Sen. Campbell (D) 1. Schroeder (D)	<b>FL</b> Sen. Graham (D) Sen. Mack (R) 2. Peterson (D) 3. Brown (D)		
<b>AR</b> * Sen. Bumpers (D) Sen. Pryor (D) 1. Lambert (D)				

(Continued)

### Identifying Characteristics

Everyone on this list meets BOTH of these criteria:

- They currently do not support any legislation that would reduce the level of legal immigration, which is the key element in present U.S. population growth.
- They either don't support legislation to crack down on illegal aliens, or the bills they do back fail to address the causes of illegal settlement in a comprehensive way.

The U.S. senators and representatives on this list actively push — or passively allow — federal policies that force the country to have to try to accommodate nearly 3 million additional people a year. Long after 2050, if these lawmakers persist, America will continue to grow toward India's population size. *(All scenarios are based on a continuation of U.S. fertility and mortality rates. This scenario likely understates future population growth because it assumes that legal and illegal immigration numbers will not keep climbing as they have for years.)*

**Estimated Population Growth 1994-2050:** 150-160 million.

**Total estimated annual immigration:** 1.3 million (1 million legal; 300,000 illegal).

numbers with each scenario are projections based on what would happen if a majority in Congress agreed with the immigration levels of that scenario.

## Charts Measure Population Results, Not Intentions

The 445 lawmakers on the "Guardians of Growth"

# 1st-Tier Guardians of Rapid Population Growth

(continued)

## HI

**Sen. Akaka (D)**  
**Sen. Inouye (D)**  
 1. Avercrombie (D)  
 2. Mink (D)

## ID

**Sen. Kempthorne (R)**  
 1. LaRocco (D)  
 2. Crapo (R)

## IL

**Sen. Moseley-Braun (D)**  
**Sen. Simon (D)**  
 1. Rush (D)  
 2. Reynolds (D)  
 3. Lipinski (D)  
 4. Gutierrez (D)  
 5. Rostenkowski (D)  
 6. Hyde (R)  
 7. Collins (D)  
 9. Yates (D)  
 10. Porter (R)  
 11. Sangmeister (D)  
 12. Costello (D)  
 13. Fawell (R)  
 15. Ewing (R)  
 16. Manzullo (D)  
 17. Evans (D)  
 18. Michel (R)  
 19. Poshard (D)  
 20. Durbin (D)

## IN

**Sen. Coats (R)**  
**Sen. Lugar (R)**  
 1. Visclosky (D)  
 2. Sharp (D)  
 3. Roemer (D)  
 \* 4. Long (D)  
 8. McCloskey (D)  
 9. Hamilton (D)  
 10. Jacobs (D)

## IO

**Sen. Harkin (D)**  
 1. Leach (R)  
 2. Nussle (R)  
 4. Smith (D)  
 5. Grandy (R)

## KA

2. Slattery (D)  
 4. Glickman (D)

## KY

**Sen. Ford (D)**  
**Sen. McConnell (R)**  
 1. Barlow (D)  
 3. Mazzoli (D)  
 6. Baesler (D)

## LA

**Sen. Breaux (D)**  
**Sen. Johnston (R)**  
 1. Livingston (R)  
 2. Jefferson (D)  
 4. Fields (D)  
 5. McCrery (R)

## ME

**Sen. Mitchell (D)**  
**Sen. Cohen (R)**  
 1. Andrews (D)  
 2. Snowe (R)

## MD

**Sen. Mikulski (D)**  
**Sen. Sarbanes (D)**  
 \* 2. Bentley (R)  
 3. Cardin (D)  
 4. Wynn (D)  
 5. Hoyer (D)  
 7. Mfume (D)  
 8. Morella (R)

## MA

**Sen. Kennedy (D)**  
**Sen. Kerry (D)**  
 1. Olver (D)  
 2. Sharp (D)  
 3. Blute (R)  
 4. Frank (D)  
 5. Meehan (D)  
 6. Torkildsen (R)  
 7. Markey (D)  
 8. Kennedy (D)  
 9. Moakley (D)  
 10. Studds (D)

## MI

**Sen. Levin (D)**  
**Sen. Riegle (D)**  
 1. Stupak (D)

## KEY

**Bold** = Names in bold face are members of Congress who in 1990 forced additional population growth. They voted for the 1990 act that increased legal admissions by at least 30%.

