

Title II Amendment	Summary	AILA Position
Blumenthal 1	<p>DREAMers who have been RPIs for at least 5 years and were younger than 16 years old on the that they entered the U.S. may adjust if they are under 18 when they submit an application and do not have to meet the education or military requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It's the right thing to do for children, and the right thing to do for our country. The Little Dreamers amendment upholds the guiding principle behind the DREAM Act to do right by children who are growing up in our country and deserve the opportunity to achieve their full potential and ultimately give back to the country they call home. 	SUPPORT
Blumenthal 12	<p>DREAMers who have honorably served in the Armed Forces and meet certain other conditions to become naturalized United States citizens through the naturalization process already in place for those who serve in the military</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This amendment allows us to recognize the patriotism and sacrifice of RPI DREAMers who serve their country through military service. There is bipartisan support for allowing DREAMers to naturalize through military service. 	SUPPORT
Blumenthal 15	<p>Changes the date of presence requirement for RPI status from Dec. 31, 2011 to April 17, 2013.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal of this legislation is to transform a broken immigration system into a legal, functional one. Leaving hundreds of thousands out runs contrary to that goal. The December 31, 2011 cutoff date for eligibility is arbitrary, and April 17, 2013 represents a sensible alternative. 	SUPPORT
Coons 4	<p>Provides a meaningful immigration path for underrepresented countries. The elimination of the diversity visa program will severely impact many countries. This amendment seeks to restore a fraction of the eliminated visas to retain a limited avenue for immigrants from previously designated as diversity visa eligible countries</p>	SUPPORT
Cornyn 3	<p>Limits eligibility for RPI status by excluding those convicted of domestic abuse, child abuse, and drunk driving.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cornyn 3 would arbitrarily bar from legalization aspiring Americans who contribute to their communities and pose no threat to public safety, based only on a single misdemeanor offense and regardless of equities or mitigating circumstances. Eliminating the 3 separate conviction dates for misdemeanors would encourage state and local police who want to conduct immigration enforcement to file multiple charges stemming from one incident. Domestic violence organizations oppose the amendment because victims are sometimes incorrectly identified as perpetrators of the violence and could be subject to the exclusion. 	OPPOSE
Cornyn 4	<p>Makes ineligible for RPI status anyone with criminal convictions unless DHS first contacts any victims of the applicant (including undocumented victims) to get their input.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not only is it unclear how DHS will contact victims who are not involved in the immigration process, but the amendment completely fails to acknowledge the fear such contact will instill in undocumented or semi-documented victims of crimes. It will also be extremely costly. 	OPPOSE
Cornyn 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expands the situations in which the Secretary is required to disclose information provided on an application for RPI, adjustment of status from RPI, or blue card status. Restricts confidentiality provisions if an application under one of the above provisions is denied or in subsequent removal proceedings. Revises confidentiality of visa application information. Confidentiality exceptions and this amendment will perpetuate immigrants' mistrust of the government, thus causing fewer people to apply and reducing the overall success of the RPI program. <p>Under this amendment, people will be more afraid to come forward and apply for RPI status than they were during IRCA.</p>	OPPOSE

Amendment	Summary	AILA Position
Cruz 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibits legalization for anyone who has ever been "willfully" present in the U.S. unlawfully. The amendment strikes to the core of the Gang of 8's deal because it would prevent almost everyone from being able to legalize through the RPI program 	OPPOSE
Cruz 4	<p>Adds to the immediate relative category the parents of LPRs. (in addition to the spouse and children of LPRs S.744 adds) It eliminates married children regardless of age. It also counts spouses/children of employment-based visas against the cap.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive: The amendment allows for LPRs to reunite with the parents. Negative: The amendment would bar families with married children from reuniting under the family-sponsored system, failing to recognize the close bonds of married children and grandchildren in families. This bar would create a disincentive toward marriage, as children will have to weigh the choice of marriage versus being reunited with their parents. 	OPPOSE
Feinstein 14	<p>Moves eligibility date from 12/31/11 to date of enactment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal of this legislation is to transform a broken immigration system into a legal, functional one, but leaving hundreds of thousands out runs contrary to that goal. 	SUPPORT
Grassley 7	<p>The amendment would have an adverse impact on the RPI application process. It would limit those who are eligible for RPI. It would also take away discretion from DHS to extend the application period. It requires DREAMers to pay a penalty, and raises the penalty fee to \$5000 (from \$1000). It also restricts the eligibility criteria for adjusting to LPR status in education, English language, and civics requirements.</p>	OPPOSE
Grassley 8	<p>Amendment would bar from RPI status those individuals with immigration status felonies. Immigration status misdemeanors would count towards the 3 or more misdemeanors bar from RPI status.</p>	OPPOSE
Grassley 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divests DHS with the authority to extend the application period by an additional 10 months for RPI status or blue card status. Limiting the application filing period to 1-year will undermine the goal of bringing immigrants out of the shadows and into the fold of American Society. Eliminating the possibility of an extension will make it extremely difficult for immigrant families to meet the other requirements of the application process 	OPPOSE
Grassley 10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This amendment removes the provision stating that DHS is not required to initiate removal proceedings against individuals whose RPI applications are denied and replaces it with one requiring the initiation of removal proceedings "unless there are compelling humanitarian interests...." Requiring DHS to place RPI-ineligible individuals into proceedings will deter potential applicants, keep people in the shadows, and undermine national security. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removes protections for RPI eligible/RPIs individuals apprehended by ICE. Eliminates the waiver that would allow deported individuals or reentered after 12/31/11 to apply for RPI status. Strips RPI applicants from receiving advance parole while their application is pending. RPI applicants accumulate unlawful presence. Allows removal of RPIs if removal ground arose after application for RPI status This amendment would discourage many RPI-eligible individuals from applying for fear that they might be detained or removed while their applications are being adjudicated, even if they remain eligible for the program. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 13	<p>Disallows the use of affidavits in applications for RPI status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RPIs are a vulnerable population that might not always have physical records to document work and education. This amendment will make it harder for immigrants to become permanent residents. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eliminates all judicial review for revocations and denials of legalization In our justice system, it would be unprecedented to bar judicial review of administrative agencies' decisions involving individual interests of this magnitude. Oversight is necessary to ensure the integrity of the system. 	OPPOSE

