

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

WHAT AMERICANS WANT FROM IMMIGRATION REFORM IN 2014

Washington, D.C.

Tuesday, June 10, 2014

Presentation of Survey Results:

ROBERT P. JONES
Chief Executive Officer and Founder
Public Religion Research Institute

Presentation of Report:

E.J. DIONNE, JR.
Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

WILLIAM A. GALSTON
Ezra K. Zilkha Chair and Senior Fellow
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

ROBERT COSTA
National Political Reporter
The Washington Post

STELLA M. ROUSE
Assistant Professor, Department of Government and Politics
Assistant Director, Center for American Politics and Citizenship
University of Maryland

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. DIONNE: Well, I think I'll just start. I'm E.J. Dionne. I'm a Senior Fellow here at the Brookings Institution, and on behalf of our Religion Policy and Politics Projects, and also the Public Religion Research Institute, I want to welcome you all here today.

We here at Brookings, Bill Galston and I have had the pleasure and great good fortune of working with Robbie Jones, Dan Cox, and Juhem Navarro-Rivera at PRRI on many surveys, including the initial Religion Values And Immigration Reform Survey that we conducted last year, in March 2013. And as Robbie will explain; that this builds on that survey; it's a Panel call back of the initial survey, so we are re-interviewing many of the same people we talked to a year ago which allows you to do some interesting things.

We are grateful to the Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation in New York for their generous support for this survey, and our work more broadly. And I just want to thank a lot of people at the beginning because thank you sometimes get lost at the end, and that is a great sin in my view.

I want to thank PRRI staff for all their work in preparing the report and the data, Emily Fetsch, and Darcy Cohan. I'd also like to thank all the Brookings folks who helped with this report and event; Korin Davis, Ross Tilchin, Christine Jacobs, Beth Stone, and the (inaudible) Aaron Locke. Korin is responsible for all of the successes that we have today, and Bill and I will responsibility for the failures. Although I'm sure, with this crowd, there will be none.

I also really want to thank, although will formally introduce them, I really want to thank our respondents. We have a great -- we have a great pair of respondents here today. Particularly, I want to welcome my friend and now colleague, Robert Costa and also Stella Rouse. Do I have your name -- did I pronounce that correctly? Yes?

QUESTIONER: Stella Rouse?

MR. DIONNE: Rouse. I have -- I have the -- somehow I wrote it down; it is certainly great to have you. Thank you. The first mistake of the day is my responsibility.

Robbie will present the findings of the survey, and then colleague Bill Galtston and I, will briefly discuss our analysis of the results. Then we will hear from our distinguished Panel, and then we are going to open it up, we'll have a discussion among ourselves, and then open it up.

Robbie Jones is the CEO of PRRI, and a Leading Scholar and Commentator on Religion Values in Public Life, in addition to his books and numerous peer-review articles, he writes semi-monthly column at *The Atlantic*, on Politics, Culture and Religion. He is also -- has regular feature, *Faith by the Numbers*, on *Interfaith Voices*.

My friend Bill Galston holds the Ezra K. Zilkha Chair in the Brookings Governance Studies Program, where he serves as a Senior Fellow. He is also College Park Professor at the University of Maryland. A Former Policy Advisor to President Clinton, and other presidential candidates, and he writes a weekly column for *The Wall Street Journal*.

I am happy and honored to introduce our good friend and colleague, and coworker, Robbie Jones.

MR. JONES: Thank you, EJ. On behalf of the PRRI Team, I'm very happy to be here, and I want to say we are also very grateful for this very fruitful partnership with the Brookings Institution, which is now, believe it or not in its fourth year. We began in 2010, and we tend to do two to three projects a year, so stay tuned. There will be more to come later this year, as we head toward the mid-terms. But today, we are going to be talking about, What Americans Want from Immigration Reform in 2014.

As EJ mentioned, this study is a little bit of a unique study, because it's a call-back study. Last year, March of 2013, again, in partnership with the Brookings Institution, we conducted one of the largest surveys that's ever been conducted on Religion, Values and Immigration Reform, where we interviewed just over 4,500 Americans, a random sample of 4,500 Americans.

This year we called back as many people as we could get back on the phone. Actually called the same respondents, to see if over the last year their views had changed in any ways on issues around immigration reform, related issues, what their sort of assessments of where the country was going had changed or not.

EJ has also mentioned we are going to say a word of gratitude to the Ford Foundation and to the Carnegie Corporation of New York, who have generously funded the study. Just one word for those of you tracking, the margin of error for the study is plus or minus 3.3 percentage points for the general sample in this study. It was a study of 1,538 adult interviews conducted in English and Spanish.

So let jump right in to the results. Before I get to immigration reform, I want to say a little bit about the shifting mood in the country, just in general, as context. What we basically found, looking back a year ago, is more disapprove of Obama's job performance, and more are dissatisfied with the direction of the country. So here's -- just quick look at Obama's disapproval rating here on the left. Those dissatisfied with -- in the country on the right.

As you can see disapproval rating has gone from 39 percent a year ago to 50 percent today. Those saying they are dissatisfied with the way things are going in the country have gone up 6 points from 58 percent a year ago, to 64 percent today. And I just want to note here, if we look underneath a little bit, in terms of Obama's job approval rating, you see the difference in 2013, 2014, and this -- the approval, a year ago 51 percent of all Americans approved of Obama's job performance, and today that

number is 44 percent.

One number I want to draw your attention to though is the drop among Hispanic Americans here, which is really significant, right. So a year ago 72 percent of Hispanic Americans said they approved of President Obama's job performance. Today that number has dropped to 51 percent, right. So that's a 20 -- more than a 20-point drop, and just over the last year. So I think that's an important point of context as well.

