

**PRESS CONFERENCE**  
**WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE**  
**JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA**  
**WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA**  
**THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB**

Federal News Service

NOVEMBER 21, 1991, 9:00 A.M. EST THURSDAY

Copyright 1991 Federal Information Systems Corporation

**Section:** MAJOR LEADER SPECIAL TRANSCRIPT

**Length:** 11358 words

## **Body**

---

MS. **CHAVEZ**: (In progress) -- on behalf of the Manhattan Institute and Empower America to this press conference and later a panel discussion of **immigration** in the '90s, and marking the release of the Manhattan Institute and Pacific Research Institute's book, "Strangers at our Gate: **Immigration** in the 1990s," which features an index of leading **immigration** indicators.

I'm Linda **Chavez** and I'm director of the Center for the New American Community at the Manhattan Institute. Six months ago we had a conference on **Immigration**, and I can assure you that not nearly as many either people or cameras were gathered in one place to talk about what was clear to us at the time was going to be one of the hot button political **issues** of the 1990s. What's changed in the intervening six months is not the **immigration issue** itself but the politics of **immigration**. And as we're gathered today barely a week after the vote on Proposition 187 in California, clearly **immigration** has moved to front burner in terms of political topics in this year's election debate.

Some have called **immigration** the sleeper **issue** of 1994 election, and we're here to discuss why that's so and what the implications of the vote on Proposition 187 in California holds not just for **illegal immigration** in the United States but also for the **issue** of legal **immigration**.

I think it would be simplistic and wrong to describe the vote in California last week on Prop 187 as simply the result of some nativist, xenophobic, anti-immigrant backlash. It was clearly much more than that. Californians were angry, and indeed, that anger, when it comes to **immigration**, has shown a surprisingly contagious fervor. The question is why Californians and, indeed, Americans in general have so dramatically turned in their attitudes towards **immigration**. I suggest the mixture of **immigration** and entitlements has become too volatile to handle. In the post-affirmative action welfare state, anxieties rise when taxpayers are told that not only must they willingly accommodate immigrants, but they must also pay for their entitlements.

Immigrant advocates over the last 25 years have pushed an agenda of multiculturalism in the schools, of affirmative action not just for indigenous minorities but also for newcomers from other countries, and a host of various welfare entitlements for all persons who reside. And it is, I believe, that aggressive push for immigrant entitlements that has helped fuel the backlash in states like California. Unless we are willing to deal with the legitimate concerns that are aroused by this volatile **issue**, I think we may face a tide not just of anti- **illegal immigration** fervor in the United States, but also unwise proposals to begin to limit legal **immigration**.

And as the second half of our program today will show, I believe **immigration** not only has been historically good for the United States, but continues to be good for America.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
 JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
 WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
 THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Immigrants are among the most hard-working and industrious of all persons who reside in this society. They are far less likely in their working years to -- despite poverty -- rely on welfare programs and, in fact, lead lives that exemplify what most of us think as traditional American values. The questions that may come up today -- and I think both my co-hosts this morning from Empower America, Jack Kemp and Bill Bennett, may deal further with this -- about what ought to be done to control illegal immigration I would suggest should be focused narrowly and exclusively on those who are in the country illegally. I think if we fail to deal with the questions of border control, if we fail to deal realistically with the questions of visa overstayers, the kind of anger and sentiment we saw in California may indeed spread eastward, and we may face a situation when proposals such as that made by the National Commission on Immigration recently to set up a national work registry will, in fact, I think, gain in popularity. We're already hearing talk of legislation to introduce a national ID card, all of which, frankly, deal with the problem that affects barely 1 percent of the population by enacting structures which will affect the other 99 percent of persons who reside in the United States.

But the question is what we can do in this era of anti-immigrant fervor that will deal realistically with the question of assimilation and what it is that has been driving those in places like California to react so negatively to the influx of immigrants. For 20 years, we have had policies in the United States -- and our education system -- that did not simply suggest that we do what we have done in the past, in terms of welcoming newcomers into our schools and helping those newcomers adjust to their new life in America. We have seen an aggressive push to teach children in their native language and about their native history and culture to the exclusion of any sense that we were pushing an agenda of helping people become new Americans.

This conference this morning will deal with the question of immigration, with the question of what we can expect by way of public policies and what steps can be taken to deal realistically with the illegal alien problem in the United States, without unduly affecting the benefits that all of us gain from legal immigration.

Most of you are here, I think, to hear from two very prominent Americans who have served in previous administrations and other public offices; and without further ado I'd like to introduce first Jack Kemp, who is co-director of Empower American and is former Housing and Urban Development Secretary.

Thank you.

MR. KEMP: Thank you, Linda, thank you very much, and ladies and gentlemen, thank you all for coming to what we think is an issue of significant importance not only to our country but indeed to the whole world. May I commend first of all the Manhattan Institute and Pacific Research for publishing "Strangers at our Gate." I would commend it only not to you in this room but to anyone who wants a better understanding of this whole issue. It is very objective, in my opinion, and will help be a critical element in the debate over the next few years on the issue to which Linda Chavez has alluded to in her opening remarks.

And secondly, may I say to Ben Wattenberg who wrote "The First Universal Nation." I think it fits very closely with the idea that Manhattan Institute and the Pacific Research Institute have pointed out the importance of immigration, that it is a blessing to America, not a curse. Illegal immigration is a problem and that is the reason that Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp and Linda have organized this session with you.

In the late 1930's Franklin Roosevelt reportedly sent a telegram to the Daughters of the American Revolution, which he started off by saying "Dear fellow Immigrants." Pretty true, albeit the numbers are not as astounding as one would have expected by such a telegram. This is a nation of immigrants. This is a nation which is predicated upon the spirit as Linda pointed out, of immigrants. Ronald Reagan used to suggest that to move to France you did not become French, but to America lawfully you are an American, the day you get here.

That is the spirit, it seems to me of not only our nation, it is the spirit of the party of Lincoln -- or at least it should be the spirit of the party of Lincoln.

I commend the Manhattan Institute and the Pacific Research Institute for not only reminding us of that which is, in my view, an a priori self-evident truth, but in doing the analysis of what contributions are made to America by immigrant Americans. A lot of people wanted to know, why would Kemp and Bennett -- loyal, bleeding-heart conservative Republicans -- take a position on an issue some suggested of which we knew little about? Someone else suggested that we were from inside the Beltway, we had no right to do it. What was the timing? What was the

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

purpose? And I would just like to clarify a couple of points before I outline what I think -- and I share with Bill -- in terms of coming up with some solutions.