**\*** = Members who opposed more rapid growth in 1990 by voting AGAINST the immigration act.

**(D)** = Democrat  
**(R)** = Republican  
**Sen.** = Senator  
**3.** = Numbers denote the congressional district represented by members of the U.S. House.

2. Hoekstra (R)  
 3. Ehlers (R)  
 5. Barcia (D)  
 6. Upton (R)  
 7. Smith (R)  
 8. Carr (D)  
 9. Kildee (D)  
 10. Bonior (D)  
 11. Knollenberg (R)  
 12. Levin (D)  
 13. Ford (D)  
 14. Conyers (D)  
 15. Collins (D)  
 16. Dingell (D)

## MN

**Sen. Wellstone (D)**  
**Sen. Durenberger (R)**  
 1. Penny (D)  
 2. Minge (D)  
 3. Ramstad (R)  
 4. Vento (D)  
 5. Sabo (D)  
 6. Grams (R)  
 7. Peterson (D)  
 8. Oberstar (D)

## MS

**Sen. Cochran (R)**  
 2. Thompson (D)

## MO

**Sen. Danforth (R)**  
 1. Clay (D)  
 2. Talent (R)  
 3. Gephardt (D)  
 4. Skelton (D)  
 5. Wheat (D)  
 6. Danner (D)

## MT

**Sen. Baucus (D)**  
 1. Williams (D)

## NE

**Sen. Kerrey (D)**  
 1. Bereuter (R)  
 \* 2. Hoagland (D)  
 3. Barrett (R)

## NV

**Sen. Bryan (D)**

## NH

\* **Sen. Smith (R)**

## NJ

**Sen. Bradley (D)**  
**Sen. Lautenberg (D)**  
 1. Andrews (D)  
 2. Hughes (D)  
 4. Smith (R)  
 6. Pallone (D)  
 7. Franks (R)  
 8. Klein (D)  
 9. Torricelli (D)  
 10. Payne (D)  
 11. Gallo (R)  
 12. Zimmer (R)  
 13. Menendez (D)

## NM

**Sen. Bingaman (D)**  
**Sen. Domenici (R)**  
 1. Schiff (R)  
 3. Richardson (D)

(Continued)

charts are there for a great variety of reasons:

- Some actively press for the doubling of the U.S. population density over the next several decades.

They extol the social and economic dynamism they say accompanies rapid demographic change.

- Most, though, not only don't advocate such

# 1st-Tier Guardians of Rapid Population Growth

(continued)

## NY

**Sen. Moynihan (D)**  
**1. Hochbrueckner (D)**  
 2. Lazio (R)  
 3. King (R)  
**5. Ackerman (D)**  
**6. Flake (D)**  
**7. Manton (D)**  
 8. Nadler (D)  
**9. Schumer (D)**  
**10. Towns (D)**  
**11. Owens (D)**  
 12. Velazquez (D)  
 14. Maloney (D)  
**15. Rangel (D)**  
**16. Serrano (D)**  
 17. Engel (D)  
**18. Lowey (D)**  
**21. McNulty (D)**  
**23. Boehlert (R)**  
**24. McHugh (R)**  
 25. Walsh (R)  
 26. Hinchey (D)  
 28. Slaughter (D)  
 29. LaFalce (D)  
 30. Quinn (R)  
**31. Houghton (R)**

## NC

Sen. Faircloth (R)  
 \* Sen. Helms (R)  
 1. Clayton (D)  
 \* 3. Lancaster (D)  
**4. Price (D)**  
 \* 5. Neal (D)  
 6. Coble (R)  
 7. Rose (D)  
**8. Hefner (D)**  
**9. McMillan (R)**  
 12. Watt (D)

## ND

**Sen. Conrad (D)**  
**Sen. Dorgan (D)**  
 1. Pomeroy (D)  
OH  
**Sen. Glenn (D)**  
**Sen. Metzenbaum (D)**

1. Mann (D)  
 2. Portman (R)  
**3. Hall (D)**  
**4. Oxley (R)**  
**5. Gillmor (R)**  
 6. Strickland (D)  
 7. Hobson (R)  
 8. Boehner (R)  
**9. Kaptur (D)**  
 10. Hoke (D)  
**11. Stokes (D)**  
 12. Kasich (R)  
 13. Brown (D)  
**14. Sawyer (D)**  
 15. Pryce (R)  
 \* 16. Regula (R)  
 \* 18. Applegate (D)  
 19. Fingerhut (D)

