



PROGRAM FOR PUBLIC CONSULTATION
SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

IMMIGRATION REFORM
NOVEMBER 2019

- QUESTIONNAIRE -

Fielded by: Program for Public Consultation **Fielding Dates:** Sep. 19 – Nov. 18, 2019 **Sample Size:** 995 adults

Today we are going to do a survey on a series of important public policy issues. In this survey, you will be asked to evaluate a number of proposals for making changes to the way the U.S. immigration system works. You do not need any knowledge of the subject to take this survey. You will receive background information on the issues and hear arguments for and against the various proposals before making your final recommendations.

Q1. First, how closely do you follow news about immigration?

	Very closely	Somewhat closely	Not too closely	Not at all	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	25.3%	46.3%	17.7%	6.9%	3.8%
GOP	32.9%	45.3%	14.3%	3.2%	4.3%
Dems	23.1%	49.9%	17.2%	6.6%	3.1%
Indep.	15.8%	38.6%	26.0%	14.9%	4.7%

[E-Verify]

Now let's turn to some specific proposals to reform the immigration system.

One major proposal that seeks to discourage illegal immigration is to require employers to use a government system to verify that the people they hire have the legal right to work in the US (by being a citizen, having a green card, or having a work visa).

Here is how this would work:

The employer would be required to go to an existing government website, called E-Verify, where the employer can enter the name and Social Security number of the people they want to hire. The website then verifies whether or not each employee has a legal right to work. All new job applicants would need to be checked out as well. Employers who do not verify their employees and are found to be employing undocumented immigrants will be fined. Employers who repeatedly fail to use the verification system and hire undocumented immigrants may be sentenced to up to 18 months in prison and their business license may be revoked.

Right now, federal contractors and subcontractors are already required to use the E-Verify system to verify the legality of their employees. Also, a few states require it.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal:

Q2. The primary reason that people immigrate to the US illegally is because they are looking for a job. The reason that the US is such a job magnet is that so many employers do not bother to check whether the people they employ are legal--often turning a blind eye because they want to pay the lower wages that illegal immigrants will accept. Honest employers who do check to make sure their employees are legal are put at a disadvantage. This clearly needs to stop. All US employers should be required to verify that their employees are legal.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	42.6%	37.9%	80.5%	12.9%	6.2%	19.1%	0.4%
GOP	57.3%	34.2%	91.5%	4.5%	3.6%	8.1%	0.3%
Dems	31.9%	40.9%	72.8%	18.6%	8.0%	26.6%	0.6%
Indep.	42.1%	37.0%	79.1%	14.5%	6.4%	20.9%	0.0%

Q3. Employers should not have the responsibility to enforce US immigration laws. It is also costly for the employer. According to one study, requiring employers to use E-Verify would cost small businesses \$2.7 billion to implement, an average of \$127 per new employee. It is the government’s job to ensure that illegal immigrants do not come into the US in the first place, rather than expecting employers to police them.

How convincing or unconvincing do you find this argument?

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	29.8%	36.4%	66.2%	18.7%	14.4%	33.1%	0.7%
GOP	31.7%	32.4%	64.1%	18.8%	16.0%	34.8%	1.2%
Dems	28.1%	40.6%	68.7%	19.0%	12.0%	31.0%	0.3%
Indep.	30.7%	33.2%	63.9%	17.6%	17.7%	35.3%	0.7%

Q4. Approximately 7 million illegal immigrants hold jobs in the U.S. At the same time there are 23 million American citizens and legal residents who are currently unemployed or can’t find full-time work. This is not right. Requiring employers to verify that their employees can work legally, would open up millions of jobs for citizens and legal immigrants, lowering their unemployment rate. Our first responsibility should be to ensure that legal workers have a job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	42.2%	29.4%	71.6%	17.7%	10.1%	27.8%	0.6%
GOP	59.3%	32.9%	92.2%	5.2%	2.1%	7.3%	0.6%
Dems	30.4%	25.9%	56.3%	26.4%	16.5%	42.9%	0.8%
Indep.	39.4%	31.9%	71.3%	19.5%	9.3%	28.8%	0.0%