First of all, Empower America is a grass roots organization. We took a position on school choice in Milwaukee. We were convinced that Polly Williams was right and the establishment of the public school system in Milwaukee and the state of Wisconsin was wrong, and -- very proud of our support for Polly and very convinced that that movement has ramifications for the whole country. In fact, it is what led to the founding of Empower America, and led to our taking a position in California on school choice. Both Bennett and Kemp raised a lot of money in California to try to advance a proposition in 1993 I believe, Bill, to promote school choice. It lost, but we had a record in that regard.

Number two, we supported "Three Strikes and You're Out," not only in California, but in the state of Washington. We supported Proposition 300 in Arizona, which was to make sure that if the government at the federal or state level were to take anybody's property or permit -- or prohibit someone from developing their property, the taking clause of the Constitution should be used to require the state or federal government to compensate the owner of the property. We took a position in Massachusetts on Propositions 6 and 7. I won't elaborate on it, except to say it lost 70 percent to 30 percent, because it was to implement a progressive income tax in the state of Massachusetts, and we were on the side of most Republicans and centrist Democrats who wanted to prevent that from happening.

We also supported the repeal of rent controls in the state of Massachusetts, and by the way, that too passed. And we supported -- we were opposed, I should say, to 186, which is the single-payer health care system for California. So Bennett and Kemp have inserted themselves into a lot of state referenda and initiatives. And it's no secret that I believe that we ought to have a national process for referenda and initiatives as a grassroots democratic expression.

And we accept the fact that the people of California voted for 187 as a cry for help to the federal government for assistance with the border, which was very legitimate, for requiring that the federal government provide some of the assistance for the incarceration of illegal immigrants in the state of California. That, too, is essential, and we agree with Governor Wilson, Attorney General Dan Lungren, as they take this into the court to test what the federal government's role is with regard to, A, protecting the border, controlling the border of a sovereign nation, and preventing illegal immigration, and also requiring that the federal government help with funding the cost of incarcerating illegal immigrants.

I had trouble, as did Bill, with the wording of 187. It's no secret that I felt very strongly, as did Bill Bennett and many of us in Empower America, that the use of the word "suspected" illegal alien -- first of all, I don't like the pejorative "alien." We're not talking here about aliens, we're talking here about men and women and children. But putting that aside for just a moment, the use of the word "suspected" illegal alien or immigrant is in Prop 187 more than 11 times. Euphemisms are used throughout 187 that cause me profound concern for not only the country but the party of Lincoln.

As Bill Bennett has pointed out many times, the Republican Party -- for just a moment here talking in a partisan way -- the Republican Party lost the vote, lost the support of immigrant Americans at the turn of the century, whether they were Italian or Irish or Polish or Central or Eastern European, Jews, Catholics, blue collar working folks, many of whom I represented when I was a congressman from Buffalo, New York. I think the Republican Party has made two big mistakes in its history, one was the loss of the immigrant vote, the immigrant American vote; number two was not being there at the battle for civil, human legal voting rights in the '50s and '60s. Dwight Eisenhower was there, Senator Dirksen was there, Congressman Rumsfeld was there, a lot of good men and women were there, but not enough, and the party of Lincoln really began to lose the votes of men and women who had a big stake in climbing that ladder of opportunity that we call the American dream, which we found out in the last few years is not American it is universal, as has been pointed out.

On other thought, and that is what Kemp and Bennett put into our press release could be done. We said emphatically a sovereign nation has the responsibility to control its borders. We believe in the rule of law. We don't believe that illegal immigrants should get welfare. We believe that, said it, stated it and tried to do it in a non-subjective and non-inflammatory way, as Linda pointed out. We think we could control the border more effectively by expanding upon the program in El Paso, as well as the program in San Diego, California, both border control

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

programs have had remarkable impact positively on reducing the flow of illegal immigrants to the United States: Hold the Line in El Paso, Operation Gatekeeper in San Diego -- both have had remarkable impact.

Number two, we should expedite the deportation process. The INS is a mess, it is an absolute mess. The New York Times reported that over 200,000 or a quarter of a million criminal immigrants or illegal immigrants have failed to be deported even though they've been reported to the INS. Last year they only deported 20,000, and estimates up to 250,000 or so should be expedited. And we think we ought to also crack down on fraudulent immigration documents. It's a cottage industry in California and Texas, and that was part of 187 that I think was quite effective and maybe one of the reasons why it passed so overwhelmingly.

Reform the INS bureaucracy. No one needs to -- as a former bureaucrat myself with an agency of 14,500 people, INS ranks up there with the top of the bureaucracies in terms of its inefficiency. We should reform the requirement for sponsorship. I don't think people on welfare should be able to sponsor immigrants. They should be off welfare first. I think that is a self-evident truth. Reduce the number of employment eligibility documents -- that, too, is a self-evident truth.

The last point I want to make is that we've got to export growth policies to the third world. Immigration, as I said, is not a zero sum game with third world economies. In my opinion, we must export democratic capitalism to this hemisphere. I would urge the administration to allow Chile, Latin America into NAFTA as quickly as possible. We should reform policies that have burdened the third world with things like the IMF and the World Bank -- I won't get into that issue, but it is a very important issue, the policies that have strangled the economies of many of our neighbors, many of our friends in Latin America and throughout the Asian, African and European world.

We should reimburse the states for the cost of federal failure to control illegal immigration. As I pointed out earlier, I watched the governors yesterday -- Weld, Whitman, Thompson and Wilson -- talk about allowing states some help at the federal level as the Clinton administration helped the state of Florida. Whenever there was a problem in Florida, the Clinton administration was there to help Governor Chiles. They should have been there to help Governor Wilson. I don't think this problem would've been so exacerbated as to turn into the possibility of and the potential for discriminating against people on the basis of the color of their skin.

I want to thank you, Linda, and thank Bill. And I look forward to the panel and the questions from our friends in the press. Thank you.

MS. CHAVEZ: I don't think our next speaker needs any real introduction. Bill Bennett, former secretary of education, former drug czar and now co-director of the group Empower America.

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Linda. Worth mentioning those jobs, because I notice in reviewing a lot of the material under the proper heading of this issue, a lot -- I've been here before on the education issues and some of the illegal issues as pertains to the drug job, but I'll get to that in a minute. I want to thank you and congratulate you and Manhattan and Pacific -- one person, two institutions -- and everyone else associated with this. I think it's a very good idea. And I also want to say how grateful I am for the work done by the people associated with this report, some of whom will be on the panel that follows, and I urge everyone to stay for the panel. These are the folks who are truly expert on these issues. I spent the weekend reading their work, and I hope you will stay.

Let me make a few points, because since Jack Kemp and I made our statement, we've gotten a lot of mail and a lot of phone calls and a number of comments, but I think we stand by what we said and I would like to elaborate somewhat further on the point of view. But this is my point of view, and this is taking off from the statement, so -- I think Jack will agree, but I'll leave that to him. Let's -- I want to advance the argument and comment some on Wilson's -- Governor Wilson's latest points, but for purposes of analysis, let's divide the issue into legal and illegal immigration. The Republican Party -- the ascendant Republican Party -- now has to consider where it stands on these issues, and let me suggest the following.