## OK

**Sen. Boren (D)**  
**Sen. Nickles (R)**  
**2. Synar (D)**  
 \* 4. McCurdy (D)  
 5. Istook (R)

## OR

Sen. Hatfield (R)  
**Sen. Packwood (R)**  
 1. Furse (D)  
 \* 2. Smith (R)  
**3. Wyden (D)**  
 5. Kopetski (D)

## PA

Sen. Wofford (D)  
**Sen. Specter (R)**  
**1. Foglietta (D)**  
 2. Blackwell (D)  
**3. Borski (D)**  
 4. Klink (D)  
**5. Clinger (R)**  
 \* 9. Shuster (R)  
**11. Kanjorski (D)**  
**12. Murtha (D)**  
 13. Margolies-Mezvinsky (D)  
**14. Coyne (D)**  
 15. McHale (D)  
**16. Walker (R)**  
**17. Gekas (R)**  
 18. Santorum (R)  
 \* 19. Goodling (R)  
 20. Murphy (D)  
 \* 21. Ridge (R)

## RI

**Sen. Pell (D)**  
**Sen. Chafee (R)**  
**1. Machtley (R)**  
 2. Reed (D)

## SC

**Sen. Hollings (D)**  
**1. Ravenel (R)**  
 3. Derrick (D)  
 4. Inglis (R)  
**5. Spratt (D)**  
 6. Clyburn (D)

## SD

**Sen. Daschle (D)**  
**1. Johnson (D)**

## TN

Sen. Mathews (D)  
**Sen. Sasser (D)**

\* 3. Lloyd (D)  
 \* 4. Cooper (D)  
 \* 5. Clement (D)  
 \* 6. Gordon (D)  
 \* 7. Sundquist (R)  
**9. Ford (D)**

## TX

**Sen. Gramm (R)**  
 \* 1. Chapman (D)  
 \* 5. Bryant (D)  
**9. Brooks (D)**  
**10. Pickle (D)**  
 11. Edwards (D)  
 \* 13. Sarpalius (D)  
 \* 14. Laughlin (D)  
**15. de la Garza (D)**  
**16. Coleman (D)**  
**18. Washington (D)**  
**20. Gonzalez (D)**  
 23. Bonilla (R)  
**24. Frost (D)**  
 \* 25. Andrews (D)  
**26. Armey (R)**  
**27. Ortiz (D)**  
 28. Tejeda (D)  
 29. Green (D)  
 30. Johnson, E.B. (D)

## UT

Sen. Bennett (R)  
 \* Sen. Hatch (R)  
 2. Shepherd (D)  
 3. Orton (D)

## VT

**Sen. Leahy (D)**  
**Sen. Jeffords (R)**  
 1. Sanders (I)

## VA

**Sen. Robb (D)**  
**Sen. Warner (R)**  
**1. Bateman (R)**

**2. Pickett (D)**  
 3. Scott (D)  
**4. Sisisky (D)**  
 5. Payne (D)  
**7. Bliley (R)**  
 9. Boucher (D)  
**10. Wolf (R)**

## WA

Sen. Murray (D)  
**Sen. Gorton (R)**  
 1. Cantwell (D)  
**2. Swift (D)**  
**3. Unsoeld (D)**  
 4. Inslee (D)  
 5. Foley (D)  
**6. Dicks (D)**  
**7. McDermott (D)**  
 9. Kreidler (D)

## WV

**Sen. Rockefeller (D)**  
**1. Mollohan (D)**  
 \* 2. Wise (D)  
**3. Rahall (D)**

## WI

Sen. Feingold (D)  
**Sen. Kohl (D)**  
 1. Barca (D)  
 2. Klug (R)  
**3. Gunderson (R)**  
 4. Kleczka (D)  
 5. Barrett (D)  
**7. Obey (D)**  
 \* 8. Roth (R)

## WY

**Sen. Wallop (R)**  
 1. Thomas (R)

growth but are not particularly aware of the American future their immigration stance is helping to create. They have concentrated on satisfying various immigration constituencies without considering the long-term effects on the environment and on the American lifestyle of personal freedoms which require lower-density population. Their status as guardians of growth is not necessarily static. One would suspect that, as the immigration debate

unfolds, many of these members would take actions that would move them onto lists supporting different scenarios. **THE SOCIAL CONTRACT** will provide readers with updates of these shifts.