Q5. The idea that the government is going to effectively keep track of who is and who isn’t legal is really dubious. There are many cases of the E-Verify system saying that someone is not legal, when they really are. For example this can happen when someone changes their name--something that is particularly likely to happen to women. Also the idea that driving illegal immigrants out of their jobs is going to free up jobs for Americans is doubtful. Americans do not want many of the jobs they take --like farm work--and driving them out will likely lead to major labor shortages that will hurt American businesses.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	31.8%	40.2%	72.0%	18.1%	8.8%	26.9%	1.0%
GOP	19.2%	42.5%	61.7%	23.6%	14.3%	37.9%	0.3%
Dems	42.3%	40.9%	83.2%	10.8%	4.4%	15.2%	1.5%
Indep.	28.8%	33.8%	62.6%	27.0%	9.7%	36.7%	0.7%

Q6. The E-Verify system has proven to work very well. An overwhelming 87% of employers who use the system report satisfaction. There have been few cases of legal workers being flagged as illegal. In any case, as we make a commitment to use the system and it plays a more important role, improvements will be made and new technology will raise the performance level every year just as is the case with all technology. It can also catch people who are already here, which other systems, like a wall, cannot do. And its cost for taxpayers is quite low.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	34.1%	42.8%	76.9%	16.1%	6.6%	22.7%	0.4%
GOP	44.7%	44.0%	88.7%	7.4%	3.6%	11.0%	0.3%
Dems	27.2%	42.6%	69.8%	20.4%	9.1%	29.5%	0.7%
Indep.	31.6%	40.7%	72.3%	21.9%	5.8%	27.7%	0.0%

Q7. While the E-Verify system sounds good on paper it can be easily fooled. A government funded study found that E-Verify mistakenly approved of 54 percent of unauthorized immigrants, mostly due to the fraudulent use of Social Security numbers. Such numbers are readily available on the black market from people who, for example, find ones associated with people who have died. Also, employers can evade some E-Verify requirements by hiring people as contractors rather than employees, which is probably why states that currently have E-Verify mandates have seen increases in the use of contractors.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	26.8%	47.0%	73.8%	20.1%	5.5%	25.6%	0.7%
GOP	21.3%	50.9%	72.2%	21.6%	5.5%	27.1%	0.6%
Dems	31.6%	45.6%	77.2%	17.9%	4.0%	21.9%	0.9%
Indep.	24.7%	42.6%	67.3%	23.0%	9.8%	32.8%	0.0%

So, here again is the proposal:

All employers must use the E-Verify system to verify that current employees and all new job applicants have the legal right to work in the US. Employers who do not verify their employees and are found to be employing undocumented immigrants will be fined. Employers who repeatedly fail to use the verification system and hire undocumented immigrants may be sentenced up to 18 months in prison and their business license may be revoked.

Q8. Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	5.7	33.2%	14.8%	51.5%	0.5%
GOP	7.0	18.1%	10.3%	71.2%	0.3%
Dems	4.7	44.7%	16.2%	38.2%	0.8%
Indep.	5.7	32.8%	19.9%	47.4%	0.0%
National	6.1	30.9%	13.3%	55.0%	0.9%
GOP	7.0	20.9%	10.1%	68.4%	0.6%
Dem.	5.5	36.8%	16.9%	45.7%	0.6%
Indep.	5.5	38.7%	11.8%	47.4%	2.1%

Q9. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	64.7%	34.7%	0.6%
GOP	85.0%	14.5%	0.5%
Dems	51.0%	48.7%	0.3%
Indep.	60.9%	37.7%	1.4%
National	72.0%	26.1%	1.9%
GOP	82.6%	16.5%	0.9%
Dem.	65.5%	32.3%	2.2%
Indep.	64.1%	32.6%	3.4%

[DACA]

Now let's turn to a different topic that deals with immigrants that do not have legal status.

As you may know there is a major discussion these days about what should happen to people who were brought into the US as minors and never got legal status, but have lived here many years.

In 2012, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, popularly known as DACA, was established to allow these people (commonly referred to as 'Dreamers') to apply for a special status so that they:

- cannot be deported
- can get a work permit

Provided that they:

- were under the age 31 when the program started in 2012
- entered the US before age sixteen
- have continuously resided in the US
- have not been convicted of a serious crime
- are in school, have graduated from high school, are in the military, or have been honorably discharged from the military

This status expires after two years and can be renewed provided that the person has not committed a significant crime.

Approximately 887,000 young people applied for this status, though it was estimated that about 900,000 more were eligible but did not apply (presumably because they were afraid that revealing their illegal presence to the government might someday become a problem for them).

In 2017, this DACA program was ended so that no new applications would be accepted. Those currently having this protected status will begin to lose it as their **two-year** term runs out. They would then become subject to being deported as an illegal alien--for some as soon as this March.