Like health care, there is not a crisis in legal immigration. This is not a crisis. Let me just say that flat out. People are trying to make it a crisis, but it is not. Legal immigration has some aspects to it that we need to look at. There are some problems. We need to adjust some, but there is no crisis in legal immigration in this country.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Let's just set it out that way because I think that's right. The problem, if there is a problem with regard to legal immigration, is a problem larger than legal immigration itself; it's a problem about American society right now, and that is assimilation. So, if you will, it's not legal immigration, stupid, it's assimilation, stupid, if we still use the metaphor for the long-ago Democratic successful campaign. The problem's assimilation -- the unwillingness, the increasing unwillingness over time in our country to affirm, advance and transmit a good common culture of beliefs, language and principles.

It is less the problem of legal immigrants coming to this country than the unwillingness of our society to say who it is we are, what we stand for, what things students should learn and the like; a real diffidence about our culture; a lack of confidence about affirming the basic goodness of the American culture and the need for all children to understand the basic principles, ideas, values and language of this country. And we should be much more confident about that, not only for the sake of affirming these American principles but for the sake of these children. Therefore, I think if we are to look at the -- if we are to improve things, we should look less to adjusting the flow of legal immigrants and much more to things like affirmative action and reverse discrimination, bilingual education, multiculturalism in the classroom, and the like. That's where we should put our attention. We will be looking in the wrong place if we look to the problem of legal immigration or if we identify legal immigration as our problem.

What I think has been the focus lately, though, has been illegal immigration and 187, so let me talk to that at somewhat greater length, though I think for the future the question of legal immigration will be the major issue. Now again, this is pretty familiar to me. I remember talking during the time I was drug czar about the need to control our borders. The context for me then was drugs, but you get the same problem. When you don't control your borders, you not only get illegal drugs, you get illegal immigration, you get all sorts of problems. At the time, there wasn't much fashion in the country or in the Congress for increasing interdiction, but I remember distinctly talking to law enforcement officials in California, who would point out that half, 40 percent or 50 percent of the population of their jails and prisons were made up of illegals who had been convicted of crimes. And a number of them said to us, "Mr. Bennett, if you and the rest of the federal government could address the problem of the illegals, we'll take care of the home grown criminals. So it's a very serious matter, and failure to attend to the borders in California has given us lots of problems; that's not the least of them.

Now, I notice Governor Wilson's visit here, a speech at the Heritage Foundation and his comments. He now looks as if he's going national on his issue. It had some success in California, so now he wishes to go national. The problem with 187 as a solution -- I will say it again -- is it is meretricious. (Proposition) 187 is meretricious. It is superficially attractive. But it doesn't solve the problem. It's not effective in solving the problem. You state the problem as a problem of illegal immigration. Illegal immigration, that is a problem. And to respond to that, you deny medical services to people and education to kids. Assume 187 is perfectly effective. If it's perfectly effective, its effect will be to deny medical services to people and education to kids. You still have a problem of illegal immigration.

You still have a problem of illegal immigration, you have not addressed that problem. This is a little bit like the Times Square situation. You know, you lose your wallet in Harlem but you go down to Times Square to look for it because the light is better.

This satisfies -- this seems to satisfy people, and when Jack and I would press people on 187 they'd say, "We're sending a message." Okay, message heard and delivered, 187 passed. Now that 187 passed, notice how things are getting better? They're not getting better at all, and they will not work better if 187 works perfectly. Because to solve the problem you have to do other things. As Jack mentioned you have to control the border more effectively, and that's a responsibility of that federal government, but you have to do some other things as well -- deport, and so on.

But let me work through 187 a little bit further. To address the problem, it seems to me, in a rational way, we want to stop people at the border -- illegals. We want to make it much easier to deport people. We introduced some legislation -- or tried to get some legislation introduced when I was drug czar to make it easier to deport people. First of all, we wanted to start with deporting criminal illegals whose stay in the United States and whose appeals process resembles what many of you are familiar with -- death row appeals. It's extremely long. And it's ridiculous.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Illegal aliens come into the country, commit crimes, and you can't deport them. But that legislation never got anywhere. I urge the Congress to take a look at that. The Republican Congress might have a better shot at this.

I agree with Jack, federal reimbursement is appropriate, and I think Governor Wilson is right about that. And an overhaul of INS is appropriate. But I am still puzzled, and maybe the panel, later, can answer this. I am still puzzled by what is a horrible problem, regarded as catastrophic in California, but regarded as not nearly so in Arizona and Texas, where borders are much larger -- much longer. I was in Arizona campaigning two weeks before the election when this thing was exploding in California. People in Arizona hadn't heard about it. Now I grant it's a state initiative but one would think people would know something about it. I asked the governor I asked Representative now Senator Kyl and others about it. Not a big problem. I talked to Senator Gramm about the situation -- I am still not satisfied as to the answers to the question why is California so different here?

I think I know something about the reasons. It has to do with history, it has to do with the flow, it has to do with habit. But I think it also has to do -- and I think Governor Wilson has to confront this fact, that in 1986, under the Seasonal Agricultural Worker Program, over a million illegal immigrants in California were legalized. And this was at the insistence and effort of Governor Wilson -- then Senator Wilson -- so I think this has something to do with it.

California draws -- is interested in attracting very large numbers of temporary workers -- illegals -- to work the fields, to work the crop -- and then complains that people stay. Well, admittedly, if people come -- and they come only under a temporary, they shouldn't stay, but, you know, when you're dealing with moving massive numbers of people -- hundreds of thousands of people, a million people -- you cannot expect a kind of neatness, that everyone is going to come in like their all third-grade Catholic school children and then leave immediately on time in lock step. I mean, a reasonable person foresees the reasonable consequences of his acts, so I think Governor Wilson ought to remember that one.

You know the expression, "locking the barn door after the horses are out." This is a little bit like locking the barn door, yelling at the locksmith -- which I have no objection to -- the locksmith here is the federal government -- but sending very mixed signals to the horses. You know, "Get out -- no, but come, come temporarily. Come for a few months, do some work, but then get the hell out. And while you're here, you can't take advantage of -- maybe you can take advantage of services while you're here, but as soon as the season's over, then you have to get out and you can't take advantage of the services." This is not neat. This is not, it seems to me, a sensible way to conduct public policy. This is confusing, to put it minimally.