• No doubt some lawmakers may protest their inclusion on the pro-growth lists, noting that they have a stellar environmental record and that they have no intention of exacerbating pollution and biodiversity problems by doubling the U.S. population.



## Scenario A2: A Future of Unending and Increasing Congestion

# 125-135 million more Americans (1994-2050)

### 2nd-Tier Guardians of Rapid Population Growth (But Major Reduction in Illegal Entry & Asylum Abuse)

<b>CA</b> Sen. Feinstein (D) * 2. Herger (R) 10. Baker (R) 11. Pombo (R) * 23. Gallegly (R) 41. Kim (R) 45. Rohrabacher (R) 51. Cunningham(R)	<b>CT</b> 4. Shays (R) <b>FL</b> 8. <b>McCollum (R)</b> 12. Canady (R) 13. Miller (R) * 16. Lewis (R) * 22. Shaw (R)	<b>GA</b> 6. Gingrich (R) <b>IN</b> 6. Burton (R) <b>KA</b> * 3. Meyers (R) <b>MS</b> Cochran (R)	<b>NJ</b> 5. Roukema (R) <b>NY</b> 4. Levy (R) 13. <b>Molinari (R)</b> 19. <b>Fish (R)</b> 20. <b>Gilman (R)</b> <b>NC</b> 10. <b>Ballenger (R)</b>	<b>PA</b> 8. Greenwood (R) <b>TX</b> Sen. Hutchison (R) 3. Johnson, Sam (R) 21. <b>Smith (R)</b> 22. DeLay (R)
---	---	--	---	--

#### Identifying characteristics

Everyone on this list has co-sponsored ONE of the following bills. (These bills are backed by an additional 23 whose names appear elsewhere based on more restrictive bills they also have co-sponsored.)

- **S-2197 (Sen. Feinstein, D-Calif.)** Illegal Immigration Control and Enforcement Act of 1994.
- **S-2105 (Sen. Hutchison, R-Tex.)** Illegal Immigration Control Act of 1994.
- **HR-3860 (Smith, R-Tex.)** Illegal Immigration Control Act of 1994.

Although showing no interest in the effect of legal immigration on U.S. congestion and environmental problems, members on this list have backed comprehensive legislation that would attack vigorously nearly all of the aspects of illegal entries and illegal overstays by foreign citizens. And they might reduce by as much as 100,000 the asylum applicants who are allowed to stay legally and indefinitely while waiting for asylum hearings that seldom occur. If successful, though, these lawmakers' efforts still would leave Americans to contend with more than 80 percent of the rampant growth that would occur if current conditions were allowed to continue unimpeded.

**Estimated population growth 1994-2050:** 125-135 million.

**Total estimated annual immigration:** 1 million (900,000 legal; 100,000 illegal).

But these charts gauge results, not intentions. And the result of members' decisions not to endorse immigration reduction would mean the doubling of the population by late next century, regardless of how high a rating they receive from the League of Conservation Voters.

- Ironically, some of the "Guardians of Growth" members of Congress have been in the forefront of advocacy for family planning and are champions of the idea of population stabilization. But the immigration policy they either support or allow leaves them

with the net result of creating very rapid growth.

These scenarios are not subjective sociological guesses. They are the rather simple mathematical and logical results of each member's current stance. Members of Congress have been on notice about the consequences for population growth of their immigration policies since the wide reporting of the 1990 Census findings. Over the last year, they have had the opportunity to choose among a variety of pieces of legislation that offer options on how to modify immigration admissions. Members who desire

## Scenario A3: A Future of Unending and Increasing Congestion

# 120-130 million more Americans (1994-2050)

### 3rd-Tier Guardians of Rapid Population Growth (Temporary Cut in Legal Immigration; Aggressive Attack on Illegal)

<u>IO</u> Sen. Grassley (R)	<u>MS</u> * Sen. Lott (R)	<u>MT</u> Sen. Burns (R)	<u>NY</u> Sen. D'Amato (R)	<u>SD</u> Sen. Pressler (R)
<u>KA</u> Sen. Dole (R) Sen. Kassebaum (R)	<u>MO</u> Sen. Bond (R)	<u>NH</u> Sen. Gregg (R)	<u>SC</u> Sen. Thurmond (D)	<u>WV</u> * Sen. Byrd (D)  <u>WY</u> Sen. Simpson (R)

#### Identifying characteristics

Members on this list have co-sponsored the following bill.