Currently, there is a proposal for creating a legal status for 1.8 million people who were eligible under the DACA program. They would also be eligible to apply for citizenship in 10-12 years provided that they:

graduate from high school

pass criminal background checks and do not commit any crime

maintain full-time employment, serve in the military or pursue a higher education or professional degree

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal. Please select how convincing you find them:

Q10. Most 'Dreamers' were brought to this country as children by their families. And while the families did break the law, the children had no say in the matter and did not actively make that decision to illegally enter the country. It would be unjust to punish people for crimes they did not choose to commit. And considering many have been here their entire lives, it would be cruel to send them to a foreign land to start their lives over. This is not to mention that about 200,000 of them have US-born children who would have to either uproot their lives as well or be left living with relatives.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	58.0%	27.1%	85.1%	8.9%	4.6%	13.5%	1.4%
GOP	42.4%	37.5%	79.9%	12.2%	6.7%	18.9%	1.2%
Dems	69.9%	20.4%	90.3%	5.2%	3.1%	8.3%	1.5%
Indep.	57.2%	24.5%	81.7%	12.3%	4.4%	16.7%	1.6%

Q11. It may not be these young people's fault that their parents brought them here, but the law was still broken and in the end, this proposal would give these law-breaking parents' children citizenship. This rewards illegal behavior and encourages more illegal immigration. We always talk about punishing lawbreakers, but in the end we keep letting them get away with it which encourages others. This is just more amnesty. In the 1980s we gave amnesty to millions of illegal immigrants. We were told that this would be followed with a real crackdown on new illegal immigrants, but it only encouraged more to come in. This proposed program is more of the same.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	23.9%	30.6%	54.5%	21.5%	23.1%	44.6%	0.8%
GOP	38.2%	37.5%	75.7%	19.4%	4.6%	24.0%	0.3%
Dems	14.3%	22.2%	36.5%	24.8%	37.4%	62.2%	1.4%
Indep.	20.7%	39.9%	60.6%	17.0%	21.9%	38.9%	0.4%

Here are some more arguments for and against this proposal:

Q12. The idea of deporting nearly two million young people who are integrated into US society makes no sense from an economic perspective. They have been educated here, at some cost to taxpayers and have a lot to offer the US economy. "Dreamers" are already estimated to pay as much as \$2 billion annually in taxes, and this will only increase as they age -- getting higher-paying jobs and spending more. [Citation?] Deporting them will hurt businesses that rely on them for employment and consumption. Just the logistics of deporting nearly two million young people cost up to \$10 billion, twice the current budget of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. It would be a waste of resources and a major lost opportunity if we deport the Dreamers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	50.4%	32.7%	83.1%	10.7%	5.1%	15.8%	1.1%
GOP	34.0%	40.3%	74.3%	17.8%	7.5%	25.3%	0.5%
Dems	64.1%	26.5%	90.6%	5.6%	2.6%	8.2%	1.0%
Indep.	46.6%	33.8%	80.4%	10.0%	6.8%	16.8%	2.8%

Q13. This plan will make it easier for immigrants who came here illegally as children to compete with young American citizens. This might be good for corporations who want to have an oversupply of workers so they can pay them less and offer little to no benefits, but it is bad for young Americans who are already having a hard time. Just recently, the unemployment rate for 18-29 year olds reached a whopping 11% and many more are underemployed. A recent study found that on average they earn 20% less than their baby boomer parents did at the same age and have more student debt. This is no time to introduce a new surge of young people into the legal job market.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	20.2%	33.9%	54.1%	25.5%	19.7%	45.2%	0.8%
GOP	30.9%	38.4%	69.3%	24.0%	6.2%	30.2%	0.5%
Dems	14.2%	28.7%	42.9%	26.4%	30.1%	56.5%	0.6%
Indep.	14.5%	39.1%	53.6%	26.0%	18.4%	44.4%	2.0%

Q14. So, having evaluated these arguments, what is your view on what should be done about immigrants who came illegally to the US as children?

