

floated by administration officials like Reagan adviser Richard Allen and others.

On the migrant labor question, in recent weeks there has been motion in the United States, particularly in Congress, to put together a viable package that the Mexicans will also find acceptable. This point could well be one of the first on which the two heads of state are able to reach substantive agreement.

There is, however, a tremendous difference in approach between the various proposals thus far put forward. The most provocative one comes from the Hesburgh Commission established by President Carter in 1978, whose modified legislative version was submitted to Congress by Sen. Walter Huddleston, a Kentucky Democrat. The premise of this approach is that the United States is in irreversible economic decline, lacking in resources, and therefore unable to maintain its traditional policy of welcoming immigrants into the American "melting pot." The Hesburgh proposals are coherent with—and in some respects actually drafted by—the authors and proponents of the Malthusian *Global 2000 Report*.

A second group of proposals goes at the problem from the opposite standpoint: that Mexico is our friend and ally, that we must aid its economic development, and that it is in America's national interest to establish some kind of "guest-worker" program for Mexican migrant labor in the United States.

A task force composed of the secretaries of Justice, State, Health and Human Services, and Labor is expected to issue a formal recommendation some time in May, but everything indicates that President Reagan favors the latter approach.

In a recent interview with CBS's Walter Cronkite, Reagan said, "Remember that Mexico is our neighbor and friend, and that it has a very high rate of unemployment. If we close the border, we will obstruct the only escape valve, which we call illegal immigration. If we close off that escape valve we could destabilize Mexico, and in any case it's not in our own interests."

The two "guest-worker" bills now before Congress, one sponsored by Republican Sen. Harrison Schmitt of New Mexico, the other by California's Sen. S. I. Hayakawa, share this orientation and are very similar in other respects. Both senators are politically close to Reagan and to Reagan intimates like Sen. Paul Laxalt, a Nevada Republican.

The shortcomings and inadequacies in these two bills are addressed in a detailed evaluation and policy proposal issued by the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC), whose advisory board is chaired by Lyndon LaRouche. We reprint the entire NDPC document below, along with a summary of the various proposals dealing with the labor question.

NDPC PROPOSAL

'No migrant law will work without a growth approach'

The following policy statement on immigration was released on April 13 by the National Democratic Policy Committee.

With the second summit meeting between Mexican President José López Portillo and U. S. President Ronald Reagan on the agenda for later in the spring of this year, the issue of immigration into the United States—and in particular of undocumented workers—is receiving important attention from legislators in Washington, D.C. and the public at large.

This long-standing bone of contention between the U.S. and Mexico actually offers the opportunity to take a long step in the direction of establishing an overall positive bilateral relationship with our neighbor to the south, which—centered on cooperation for the rapid, high-technology industrialization of both countries—can serve as a model for North-South relations as a whole. It is toward this end that the National Democratic Policy Committee (NDPC) has elaborated the following policy proposal.

The constitutional question

At the heart of the immigration issue is nothing less than the constitutional purpose for which our nation was founded. As established by our Founding Fathers in the Constitution, America was created as a temple of liberty committed to the continuous industrial progress of its people. We not only welcomed the world's "tired, poor, and hungry" to American shores; we quickly absorbed them into the mainstream of our booming economy, an economy which they in turn helped develop through their applied skills.

There isn't an American today who isn't the descendant of an immigrant from one country or another. This "melting pot" approach—premised on a constantly growing economy—is the American way.

That this is in fact the central issue of immigration policy is recognized by the bills on the matter now before the U.S. Senate. The one submitted by Sen. Harrison Schmitt (R-N.M.) proposes that this tradition should be maintained, and for that reason the NDPC endorses it with certain proposed amendments included.