And even among President Obama's conscious supporters, African-Americans, here you see a significant drop as well. So that's kind of the big picture of the country. So what's interesting about the study is at the same we found general dissatisfaction with Obama's job performance, and was kind of the mood in the country in general, we actually found an uptick in people's views of immigrants in the country.

So one question that we are able to track, actually back to 2010, is the general question about kind of the cultural impact of newcomers to the country, so the question said, "The growing number of newcomers from other countries either (a) strengthens traditional American values and customs, or (b) sort of threatens -- sorry -- threatens traditional American custom values, or (b) strengthens American society, which comes closer to your views?"

As you can see, there's been a substantial movement on this question just over the last four years, so back in 2010 -- as recently as 2010, the country was evenly divided on this question; 44 percent said the growing number of newcomers threatens traditional American customs, values, 44 percent said strengthens American society, and you can see the gap has sort of opened up here to a 20-point gap over the past four years.

So today, 58 percent of Americans, nearly 6 in 10, say that the growing numbers of newcomers from other countries strengthens American society, and indeed we even see 4 point uptick over the last year on that question. So that's about cultural

impact.

One question sort of measuring economic impact, I hear. We also see a movement in a similar direction, so this question asked, "Do you think illegal immigrants mostly help the economy by providing low-cost labor, or hurt the economy by driving wages from many Americans?"

So, a year ago you can see it was pretty lopsided; a solid majority, 56 percent, actually they hurt the economy by driving down wages for many Americans, that number has dropped 10 points over the last year. So today Americans are basically divided on this question, about the impact of illegal immigrants on the economy.

So that's the kind of context. Soto kind of summarize the general pessimism in the -- kind of a more pessimistic mood in the country but a more positive views of immigrants over the last year. So what does that mean for Immigration Reform Policy? And here we have this kind of remarkable finding that is mostly remarkable because it's the same, right? Really no movement over time, and for those who follow public opinion polling you know that this is sort of a rarity, right.

You would at least see some wiggling in these lines, if not some outright movement based on people's perception of the general country, all kinds of factors. And in fact, you know, this is table-top flat; I mean it's really a fairly remarkably stable finding.

So a year ago, March 2013, we found 63 percent supported -- and our question actually had three options to it, so it's how should the immigration system deal with immigrants currently living in the U.S. illegally? Should it allow them a way to become citizens provided they meet certain requirements, or allow them to become permanent legal residents but not citizens?

All right, you'll see two drops of rain on the pavement, and we alarms going. For those of you who drove in, you might realize the kind of extreme reactions we found on the streets today, to just a little bit of precipitation. All right I think we are all

clear.

All right, so back to the question here, three-part question. Allow them a way to become citizens provided they meet certain requirements? Allow them to become permanent legal residents but not citizens, or identify and deport them?

And as you can see, you know, on all three of three of these measures, a fair amount of stability over time. A year ago 63 percent said allow them the way to become citizens providing they meet certain requirements, today that number is 62 percent, which is not statistically different than it was a year ago.

We also had two independent samples in August and November that we actually called with separate samples, and again, even using separate samples the numbers really don't move over this time, so very stable over time. And we look underneath in terms of party affiliation, and what we see here is that we have basic cross-party support, although some significant differences in intensity of support here.

So all Americans, again, 62 percent, Democrats 70 percent, Independents, talk about like the general population at 61 percent; 51 percent of Republicans saying that they -- that their positive preference is allow them to become citizens provided they meet certain requirements. And the group though with a much lower view, are those who say they identify as members of the Tea Party, right; only 37 percent of that group says that their preferred policy is allow them to become citizens providing they meet certain requirements.

Here the other two, as you can see, still, this middle option of permanent legal resident status has, sort of, a few takers across party lines, and then you can see the differences here. One thing I will point out is that even only 30 percent of Republicans favor a deportation option, the numbers are at parity among Tea Party members, right. So 37 percent -- as many Tea Party members say their policy preference is deportation as say it is, path to citizenship, so evenly divided on that

question.

Among religious groups, we also see a fair amount of consensus across religious groups, in fact, with the exception of White Evangelical Protestants; every religious group in the country is in pretty solid majority support territory, with religious unaffiliated Americans having the highest level of support.

I'll say one thing about White Evangelical Protestants here; it's the one religious group where we saw, statistically, a significant drop over the last year. So a year ago they were at 56 percent, and they have now dropped to 48 percent. So this is a sort of 8-point drop over the last year. One thing, I don't have it on the slide here, but one thing to note about that though, is that the movement has been from the path to citizenship category to the permanent legal resident status category, not to the deportation category.

So, among Evangelicals, the deportation category has remained stable, so there was a 7-point uptick in the permanent legal resident status category that goes along with this downtick in support for path to citizenship. But that's still a plurality of White Evangelicals in that category supporting a path to citizenship, but a drop over last year, which we'll maybe talk about a bit later.

One other policy, and we've been measuring as well, that has remained fairly stable -- or very stable over the last year, about two-thirds of Americans say they support basically the tenets of the DREAM Act, allowing illegal immigrants brought to the U.S. as children to gain legal resident status if they join the military or go to college.

Again, very similar patterns, you can see, among Democrats, Independents and Republicans, again with the Tea Party being the one group that is less than the majority in support, and 53 percent actually opposing this policy.

One other interesting thing that we found that E.J. Dionne and Bill Galston are going to have more to say about here in the second part of the presentation,

but I'm going to try to tee up just a few things here. Is, we found a significant -- a significant correlation between those who said they most trusted Fox News and attitudes on a whole range of policies, including immigration policy.