1) Adopt a proposal for providing them legal status and make them eligible to apply for citizenship in 10-12 years provided that they:

- -graduate from high school
- -pass criminal background checks, and do not commit any crimes
- -maintain full employment, serve in the military or pursue a higher education or professional degree

2) Support the policy that would make them subject to deportation, most of them immediately, and all of them within the next two years

	Adopt a proposal for providing them legal status and make them eligible to apply for citizenship in 10-12 years provided that they: graduate from high school, pass criminal background checks, and do not commit any crimes, maintain full employment, serve in the military or pursue a higher education or professional degree	Support the policy that would make them subject to deportation, most of them immediately, and all of them within the next two years.	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	81.3%	17.7%	1.0%
GOP	70.5%	27.0%	2.5%
Dems	90.8%	9.0%	0.2%
Indep.	77.3%	22.2%	0.4%
National	79.5%	17.4%	3.1%
GOP	68.5%	27.0%	4.5%
Dem.	92.0%	6.0%	1.9%
Indep.	73.8%	23.4%	2.8%

[Path to Citizenship]

Now that we have looked at a proposal for what the government should do immigrants without legal status that were brought to the US as children, we are going to look at a proposal for what the government should do about all of immigrants in the US without legal status.

Currently, there are about 10.5 million immigrants in the US who do not have legal status. While the number increased in the 1990s, it stabilized around 2005 and more recently has come down a bit.

A bit less than half are people who entered the US legally with a work or travel visa and then overstayed, while a bit more than half are people who crossed the US border illegally.

About two thirds of such adult immigrants have been here more than 10 years.

Some people favor trying to deport most or all of these immigrants, but others say that they should be offered a way to live here legally.

We are now going to look at a proposal for a new type of long-term visa for immigrants who have been living in the US for some years without legal status.

Here are the basic elements:

Immigrants without legal status could apply for a new type of visa, if:

- they have been in the US for some years
- have not committed any serious crimes
- have paid a penalty and any taxes they may owe

This new type of visa would:

- allow them to live and work in the country legally,
- require that they pay taxes.

They would eventually be allowed to apply for citizenship, but they would have to go to the back of the line, like anyone who applies for citizenship.

Q15. Here is an argument in favor:

We need to face the fact that it is simply not feasible to deport over 10 million people living and working here, most of them

for more than a decade. These people have integrated into American society and are making valuable contributions to the economy and the society. If we were to try to deport them all it would undermine numerous industries and have very negative effects on the economy. If we give these immigrants legal status they would no longer need to live in the shadows and their children would not live in fear that their parents will be suddenly taken away. It would also benefit American workers, because they would be competing with immigrants on a level playing field, rather than competing with people who can be easily exploited and underpaid by employers. This proposal is a way to deal with immigrants in an orderly, realistic and humane fashion.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	43.8%	35.3%	79.1%	11.7%	6.4%	18.1%	2.8%
GOP	26.1%	43.9%	70.0%	16.4%	12.0%	28.4%	1.7%
Dems	57.3%	31.1%	88.4%	7.9%	2.0%	9.9%	1.7%
Indep.	43.2%	28.9%	72.1%	12.7%	6.9%	19.6%	8.3%

Q16. Here is an argument against:

We need to remember that these undocumented people are here illegally. If we let them stay that would be giving them amnesty. This will undermine the rule of law. It is simply surrendering in the battle to defend our borders and a country with undefended borders is not a real country. Furthermore, legalizing millions of illegal immigrants will only make the problem worse. It will encourage more immigrants to come here illegally. In the 1980's when we granted amnesty illegal immigrants kept on coming. Giving illegal immigrants a free pass, just because they have been here a few years, is not fair to those who are abiding by our laws and going through the proper channels. We should not let people, who knowingly broke our laws, live here and try to become citizens.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	25.7%	29.3%	55.0%	23.3%	19.2%	42.5%	2.5%
GOP	44.5%	32.0%	76.5%	17.2%	5.3%	22.5%	1.0%
Dems	11.8%	25.3%	37.1%	29.3%	31.1%	60.4%	2.6%
Indep.	25.1%	35.0%	60.1%	19.4%	15.2%	34.6%	5.2%

Now that you have heard the arguments, here is the proposal again:

Immigrants without legal status could apply for a new type of visa, if:

- they have been in the US for some years
- have not committed any serious crimes
- have paid a penalty and any taxes they may owe

This new type of visa would:

- allow them to live and work in the country legally,
- require that they pay taxes

They would eventually be allowed to apply for citizenship, but they would have to go to the back of the line, like anyone who applies for citizenship.

