S744 Debate Sample Briefs/Opinions

Pro Sample Brief 1

SB 744 Pro-Lawyer Brief The Senate bill 744 on immigration reform should be brought back in the house and senate because of the improvements and revenue that it would bring to the United States. With the senate bill 744 “it would help add $276 billion in revenue over the next 10 years while costing only $33 billion”(wikipedia). With that large amount of money coming in it would leave about $243 billion that would be leftover for government use. The way this would work is that when illegal immigrants apply to be citizens they are required to pay a one thousand dollar fine and also pay back all of the taxes that they did not pay while living in the united states illegally. Another way that money would be coming in is by the illegal immigrants having proper documentation when they get a job part of their paycheck will go towards government programs they same way all citizens do. Also with the H1B visa program it would restrict their access to government funds such as social security, food stamps, etc., because of this the money that is coming out of their paychecks will not be used for them but for citizens of the United States. Another reason to pass the bill is to protect the dreamers (children who came to the United States when they were children by their families in search of a better life) and immigrants who work in agriculture are protected. “Dream act and agricultural job opportunities, benefits, and security act are incorporated into the RPI (registered provisional immigrant) program (american immigration council). Having this place would allow for the government to make sure that all of the benefits are going to the U.S. citizens first.

Some of the reasons that people oppose the bill is because it would allow for illegal immigrant to apply for legalization which in turn would be a reward for breaking the rules. “Legalize the undocumented six months later, amounts to amnesty rewarding criminal behavior” (Brooking). While this may be the case for some illegal immigrants, dreamers who were not old enough to know they committed a crime will benefit from this bill. Another way it would help is by keeping families together. When one person in a family is legalized then the process of the other family members is easier meaning people want to become legalized. Another question that is frequently brought up is “ why double immigration when so many people already aren’t working?” (National Review). This bill will not double the amount of immigrants that are coming in but rather increase the amount of legal immigrants in the United States while decreasing the amount of illegal immigrants in the United States. Another concern is “the senate devotes $30 billion over 10 years to the hiring of “at least 19,200 additional trained full time active duty U.S. border patrol agents” to work the border with Mexico”(Heritage). Even though the cost of protecting the border is a major cost the revenue that the bill would create would out way the cost of having more patrol on the U.S. Mexico border.

Works Cited

American Immigration Council.
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Border_Security,_Economic_Opportunity,_and_Immigration_Modernization_Act_of_201. Accessed 22 Apr. 2019.
Brooking.
www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2014/08/04/the-real-reason-why-the-house-wont-pass-comprehensive-immigration-reform/. Accessed 22 Apr. 2019.
The Free Encyclopedia. Wikipedia. Wikipedia,
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Border_Security,_Economic_Opportunity,_and_Immigration_Modernization_Act_of_2013. Accessed 22 Apr. 2019. Heritage.
www.heritage.org/immigration/report/the-senates-comprehensive-immigration-bill-top-10-concerns. Accessed 23 Apr. 2019.
National Review.
www.nationalreview.com/corner/why-did-senate-amnestyimmigration-surge-bill-fail-mark-krikorian/. Accessed 23 Apr. 2019.

Pro Sample Brief 2

I believe the bipartisan immigration bill should be passed into the law. There are five different sections of this bill: Border security, immigrant visas, interior enforcement, reforms to nonimmigrant visa programs, and jobs for youth. The first title, border security, talks about having a “comprehensive strategy” to have a fair and effective immigration policy. In order to increase border security, there are plans to deploy “38,405 full time border patrol agents” in addition to the 19,200 currently placed. With more people on guard, there will be a higher chance of catching those who are trying to enter the country illegally. They will be putting up at least “700 miles of fencing” along with double fencing, mobile surveillance, aircraft and radio communications. The goal is to catch 90% of the illegal immigrants from crossing the border, and if we put of these specific measures, there will be a higher success rate. Title two talks about immigrant visas; giving a chance to those, who came to the United States illegally, permanent legal status. Passing the bill will allow immigrants to apply for “Registered Provisional Immigrant status”. An RPI will be able to stay in the US is they have been in the US since December 31, 2011, have not committed a crime or felony, had more than three or more misdemeanors, paid their taxes, pass a background check, and pay $1,000 for application fee. The only catch to this, is RPIs will not be eligible for public benefits such as food stamps, Medicaid, and they will not receive a social security number. Although it is a long process to become a legal citizen, DREAMers are on a faster track to permanent legal status than their parents. In order to qualify,DREAMers will have to have been an RPI for five years, he or she must have entered the US before the age of 16, earned a highschool diploma or GED, completed at least two years of college or four years of military service, and pass an English test as well as a background check. Not only do DREAMers have special benefits, but those who are farm workers will get the chance to earn a “blue card”. Title three, interior enforcement, in other words this section talks about E-Verify. E-Verify is a system that allows businesses to decide the eligibility of their employees. However there are concerns to for this system, businesses can possibly be penalized for having illegal immigrant workers without knowing and