So, just one question here on -- over on knowledge, the question; and the question read, "So over the last five or six years, do you think the number of illegal immigrants who were deported back to their home countries has increased, decreased or stayed about the same?"

Among all Americans 25 percent say that deportations had increased over the time, only 12 percent of Fox News viewers say that they had increased over the last five years, which is in fact what has happened. And then public television viewers are the most likely to say that deportations have increased at 35 percent. So we see a pretty big difference in terms of knowledge between Fox News viewers on the one hand, public television viewers on the other hand.

In terms of policy, here's how this plays in terms of policy. Among Republicans you see -- on attitudes towards immigrants, whether immigrants today strengthen our country because of their hard work and values, or whether immigrants burden our country because they take our job, housing and health care? Among all Americans 60 percent say, they strengthen our country because of their hard work values. Among Republicans, all Republicans, 44 percent.

But if you break out Republicans by Republicans who say they most trust Fox News, and Republicans who say they must trust any other news source, you see a very significant difference here. In fact, it's more than 20 points. Only 33 percent of Republicans who say they most trust Fox News agree that immigrants strengthen our country because of their hard work and talents, whereas 56 percent of Republicans who most trust other news sources, say that, and here you can just see the other side of it.

So, again, among Republicans who most trust Fox News, 60 percent say

the opposite, or agree with the second question that immigrants burden our country because they take our jobs housing and health care; so a big difference between Fox -- those who most trust Fox News among Republicans on the question about immigrants.

We see similar patterns on this three-part question about most-preferred policy for dealing with immigrants currently in the U.S. illegally. So again, among all Americans 62 percent, Republicans 51 percent, and you see this big divide here that Republicans who most trust Fox News at only 42 percent support a path to citizenship, versus 60 percent of Republicans that most trust any other news source. And there here is the other ways they stack up, here. So, again, you can see the real differences between these two subgroups, Republicans divided by most trusted media source, and EJ will return to this in just a minute.

The other place that you see this playing out interestingly enough, it may not be that surprising, for example, that you see this playing out among Republicans, but we actually see it also playing out among Independents, right. So there's actually the thought that those who most trust Fox News and actually segments Independents quite powerfully as well. So as you can see, all Independents look about like the general population in terms of their support for a path to citizenship.

However, Independents who most trust Fox News drops below majority, Independents who most trust, Independents who most trust any other news source it popped up to two-thirds here. And again, you can see the other pieces of the puzzle there.

All right, so let me kind of pivot a bit and talk about, a little bit about immigration reform in the 2014 elections. What do we know? Well it turns out just a little of a complex picture. So, on the one hand we see that the Democratic Party is more trusted today to be the party to handle -- to better handle the job of the immigration. At 46 percent today, it was 39 percent a year ago, and back in 2010 it was 37 percent. So

really, it's over the last year that we see movement, and Democratic Party gaining advantage among all Americans saying it's the best party to handle the issue of immigration.

We also found this finding, and we asked people to think about candidates running for Congress, would you be more likely, less likely to vote for a candidate who opposes immigration reform that includes the path to citizenship, for immigrants who are living in the U.S. illegally. And interestingly enough we found that basically that more Americans than not say -- by about a margin of three to one in fact say that they would be less likely to support a candidate who opposes immigration reform that includes the path to citizenship.

Sixteen percent said they'd be more likely to support such a candidate, 3 in 10 say it would not make a difference. Even among Republican voters, interestingly enough, it still -- we still there's a 2 to 1 liability. Nearly half of Republican voters say they'd be less likely to vote for a candidate who opposes immigration reform, 21 percent say they would be more likely there.

We could talk about the implications of that for 2014 and for 2016 a bit later. So that sort of points to there being sort of -- opposing immigration reform that includes the path to citizenship being more of a liability than an asset. But then there's also this finding. When we asked about how important immigration reform is for President Obama and Congress, what we find is that immigration reform, this is the number saying that it is the most important issue, so reforming the nation's immigration system, as you'll see, shows up fairly low, of those saying that it is the highest priority for them.

Among Americans overall, jobs, budget, health care, easily the top three, in the top tier of American's concerns this year; and when we break it up by party, we see some differences here, for sure, but not dramatic differences. And in the report actually,

toward the end of the report, one of the things that we show is that across a whole range of demographic groups, the priorities are among Americans who are actually quite stable among a whole range of demographic groups here.

The base at the top here, issues are improving the job situation, reducing the budget deficit, reducing health care costs, and pretty much among all groups those who were in the top tier, and these others, are things that are down at the bottom tier. And you can see among Republicans and Democrats here on reforming the nation's immigration system, not a lot of difference, or actually no difference between the parties on how important this issue is for them.

And then finally, before I turn it over to EJ, one of the things that sort of -- you know, kind of cast the light ahead on the 2014 election, is who is engaged and who is disengaged, heading into the election. And this graph shows different subgroups saying they are absolutely certain to vote in the 2014 mid-term elections.

And one of the things you'll notice if you just look at the bottom of the chart, two groups that have the highest -- one of the highest supports for immigration reform are among the least likely to vote, right. So, among Hispanics only 30 percent tell us that they are absolutely certain to vote in the 2014 election among younger Americans, less than a quarter of younger Americans, ages 18 to 29 say they are absolutely likely to vote.

If you compare that to seniors and Republicans, right, we are 7 in 10 say they were absolutely likely to vote. You see a real enthusiasm gap, if you will, that we talk about later in the report among the perspective electorate heading into the elections.