Q17. How acceptable or unacceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	6.3	21.8%	17.7%	60.4%	0.2%
GOP	5.9	23.6%	19.6%	56.5%	0.3%
Dems	6.9	17.8%	15.1%	67.0%	0.1%
Indep.	5.8	28.8%	21.0%	50.2%	0.0%

Q18. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose such a new type of long term visa for immigrants who have been living in the US for some years without legal status?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	73.7%	24.8%	1.5%
GOP	61.3%	37.8%	0.9%
Dems	85.2%	13.9%	0.9%
Indep.	67.7%	27.8%	4.5%

[If “oppose” (q18 = 2), then present q19]

Q19. Do you oppose this proposal because:

	you would prefer that all illegal immigrants be deported	some other reason	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	15.5%	9.2%	0.1%
GOP	28.4%	9.4%	0.0%
Dems	6.7%	6.9%	0.3%
Indep.	12.9%	15.0%	0.0%

[If “some other reason” (q19 = 2), then present q20]

Q20. What is that reason?

[Text box open-ended]

[If “Favor” in Q9 AND “Oppose” in Q18, Present Q21]

Q21. If employers were required to use the E-verify system to discourage people from coming to the US or staying illegally, would you then favor or oppose such a new type of long-term visa for immigrants who have been living in the US for some years without legal status?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	7.4%	10.6%	0.0%
GOP	12.3%	21.1%	0.0%
Dems	4.5%	3.5%	0.0%
Indep.	5.4%	9.0%	0.0%

	Favor path to citizenship (Q18)	Favor, only if use eVerify (Q21)	Total favor Long-term Visa	Oppose PtC, even with eVerify (Q21)	Oppose both PtC and E-Verify	Total oppose Long-term Visa	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	73.7%	7.4%	81.1%	10.6%	6.7%	17.3%	1.5%
GOP	61.3%	12.3%	73.6%	21.1%	4.4%	25.5%	0.9%
Dems	85.2%	4.5%	89.7%	3.5%	6.0%	9.5%	0.9%
Indep.	67.7%	5.4%	73.1%	9.0%	13.5%	22.5%	4.5%

[Non-Agricultural Guest Workers]

Now let's turn to proposals that deal with visas for immigrant workers in the US.

There are industries that rely on temporary, often seasonal, labor, such as landscaping, construction, hotels, conservation, and amusement parks. Currently, there are several million undocumented workers working in these industries.

We would now like to consider a proposal for reducing the number of undocumented workers in these industries by bringing more of them into the legal immigration system.

Currently, to fill these temporary positions employers can request visas so that they can hire foreign workers on a temporary basis. However, they must first go through a process with the Department of Labor (DoL) to try to hire American workers. Once it is determined that the workers are needed, the company can take applications from foreign workers. The workers are granted visas to come into the US and work for nine months.

Employers must pay the same prevailing rate as Americans are paid for the same work (determined by the DoL or an independent source approved by the DoL).

Such visas are renewable for up to three years. After that the worker must return home for at least three months before reapplying.

These workers are not allowed to collect any public benefits, but they do pay federal, state and local taxes.

These visas are called H-2B visas and up to 66,000 are issued annually. This number has varied depending on what Congress decides and has been both substantially higher and lower than the current number. Demand for these workers has gone up and down over the years. Right now demand is high because of low unemployment.

Currently, there is a proposal in Congress to enable the Departments of Labor and Homeland Security to provide substantially more of these H-2B visas. In the current labor market this would likely increase the number of workers with such visas to about 200,000 and in future years could go higher. If the labor market were to change and more Americans were to want those jobs, the number would go down.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal:

Q22. The fact is that there are many industries in the United States that need immigrant labor which is why they currently hire millions of them. It would be much better if this process was done in a legal way. It is essential to ensure that American workers get the first crack at those jobs. It is also important that the workers are paid the kinds of wages that go to Americans so that the immigrant workers do not undercut American workers. All this can only be done if we have a legal system of guest workers. American companies don't want to break the law by hiring illegal immigrants, but they have to be provided a way to do it legally when there is the need for those workers. And if they have that option to do it legally it will be more feasible to put more pressure on them to stop hiring illegals. By bringing immigrant workers out of the shadows it will also be possible to get tax revenue from them, as well as to provide them protection from the abuses that are so common in the shadow economy.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	39.3%	45.9%	85.2%	9.9%	2.3%	12.2%	2.6%
GOP	36.3%	48.4%	84.7%	11.9%	2.0%	13.9%	1.4%
Dems	44.2%	45.3%	89.5%	7.3%	1.5%	8.8%	1.6%
Indep.	32.3%	42.0%	74.3%	12.8%	4.9%	17.7%	8.0%

