

There is widespread agreement that the U.S. immigration system is broken, but lack of any consensus on what ought to be done to fix it. Economic analysts from [Center for American Progress](#) used “a computable general equilibrium model to estimate the economic ramifications of three different scenarios: 1) comprehensive immigration reform that creates a pathway to legal status for unauthorized immigrants in the United States and establishes flexible limits on permanent and temporary immigration that respond to changes in U.S. labor demand in the future; 2) a program for temporary workers only that does not include a pathway to permanent status or more flexible legal limits on permanent immigration in the future; and 3) mass deportation to expel all unauthorized immigrants and effectively seal the U.S.-Mexico border.”

Many [faith-based groups](#) are advocates for something like scenario (1), based on moral imperatives to treat all people with dignity, welcome the stranger and lift up the down-trodden. A [blog](#) on the website Christians for Comprehensive Immigration Reform notes the impasse in Congress and suggests that giving more attention to root causes of unauthorized migration would “expand the discussion and perhaps create opportunities for compromise.” A [report](#) from Bread for the World Institute holds up the For a Just Market project in rural Mexico as an example of foreign aid designed to lessen flows of immigrants by reducing poverty in sending countries.

The University of Denver convened a Strategic Issues Panel on Immigration, people from various backgrounds who met to puzzle over the interconnected issues of immigration and devise a framework for immigration policy. The panel made numerous detailed [specific recommendations](#), including all the elements of scenario (1) above.

The bipartisan Council on Foreign Relations' Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy [released a report](#) with policy recommendations in July 2009. This task force plan, like the DU panel, arrived at a plan that fits in the scenario (1) category.

The [Red Card Solution](#), outlined by Helen Kriebel of the Vernon W. Kriebel Foundation in Denver, corresponds closely to Scenario (2). Red Cards is Kriebel's term for smart cards based on permits for non-citizens to work legally in the U.S. for a specific employer, location and time duration encoded on the card along with the worker's biometric data. This proposal is premised on the belief that most illegals come here to seek work and intend to return to their home country. Private employment agencies licensed by the government would match foreigners with U.S. businesses who need workers. Those now in the country illegally could remedy their status by leaving the U.S. and then applying for a Red Card. There would be sanctions against employers who work around the system.

Richard D. Lamm, former governor of Colorado, and Lawrence Harrison offer a “bold plan to solve America's illegal immigration problem.” Lamm and Harrison are both members of the advisory board of the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), an anti-immigrant organization. In a Christian Science Monitor [article](#), they outline two critical steps to be taken. First, they propose a process by which illegal immigrants become eligible for amnesty by paying a fine of \$10,000 per person. The second step is designed to strengthen national unity, greatly

limit numbers of future legal immigrants and give preference based on past performance of ethnic groups, with the aim of admitting only those who will acculturate most quickly and whose children will achieve great academic success and thereby contribute most to our society. This scenario is unlike any of the three considered by the Center for American Progress, and differs from them in that it focuses on promotion of traditional values and a uniform national identity.