Amendment	Summary	AILA Position
Grassley 18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requires disclosure of any SSNs used. RPI status can be revoked for failure to disclose. Allows disclosure of SSNs used to "any Federal or State agency" to notify the individual whose number was misused. The RPI applicant may not be aware of all counterfeit names and SSNs used on his behalf. The use of a fake SSN is a felony, and fear of being charged with this crime may deter the RPI applicant from applying for the legalization program. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prohibits RPIs from naturalizing while in RPI status This amendment is redundant because current law and the S. 744 prohibit RPIs from naturalizing. An RPI would have to adjust to green card status and remain in that status for a number of years before naturalization would be available. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strikes the 2313 waiver Section 2313 should be preserved because it gives judges and DHS officers authority to prevent unfairness in a narrow set of compelling cases. Judges and DHS officials must make tough decisions that have permanent consequences for a person's life, including deportation. Congress should restore their authority, taken away in 1996, to exercise discretion in some cases. 	OPPOSE
Grassley 22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrows the class of cases in which judges & DHS may exercise discretion under Section 2313 of the bill to terminate cases where not doing so would be contrary to the public interest or would cause hardship to qualifying relatives. Expands the universe of inadmissibility provisions that preclude discretion to include 212(a)(2)(D)(i), (iii), (F), (G) and 237(a)(2)(G). The amendment reflects an one size fits all outdated approach, one that chooses disproportionate punishments and categorical exclusions over common sense policies that provide solutions for the future. See Grassley 21 	OPPOSE
Grassley 27	Eliminates provision stating that frivolous asylum claim & failure to voluntarily depart bars do not apply to RPI applicants. Eliminates provision eliminating one year asylum bar. Eliminates provision allowing grants of asylum in credible fear interviews.	OPPOSE
Hirono 1	By exempting children of certain Filipino World War II veterans from the numerical limitations on immigrant visas, the amendment will provide for more immediate reunification of specific elderly Filipino WWII veterans with their sons and daughters.	SUPPORT
Hirono 5	Allows U.S. citizens and LPRs, needing an avenue outside of the family visa system created by S.744, to reunite with 2 siblings, adult children, or extended family who are their closest family members. It is limited to those who have not previously sponsored any other family member.	SUPPORT
Hirono 6	Restores the F4 (Brothers and Sisters of Adult U.S. Citizens) category and removes the age restriction on the F3 (Married Sons and Daughters of U.S. Citizens) eliminated by S.744. Adult children and siblings are an integral part of the family structure and critical to the integration of immigrant families.	SUPPORT
Hirono 7	As a compromise solution, restores the F4 (Brothers and Sisters of Adult U.S. Citizens) category and removes the age restriction on the F3 (Married Sons and Daughters of U.S. Citizens) 10 years after enactment. This amendment will allow Congress to address and clear the backlog before allowing U.S. citizens to again sponsor their married adult children and siblings.	SUPPORT
Hirono 8	Acknowledging that one's children never stop being one's children, the amendment raises age cap on married adult sons and daughters to 39 years (from 31), allowing more families to reunite.	SUPPORT
Hirono 9	The amendment would fix the V visas to treat equally all family-based petitions filed within a certain time by allowing siblings and married sons and daughters over 31 (not just spouses and unmarried children) with pending visas to live and work in the U.S. while waiting for their visas to become available.	SUPPORT
Hirono 10	The amendment allows for a small number of visas for U.S. citizens to apply for a family member if the separation will result in extreme hardship if their brother, sister, son or daughter is not in the U.S.	SUPPORT