I have to say something else. I think that -- I supported Governor Wilson, and I'm glad he's the governor, but I think he's being less than fully candid about the real problem in California. The burdens under which Californians suffer -- yes, there's an illegal immigration problem, but he really ought to address the welfare state, which is, I think, the real problem in California, a much more serious problem. I'd be much more impressed if he took on the welfare state, if he took on the state teacher's union, if he took on some of the big boys who are really causing him problems and not just focus on illegals. After complaining about all the illegals and complaining about people staying and getting medical services and educational services, he then -- while he was here, I understand, according to an account in the LA Times -- suggested another temporary worker program in California. This is going to cause him more problems. And, I mean, there's something wrong here, when you keep turning on the spigot and then complaining that all the water's not going back up in the faucet when you stop.

A lot can be done. A lot can be done about illegal immigration without employing a policy which will do nothing, I think, but hurt people. Again, consider the rationale of 187. If it works perfectly, what it will achieve is the denial of benefits -- denial of educational benefits to children and the denial of medical services to all illegals. But will that stop the flow or not? It may be -- I thought about this, put it in perspective. I guess I do understand one argument for this policy, and if this is the policy, the reason for it, let's be plain. I do understand one argument for it, though it's not one I agree with, and that's this: If you, as Americans, become mean as hell and punitive as hell, take it out on the children, probably over time people are not going to want to come here.

You know, if you become a really just mean-as-hell country, it probably will affect people's willingness to come here, but that would be a very bad idea.

Thank you very much.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to open the floor to questions, but I'd like to ask your cooperation in abiding by a few ground rules. We have two sections of the program this morning, a later section that will deal with some of the policy questions, and I know some of you here today are from the policy community, others are from the press. We're only going to have Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp here with us for the first part of the program. I'd like to ask them both, if they wouldn't mind, to come up to the front so that we can get your questions. And I'd like the first questions to go immediately to the press. If you will stand, identify yourself and your organization, and I will repeat the questions for the benefit of the recording here.

Q Back here.

MS. CHAVEZ: Yes?

Q Mark Stern with Copley News Service. And I'd like to ask all three of you to what extent do you think this issue will be a factor in the 1996 campaign in terms of the GOP primary? How do you think it will (cut?)?

MR. BENNETT: Go ahead, Jack.

MR. KEMP: Go ahead.

MR. BENNETT: Well, I think it will be an issue, and I hope our party's on the right side of the issue, the right side not just of history here but of principle. There's a lot stirring on this right now. But I think actually it's pretty straightforward. As I said, legal immigration is not a crisis as I see it, and one needs to say that and then address the serious problem, the very serious problem of illegal immigration, and that's primarily a federal government responsibility. I think this is a pretty straightforward issue.

But this isn't to deny that there aren't all sorts of things swirling underneath here. This is not a -- one of these neat and sanitized problems in America. One of the pieces of material in this wonderful report is a survey, a public opinion survey of people's opinions of whether certain nationalities benefit the U.S. or not. It's extremely interesting to see the Irish at the top of the list. I'm Irish; I find this extremely interesting -- a bit puzzling, but extremely interesting. I mean, I'm all for the Irish, but first? Koreans are in the middle and Vietnamese in the middle and Cubans at the bottom. What is this about? Does this make any sense? I don't think this makes much sense, but this tells you that when you're dealing with this issue you're dealing with people's assumptions, people's attitudes; these are tricky and dangerous waters. On policy level -- at a policy level I think it's pretty straightforward. But at the level of the culture, the level of attitudes, I think it's an explosive issue. All the more reason, I think, to proceed with it in a straightforward, honest and rational way.

There are all sorts of sub-debates here, as you noticed. Linda made reference to them and I did, and I'm sure Jack will, but all the issues -- multiculturalism and affirmative action, bilingual education -- these are kind of subheadings which are themselves extremely explosive but again, I think, susceptible to pretty straightforward analysis in terms of public policy.

I don't think it's difficult to argue that every child in this country should learn how to speak English. I think that's a very easy and straightforward argument to make. That's not to say it isn't controversial. And this is how I view the whole issue.

MR. KEMP: I think to look at '96, you've got to look at '94, and I view '94 as a mandate to the Republican Party to be a party of growth and jobs and opportunity, less intrusiveness by government, more jobs, better education, and certainly an answer to the problems of safe streets or safe schools. Clearly the Republican Party capturing the House and the Senate in one fell swoop is a desire by the American people to return in a post-Cold-War era to the politics and economics of normalcy. It is not normal to tax people to the point of crushing their entrepreneurial opportunities. It is not normal to tax working men and women at a level of 26 to 35 percent for most median-income people when that is far beyond anything this country has ever faced in its history.

So these are the issues around which -- along with multiculturalism and affirmative action that leads to quotas. There are affirmative efforts that this country can make, but I think that if the message of '94 means anything, it means that the party of growth and jobs and opportunity should be a Lincoln-like party.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

And I'll say one last point about this as a -- well, not a postscript, it is a key point that I've been trying to make all over the country. That is, the Republican Party has no chance of being a majority party in this country without being the party of immigrants, without being the party of men and women who seek civil and legal and voting and equal rights, a party that is inclusionary, not exclusionary. And notwithstanding the fact that white males voted Republican, candidates who ran on inclusion and expanding opportunity and reaching out to black and brown and immigrant votes won overwhelmingly. I praise Pete Wilson for getting double digits in the black community, but Voinavitch (sp) got 40 percent, John Rowland got 35 percent, Trent Lott in Mississippi got 37 percent estimates in Mississippi of his vote in the black community. And candidates who did not reach out to men and women of immigrant or color or minority status lost. They lost.

You even look to Maryland, look to Virginia. Kay James (sp), who works for George Allen pointed out that the Republican party of Virginia -- I'm not trying to attack on an ad hominem or in an ad hominem way people in Virginia in the Republican party, but the candidates that did not reach out, as George Allen did, for the black vote and votes of the low income people lost, and that's true all over the country.

So, in terms of '96, I think the party has to be has to be a party of growth and jobs and opportunity, education, type of things that Bill Bennett has been talking about, and not a party that is -- well, it has to be said -- there are those who want the party to be the equivalent of the 19 -- 18 I should say '50s - the Know-Nothing party that was anti-immigrant, anti-Catholic, anti-black and failed to see what the Declaration of Independence was all about.

So, this is a key issue, one of the key issues, and certainly getting our party to reach critical mass it seems to me that we've got to welcome the spirit of entrepreneurship that exists in the immigrant family. The spirit of work ethic and the values of family and the values of risk taking that are in the Asian and Latino and the -- immigrant community. And if we're that party, we will find people voting Republican for the right reasons.