Q23. This whole idea of trying to solve the problem of illegal workers by replacing them with legal temporary workers fails to address the reason that illegal workers are a problem in the first place. Wages have been stagnant for decades now, especially in the lower wage industries that want to hire guest workers. It is Economics 101 that when wages are low it is because there is too big of a supply of workers. So many American workers have been frustrated in their effort to get a good job that the percentage of the population in the workforce is historically low. None of these things will improve as long as there is a ready availability of illegal workers ready to take jobs at low wages and with few benefits. While advocates of this proposal for guest workers may claim that it will think of American workers first, the chances are that the government will think of corporations first, and the corporations want an oversupply of labor so that they can keep wages low. That means they will pressure the government to look the other way and let the corporations hire guest workers who will undercut American workers, even when there are American workers still in need of a good-paying job.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	22.2%	37.4%	59.6%	25.0%	12.4%	37.4%	3.0%
GOP	27.8%	44.0%	71.8%	21.6%	4.7%	26.3%	1.8%
Dems	17.6%	32.7%	50.3%	28.6%	18.5%	47.1%	2.5%
Indep.	23.1%	36.7%	59.8%	22.3%	11.3%	33.6%	6.6%

So, here again is the proposal:

Making it possible to substantially increase the number of temporary work visas, called H-2B visas, for industries that rely on temporary, often seasonal, labor, such as landscaping, construction, hotels, conservation, and amusement parks. Such increases would only be allowed if the government determines that there are no American workers who want those jobs and employers pay the same wage that is paid to American workers in those jobs. Guest workers are not allowed to collect any public benefits, but they do pay federal, state and local taxes and are required to periodically return to their home country.

Q24. How acceptable or unacceptable do you find this proposal?

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	6.1	20.5%	22.1%	56.7%	0.7%
GOP	6.0	20.8%	22.6%	55.6%	1.0%
Dems	6.3	19.0%	20.9%	59.6%	0.4%
Indep.	5.6	23.9%	24.3%	51.0%	0.8%
National	5.6	31.6%	16.0%	51.2%	1.2%
GOP	6.0	26.7%	14.3%	58.0%	1.0%
Dem.	5.5	33.4%	17.3%	48.1%	1.3%
Indep.	5.1	38.0%	16.8%	43.7%	1.5%

Q25. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose the proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	69.0%	29.6%	1.3%
GOP	66.8%	31.7%	1.6%
Dems	73.7%	25.8%	0.6%
Indep.	61.1%	35.9%	3.0%
National	69.1%	29.0%	1.9%
GOP	73.3%	25.2%	1.6%
Dem.	67.1%	31.1%	1.8%
Indep.	64.8%	32.4%	2.9%

[Visas for Farm Workers]

Another important issue is the role of migrants in farm work.

Right now there are about 2.2 million people who work on farms. Of these, approximately:

- 330,000 are US citizens
- 180,000 are permanent residents, i.e. green card holders
- 200,000 have special visas as guest workers
- 1.5 million are undocumented workers primarily from Mexico and Central America

Right now, there are no proposals for simply deporting the 1.5 million undocumented farm workers. Deporting large numbers of undocumented farm workers is strongly opposed by the farming industry.

But, there are some proposals to reduce the number of undocumented workers by replacing them with legal workers. This would be done by expanding the program that allows farmers to hire guest-workers from other countries for a limited amount of time, after which the guest-workers would be required to return to their home country for a period.

Currently, there is a visa system for farmers to hire migrants to work on their farms as guest workers for up to 10 months and, as mentioned above, currently there are 200,000 farm workers who have such visas. After the visa expires the workers can apply for extensions for up to three years after which they are required to return home for a period.

However, most farmers do not use this visa system, opting instead to hire undocumented workers which is less costly for them. The guest worker visa program requires that farmers pay workers about \$11-14 per hours and to provide them housing and transportation. This is higher than the amount generally paid to undocumented workers, which is about \$8 an hour, with no requirements to provide housing or transportation.

One proposal is to expand the guest worker visa program by lowering the requirements on farmers, making it more attractive for farmers to hire legal migrants. Under this proposal:

farmers would be able to pay workers a minimum of \$8.43 an hour;
 farmers would not be required to provide them housing or transportation; and
 the length of the visas would be extended from 10 to 18 months and can be renewed once, after which the immigrant must return to their home for a period.

This change would be coupled with a stronger effort to require employers to ensure that their workers are legal. Employers who intentionally hire undocumented workers would be subject to penalties, including fines and revoking of business licenses. Employers who persistently hire undocumented workers could be subject to prison time.