A second, submitted on March 24, 1981 by Sen. Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.), would explicitly reverse America's traditional immigration policy on the indefensible grounds of a supposed "resource scarcity" in the United States. The Huddleston bill (S. 776, the "Immigration and National Security Act of 1981"), is surprisingly explicit on this point:

(1) immigrants have played an historic role in populating the United States, developing commerce and industry, making cultural contributions, and otherwise enriching the United States; and (2) at present the United States is no longer receptive to unlimited and uncontrolled immigration because the United States is fully settled, confronted by resource shortages in many areas, and completely committed to advancing the quality of life of its own disadvantaged citizens.

(b) It is the policy of the United States to mediate between a traditional hospitality toward immigrants and the restraints imposed by resource limitations and by an expanding population, by maintaining a policy of limited and controlled immigration.

This thinking is identical to that of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy, set up by President Carter in October 1978 under the guiding hand of Father Theodore Hesburgh—chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation, a director of the New York Council on Foreign Relations, and chairman of the Overseas Development Council. The Hesburgh report says: "We [are] faced with the reality of limitations on immigration. . . . The United States cannot become a land of unlimited immigration. As important as immigration has been and remains to our country, it is no longer possible to say, as George Washington did, that we welcome all of the oppressed of the world."

Thus, the guiding assumption of both the Hesburgh Report and the Huddleston bill is that the Era of Progress is over for America, and that we have to tighten our belts and adjust to British-style economic contraction.

It is not surprising that, on such premises, the Huddleston bill proposes a series of odious and unacceptable measures designed to cut off immigration. These measures include:

1) The establishment of a national identity card, which *all* workers—Americans and foreigners alike—

would have to present for computer clearance before being hired. Many political groups have correctly rejected this measure as a dangerous step towards a Nazi-like national police state.

2) Sanctions against employees who hire undocumented foreigners, consisting of \$1,000 fines per illegal employee. This would simply induce employers to preventively discriminate against *all* prospective employees of Hispanic origin, without seriously affecting the immigration question.

3) Limit total immigration to the U.S. to 350,000 per year. In 1980, legal immigration totalled over 800,000.

4) The Huddleston bill tries to sugar-coat these proposals in a way designed to appeal to those seriously concerned with law enforcement, by calling for a significant increase of the border patrol, in terms both of staffing and equipment. In the context of the economic collapse in both Mexico and the U.S. foreseen by the bill, such measures will at best degenerate into police repression designed to enforce an untenable economic situation.

The 'Paddock Plan'

Yet, an even greater evil than this lurks behind the Huddleston bill. Whether Senator Huddleston himself is aware of it or not, the fact is that his bill is nothing but the legislative version of a policy long espoused by State Department adviser and agricultural specialist William Paddock, a policy known as the "Paddock Plan." The Paddock Plan was first brought to national attention in 1976, when NDPC Advisory Board Chairman Lyndon LaRouche denounced it on nationwide television as "genocidal"—a reference to Paddock's own candid call for reducing Mexico's population by half by the end of the century.

The Huddleston/Paddock approach is itself only the immigration component of the broader Global 2000 policy document drafted by the Carter administration, which calls for reducing the *world's* population by 2 billion from the projected 6.5 billion by the year 2000.

The Paddock/Global 2000 connection to the Huddleston bill is unequivocal. Huddleston's key staffer responsible for the bill is Roger LeMaster, who has personally stated that the ideas for the bill were developed in close cooperation with Zero Population Growth (ZPG), the Environmental Fund, and the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR). The last two were founded by none other than William Paddock—who remains on the boards of directors.

A directly contrary outlook is contained in the bill submitted to the Senate of Jan. 5, 1981 by Senator Schmitt (S. 47, the "United States-Mexico Good Neighbor Act of 1981"). Endorsed by Sen. Paul Laxalt (R-

Nev.) and other congressmen close to President Reagan, the Schmitt bill argues that a solution to the undocumented worker problem must be based on "strong economic and political cooperation between the United States and Mexico [which] will benefit not only the people of these countries, but will also help to eliminate Western hemispheric tensions."