Amendment	Summary	AILA Position
Hirono 11	S. 744 creates a new merit-based visa system. The amendment would require the GAO to conduct a study to assess the impact of the point system by studying the family relationships, diversity countries, gender, age, education and occupation of those who received visas under the system.	SUPPORT
Hirono 12	Eliminates the requirement that first installment of penalty for RPI applicant be in the amount of \$500. Allows for installments until the \$1,000 amount is paid off, which must happen before applicant may renew.	SUPPORT
Hirono 13	Amendment would allow RPIs who are immediate relatives to adjust through means other than RPI-adjustment/DREAM Act/merit system.	SUPPORT
Hirono 14	Eliminates the physical presence requirement for dependent spouses and children of RPIs. The amendment will allow families to reunite sooner by allowing RPIs to petition for their dependent spouse and minor children regardless of their physical location if they meet other eligibility requirements.	SUPPORT
Leahy 8	Amends the fine payment provisions to allow for payment on an installment plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> By allowing the penalty fee to be paid in installments this amendment will maximize the number of potential applicants. 	SUPPORT
Lee 7	Changes date of required physical presence in United States for RPI status to December 31, 2009. Changes date of required physical presence in United States for RPI dependent spouses and children to December 31, 2011. Those who left the United States or illegally reentered after December 9, 2009 are ineligible for RPI status. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The goal of S.744 is to put everyone on a road map to citizenship, this bill works against that goal. S.744 already restricts who may qualify for RPI status, and this amendment would restrict it further. 	OPPOSE
Lee 8	Tightens the (a)(9) and (a)(6) inadmissibility barriers to legalization. One of the big things this amendment does is to make the permanent bar at (a)(9)(C) a complete barrier to legalization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prevents many deserving individuals from obtaining RPI status. Prior laws have permitted individuals with status-related violations to apply for legalization. 	OPPOSE
Lee 12	Prohibits the use of sworn affidavits to verify the employment or education of registered provisional immigrants applying for permanent residence. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RPIs are a vulnerable population that might not always have physical records to document work and education. This amendment will make it harder for immigrants to become permanent residents. 	OPPOSE
Sessions 1	The amendment would rewrite the family section, terminating all immediate relative category and eliminating parents, siblings, and all adult children from being petitioned by U.S. citizens or LPRs. It also restricts the number of nonimmigrants who are here from working. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendment would hinder families from reuniting. Children are still children; they do not stop being family because they turn 21. Also, parents do not stop becoming family because one turns 21. 	OPPOSE
Sessions 2	By prohibiting nonimmigrants from working without an EAD and going further to limit the issuance of EADs to 1 million/year, the amendment could leave many who are here lawfully and authorized to work from actually being able to work.	OPPOSE
Sessions 17	Provides that RPI applicants are subject to the public charge inadmissibility ground in §212(a)(4). Adds that the Secretary "shall" consider the likelihood of an RPI applicant's reliance on all federal means-tested public benefits. Mandates that the Secretary should consider any comments submitted by the Secretary of State of the government of the state of the alien's primary residence, and provides that there should be a notice and wait period to allow the states to submit comments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denies low-wage workers RPI status if they are likely to qualify in the future for even modest benefits. Undermines the goal of immigration reform to bring undocumented immigrants into the mainstream of the nation 	OPPOSE

Amendment	Summary	AILA Position
Sessions 22	<p>Bars anyone with 3 misdemeanors from RPI eligibility with no ability to ask for a discretion in compelling cases.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This goes to the heart of the legalization plan. The amendment would create an absolute bar to RPI status for many people who have committed only minor offenses that occurred long ago. DHS should be able to make a fact-based determination to exercise discretion if favorable equities support it. 	OPPOSE
Sessions 24	<p>Eliminates the provision that allows DHS to permit people previously deported or who have re-entered since Dec. 31, 2011 to apply for RPI status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This amendment will stop U.S. citizens and green card holders from reuniting with their loved ones. The number of family members excluded from the country without this amendment would reach into the hundreds of thousands. 	OPPOSE
Sessions 26	<p>Strikes the bill's language for RPI eligibility requirement to demonstrate average income or resources and inserts prohibition adjustment of status to lawfully admitted for permanent residence if an RPI might be eligible for public benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Denies low-wage workers RPI status if they are likely to qualify in the future for even modest benefits. Undermines the goal of immigration reform to bring undocumented immigrants into the mainstream of the nation 	OPPOSE
Sessions 47	<p>Eliminates diversity points in the merit-based track point system, With the elimination of diversity visas in S.744, removing the points would eliminate even this small recognition for the value of diversity from underrepresented countries</p>	OPPOSE
Sessions 48	<p>S.744 already eliminates sibling petitions. The amendment, by eliminating points for siblings in the merit-based point system, would severely hinder the ability of immigrant families to reunite. Siblings have long contributed to the economic and social fabric of America, and there is no reason to eliminate even this small acknowledgement of their value.</p>	OPPOSE