Here are some more arguments for and against this proposal.

Q26. Having so many illegal undocumented workers is not a good thing, but the fact is there is a demand for farm workers. Simply deporting them would be a huge blow to the farm industry and is not an option. We do have a guest worker program but the current requirements are not realistic. It requires farmers to pay as much \$5 an hour more than the actual labor market costs, so they do not use the program and simply hire undocumented workers. Farmers who do use the program are at a competitive disadvantage. If all farmers were to have to pay these higher costs, the price of food would go up, which would be a burden on American families, especially ones with low incomes. This proposed change to the guest worker program would allow for more competitive wages and remove the burdens of providing housing and transportation. This will make it possible for farmers to use the guest worker visa system. More legal employment means more local and state tax revenue, and also more protections for workers. Employers will have better access to a stable supply of workers.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	26.2%	47.0%	73.2%	13.7%	6.3%	20.0%	6.8%
GOP	24.7%	49.0%	73.7%	13.0%	6.1%	19.1%	7.2%
Dems	27.6%	47.4%	75.0%	14.5%	6.0%	20.5%	4.5%
Indep.	25.2%	41.8%	67.0%	12.7%	7.6%	20.3%	12.6%

Q27. Right now farmers already have an option to hire foreign workers through the guest worker visa program and they should be required to use that system, rather than hiring undocumented workers. These proposed changes to the guest workers visa program will reduce wages and conditions for a group of people that work in some of the toughest conditions in the country, and that have for years provided this nation with an affordable source of food. Right now there are over 500,000 legal workers, including US citizens, whose wages would be reduced by letting farmers hire foreigners to do back breaking work for very low wages. For somebody who is working here under the current guest workers system, sending money back home to their families, a decrease of up to \$5 an hour will make it nearly impossible to afford short-term housing and transportation. Basically, this proposal is giving farmers the right to exploit both American and foreign farm workers by opening up the possibility of hiring unlimited numbers of foreign workers at exploitive wage levels.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	27.4%	38.3%	65.7%	20.2%	6.6%	26.8%	7.5%
GOP	29.9%	36.3%	66.2%	19.5%	7.0%	26.5%	7.2%
Dems	27.1%	39.7%	66.8%	21.0%	6.2%	27.2%	6.0%
Indep.	22.9%	38.6%	61.5%	19.5%	6.6%	26.1%	12.3%

Q28. So, having heard these arguments, here again is the proposal:

The guest worker visa program that currently requires farmers to pay workers about \$11-14 per hour and to provide them housing and transportation would be replaced by one that allows farmers to pay the workers a minimum of \$8.43 an hour and removes the requirement to provide them housing or transportation. The length of the visas would be extended from 10 to 18 months, which can be renewed once for up to another 18 months, after which they would be required to return to their home country for a period. This change would be coupled with a stronger effort to require employers to ensure that their workers are legal by imposing penalties on employers who hire undocumented workers.

Please select how acceptable or unacceptable this proposal is to you on the scale below.

	Mean	0-4	5	6-10	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	5.4	29.9%	18.4%	43.6%	8.0%
GOP	6.2	19.1%	18.5%	54.5%	7.9%
Dems	4.9	38.1%	19.3%	35.7%	6.9%
Indep.	5.5	29.8%	15.8%	43.0%	11.4%
National	4.9	44.5%	16.4%	38.6%	0.5%
GOP	5.9	32.7%	14.7%	52.4%	0.2%
Dem.	4.2	54.2%	16.4%	28.7%	0.6%
Indep.	4.5	47.2%	19.8%	31.9%	1.1%

Q29. In conclusion, do you favor or oppose this proposal?

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	53.6%	41.5%	4.9%
GOP	60.3%	33.5%	6.2%
Dems	48.2%	48.4%	3.4%
Indep.	54.6%	39.2%	6.2%
National	54.9%	43.4%	1.7%
GOP	68.8%	29.9%	1.4%
Dem.	43.3%	55.3%	1.4%
Indep.	52.2%	44.7%	3.1%

[Border Wall]

Now let's turn to the last issue.

Another issue related to illegal immigration is a proposal for the US to spend \$25 billion to build a barrier along the US southern border with Mexico, primarily by building a wall. This border is 1,195 miles long.

The US government currently spends about \$3.8 billion per year policing the southern border. In 2016, 409,000 people were caught and prevented from crossing the border. However, the Department of Homeland Security estimates that 170,000 succeeded in entering illegally.