- S-1884 (Sen. Simpson, R-Wyo.) Comprehensive Immigration and Asylum Reform Act of 1994.

These senators see a need to reduce not just illegal immigration but legal as well. Their proposal to do so, though, fails to cut numbers back to even the average annual level during the Great Wave at the turn of the century, and the cut is for only five years. The results of their concern are little different from scenarios proposed by members who see no problem from population expansion due to legal immigration.

**Estimated population growth 1994-2050:** 120-130 million.

**Total estimated annual immigration:** 580,000 legal for five years, 900,000 legal thereafter (plus 100,000 illegal).

population stabilization but who don't like the details of controlling immigration as contained in existing bills have been free to offer their own "environmental protection and population stabilization acts." The bills listed in the "Supporters of Stabilization" charts are the only ones, thus far.

Because the leadership of both parties has blocked serious hearings and votes on whether to continue the federal population-growth program, the primary method for rank-and-file lawmakers to raise the issue has been through co-sponsorships of bills.

These bills or similar ones yet to be proposed would allow Americans to begin to reap the fruit of their individual decisions for replacement-level fertility the last two decades. If the nation's demographic future had rested on the fertility choices of American women since the first Earth Day in 1970, U.S. population never would have gone as high as it already is today. Americans in the 1990s would be living in a culture:

- without the perpetual conversion of farmland and natural habitat into suburban streets, housing tracts, malls and parking lots;
- without the draining of wetlands and destruction of other eco-systems to replace the farmland and to make room for more urban sprawl;
- without the accelerating tensions between the needs of wildlife and humans for open spaces and the needs of business to provide jobs and goods for a larger population;
- and without the ever-increasing congestion in our schools, streets, roads, parks, waterways and beaches and ever-expanding government regulation of individual activities to control their frictions in continually more dense habitation.

#### Methodology of this Report

The current number for annual permanently-settling illegal aliens (300,000) comes from the Census Bureau. It is widely believed to be a conservative estimate. Scenarios

## Scenario B1: An End to Additional Congestion in Mid-21st Century

**50-70 million more**

### 1st-Tier Supporters of Population Stabilization (Declining Immigration, After Three-fourths Cut)

#### AL

1. Callahan (R)
2. Everett (R)
- \* 3. Browder (D)
6. Bachus (R)

#### AK

- \* 1. Young (R)

#### AZ

- \* 3. Stump (R)

#### CA

4. Doolittle (R)
25. McKeon (R)
43. Calvert (R)
- \* 44. McCandless (R)
- \* 47. Cox (R)
- \* 48. Packard (R)
52. Hunter (R)

#### CO

- \* 5. Hefley (R)
- \* 6. Schaefer (R)

#### FL

- \* 1. Hutto (D)
- \* 6. Stearns (R)
- \* 14. Goss (R)

#### GA

1. Kingston (R)
3. Collins (R)
4. Linder (R)
7. Darden (D)
- \* 8. Rowland (D)
9. Deal (D)
10. Johnson (D)

#### IL

- \* 8. Crane (R)
- \* 14. Hastert (R)

#### IN

5. Buyer (R)
- \* 7. Myers (R)

#### IO

3. Lightfoot (R)

#### KA

1. Roberts (R)

#### KY

2. Lewis (R)
- \* 4. Bunning (R)
- \* 5. Rogers (R)

#### LA

- \* 3. Tauzin (D)
6. Baker (R)
- \* 7. Hayes (D)

#### MD

1. Gilchrest (R)
6. Bartlett (R)

#### MI

4. Camp (R)

#### MS

- \* 3. Montgomery (D)
- \* 4. Parker (D)
- \* 5. Taylor (D)