And now we'll turn it over to E.J. Dionne to talk a little bit more about the Fox News difference and America's role in the world.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. You probably already have a million questions on the basis of that great presentation from Robbie. I suppose it's odd that I

am doing a presentation on the media since I am multiple inveigled in this, and so I should say as a disclosure, right off the top, I write a column for *The Washington Post*, I do commentary on MSNBC, and I talk about politics every Friday, with my friend David Brooks, on NPR. So judge that, just bear that in mind, although I hope it didn't influence my analysis at all, indeed you will see why it might not have at all in some of the presentations.

In talking about political polarization, it's common to argue that our new media environment sharpens political divisions as citizens of the left and the right consume media that reinforce their own predilections. We also talk about whether ideologically-oriented media push people further along the philosophical spectrum, turning moderate conservatives who are more conservative. So are moderate liberals who are more liberal still.

You could argue that the survey provides some support for this view, although as I will be repeatedly pointing out, it is hard with a survey sort to answer the chicken and egg question, the cause and effect question. I'll be talking a lot about Fox, so do people's predilections lead them to Fox, or is it Fox that pushes them further down a road. And my hunch is we could have a whole discussion about that, I don't think our data can be this positive on that.

I would upfront, before I go to the slides, make the point that not everything in this survey supports the idea that media are clearly pushing people in a particular direction. For example, the public radio audience, demographically, it's almost a perfect match for the nation as you will see in the report. You know, there's just an example. Republicans make up 23 percent of the whole sample, 21 percent of those who say they use public radio as a news source for information about politics and events.

We had two questions, by the way, one is just use of media, and the other most-trusted television media, and the latter half of my presentation will focus on

that. All our friends that work in television news, local television news, will be pleased to know, that it is one of the most widely used sources of information; 76 percent of all survey use local television news; 69 percent said they watched cable, 57 percent read print newspapers and magazines -- God bless every one of them -- that's bias; 42 percent listen to talk radio.

I think it needs to be emphasized more often than it is; that while politically-engaged sources of information have important effects, large numbers of Americans continue to use news sources that lack obvious ideological sympathy. But I want to, and then we have some interesting findings on the impact of talk radio, and like, I just want to say that we did find one interesting effect, and our friends, maybe *Daily Kos* and *Talking Points Memo*, perhaps, *The Huffington Post* might be interested in this.

There was very little effect on media usage, but those liberals who used the -- who used -- relied on websites, Democrats, rather, who used online sources are more likely to call themselves liberal. And so the marketers at various websites may be interested in that. But here is where we get to the Fox News effect.

And I'm going to talk about two groups here, one, and Robbie already touched on this, on the immigration issue, Fox News Republicans, but one of the most interesting findings, I thought, is we found what you might call a new group, Fox News Independents, who are very distinct from other kinds of Independents. But we will get to that. As you can see on the chart there are some issues where Fox News Republicans are quite different than other Republicans.

On the one hand most Republicans, not surprisingly, said they'd vote Republican today, but there is still a difference, 92 percent of Fox News, Republicans, they really know where they stand. To paraphrase their slogan, they have decided, whereas there is still some looseness among the rest of the Republicans. But look at the minimum wage question, only 33 percent of Fox News Republicans favor increasing the

minimum wage, whereas 56 percent of non-Fox Republicans favor increasing the minimum wage.

That struck me as a very important difference. Most survey show, including ours, show majority support among Republicans for increasing the minimum wage. That split is very important. Similarly on allowing gay and lesbian couples to marry legally, most Republicans are opposed, but again, there is this significant difference there, 19 percent of Fox News viewers versus 36 percent of the non-Fox Republicans.

I think this has all kinds of implications for the 2016 race. And as I'll be showing you shortly, about 53 percent of Republicans trust Fox News most. So you really have a party split almost in half between the Fox News Republicans and the non-Fox Republicans.

But what really jumped at me and us when we looked at this data, were the Fox News Independents. Now, bear in mind, there's a lot of research that shows that Independents are in some cases not a very helpful category because a lot of Independents lean toward one party or the other. There are people out there who happen to vote for every Democrat or every Republican but like to call themselves Independent.

But this really, I think, the Fox News effect, or factor, really allows us to distinguish among Independents. There's some research suggesting a number of Republicans have flowed into the Independent category particularly some Tea Partyers, who were disillusioned with the Republicans after the Bush years, this may be part of that evidence. But just to look to at these issues.

The Fox News Independents, 70 percent would vote Republican, but non-Fox News Independents, 21 percent would vote Republican. Minimum wage really, a huge difference, 36 versus 77 favoring the increase, also a huge difference on gay and

lesbian couples marrying legally, 40 percent to 72 percent. I mean, these are two different worlds. Once you impose this -- you know, once you do this split, and so I think there is some more interesting work to be done on the Fox News Independents.

The other thing that gives Fox -- makes it important is this chart, and I hope you can read it, it's in the report. The biggest difference is that Fox News has an acceptance and -- popularity, it's better to say among Republicans and Conservatives. Among liberals and Democrats, there is no dominant media source. So if you look on the trust in television news sources, 53 percent of Republicans say they trust Fox News. Most compared to the second group it's only 22 percent.

Look at Democrats. Democrats are all over it a lot, only -- Fox News Democrats might be an interesting group to analyze, but there weren't that many of them but, you know, 31 percent broadcast news, 26 percent CNN, 14 percent public television, 9 percent The Daily Show with Jon Stewart; 10 percent MSNBC. There is no hegemonic liberal and then similar numbers among liberals. There is no hegemonic liberal news source. Now, one can give various reasons for this. I had mentioned these findings recently to a Conservative friend, who said, well, look, of course we rally to Fox, Fox is all we have.

Now I disagree with my friend that all these other media sources, with the exception of MSNBC in the evening are clearly Liberal sources. But it doesn't really matter what I think, what matters is a lot of Republicans and Conservatives feel that way, but I think this suggest a political power in -- on the Republican side of Fox News that no other medium has on the Democratic side.

