## THE HUDDLESTON BILL

## Paddock's friends draft Senate act

by Timothy Rush

In the United States, there are currently three major bills in the Senate affecting immigration policy, and three major proposals on the subject. What follows is a brief summary of each. An estimated 1 million undocumented Mexican workers at any one time are in the United States, while the U.S. immigration quota for Mexico, as for all other Western countries, is 20,000 per year, including relatives of legal immigrants.

The Huddleston bill (S. 776), "Immigration and National Security Act of 1981." This legislation's view of relations between the United States and countries with potential immigrants is that the United States is resource short, and therefore immigration must be limited. It proposes a quota of 350,000 foreigners per year as the ceiling on total legal residence of immigrants. There are no guest-worker provisions. The bill proposes to increase the U.S. border patrol to 6,000 and provide it with new equipment. Sanctions of \$1,000 per illegal alien are imposed on employers, with identity cards mandatory for all workers in the United States in order to facilitate policing.

The Hayakawa bill (S. 930). This bill is based on the view that economic and political cooperation is necessary between the United States and Mexico. It would allow 1 million Mexicans per year to enter the U.S. over a five-year period on guest-worker visas. The visas' maximum duration would be 180 days. Agriculture and services would be the mandatory areas of employment; immigrants are not allowed to displace American labor, says the bill. Guest-workers would post a \$500 bond in Mexico before coming to the U.S., which they would forfeit if they stayed illegally. Penalties of \$500 per undocumented worker are specified for employers violating the law. No I.D. cards would be introduced, but guest-workers would not be covered by the minimum wage.

The Schmitt bill (S. 47), "The Mexico-U.S. Good Neighbor Act of 1981." This bill calls for economic and political cooperation with Mexico, and centers around a guest-worker program, like the Hayakawa bill. Quotas, however, would be set by a special commission providing 240-day visas. The bill expects that most of these jobs will be in agriculture and service industries, but does not

restrict employment to those areas. A proviso stipulates that American labor cannot be displaced, and that the secretary of labor can rule work-sites off limits to guest-workers if adequate numbers of U.S. workers are available. No employer sanctions or I.D. cards are mandated. The bill does not specify minimum-wage coverage for guest-workers, although all other labor rights are protected.

The Hesburgh report. U.S.-Mexico relations, according to this report, should be focused on bilateral consultations to effect limitations on immigration. A permanent total of 250,000 immigrants a year from all countries would be allowed into the United States, plus 100,000 annually above this total each year for the first five years to clear away "the backlog." No guest-worker program is proposed. Limits on areas of employment would be set by a special commission. A superagency would be created to oversee a border crackdown. "High levels of alien apprehension, detention, and deportation" are recommended. The plan features employer sanctions, I.D. cards, and gradual legalized status for illegal aliens already in the United States.

The Clements proposal. According to the Republican governor of Texas, William Clements, a friend of President Reagan, U.S.-Mexico relations should be based on American help for Mexico's economic development. A joint committee made up of appointees by the two presidents should be established on immigration, and a guestworker program should issue 270-day visas for an unspecified number of Mexicans. Areas of employment would be unlimited, and there is no mention of I.D. cards. Employer sanctions would be \$1,000 fines. Guestworkers would be covered by the minimum wage, discrimination discouraged, and the status of Mexicans currently in the United States legalized.

The NDPC proposal. U.S.-Mexico relations are to be based on bilateral oil-for-technology accords for Mexico's industrialization, as a model for North-South entente. For the first year of the program, a quota of 1.5 to 2 million Mexicans would be set under a guest-worker program; thereafter there would be no immigration limit. Guest-worker visas of two to three years could be indefinitely renewed. Areas of employment are unlimited, but high-technology employment is encouraged.

An EIR seminar on "Mexico: America's \$100 Billion Neighbor," held April 16 in Los Angeles, received a telegram of greetings from California's Sen. S. I. Hayakawa, which read, "I applaud your efforts to develop a humanistic approach to Mexican-American immigration. Your proposals should be considered if any workable immigration policy can be developed. America was founded on the notion of opening our shores, and our borders, to all in need. This tradition must be continued."