there are higher risks of the system being hacked, which can lead to loss of money. In my opinion, one of the most beneficial merits to this bill is title five, Jobs for Youth. This has nothing to do with illegal immigration, but it will allow low-income youth ages 15-25 a summer and year-round employment opportunities. This is a win-win for both sides, illegal immigrants will be given a chance to become permanent citizens and poor youth can have opportunities to support their family. A big concern would be the price for the bill, but it was estimated that in the next 20 years there will be a decrease in out budget deficit. Passing this bill will help prevent the amount of illegal immigrants crossing the border and encourage immigrants to enter this country legally.

Sources:
https://www.nilc.org/issues/immigration-reform-and-executive-actions/irsenatesummanalysis/
https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/research/guide-s744-understanding-2013-senate-immigration-bill https://www.prideimmigration.com/senate-immigration-proposal-2013/
https://www.cbo.gov/publication/44346
https://www.congress.gov/bill/113th-congress/senate-bill/744/text

Con Sample Brief 1

Some might say that the wall will solve all our immigration problems, but I believe that the wall will cause more problems and not fix anything. I am against this bill, there are other ways to help the immigrants. We can make the process of getting a green card easier, all the immigrants can get jobs easier and have more freedoms and be treated like normal people. “50% of illegal immigrants are seen bad people, only 36,000 of immigrants were guilty of crimes, 1,000 were guilty of homicide or other crimes” (Frontline Battle). People see immigrants as bad, but they are just people who want to escape their countries because of safety reasons or financial reasons. Less than one percent of immigrants actually are murderers, people assume that all illegal immigrants are murderers, but that is false. This bill is a bad idea because, it’s still an incredibly long process for immigrants to become U.S. citizens “it will take at least 13 years or longer” (National Immigration Law Center). The process of becoming a U.S. citizen is way too complicated and complex, we can still have an effective simple immigration system. We don’t need a wall to help separate the immigrants, we can come up with solutions. This bill also stops some immigrants from getting a job to support their families, people reject them hoping that they will self-deport. Better border security is a way to solve the immigration problem. “The border surge militarizes the border, harms the environment, and threatens health and safety of border residents”(National Immigration Law Center). The wall and all the supposed “border control” is harming the earth and all its beauty. Also money is a big concern people have, how will the wall be funded? And how much will it cost? At least $2,000,000 is going towards the wall. Why? We can put it towards something better than a security wall that isn’t going to solve any problems. I believe in helping in ways that won’t hurt people or the environment in the process. This bill will charge people, “fines and penalties include $1,000 at RPI application and $1,000 when applying for lawful payment” (National Immigration Law Center). Fines shouldn’t be this much, they wouldn’t be this much for a U.S. citizen, why should immigrants seeking help have to pay so much money? They shouldn’t have to! Money is already hard to get for some people, we should

be helping people out, not making them miserable. The bill also “eliminates the ability of U.S. citizens to petition for their adult married children over age 31 and over”(National Immigration Law Center). This bill doesn’t allow people to sign for their adult children to become U.S. citizens and they can’t be citizens in the U.S. even if they’re married. All immigrants should be treated as a person, and not a thing. Immigrants are people too, some people don’t see immigrants as being the same as them, even if someone is different than you we should still treat them kindly and be helpful to them.

Con Sample Brief 2

As part of the con side for the debate I state that the bipartisan immigration bill S744 should not be passed into law. I think it is time for immigration reform but not with this particular bill. I am willing to keep an opened mind but I don’t necessarily think the pros outweigh the cons, not really. Immigration should be about equal opportunity, the standard we have held for everything. The truth is that this, like the last debate, is dealing with a moral issue. I personally want it to be more efficient, but we see countless people waiting years to even uphold a RPI, not to mention how difficult it can be to keep it and to eventually lead an immigrant to citizenship (immigration-defense.com). An RPI would not be allowed to apply for a green card after ten years unless the border is deemed secured (immigration-defense.com). This is just another barrier that makes this bill complex. Not to mention that the bill would allow for 7000 miles of fencing which is just as ridiculous as what Donald Trump is trying to do with building his wall. How much is this going to cost us? I would like to think that relying on the immigrants who are paying fines and such things like that would pay off for how much all of this is going to cost would make me feel better, but the tricky part is that this could actually end up failing and costing us more than intended, not to mention that we can’t put our entire faith on something that's never been done in the states before, we have to be sceptical about what this bill means for the united states. I saw that implementing this act would require the funding of 46.3 billion dollars, funding things like 19,200 additional border patrol agents for 30 billion dollars over a ten year period(american immigration council). I do think we are moving in the right direction but we need to be cautious when it comes to how much we are spending on a border plan that may end up failing us. We need to act now, yes, but we need the time to do it right, to keep the majority happy, right now we’re in the midst of a split government, and i’m hoping that can change. Another thing that we have to consider is the E-verify. E-verify is sold to us as something that will not fail us, something that will be accurate all of the time, but a firm called Westat found that the system was only able to identify illegal immigrants about half of the time and not to mention that workers who don't pass the E-verify check might have to make ends meet by relying on other ways of getting money that can affect the labor force(Marketplace.com). We have an obligation to find a fair and effective way to implement this sort of law to find a solution to reduce illegal immigration, but keep in mind that it will never fully go away, especially with the on going problem of overstayed visas.