Not all of these are people who are seeking to cross the border are seeking to immigrate into the US. Some are smugglers.

There are different ideas about how this \$25 billion should be spent. Some say that there should be a solid wall along the full length of 1,195 miles. Others say that this poses many engineering challenges, particularly in mountainous areas and

that in some areas it is better to have fences, or just more intensive surveillance.

The question we would like you to evaluate is whether the US should invest \$25 billion, over and above current spending on border security, to create a stronger barrier on the southern border, primarily by building a wall.

Here are some arguments for and against this proposal:

Q30. Spending \$25 billion on securing our southern border is a good investment. Every day hundreds of immigrant succeed in entering the US illegally through the southern border. Many are immigrants who come here and use government social services, in addition to taking jobs that should be going to American citizens. Many are criminals, bringing in drugs and undermining the fabric of our society. Some are members of terrorist groups. New research suggests that the large build-up in border security and enforcement in the last decade contributed to the decline in illegal crossings. By preventing large numbers of economic migrants from crossing, our border patrol agents can focus more of their resources on the most serious traffickers causing the most harm. Ultimately we need to recognize that a nation is only as strong as its borders. A country that can so easily be entered is a weak country. We need to make a statement to the world that we are in control of our destiny.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	33.6%	20.9%	54.5%	16.4%	25.2%	41.6%	3.9%
GOP	63.5%	22.7%	86.2%	7.8%	3.5%	11.3%	2.5%
Dems	13.5%	19.0%	32.5%	19.6%	43.9%	63.5%	4.0%
Indep.	27.6%	22.5%	50.1%	24.9%	18.4%	43.3%	6.5%

Q31. Building a wall sounds bold and dramatic, but, realistically, it will not significantly reduce the number of people crossing the border illegally. Walls can be scaled with ladders. More importantly, if one route is blocked people will use others already in use. Hundreds of tunnels have been dug under the border. People can be smuggled by boat. People can be hidden in trucks and vans crossing the border, as there is no way that the border guards can check all of the millions of vehicles that cross over every month. Surely, there are a lot of big companies out there eager for the opportunity to get lucrative contracts building such a wall, but in the end we will see it was all just a boondoggle. If we want to get serious about reducing the number of people coming here illegally, there are more effective means, like discouraging them from coming by making sure that employers do not hire them once they get here.

	Very convincing	Somewhat convincing	Total convincing	Somewhat unconvincing	Very unconvincing	Total unconvincing	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	37.7%	31.1%	68.8%	15.5%	12.9%	28.4%	2.8%
GOP	23.8%	29.4%	53.2%	19.6%	25.2%	44.8%	2.1%
Dems	49.8%	31.5%	81.3%	11.6%	4.7%	16.3%	2.4%
Indep.	32.9%	33.5%	66.4%	18.2%	10.2%	28.4%	5.2%

Q32. So, in conclusion, do you favor or oppose the government spending \$25 billion to build a stronger barrier along the US southern border with Mexico, primarily by building a wall.

	Favor	Oppose	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	43.5%	55.7%	0.8%
GOP	78.1%	21.2%	0.7%
Dems	20.0%	79.8%	0.2%
Indep.	37.2%	60.3%	2.5%
National	39.0%	59.1%	1.9%
GOP	74.1%	23.8%	2.2%
Dem.	13.3%	85.4%	1.3%
Indep.	28.2%	68.9%	3.0%

[If “oppose” (q32=2), then present q33]

Q33. Would you favor spending on the southern border:

	1. No more than the current \$3.8 billion per year on policing the border	2. An additional one-time amount to build a stronger barrier, but less than additional \$25 billion proposed	Ref / DK
New York CD-25	42.9%	8.4%	4.4%
GOP	13.1%	5.8%	2.4%
Dems	64.7%	9.7%	5.4%
Indep.	44.3%	10.5%	5.6%
National	48.8%	9.0%	1.3%
GOP	13.0%	10.2%	0.6%
Dem.	76.4%	8.1%	0.9%
Indep.	56.8%	8.8%	3.3%

[If “an additional one-time amount . . .” (Q33=2), then present Q34]

Q34. How much would you favor spending on building a stronger barrier? Please write your number in billions of dollars. You can also enter a fraction of a billion. (For example, if you want to put \$250 million, then enter 0.25)

	Median
New York CD-25	0.5
GOP	0.5
Dems	1
Indep.	0.5
National	0.5
GOP	5.0
Dem.	0.25
Indep.	0.23

###