#### MO

- \* 7. Hancock (R)
- \* 8. Emerson (R)
- \* 9. Volkmer (D)

#### NV

2. Vulcanovich (R)

#### NH

1. Zeff (R)
2. Swett (D)

#### NJ

3. Saxton (R)

#### NM

2. Skeen (R)

#### NY

22. Solomon (R)
27. Paxon (R)

#### NC

- \* 2. Valentine (D)
6. Coble (R)
11. Taylor (R)

#### OH

12. Kasich (R)
- \* 17. Traficant (D)

#### OK

- \* 1. Inhofe (R)
3. Brewster (D)

#### OR

- \* 2. Smith (R)

#### PA

10. McDade (R)

#### SC

- \* 2. Spence (R)

#### TN

1. Quillen (R)
- \* 2. Duncan (R)
- \* 8. Tanner (D)

#### TX

2. Wilson (D)
- \* 4. Hall (D)
6. Barton (R)
- \* 8. Fields (R)
- \* 17. Stenholm (D)
- \* 19. Combest (R)

#### UT

- \* 1. Hansen (R)

#### WA

8. Dunn (R)

#### WI

- \* 9. Sensenbrenner (R)

#### WY

1. Thomas (R)

#### Identifying characteristics

Members on this list have co-sponsored the following bill:

- **HR-3862 (Stump, R-Ariz.)** Immigration Moratorium Act of 1994.

Even under this most restrictive immigration bill currently proposed in Congress, no American now over the age of 40 is likely to live to see a stabilized population, because of the population momentum from immigrants brought here the past 30 years. But the actions of the U.S. representatives on this list would lead to an America of much slower population growth than during the past four decades. Governments would have to contend with far fewer needs for expanding highways, sewers, schools and other infrastructure and services while devoting more time to maintaining and improving existing infrastructure and institutions.

The proposed starting level of legal immigration, around 235,000, is set high enough to continue to allow unlimited numbers of spouses and minor children of immigrants who become citizens. That level still is above the annual average during the mid-1800s when immigration was used to settle an open Western frontier during the continental expansion. As far fewer immigrants in other categories are allowed to split up their families to come to America, the number of later entries under the family reunification classification and total immigration will fall, probably to well under 100,000 a year.

**Estimated population growth 1994-2050: 50-70 million.**

**Total estimated annual immigration: 235,000, declining to perhaps as low as 50,000 by 2050 (plus 100,000 illegal).**

## Scenario B2: A Future of Unending and Increasing Congestion

# 90-100 million more

### 2nd-Tier Supporters of Population Stabilization (Two-thirds Cut in Immigration to Near Traditional Level)

AL  
Sen. Shelby (D)

CA  
19. Lehman (D)  
\* 21. Thomas (R)  
\* 24. Beilenson (D)

\* 27. Moorhead (R)  
39. Royce (R)  
\* 46. Dornan (R)

DE  
Sen Roth (R)

ID  
Sen. Craig (R)

NE  
\*Sen. Exon (D)

NV  
Sen. Reid (D)  
1. Bilbray (D)

OR  
4. DeFazio (D)

PA  
6. Holden (D)  
7. Weldon (R)

TX  
\* 7. Archer (R)  
\* 12. Geren (D)

VA  
6. Goodlatte (R)

8. Moran (D)  
11. Byrne (D)

WI  
\* 6. Petri (R)

#### Identifying characteristics

Members on this list have co-sponsored ONE of the following bills. (An additional 13 lawmakers have signed onto the Bilbray Bill and are listed under Scenario B1 because they also have co-sponsored the Stump Bill which would bring stabilization more quickly.)

- **S-1923 (Sen. Reid, D-Nev.)** Immigration Stabilization Act of 1994.
- **HR-332 (Bilbray, D-Nev.)** Immigration Stabilization Act of 1993.
- **(Archer, R-Tex.,** number and title pending).

These members are pushing actions to cut in half the population growth that current policies would create by 2050. The leaders on this list, however, step back from the opportunity to stabilize U.S. population by the middle of the next century because they don't want to cut immigration to below its traditional average. (From the beginning of recordkeeping in 1820 to the massive overhaul of immigration law in 1965, average annual immigration was 297,000.)