Pro Sample Judges Opinion 1

In the case of whether or not senate bill 744 should begin to be enforced, I agreed that it should be passed. I thought the pro side of this debate had a stronger argument for the bill and provided ample evidence to support their cause. The con side failed to produce any secondary plan to 'battle' immigration and lacked factual evidence to support their claims. The pro side argued how even though that the bill would cost a lot initially, that it would ultimately created billions for the United States of America. By considering a simpler immigration system, it would allow more legal immigrants to be able to live in the United States of America, which in turn would create more jobs and fill those that are not being fulfilled already. Having jobs leads people to pay taxes, which would boost the economy of the United States of America significantly. Also, by allowing more legal immigration to happen, this would help a great deal with our current illegal immigration issue. The pro side argued to build the hundreds or mile long border wall. This conflicted me, this wall is proposed at as much as $70 billion dollars and that money could be used in many other areas of the United States' system. However, they also proposed other security options such as more border patrol agents and improved technology. With a combination of a few of these methods, it is bound to make a difference for our lacking border security. Some argue that a fence will not stop people from crossing the border, but combined with some of the other methods mentioned, it has the potential to. As someone who is pro immigration, I feel like the United States should crack down on border security not just on the US/Mexico Border, but everywhere. 41% of illegal immigrants come from Asia, most likely on expired visas or being smuggled over. There is also an issue funding our potential one thousand nine hundred and fifty four mile border wall along Mexico's northern border. The United States is already struggling with crippling debt, that seems to never stop increasing. Spending a few hundred billion dollars on this increased border security plan could be detrimental to other services of the government. You could argue that money could be better used in areas such as education or environmental protection. This is in fact a true statement. There are areas in the United States that don't even have clean drinking water at the moment. The border wall should not be our first concern at the moment, but it is definitely something that needs to change in the future. Illegal immigration is something our country has been struggling to deal with for decades. We truly do not know whether or not that this plan will solve our current immigration issue, but it's a step in the right direction. By creating an idea to solve the problem, we are taking steps in the right direction.

Pro Sample Judges Opinion 2

In my personal opinion the pro side won the debate, this also was the side I was leaning towards in the debate. The pro side made the arguments that this was a bipartisan bill that help benefits for both sides of the political spectrum while the con side retorted with it being too liberal/it wasn't REALLY bipartisan. If I were a lawyer I would have loved to argue that a non bipartisan bill on an issue that's in such political turmoil would never be

passed. I agree with the con side that the E-Verify process is potentially flawed but nowhere in the bill did it say that E-Verify had to be used as-is, but instead can be improved over time. I agree that E-Verify having access to social security numbers is no more dangerous than giving it to the university or college you're applying to. I found that the con side had kept using the same borderline irrational argument over and over and I, along with the pro side, thought it was redundant and proved nothing. The con side failed to sway my opinion on SB744 in any fashion. I still believe that the bill being bipartisan is the only way that it'll ever be passed therefore not including certain parts of the bill could possibly ruin the chances of it being made into law. As a moderate, it appeals to be that border security is being increased but it also REALLY appeals to me that there is still a process to immigrate. I'm not a fan of forgiveness of illegal immigrants but I know that we can't have A without B.