The last thing I want to touch on is the issue of America's role in the world, and this is a discrete set of findings from the earlier findings. We are very divided as a country in our attitude towards how to deal with the world, there is -- for those people who hate polarization, there's good news in these findings which is that the normal lines

of polarization do not neatly explain our attitudes toward how much the U.S. should be engaged in the world.

Now, we have talked among ourselves about the particular question we asked. There are many different ways to ask the engagement question. If the word military had been thrown in there, we might have a somewhat different set of findings. I'm hoping we'll do more work over time, on different forums of engagement. This question may lean a little bit in the humanitarian direction, which is why you have fairly high numbers among Liberals.

Nonetheless, it really shows us we are very divided in how we want to approach the world. Liberals, you know, the question asked -- respondents to choose between two statements. U.S. should mind its own business internationally, or that we have a responsibility to help people in other countries. Liberals split 58/39, Moderates are basically split in two, Conservatives 49/45; similar splits among Republicans.

I think this shows, above all, that we may be in for a very interesting argument, particularly on the Republican side in the coming election. Over internationalism versus non-interventionism, however you might want to cast, whatever words you might want to use. On the one hand, there is a big audience among conservatives for non-interventionism, on the other hand, there remains a strong Conservative constituency for intervention.

So, I think you'll see very interesting arguments between, say, Rand Paul and, say, Marco Rubio or Jeb Bush. And that debate is very open inside the Republican Party with a slight leaning, as you can see, toward the engagement side, and on the Tea Party front, leaning the other way.

What has charged us to bring together this finding with the immigration finding -- oh, I'm sorry, the demographics are very interesting. The higher level of education, more for engagement, very little difference by age, little difference by gender;

very interesting, quite a high number among African-American for engagement. The education effect is probably the biggest demographically.

The last slide you see clearly is a relationship between attitudes toward the outside world, and attitudes towards immigration. The, identify and deport group in our survey, on the immigration question, also wants just the U.S. to mind its own business internationally; the path to citizenship group is much more internationalist or pro-engagement. And so, again, I think you -- while we don't have the traditional forms of polarization, you are seeing clusters that are identifiable. A Tea Party cluster, perhaps, visible here.

And now my friend, Bill Galston, who explored a couple of issues that Robbie touched on as well, is going to offer his thoughts. And then we are going to invite up our distinguished respondents. Bill?

Oh, actually, I got that wrong. I think we are all going to up on the stage. So that's my second mistake. Three and I have to go and sit in the audience.

QUESTIONER: Now EJ, you are the RTs of RT.

MR. DIONNE: (off mic)

QUESTIONER: It would, that you were surrounded by equally heavy hitters.

MR. GALSTON: In the interest of time I'd like to make just two brief points about the survey, and then introduce our commentators, whom we are very eager to hear from.

Point number one, we found much more agreement than disagreement across all of lines you can imagine. Whether it's ideology or partisanship, or age, or gender, race and ethnicity, you name it, we found more agreement than disagreement about the top priorities for the President and the Congress. And in particular every single subgroup in population, singled out improving the job situation as job one, for the

President and Congress, and it wasn't even -- it wasn't even a close call, which leads to a very interesting question. Well, why aren't they focusing like a laser beam on that issue?

And to answer that question you have to delve deep into the dysfunctions of contemporary American -- American politics. As Robbie indicated, for virtually all subgroups there was a top tier and a bottom tier, and the top tier was the job situation, and the budget deficit and reducing health care costs; and the bottom tier dealt with moral decline, immigration reform and climate policy. And interestingly we had vigorous discussion of this in the press briefing earlier this morning.

Even among Latinos, immigration reform is not a top tier issue. For Latinos, your bread and butter issues, such as jobs and health care, emerged at the top that is consistent with previous PRRI findings. And my understanding is consistent with other research as well, which we'll hear about in -- hear about in just a couple of minutes. If you are interested in the details, all of these subgroups, the issues priorities are summarized on page 41 of the report.

The second point I want to make is just to underscore something that both Robbie and EJ referred to in passing, namely, the immigration -- the enthusiasm gap is real, it's not just a journalistic trope, it's not just conventional wisdom, it is real. If you want my summary, the more a group disapproves of President Obama's performance, the more likely that group is to vote in 2014.

And I don't care, once again, how you break down the population, that correlation exists. This is not the first time we've seen this, we saw something very similar in 2010, the difference this time, we talk about this a little bit in the report, is that Democrats from the President on down, are painfully aware, you know, of the fact that especially in midterm, some of -- some groups that tend to support them, most broadly, don't do so very deeply, with not enough motivation to turn out and vote.

That is especially the case for young adult ages -- you know, ages 18 to

29 and also for Latino-Americans, and especially in midterms, politicians respond to their assessment. Who is going to turn out, who is going to be for, and who is going to be against them in the electorate, as opposed to the general population. So those are two questions, this very rich dataset enabled us to explore in some detail.

And now, without further ado, let me introduce our two wonderful commentators in the order in which they will comment. You know, Stella Rouse is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland, and therefore in some remote way, a colleague of mine. We are happy to welcome you to Brookings, I believe for the first time. She is also a research Center, Fellow at the Center for American Politics and Citizenship.

Her teaching in research focus on Latino politics, minority politics, legislative and political behavior, institution, state politics, immigration and network analysis; she holds a PhD in Political Science from LSU, and is the author of *Latinos in the Legislative Process: Interests and Influence*, published by Cambridge University Press, another point we have in common.