MS. CHAVEZ: Let me take a stab before I move on to the next question, because I think there's some very specific issues that are going to represent minefields for the Republican party in '96. If Republicans rush to support something like the National Commission's recommendation for national work registry I think you could see a different kind of backlash emerge in 1996. In 1986 the administration dealt with the perceived problem of illegal immigration by passing the Immigration Reform and Control Act, which turned every employer in America into an immigration officer. And what we saw, as the results of that was not just the high-profile Zoe Baird cases, but ordinary small business people who were required suddenly to keep extensive and to become persons who were supposed to be able to judge whether or not a person had proper documentation. Now we're talking about a national work registry in which every single time an employer went to hire an employee on a part time or a full time basis, they would have to contact a federal office to find out whether or not that person was eligible to work.

That's going to affect 100 percent of all the people who work in the United States. Unless you think that's a good idea I suggest you go back to your offices today, try calling up the INS and ask a simple question, and see, number one, whether you can get through; and number two, whether or not the people at the other end of the line can answer even a simple question on immigration policy. So the idea that we're going to transform the United States into a country where there is some centralized bureaucracy that is going to clear all employment decisions, I think could end up being a disaster.

If the Republicans jump on that bandwagon along with Democrats I think what we're going to see is a backlash by ordinary small businessmen and women who are going to be subjected to even further bureaucratization of the workforce.

Next question? Yes, in the back.

Q Yeah, since the self-employment rate -- can you hear me?

MS. CHAVEZ: Can you state your name and affiliation?

Q (Name and affiliation off mike.)

MS. CHAVEZ: I'll repeat the question; just ask it.



PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Q Since the self-employment rates for just about any group of immigrants you look at tend to be higher than that of the native population, and since study after study shows that new jobs come from new businesses, economically, can the U.S. afford immigration controls?

MS. CHAVEZ: Okay, the question is, since the self-employment rates for virtually all immigrant groups exceed those for the native born, is it in the economic interests of the United States to engage in further immigration control?

Jack --

MR. KEMP: Well, I feel very strongly, as I said earlier, that the spirit of entrepreneurship among immigrant Americans is just overwhelmingly and a plus, as you pointed out, because 91 percent of all new jobs in the United States of America over the past 20 years have come, according to David Birch (sp) at MIT, from the small business men and women, mom and pop. And certainly Asian and African and European and Latino men and women are entrepreneurial. And we're talking here about lawful, legal, documented immigration, not illegal.

And secondly, I'm reminded of one of Thomas Soul's (sp) comments; he said at the turn of the century when Jews moved from Europe to New York City, he quoted somebody who said wasn't it fortunate that the garment industry sprung up at exactly the time that all of those European Jews were moving to the United States. And then he went on to say that is the equivalent of suggesting that Hank Aaron was lucky because he came to bat when a home run was going to be hit -- or Reggie Jackson or Roger Maris or Babe Ruth.

Look, it's not luck, it is that spirit that you alluded to, I think, in the premise of the question. One other aspect of this. We should be helping Mexico. We should be trading freely with Mexico and Latin America and probably -- I support the president's efforts to get APEC to be an Asian NAFTA, but to do it for the year 2020 is ranking off there in the blue sky somewhere. It ought to be done as quickly as it is possible to bring the benefits of open trade to the world. Obviously that, too, should be fair, but it has to be open trade if we are to ever deal with the problems that third world countries and developing countries have with the enormity of their problems. And my hope is that California, as Bill Bennett pointed out, will take steps to open up their own economy. He mentioned some of the things about the guest worker program.

My postscript would be, California has the highest income tax rate in the United States of America. It has a regulatory burden that exceeds probably 30 or 40 other states in the union. And thirdly, it wouldn't be a Jack Kemp speech if I didn't mention at least a remark that the capital gain tax rate in the state of California is 11.9 percent on top of an unindexed 28 percent federal rate, and if California does not take steps to reduce the regulatory and tax burden on the spirit of risk-taking in this state, they will find a lot more problems than just illegal immigration.

MR. BENNETT: There's -- apart from the economic issue, there's the matter of cultural renewal and the great strength that immigrants bring to this country, and one shouldn't forget that. Walter Burns (sp), professor at Georgetown AEI, has what he calls "Burns' Law": The more recent the immigrant, the better the citizen. In some -- it's very often true. Not always true, but very often true. But I understand there are more Nagoyans (sp) -- if I'm saying it right -- in Orange County now than Smiths, and it's not self-evident to me that hordes of Gore Vidal's are better for the country than Nagoyans. Most of the bad ideas that have gone about the -- that have contributed to the ruination of American institutions have not come from immigrants -- it's very important to point out -- they have come from people of, you know, good Anglo-Saxon stock at American colleges and universities -- not always Anglo-Saxon stock, but often.

I mean, the notion that people have come in here with bad ideas -- take the ideas which have ruined a lot of American communities, ideas about -- you know, we don't need nuclear families, all values are relative, we need the government to solve all our problems, welfare will be a great idea -- these weren't imported ideas. These came out of -- these are homegrown, and there's a lot of scapegoating going on that isn't right. Immigrants -- legal immigration is a net positive plus, a strong positive plus in this country and continues to be.

I want to say one other thing about Wilson while you're being nice to him. He's scapegoating, damn it, and he should stop doing it. He should stand up to the teachers unions, he should stand up to the welfare state. He should not blame all the problems of California on illegals. Now he's riding this horse nationally. He was perfectly glad to avoid this before the election, but now the election's over. Come on, Pete. And this notion that it wasn't any of our

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

business being in this -- you know, we were invited -- Jack and I -- to participate on school choice, a California issue. We were -- I was invited by Alan Nelson (sp) to get involved in the immigration debate. He's one of the sponsors of 187. He just assumed I'd be on the other side. And finally, you know, Jack and I had good enough credentials to be on the Wilson Host Committee for Reelection, you know, when he was running for governor. So, we can get involved in this issue. Again, I don't minimize of illegal immigration. Things need to be done. I agree with the governor that he needs -- that the federal government should reimburse here, but let's get all the facts out on the table. Let's take a look at the history here. Let's take a good, hard, analytical look at California, Arizona and Texas and find out where responsibility is on a number of fronts. MS. CHAVEZ: Roberto Sora (sp)?

Q On the question of reimbursements, do you simply include the cost of public education in that, first, and secondly, given the fact that your colleagues on the hill have put balancing the budget as a high priority -- for example, talking about the need to reduce taxes -- and given that Governor Wilson is asking for \$3 billion, and Texas, New Jersey, Florida, New York and -- I'm leaving somebody else out -- have all also pressed rather large bills on this, how do you square the fiscal issue on having generously offered this reimbursement?

MS. CHAVEZ: Just for those of you who didn't hear, the question is on reimbursements and do federal reimbursements and Jack Kemp and Bill Bennett's support of those also include reimbursements for the cost of education.

Jack, do you want to take that?