**Estimated population growth 1994-2050: 90-100 million.**

**Total estimated annual immigration: 325,000 to 350,000 (plus 100,000 illegal).**

for the various congressional bills are based on the assumption that efforts will be very successful but that there is little chance illegal numbers can be cut much below 100,000 annually. Apparently at least that number of babies is born each year to illegal aliens and is given citizenship.

The current number for legal immigration (1 million) is based on a recent report by the Center for Immigration Studies that counted 972,000 legal admissions in 1993, and adds an estimated 3 percent growth for 1994. Growth was 10 percent in 1993. Projections are conservatively based on the rather unlikely assumption that legal immigration will not continue to grow even if it is not checked by legislation.

The range of projected growth under each scenario was

determined after establishing a range of **net** in-migration under each. This was computed by assuming 100,000 to 200,000 annual out-migration for scenarios with high gross in-migration, and an out-migration of 200,000 declining to 50,000 for scenarios with low gross in-migration, on the likelihood that most Americans permanently leaving the country originally were immigrants.

With the help of a demographer, the net annual immigration range under each scenario was placed in relationship with the net immigration figures used in three separate U.S. Census Bureau projections and in three others by Leon Bouvier, retired vice president of the Population Reference Bureau. Projection ranges were extrapolated from those comparisons. ■



*Rosemary Jenks is a senior analyst at the Center for Immigration Studies. She is the editor of Immigration Review, the Center's quarterly journal, and Immigration and Nationality Policies of Leading Migration Nations, a comparative study of national immigration systems. This study is a periodically updated notebook which can be ordered for \$18 from the Center, 1815 "H" Street., NW, Suite 1010, Washington, D.C. 20006. It currently covers 11 countries, with 3 more about to be added.*

# European Immigration Reform: A Model for the United States?

By Rosemary Jenks

Western Europe has been plagued with economic recession, growing unemployment, particularly among immigrants,<sup>1</sup> and rising public service expenditures in recent years. It has also been faced with unprecedented immigration pressures — tens of thousands of Eastern Europeans seeking jobs and better living standards, and millions from the former Yugoslavia and Soviet Republics forced from their homes by ethnic strife have added to the already-significant stream of North Africans, Middle Easterners, Asians and others pouring into Western Europe. These pressures, along with an increasingly dissatisfied public, have prompted a wide range of immigration reform measures throughout Europe. This is particularly true in the member states of the European Union (EU), whose vision of a unified Europe requires that external borders of the EU be tightly regulated so that internal national borders can be abolished.

The United States is facing many of the same problems as Europe — unparalleled levels of immigration, a sluggish economy, high unemployment, rising taxes, and skyrocketing public service outlays. The main difference, however, is that the United States' perception of the historical role of immigration is vastly different than that of Europe.

European identity is tied strongly to national culture. The United States, in contrast, has always characterized itself as a nation of immigrants. Americans take great pride in our generous tradition of accepting legal immigrants and providing safe haven to those facing persecution at home. The true nature of this tradition, however, has been distorted in recent years by some politicians and special interest groups who have sought to make some of the excesses of current immigration policy sacrosanct.

While these politicians and advocacy groups quote Emma Lazarus and hurl accusations of nativism, racism and xenophobia to stifle political debate, mass immigration continues to contribute to the United States' economic, environmental and social problems, creating a public reaction that is increasingly critical of Congressional inaction and skeptical of cornucopian rhetoric.

As a result of this public pressure, a wide variety of immigration reform measures — ranging from a major reduction of legal immigration levels to accelerated asylum determinations to tougher border controls — have been introduced in the U.S. Congress over the past year. Instead of encouraging an objective evaluation of the problems of, or solutions to, mass immigration, the political debate spurred by these proposals continues to be characterized by emotionalism and inaction. The fact that Western European countries have already implemented and tested most of the U.S. proposals — along with a variety of other reform measures — is ignored in this debate. It seems only logical, though, that an evaluation of the effectiveness of the European measures would lend valuable insight into potential reform efforts in our country.

## Legal Immigration

Immigration to Western Europe, like that to the United States, takes three main forms: 1) legal, including family- and employment-based immigration; 2) humanitarian, including asylum seekers and/or refugees; and 3) illegal.

Employment-based immigration traditionally has been the central focus of European immigration policies. The industrial boom across Western Europe after World War II created a need for large numbers