Our second commentator, Robert Costa is a National Political Reporter at *The Washington Post*. Previously he was the Washington Editor for the *National Review*, and a CNBC Political Analyst. He holds a Bachelor's Degree in American Studies from the University of Notre Dame, and a Masters Degree in Politics from the University of Cambridge; so without further ado, Stella, and then Bob.

MS. ROUSE: Thank you, Will, for that warm welcome. Good morning, everyone. I'm excited to be here and to be part of this important discussion to discuss these poll results which are very interesting. I don't have to tell any of you who are here - here in the audience that immigration and immigration reform has been hot-button issues for many years; both among the public and politicians alike.

With no clear eminent solution to this debate, as the PRRI Brookings poll

brings to light, the issue of immigration divides Americans among a number of lines. And also unites them, which I'll discuss in just a moment. Immigration, of course, is a complex issue because it is so intertwined with so many other issues, such as human rights, enforcing the law, security and opportunity.

And often when people discuss opportunity and immigration it's not just a debate about the opportunity for immigrants who are looking for a better life, but it's often framed in a zero sum way. Right, and the way that an opportunity for an immigrant either documented or undocumented, may be a lost opportunity for an American, and so all these things bring this issue, really, to the limelight and brings about lively debates.

More broadly, but related, immigration can be discussed an issue of egalitarianism, right, or equality for all people, that all people should be equal and have equal opportunity. So with the questions posed by the PRRI Brookings Poll, a number of these topics related to immigration can be explored and were interesting to me as I was reading through the poll.

So let's start where there's agreement on immigration across American society, and Bill and EJ talked about this. The one thing people seem to agree upon about immigration is that it's not really a priority for most Americans, right? It's really low on the ladder of priorities, as EJ, again, and Bill mentioned, really jobs are the number priority for most Americans. And improving jobs, you know, that Americans want Congress and the President to deal with.

This is also true among subgroups, and this was touched upon a little bit, but I'd like to discuss this just a little bit further. Right, especially among Hispanics, jobs were listed as a top priority at 62 percent, 62 percent of Hispanics believed that's the top priority for the President and for Congress to deal with; and similar numbers for African-American and Whites.

So again, immigration is not really up there as a priority. It may be

surprising to some that immigration is not a high priority for Latinos. But it's consistent with other polls, and it's consistent with my own research. Recently a Pew Research Center Poll, again, found that education, jobs and the economy are the top priority for Latinos, and immigration is, again, lower on that priority scale.

The lower priority placed on immigration by Hispanics also matches what I found in my book, *Latinos and the Legislative Process*. I examined both the priorities of Latinos in the mass public, and priorities of Latino legislators, and again found that consistently it's really about education, about jobs and the economy, and about health care, and immigration is lower on that level.

So why is it then that immigration is so identified with Latinos, and is a priority for Latinos? Or at last it's identified among the media, right? As I note in my own work, immigration is more of a headline-grabbing issue than a life-changing issue for most Latinos. And I don't want to deemphasize the importance for immigrants, undocumented immigrants; those who have family members that they are trying to bring into this country about the importance of immigration but, generally speaking, it's just not a priority.

It's an issue that does a carry tremendous amount of weight -- a tremendous amount of emotional weight, and it's inevitably tied to other issues. So for example, in a number states immigration is tied to education, and whether or not school districts must report the number of undocumented immigration students or face penalties from the State. So it's hard oftentimes for Latinos, as much as they may want to, to sort of separate the issue of immigration from other issues that they care about.

Therefore, the issue of immigration becomes a mobilizing force for Latinos. It's an issue that the Hispanic community can rally around, but the mobilization is usually in response to anti-immigrant actions by groups or the government. For example, we can look at SP 1070 in Arizona, and we can look HB4437 in Congress

several years ago.

However, from what the PRRI and Brookings Poll, and other polls have shown, Hispanics would like to move beyond immigration and focus on issues that affect them on a day-to-day basis. While immigration is consistently not a top priority for Americans, there are a number of divisions and opinions about the topics, and this was discussed a little bit earlier, right; the difference between Democrats and Republicans, and Republicans being three times more likely to favor deporting undocumented immigrants.

Differences in these topics also exist among religious groups, which I'd like to touch on a little bit. For example, the majority of most religious groups support a path to citizenship except for White Evangelical Protestants, as was mentioned before. Also, White Evangelical Protestants say immigrants hurt the economy, 60 percent of them say that, while other religious groups are more divided. And I'll be back to the importance of this in just a second.

But another issue about immigration or a sub-issue that the results of the poll shows, and I'd like to discuss just a little bit is the agreement about support for the DREAM Act, right, and we see this as a difference above immigration as a whole, or how people feel about immigration as a whole. More than two-thirds of Americans favor the policy, while 30 percent are opposed.

And there is general agreement across political religious and subgroups that the DREAM Act should be passed at the national level; although, again, White Evangelical Protestants are most divided with 48 percent of them favoring, 47 percent opposing the DREAM Act. While not directly covered in the poll, other polls and research has shown that people view DREAMers differently than other undocumented immigrants. Therefore, the debate around the issue is not as contentious, and there's much more agreement across typical divides about the DREAM Act.

There's been a movement in states to pass some form of DREAM Act legislation, even though we haven't had it passed up to a national level. For example, just yesterday, Governor Rick Scott of Florida signed into a law, a Bill that provided in-state tuition for children of undocumented immigrants. And he (inaudible) this debate even though he's a staunch supporter of cracking down on illegal immigration, he framed the debate more about education and about the cost of tuition than he did about dealing with the issue of illegal immigration. So it's very interesting how people sort of make this division on broader issues if immigration versus the DREAM Act.