MR. KEMP: It's very difficult to assess the cost of -- or the cost to the state of California on so-called education or even medical services, as Bill Bennett pointed out, for illegal immigrants, but I do favor the effort that the state of California is making, having talked to Dan Lundgren (sp), their attorney general, who is an old colleague of mine and one of my good friends. I do support the idea of getting a clarification from the central government, the federal government as to how to handle the problem with incarceration, education, the border more effectively. And as I said in my opening remarks, I think the Clinton administration has treated Florida, with all due respect, a lot better than they've treated the state of California on this question.

The fiscal side of it in terms of the macro, the federal budget -- you said that I was in favor of cutting taxes. Let me make it clear I am for lowering the tax rate, not to get less tax but to get more revenue, get a better economy, get more employment and more entrepreneurs, as I suggested. I think there is a radical difference between tax rates and tax revenues. Even Lloyd Bentsen said the other day that cutting tariffs -- i.e., an international tax cut -- would get more revenue. I support Bob Dole heartily in his attempt to tie GATT to dynamic analysis of what GATT would do for the American economy and also what -- the dynamic analysis of what cutting the capital gain tax in half and indexing it would do for the American economy. So I -- that question has a premise with which I don't agree, but I do believe that there should be a court decision for the state of California that will help clarify the burden of illegal immigration and what is the federal response to that. And Bill and I have said repeatedly we think the federal government does have responsibility for controlling the border and a -- should make a favorable response to helping the state of California deal with the cost of illegal immigration.

MS. CHAVEZ: Yes?

Q Joanne Siegel (sp) from the Sidwell Friends School.

MS. CHAVEZ: Can I just ask you, if you wouldn't mind, to hold your question? I'm trying this first part to make it exclusively press, and we'll get to your question afterwards.

MR. KEMP: That would be better for the panel that's going to --

MS. CHAVEZ: Yes?

Q (Name inaudible) -- with ABC News. Is this issue going to divide, the entitlement issue -- (off mike) -- candidates in '96? Pete Wilson may be running, either of you or both of you may be running for candidate. So what's going to happen -- (off mike)?

MR. KEMP: Well, I know Bill wants to answer this. I'll just say thanks for the premise. Pete Wilson yesterday suggested that he might very well not. I have not made my final decision. Bill has made a decision. But put aside

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

'96 in terms of the personalities, it is going to be an issue. That doesn't mean that it is going to divide the party. The party has had divisive issues in the past, and I have repeatedly pointed out that unity of a party does not require uniformity or unanimity. And as Bill pointed out, we campaigned heartily for Pete Wilson. We campaigned and raised money for his reelection. We were thrilled that he was reelected, and Dan Lundgren (sp), who was also opposed to my position on 187.

So, I'll tell you, where the battleground will be fought is if they want to carry this nationally and turn the party away from its historic belief in opportunity and jobs and growth and turn the party inward to a protectionist and isolationist and more xenophobic party. That would be something around which the soul of our party would be decided.

And I didn't really want to take a position on 187 until I was asked about it campaigning for Mary Alice Acevedo in San Diego, campaigning for Matt Fong in San Francisco, campaigning for Pete Wilson every time we were out there, 21 times, asked about this question. And I repeatedly said I favor their election but I don't favor ID cards, I don't favor a national registration, I don't favor turning the party inward. It's no secret I am a free trader. I believe in internationalism, albeit not Boutros Boutros-Ghali internationalism. So I am convinced that there will be a struggle, but I believe that the Republican Party, if it captures the Zeitgeist, the spirit of the times, I believe that it will be not only successful in the House and the Senate but at the presidential level in '96.

MS. CHAVEZ: Bill has promised me brief.

MR. BENNETT: Yes. There will be a big debate about this in the Republican Party. On all of the interesting and vital questions -- immigration, abortion, school prayer, school choice, welfare reform -- there will be vital and interesting disagreements within this vital Republican Party. The Democratic Party will be, I think, nowhere. It will be party line. It will be dull. There will probably not be any vital debates or disagreements. And that's great news for us. We can have these discussions inside the party. Reasonable people of good will can disagree. This is the party -- this is not only the party of ideas, this is the party of different ideas, competing ideas. This is the party of dialogue, which is a great thing to be.

MS. CHAVEZ: And by the way, I might add the party, the Democratic Party that brought to California things like teaching Hispanic children in Spanish for a minimum of six years, that brought the idea of advocacy groups, that won entitlements for immigrants, not just legal but illegal, was also on the 187 bandwagon.

This was not simply a Republican issue in California. There were a lot of people who seemed to support the policies that I think fueled the backlash that created 187 on the other side of aisle as well.

Yes, right here.

Q (Inaudible.) Would you care to comment on the written article seen in Atlantic Monthly -- (inaudible) -- that the size of the world population is going up so rapidly and that the whole situation changing is rapidly -- (inaudible) -- to the extent that it really requires much more serious attention to legal immigration, illegal immigration. But the whole situation has explosive implications -- (inaudible.)

MS. CHAVEZ: The question has to do with an article in this month's Atlantic Monthly on the question of a world-wide population explosion and how that will affect immigration.

MR. KEMP: Well, and whether or not the world is going to collapse from women having babies somewhere on this earth. This is an extension in my view of the Malthusian premise upon which the debate has taken place in this century in a neo-Malthusian climate over the supply of food, the supply of resources, the supply of energy and to Al Gore, whether or not there's enough oxygen on this earth. With all due respect to my friend Al Gore, he was in Cairo lecturing women on why they shouldn't have babies, lecturing the world on population. The Atlantic Monthly has a headline about how the world is going to turn into warfare in every single Third World country, and frankly, it's -- it is the equivalent of, in my view, of a Chicken Little approach to population that doesn't recognize that children are not just mouths to feed, they are mind and soul and heart and resources, and if you've taken a look recently at the Washington Post and the study of food production in the last few years in the Third World, it is exploding -- it is expanding, I should say -- a better word. And very frankly I think it is elitist for the United States to sit here in our comfortable homes and decry the fact that other countries are having children and the population is expanding.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

One last point that I think is important: Look, countries that have sound economies, have growing nations, have growing opportunities for people, better education, better jobs, families begin to limit the number of children they have. And that has been, I think, historically, empirically proven probably every 10 years since the industrial revolution. Therein lies the secret. It seems to me, and not looking for an economic answer to every single problem, but if you look at the Third World, they are in desperate need of some policies of economic hope and opportunity, get the IMF to recognize its responsibility to help nations, not hurt nations, and I think some of the problems alluded to in the Atlantic Monthly article and the National Review article, where they suggested Kemp and Bennett are wrong, the arguments that were made in both cases, in my view, were wrong.

MS. CHAVEZ: I'm going to take four more questions. Here, here, here and here. Start with you.