## Who's saying what on immigration

by Dennis Small

With the introduction of Sen. Walter Huddleston's "Immigration and National Security Act of 1981" last month, the long-held dream of a man named William C. Paddock has taken a big step closer to reality.

An agronomist who worked for the U.S. government in Central America, Paddock was one of the founding triumvirate of figures in the late 1960s who popularized the notion that the best approach to dealing with alleged worldoverpopulation is the quickest possible elimination of excess population. His book *Famine 1975* called for applying the medical policy of triage to entire Third World populations.

Garrett Hardin, a biologist, coined the companion term "lifeboat ethics." If a lifeboat is overcrowded, and taking on more people will mean the entire boat sinks, it is justified to deny survival to the latecomers. In the case of food and population, the "rich nations" are now floating lifeboats in a sea of drowning "poor nations," Hardin propagandized. He testified in congressional hearings against U.S. aid allocations to famine-ridden countries. Paul Ehrlich's 1968 popularization of Paddock's and Hardin's work, *The Population Bomb*, became a nationwide bestseller.

In 1973 Paddock and Hardin led a split-off from the bulk of family planning organizations to found a new group dedicated explicitly to popularizing coercive birth control methods. This was the Environmental Fund, which wedded the environmentalist thesis of declining resources to Paddock's obsession with population reduction. The Fund's statement of purpose described it as "an effort to stimulate thinking about the unthinkable." The Fund has "no use, no time, and no interest" in merely voluntary birth control programs, knowledgeable sources state. "Almost 100 percent" of the funding for the Environmental Fund came from the Mellon Gulf Oil heirs of Pittsburgh, according to the same sources. Paddock also pitched in funding from his personal fortune.

Paddock has very specific ideas about Mexico. In a series of 1975 interviews he insisted that Mexico's population must be cut in half. He said the way to do this is to "shut the border" with the U.S. and "watch them scream." How would this reduce the population? "The usual means—famine, war, and pestilence." In a mid-1980 interview with EIR, Paddock reiterated that reduc-

ing Mexico's 68 million population by half "would be an excellent thing." Asked if Mexico's rapid economic growth and technological advance didn't permit more population, Paddock objected: "Growth is something you have to stop."

## **FAIR's origins**

Paddock decided that the Environmental Fund's "educational" legal status and general population focus inhibited adequate lobbying for specific "close the border" measures. In 1979 he teamed up with a Michigan doctor and fellow Environmental Fund board member, John Tanton, to found the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

Tanton, like Paddock, had also served on the board of directors of Zero Population Growth in the mid-1970s. According to ZPG Executive Director Roy Morgan, "Tanton moved out because our position on immigration was too moderate for him." Tanton tapped a hard-core environmentalist from his home district in West Michigan, Roger Conner, to become FAIR's executive director. Conner set up a close working relationship with Paddock, who joined FAIR's board of five directors in early 1980. Says Morgan, "I can tell you exactly who in Washington knows Bill Paddock front and backwards, up and down, right and left and works with him. That's Roger Conner."

Conner describes the Carter administration's Global 2000 Report, which he worked on, as a "realistic document" that "puts into governmentese what Bill Paddock was saying in 1965." If the Reagan administration fails to implement the report, it "will be a tragedy."

With a 1981 budget approaching \$1 million, and mass mailings of over a million pieces at a time, Conner went to work on Congress. He found an entry point with Sen. Walter D. Huddleston and Huddleston's aide Roger LeMaster. The Huddleston bill is the product of work with FAIR, the Environmental Fund, and ZPG, says LeMaster; Conner is unabashed about FAIR's preeminent role: "We gave Huddleston's office a tremendous amount of information . . . as well as strategy. . . . They have been able and willing to work very closely with us."

Conner has assiduously lobbied among Reagan's conservative supporters by playing up the bill's provisions against drugs and illegal arms, while downplaying its police-state labor control features and its implications for U.S.-Mexico relations. As for Paddock, his "only interest in life right now," according to friends, "is immigration into the U.S." On his way to FAIR's April 11-12 board of directors meeting in North Carolina, Paddock was asked about the Huddleston bill. "It's a wonderful bill," he said. "But I wasn't directly in touch with Huddleston on it. That was Roger Conner's work."

EIR April 28, 1981 / National 53