And again, one other important group that the previous panelist discussed was about young adults or millennials, and how they feel about immigration. As the survey shows, the strongest supporters of immigration reform are young adults and Hispanics; 76 percent of young adults say newcomer strength in American society, and this comports with my own work that I've done on millennials' attitudes towards immigration.

One thing that I found in my work is that the great recession has had an impact on how millennials look at immigration particularly those that have been threatened directly. Either economically or in having to compete for jobs, but in general millennials are very supportive of immigration, are very supportive of new groups coming into the country. And the reasons that I found for this is that millennials in general are more liberal, and they've grown up in a very diverse society, much more diverse than any other cohort in American history.

So one last subject I'd like to track back to, is the ideal of egalitarianism and immigration. Many people see immigration reform not only as a human right but as an issue of equality. The interesting thing is that egalitarianism is often equated with religion, right, and different religious dominations assisting those that are downtrodden individuals in our society. We see this with the support that the Catholic Church has

provided towards immigrants, undocumented immigrants in their support for immigration and immigration reform.

What is striking to me about this with the PRRI Brookings Poll; is how White Evangelical Protestants stand out in their attitudes toward immigration. As previously mentioned, the majority of other religious groups, except White Evangelical Protestants, support a path to citizenship, 60 percent of White Evangelical Protestants say immigration hurts the economy, and the majority of most religious groups believe newcomers strengthen American society, but the majority of White Evangelical Protestants say newcomers threaten traditional American values.

White Evangelical Protestants are simple that the more -- than other religious groups, that immigration rates have actually increased, when the truth is that they have decreased over the last five or six years. The reason I raise the effects of being a White Evangelical Protestant, on opinions about immigration, is that it is consistent with research that I had done in other research, about the effects on religion on other issues of egalitarianism.

So a paper that I co-wrote, finds differences of religion across racial ethnic groups; the differentiating effects of religion on other egalitarian issues, such as overcoming discrimination against women, reducing intolerance towards gays and lesbians, and achieving racial equality. And these findings demonstrate that greater conservatism depresses interest in gender equality, intolerance for gays, and both White and Latinos Evangelicals are less interested in overcoming gender discrimination and mitigating intolerance for gays and lesbians.

Finally, for African-Americans and Latinos, religion does not exert a negative effect, but White religious Conservatives and Evangelical Protestants there is a great effect on the opinions about racial equality, great negative effect. So the result of the survey support the overall attitudes of White Evangelical Protestants that I have found

in my study, not only about immigration which I did not test in that study, but the survey shows that White Evangelical Protestants also oppose same sex marriage at rates that I find in my own work; and certainly much less than other religious groups.

So this certainly highlights the importance of examining immigration through a religious lens, and shows an important cleavage on the topic of immigration that is sometimes overlooked by the mainstream media. And so with that, I'm going to turn it over to Robert.

MR. DIONNE: Thanks so much, Stella.

MR. COSTA: Again, thanks to Bill and to EJ for the invitation, it's great to be back at the Brookings Institution.

For *The Washington Post*, I'm a political reporter and I focus a lot on the Republicans Party. And so just briefly I thought I'd give you a glimpse of some of the current, especially of light of this great survey done by Brookings and PRRI about where immigration stands right now ahead of the midterms, and why we are at the moment we are.

I was thinking before I came over here, about 1984, Ronald Reagan's debating Walter Mondale, and he says, quote, "During the debates I believe the idea of Amnesty," and this was the Republicans Party in 1984, and two years later, in 1986, Reagan signed a sweeping immigration Bill, and he sold it as a security measure, and it's something that he was upfront about amnesty, and the idea of legalization.

And then contrast that moment in 1984 and in 1986 with today, where just two hours south, in Richmond, Virginia, House Majority Leader, Eric Cantor, is having his Primary, and he is running against a Randolph-Macon Economics Professor named David Brat. And David Brat has spent his entire campaign, I just spoke with him a few days ago, focus on immigration in pressuring the Majority Leader Cantor from the right.

And saying, Cantor, who has not yet brought one immigration Bill to the

floor, of any substance, he is -- the argument of Brat is that Cantor is a threat because he has the ability to do so even though he has not done it. And this is reflected in what we see in this survey. We see a culture right now within the Republican Party, where though there is no action on immigration reform, there is fear in the ranks that it is on the horizon.

I just got back yesterday from Mississippi where there's a contested Republican Senate Primary. I spent a day with Chris McDaniel, a Tea Party challenger running against Senator Todd Cochran. And at the top of his list was immigration, though of course Senator Cochran did not support much of the immigration efforts in the Senate.

And so why are we here? Well, I think the survey tells us a lot, and I think for the time being, Republicans, in spite of their broad talk about wanting to do immigration reform, are really not moving in that direction. They feel -- it's not so much pressure, but it's an overwhelming sense that they can't do anything, can't find consensus, and that the base will truly revolt against them.

And when I'm on Capitol Hill and I speak with members about this, and I've spoke with Leader Cantor recently about this. A lot of the members talk about the census and how the redrawing of lines in 2010, 2011 have enabled Republicans to have much safer House seats, and this an optimistic thing from their perspective, they think they can hold the House, perhaps, at least till 2020, but in this new climate we have a lot of conservatives who are really shaping the agenda in their own districts and states.

When you look at the House Republicans' agenda for June, ahead of the August Recess, immigration is not mentioned once. And most Republicans in both the Senate and the House believe that it is a remote possibility for 2014, and that without any preparation ahead of the August Recess, this is not happening. Cantor has spoken about perhaps bringing a Republican version of the DREAM Act to the floor, that does not seem to have much energy behind it at all, and no one is whipping that at the moment.