Con Sample Judges Opinion 1

My overall opinion based on the classroom PRO & CON debate is in support of the CON side which would not allow the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) law to pass congress. The pro side argument mostly centered on the money (tax) gain by the US Government based on the passing vote and and eventual tax payments and collections for the fiscal year. However positive the overall tax gain of 10 billion yearly does not consider the resource drain on the local & state governments supporting this populations health care, welfare, education, etc. The tax gain would be cut dramatically over the 10 year period as these government resources are drained over time. Other pro side arguments would require significant spending on border security including added border guards, metal fencing, expensive night vision cameras, manned check points and improved radio & telecommunication systems. The border security items and data collected would require more profession support staff in additional to the border guards to gather & report the findings. This border work however simplified would require 700 miles of coverage with this new border fencing and detection systems. The other complexity not argued is the raw farm land needed to be enlarge the existing fences and build the infrastructure to support all of these new security systems. How will this land be attained when it's mostly owned by US farmers for generations. The cost involved to simply purchase the needed raw land would be tremendous and really upset law abiding US Citizens along the US/Mexican border.

Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) being passed would automatically require the creation of an E-verify software program and database which would allow screening of illegal immigrants and those people would not be able to get much needed jobs to feed their family. Most people would think this would beneficial because it would allow legal workers to get those jobs instead of illegal southern immigrants. Many fail to realize that them not being able to get jobs would cause a large deficit of workers in those fields and would cause things not to get done as those very laborious jobs may never be filled by legal workers simply because no one wants to do those difficult jobs. Some jobs illegal immigrants tend to work are jobs like maid and housekeepers, grounds maintenance workers, construction laborers, janitors and fast food workers. The fact of the matter is that American tend to not work these jobs already and will

likely not want to work these if they become readily available to the masses. If these workers could not work it would potentially dampen the economy because these jobs would simply not get not. These jobless illegal immigrants may also cause a major humanitarian crisis in America due to people not being able to support themselves or others and no ability to get back home and may become homeless and again an additional drain on local resources. For these reasons described and others not considered I am not in support of the Deferred Action for due to inaccurate money predictions, no projected timeframe from the pro side, hiddens costs, worker deficits, potential humanitarian crisis as well as displacement of peoples land near the border.

Sources:
https://blogs.voanews.com/all-about-america/2015/08/24/most-common-jobs-held-by-immigrants-in-each-us-state/
https://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/what-kind-work-do-immigrants-do-occupation-and-industry-foreign-born-workers-united-states
https://www.heritage.org/immigration/report/why-congress-should-not-legalize-daca-the-myths-surrounding-the-program
https://www.postbulletin.com/opinion/columnists/pro-con-daca/article_e9f09dd9-3c97-5804-b218-2a6c60b469b7.html https://www.chronicle.com/article/Running-Out-of-Time-in-the/242508

Con Sample Judges Opinion 2

Last week our class had a small debate on the bipartisan immigration bill. This bill would include the building of a "fence" on America's southern border. The opposing side of this bill would include a reaction of two bills instead of one. The first would be a bill on tightening up border security more by increasing the amount of guards on our border. For this opinionated paper I will be writing for the majority. Which in this case was the side against the bill. I have many reasons and personal beliefs on why I chose to side against the bill. In this document I will use references as to why I sided this way.

The majority of the reason why I sided the way that I did was because of how the pro-side presented their arguments. With that being said, the way the con-side presented their arguments was less than adequate as well. So I am going to begin with the con-side. My one and only problem with the con side was the lack of information there was to present. A note that I have is when X brought up that immigration was never going to stop (Con-side #1). I think that we can all agree that immigration is something that you can't stop. I don't think that she was grasping the material being held at hand. The argument isn't based on banning immigrants. It was focused on the fact that illegal immigration is starting to become a large problem in the United States. I feel as if she would have crafted her argument better, her plan to pursue the judges would have worked out even better. My other problem with the con-side would be the repeated information being splayed out over and over again. It was exhausting.

Moving on to the pro-side I saw many things I disagreed with. An example would be when I asked for a solution to the racism that most people feel a wall would bring. I had asked the question to Y, Z, and the group as a whole and no one spoke up. Instead they changed the subject (Pro-side #2). I would never be able to vouch for something that has become for such a grotesque sign of racism. Another problem I had would be when W said being American is right and not a privilege (Pro-side #3). And though this statement would be one that most agree with. It was the intent behind the message that I could not get by. It was as though as what was being said was that immigrants are not true Americans. It's their privilege not their right. Though you would never say that to someone born here. Are immigrants not as American as those who were born here? Because that was the message getting sent. The fourth problem I had with the pro-side was when Y kept making comments on how the wall is a fence (Pro-side #4). If the wall is a fence then how is it suppose to help secure the border any more than all of the other fences around? You can't put a fence everywhere. And my final problem wasn't actually with either side. It was with a judge. O said that the only business people bring from the south is gardening (Judge #5). This was not only OFFENSIVE but it was completely inappropriate and supported the racist intent behind of what many people of the pro-side hold. The comment was not funny. It was hurtful. Which I guess is what the pro-side chooses to support considering they never responded to the racist comment. In conclusion my personal bias was failed to be shifted.