The Schmitt bill also correctly rejects any "attempts to seal our vast border with Mexico to the flow of migrants," as a policy certainly "doomed to failure." It also rejects employer sanctions and the establishment of a national I.D. card, and calls instead for a "guest-worker" program of documented migrant labor. The annual quota of such workers would be set by the attorney general, in consultation with the secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The only restriction placed on their employment is that they "not displace available, qualified, and willing domestic workers."

But where the Schmitt bill falls short is on the point of the necessary framework of joint industrialization which is the sine qua non of an immigration policy which does not encourage a fight for too few jobs. In a word, in the absence of an economic boom on *both* sides of the border, an immigration policy acceptable to both the United States and Mexico simply cannot be devised. That the Schmitt bill does not contemplate such a context of economic growth is evident when it states that "the vast majority of jobs that will be taken by Mexicans are in the agricultural and service industries"—precisely the degrading, stoop-labor jobs that would be rapidly eliminated under conditions of industrial expansion. Schmitt also proposes that the maximum stay in any calendar year for documented workers should be 240 days. This would guarantee that Mexican labor would continue to be employed only in seasonal agricultural stoop labor, and not in year-round jobs in industry and manufacturing which would help them seriously develop their skill levels.

The NDPC therefore endorses the Schmitt bill, while proposing its amendment on the following two points:

- Premise the entire immigration policy on establishing economic accords with Mexico around the idea of trading oil for technology, measures which will guarantee economic boom conditions on both sides of the border; and
- Increase the funding for border law enforcement activities against arms and drug smuggling.

Under such conditions, the United States can safely open the border to virtually unlimited flows of Mexican workers, who would be absorbed into an expanding high-technology industrial sector in the U.S., since this sector would quickly become labor-short. This, combined with the necessary adoption of minimum wage

and basic social security benefits for the migrant labor, will guarantee both the foreigners' well-being, as well as protect the jobs and labor rights of American workers. Encouraging the capital-intensive development of Mexico will also guarantee that Mexicans have attractive jobs to return home to, once they have acquired adequate skill levels in the U.S.

Within this context, it will become desirable to expand the American consular presence in Mexico, to help attract and document prospective guest workers. It is also in America's interest for Mexico to expand its consular offices in the United States, in order to help guarantee the protection of the human rights of the migrant labor from possible abuses by unscrupulous employers.

The NDPC proposal

Restating our proposal for immigration policy in summary form, the NDPC believes Congress should:

- 1) Establish a bilateral, oil-for-technology economic accord with the Mexican government. Use this as the bedrock on which to build an industrial boom on both sides of the border. Reject the "North American Common Market" and similar schemes as unworkable.
- 2) Grant two- to three-year work visas to Mexicans who wish to work in the U.S. and their families. Guest workers will be allowed to work in any geographic area or any industry they desire, but an emphasis will be placed on absorbing them into higher-technology sectors, in an effort to rapidly upgrade their skill levels.
- 3) The best protection of American workers' jobs is to vastly expand the demand for skilled labor—which will result from the proposed oil-for-technology accord. An interim quota system can be established if necessary, as per the Schmitt bill's provisions, but with first-year quotas set in the 1.5 to 2 million range. Beyond that, the border can and should be virtually open.
- 4) Minimum wage guarantees and all federal educational and welfare services will be provided to all foreign workers.
- 5) Expand Mexican consular services within the U.S. to help protect the labor and human rights of Mexican guest workers.
- 6) Reject employer sanctions and the proposed national I.D. card, as measures that are discriminatory and endanger our democratic system.
- 7) As the new system takes hold, normalize the status of foreign workers—both documented and undocumented—currently in the U.S.
- 8) Significantly increase the funding for the border patrol and other law enforcement agencies, in order to crack down on the illegal flow of arms and drugs across our border with Mexico. Expand cooperation with the Mexican government in this regard.