Q I'm Mark Caimber (ph) of the San Francisco Chronicle. One follow-up on the debate in the Republican party question. The reason that Kemp and Bennett got such headlines is that it's so unusual for Republicans to be speaking out on this. After Speaker to be Gingrich met with Governor Wilson last week, he talked about nationalizing 187 himself and you didn't hear complaints -- not only from Republicans, even from Democrats. I'm wondering when you talk about there being debate in the Republican party, besides the two of you saying -- (off mike) -- where else is the debate? Who else is there on your side?

MR. KEMP: It's interesting that the people running for governor in many other states took positions to the Kemp and Bennett position. Jeb Bush in Florida, George W. Bush in Texas, Fife Symington in Arizona -- I noticed that Bill Weld and Christy Todd Whitman yesterday on the Brinkley show both suggested that they would not support a 187 for their state, notwithstanding the fact that they were supporting Pete Wilson, and that's understandable. We have supported Pete Wilson and Dan Lundgren in bringing this case to the federal government of what should be done, but not of course the language. And I think what Bill and I tried to do is start the debate, and now today with Linda Chavez and the two prestigious institutions that are represented keep the debate going so that we do not make the mistake that was made in the past.

I want to say it once again. To me, the Republican party was on the wrong side of the issue at the turn of the century with regard to immigration, it was on the wrong side of the movement for civil and voting and equal rights for black Americans, in repealing the Jim Crow laws; and we were on the wrong side of the issue with regard to the incarceration or internment of Japanese Americans. I grew up in California. I'll be honest, I wish my mother and dad had spoken out, I wish somebody had spoken out. And that's why Kemp and Bennett spoke out, as a matter of conscience on this issue to make sure the party does not make similar mistakes at this time.

MR. BENNETT: That sideline comment really hurt, these -- two of us, you know. That was intended for you, I think, Jack -- (laughter) -- thinking -- you're on the bench, back in the game. Anyway, the debate has just begun, and Gingrich and the others said we'll take a look at this. But I think the debate has just begun. But, Jeb and George W. Bush, Bill Kristoll, James Q. Wilson, Linda Chavez, Wall Street Journal editorial page -- not bad company, that.

MS. CHAVEZ: San Diego Union, Santa Anna Register.

MR. BENNETT: Santa Anna Register, okay? That, too. But, I mean, that's not bad company. But if nobody thinks we're right, there wouldn't have been a controversy -- or if people thought what we had to say was inconsequential, there wouldn't have been much controversy. But I think now you will see people paying attention, closer attention to us.

MR. KEMP: One other thing. Excuse me, Linda, I'm just going to make one other point. I think the cause of 187 -- the opposition to 187 was hurt significantly by people waving Mexican flags and turning it into kind of a "take back southern California" approach. I think a lot of -- it was a disservice to the cause to go to the streets, leave schools. I'm not blaming anybody either for support of it or being in opposition to it, but it was carried away, and we wanted to prevent it from being carried away and tried to introduce a note of objectivity, hopefully, to the debate.

MR. BENNETT: Kids who were waving those flags need more education, not less.

MR. KEMP: Not less.

MS. CHAVEZ: And by the way, I don't think that this was a debate about whether or not people like Bill Kemp -- Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp and -- (laughter) -- they haven't merged, they're not the Siamese twins -- and Linda

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

**Chavez** are about supporting illegal immigration. The question is what to do about illegal immigration, whose responsibility it is. Is it the federal government's responsibility to control the borders? Should the federal government enact some way of trying to monitor whether or not people who admitted illegally in fact leave the country when their visas expire? We used to have an Alien Registration Act. Once a year, you had to go -- if you were in the country on a temporary visa -- and register your whereabouts. These are responsibilities of the federal government.

And the question is whether or not we're going to let those legitimate concerns about illegal immigration spill over to turn us into an anti-immigration, close the borders, restrict legal immigration fervor. And I think that's the danger, and that's what we'll see. And that is certainly the goal of some of the groups -- groups like the Federation for American Immigration Reform have jumped on the illegal immigration because for several years they've tried to propose measures that would control the flow of legal immigrants, and they've been unsuccessful in getting support for that position.

Yes, in the back?

Q (Marsh?) Williams from The Christian Science Monitor. Your comments come close to addressing my question. You all have made a very clear distinction between immigration and illegal immigration, yet you don't seem to be crediting any California voters and some of your fellow Republicans with making that distinction. Why so pessimistic?

MR. KEMP: We're not pessimistic, and we don't share the pessimism which is apparent in the body of your question.

They're not racists or bigots. There was some impression given by some that our statement was suggesting a vote for 187 was racist. It isn't. We just were warning the party to be careful about taking a step that becomes very slippery as you begin to promote things at the national level like ID cards for work or health care services.

Q So you don't think the 187 vote was an anti-immigrant vote essentially?

MR. KEMP: I don't know the motives of everybody who voted for it. I am not suggesting the people of California are anti-immigrant. California is a nation of immigrants. Tom Peters pointed out that there are 140 separate languages spoken in Los Angeles, California, and when I grew up there were a number. So, no, I'm not suggesting that at all. There are and were mistakes on both sides of this issue, and a rational debate is what Bill and I have welcomed and hopefully have helped to start, and I want to praise Linda **Chavez** for entering it on behalf of these two prestigious institutions.

MS. **CHAVEZ**: I have -- before you speak, Bill, I actually think I have a different point of view than Jack. I am more pessimistic than he is, and the reason I'm pessimistic is that, if you look at the public opinion data, it suggests that Americans have a somewhat distorted view of immigration. I mean, you can't deny that 60 percent of Americans think that the old immigrants who used to come here were good for the country but 60 percent of Americans also believe that the immigrants who are coming here today are bad for the country.

And part of that reason, I think -- part of the reason for that, I think, is that we have a distorted view on who those immigrants are and what contributions they're making. That's the point of our issuing today the index of leading immigration indicators. It is to show that, despite the fact that many Americans believe immigrants come here for welfare, working age immigrants living in the United States, even those entitled by virtue of their poverty status to receive benefits, have a lower immigration -- lower welfare rate than the native born do.

We have a sense that all of the immigrants that are coming here are low-skilled, uneducated and not assimilating. In fact, the facts show the opposite. We have a higher proportion of the foreign born with PhDs and college degrees than we do the native born. And even among those immigrants like Latinos, who come here with very low education levels, after 15 to 20 years in the United States, their earnings go up, they catch up with their co-ethnics. And after about 20 years, they actually exceed the earning power.

There's every indication that, despite 25 years of concerted effort by the part of the federal government to keep immigrant children speaking their native language and being taught in their native language, that in fact the same thing is happening to this generation of immigrants as happened to previous generations.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

They learn English, and by the third generation in the United States, English becomes their only language, not just their dominant language.

MR. BENNETT: I'm somewhere in between. Notice 187, it was -- support for it was dropping like a rock in California until you got the flag business, people walking around with the Guatemalan and Mexican flags. You then, I think, did stir the juices. And one understands. People thought, well, what is my choice here, voting for the American flag or voting for the Guatemalan flag? They voted for the American flag. Without a lot of stupid, counterproductive stuff like that, I'm not sure the result would have been -- the result might well have been very different.

But Linda's right to this extent. There is some irrationality about this. Now, I argued against the Wilson position on public policy grounds, and I think that's where the argument should be conducted. But, you know, this thing stirs a lot of juices, and not all of them are good. It stirs a lot of nativist juices. I mean, you should read the mail at Empower America, listen to the voice mail or read our mail. You know, there's a lot of it, and some of it ain't so healthy, isn't so good.

But this, which the panel can talk about later, public opinion on immigrants by ethnicity, it's quite remarkable the numbers. You know, percent saying these nationalities generally benefit the country: Irish, 76 percent, 1993, Americans. Seventy-six percent said the Irish benefit America, but only 24 percent of Americans think Cubans do, and only 41 percent think the Vietnamese do. This is irrational, I'm sorry to say, so we need -- it's very good we're airing, debating this issue and discussing this issue so we can get facts out on the table. And that's the great thing about this report; it gets facts out on the table.

MS. CHAVEZ: I'm going to change the rules here in midstream. We have two more questions. I'd like each of you to pick whom you want to respond to your question so that we can get on with the panel. Yes?

Q Steve Daley from the Chicago Tribune. All of you have addressed the cultural aspects of this -- multiculturalism, bilingualism, affirmative action. I don't recall Governor Wilson talking about the aspects of this -- (inaudible). Is there any evidence that what happened in California with Prop 187 was anything other than economics? Any real world evidence? MS. CHAVEZ: I am going to take this since you didn't pick one of the others and just suggest that we have on the next panel Ron Untz (sp), who will be talking about some of the polling data he did when he challenged Governor Wilson in the primary, which in fact does indicate that some of this multiculturalism was driving the sentiment. I can tell you from just having come back from California that when you talk to people about what concerns them, it is the fact that they're worried that there is a fundamental change that's taking place in the culture of the United States. They don't like the fact that these kids were out in the streets waving Mexican and Salvadoran and Guatemalan flags, and they don't like the fact that their tax dollars are going to pay for education that costs 50 percent more than the education of the native born because these children are being put into special classes in which the native language is used as a method of instruction.

Q Maria -- (inaudible) -- at USA Today. I'd like to ask any one -- either of you what's your assessment of what will happen on the Hill now that the Republicans have taken over on this issue of immigration, particularly since so many Democrats support many of the things that Governor Wilson pushed in California?

MR. KEMP: Well, the purpose of this meeting is to elevate the issue to a front burner so that mistakes are not made. My hope is that the Republican Party will approach this from a rational and logical and objective viewpoint. And I stand by the things I've said throughout this conference about the fact that immigration is a plus for the United States. Ron Untz (sp) has pointed out in his outstanding article in the Policy Review, a Heritage Foundation publication, that in the 1980s it wasn't much of an issue because we created jobs at such a level that there was an easy -- or easier assimilation -- assimilation --

MR. BENNETT: Assimilation.

MS. CHAVEZ: Assimilation.

MR. KEMP: Assimilation. That will make the evening news. (Laughter.) Somehow it always makes the evening news when someone on the right does it. (Laughter.) It doesn't make the evening news when --

MR. BENNETT: (Off mike) -- has to spell it.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTE  
JACK KEMP, EMPOWER AMERICA  
WILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICA  
THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

MR. KEMP: Yeah, right. Yeah. (Laughter.) I can spell it better than pronounce it. Assimilation -- (laughter) -- was not an issue in the '80s when the economy was growing, when 21 million new jobs were created. And it's become a zero sum game when you get an economic contraction. This happened in Europe in the 1930s and it manifested itself in my view against Jews. It happened in the -- in another century it happened against immigrants, and it happened in California, in my view, because of the terrible consequences of the collapse of real estate values, the collapse of defense spending, the collapse of the economy caused by too much regulation, too much federal government intrusiveness, and of course, over taxation.

So my hope is that we can carry on this debate and assimilate those with whom we disagree.

MR. BENNETT: This immigration problem may come and go, but again I want to end -- assimilation is the issue, and assimilation is not just the issue for people born in foreign countries. Assimilation is a problem for people born in this country, too. Babies are immigrants from heaven or wherever you think they come from, and they have to be assimilated. We are not transmitting our culture. We are not transmitting the values of the culture. We are not transmitting the key principles of this culture. We're not doing a very good job with home-grown kids. We're not doing a very good job with immigrants. And this is exacerbating pressure, I think, on all points, including the immigration point, and is creating a focus that is sometimes in the wrong place. Again, I think more attention to assimilation -- these are heated debates.

Maria, I think one thing will be what the Republican Congress' stand be on things like bilingual education and affirmative action and multiculturalism? There is no example -- that I know of -- of a truly multicultural society that survived. I don't think there is one. It's almost definitional, but check your Durkheim. I don't think there is one. And so we have got to do -- be very clear and plain about this. And this is the challenge not just for the next four years, five years, 10 years. This is the challenge for the future of this country.

MS. CHAVEZ: With that challenge to go out and check your Durkheim, I'm sure some of you will be rushing for the doors.

I'd like to thank Bill Bennett and Jack Kemp for being here this morning, and all of you.

END

## Classification

---

**Language:** ENGLISH

**Subject:** IMMIGRATION (91%); US STATE IMMIGRATION LAW (90%); HISPANIC AMERICANS (90%); PRESS CONFERENCES (78%); MIGRATION ISSUES (77%); ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS (77%); MINORITY GROUPS (77%); PLATFORMS & ISSUES (73%); CAMPAIGNS & ELECTIONS (73%); POLITICAL DEBATES (68%); WELFARE BENEFITS (66%); AFFIRMATIVE ACTION (64%); RACISM & XENOPHOBIA (63%); RESEARCH INSTITUTES (57%)

**Company:** RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR AZOV SEA FISHERY PROBLEMS (58%); RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY (58%); RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (58%); RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR AZOV SEA FISHERY PROBLEMS (58%); RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY (58%); RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (58%); NATIONAL PRESS CLUB (84%); NATIONAL PRESS CLUB (84%)

**Organization:** NATIONAL PRESS CLUB (84%); NATIONAL PRESS CLUB (84%)

**Geographic:** CALIFORNIA, USA (94%); UNITED STATES (94%)

PRESS CONFERENCEWITH: LINDA CHAVEZ, MANHATTAN INSTITUTEJACK KEMP, EMPOWER  
AMERICAWILLIAM BENNETT, EMPOWER AMERICATHE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

**Load-Date:** November 22, 1994

---

End of Document