After the August Recess, I'm now hearing the refrain from congressmen

and senators that next year is the goal for immigration reform. But even that seems to be dimming, because most Republican leadership aides say that another Bill will be needed from the Senate to be able to have any kind of action in the House; and so all those efforts in the Senate over the past year seem to be for naught.

And then once -- if we go into next year if the House Republicans wait, we are now entering then in 2015 in the summer, the 2016 Republican Presidential Primary season. And when you look at what happened over the weekend in Texas, Senator Ted Cruz spoke to the Texas Republican Convention. And he spoke actively about immigration, about how the White House is lawless, and you saw Drudge Report, or you listened to Senator Cruz's speech, Republicans on the Conservative side are now blaming the White House very much for this position and not deporting those who are DREAMers, and really emphasizing enforcement in their arguments.

And Ted Cruz is a likely Presidential Candidate, and he seems to be pulling the party farther to the right, as those who want to see immigration reform happen, like Former Florida Governor, Jeb Bush, seem to be wavering about whether to run. Now that does not mean that immigration is dead, we see Paul Ryan in the house right now, he's working with a Congressman from Florida, Mario Diaz-Balart. And even with Tea Partyer, Mick Mulvaney from South Carolina, they are holding private meetings, trying to get some kind of consensus on House immigration legislation.

And I think Speaker Boehner is sympathetic to this, I ran into Speaker Boehner the other day, and who was coming out of his office, but no other than Cardinal Theodore McCarrick, the Former Cardinal of Washington, D.C. A prominent Roman Catholic Leader. And I asked the Cardinal, what did you say to the speaker? And he said, I urged him to try to do something now in immigration. He said Boehner listened intently, Boehner seemed to care, Boehner is a devout Roman Catholic himself, and Boehner has spoken about the need to get things done.

And so -- yet, Boehner has not done anything. Cantor has -- in a primary right now has not done much blocking Bills, nothing on the DREAM Act. And I think that the survey really tells us why. Republicans don't feel -- they may feel forces from the right, but they really feel forces from the left.

The survey talks about President Obama's approval rating, and when you speak to people like David Winston, a Republican Pollster for the House of Republicans Leadership, and other Republican insiders, they say that this is really the dominant effect, more than the talking point about lack of enforcement from the White House. It's President Obama's lack of political capital and the inability of Democrats in the midterm season to really draw out the vote.

That is leaving the Republicans not really feeling the heat from the broader electorate, and I think that's a question Democrats need to ask. Is, could the White House be doing more to engage with Congress? Perhaps the Congress is intransigent and they don't want to do much, but politically, there is an open question about -- if President Obama has low political capital, what is the next move to get some kind of action from Republicans. And there's not a clear answer there.

And Paul Ryan, as much as he was able to get Republicans together on the budget he does not seem to be getting much traction inside of the house. And so we are left really, right now, where we were in February, when I was in Williamsburg, Virginia, and I saw House Republicans come out with their Statement of Principle on immigration, which was very broad. Did not say anything really specific, expect trying to have enforcement, and maybe considering a path to legalization.

And so -- even if Cantor wins heartily today, he wins a strong Primary victory, this experience for Cantor, where he has had to spend a lot of money, and where he has really felt under threat from a Tea Partyer who has really no political profile, this is shaping the currents of the Republican Party, shaping their thinking and then added all

data from Fox News here, from President Obama's approval rating. We've seen a Republican Party that's just not moving forward.

And just one last note on Fox, it really is a potent force to Republican politicians, as a reporter, this is just an anecdote, but there's a place near here, 400 North Capitol Street, it's where Fox is housed, their Washington Bureau, and whenever reporters want to get a quote from a Republican politician, and the Speaker's lobby is closed in the Capitol, or the Senate is closed, you go over and hang out at 400 North Capitol Street, because that's where the Republican Party goes. And anytime I want to look for Senator Cruz, that's where I go.

And so, Fox it's -- the audience of Fox is very important, we are studying, but it really is the place and, you know, I can be sure that the Republican politicians are looking at this data, as well as when they pick their own media appearances. And so, or all the optimism, and all the clamor for reform, we saw Louise Goodier, and the Democratic Congressman actually go to Richmond and try to rally Democrats and Independents to vote against Cantor. We are still where we are in February, and anything like what we saw with Republicans party in 1984, and then of course in 1986, it's a changed party, and I doubt we'll see anything like any time soon. Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Could I say that never has an anecdote so perfectly illustrated a finding from data. Thank you very much for that. I want to consult with Bill here. What I'd love -- what I'd like to do is give Robbie a chance to respond to any of this, or add. I have one observation and a question for each of our participants, and Bill, where do you want to take it from there?

MR. GALSTON: Just to tell everybody where we are. It is not 11:33, the session ends at 12:00, I hope we have time for at least 15 minutes of Q&A involving the audience, so please conduct yourselves accordingly, my fellow panelists.

MR. DIONNE: Robbie, you have first response to those two great

presentations.

MR. JONES: Yeah. Thank you so much, Bob and Stella for putting so much on the table. I do want to address two quick points. One is on White Evangelical Protestants which Stella sort of outlined so well. A really interesting group, and we actually did a paperback of the American Political Science Association where we looked at the differences between White Evangelical Protestants of White Catholics and their attitudes on immigration reform and towards immigrants.

And one of the things that we found is that while White Catholic concerns about immigration were mostly driven by economic concerns, about jobs, you know, resources, those kinds of things; White Evangelical Protestants were driven both by economic concerns and by cultural concerns. That is the ways in which they perceive American culture to be changing very rapidly as a result of the immigration reform that feeds the kind of anxiety among White Evangelical Protestants.

I wrote a piece last month at the Atlantic that sort of laid this out, that's what I want to kind of put on the table. That we had a very interesting question we asked in a previous survey that's about this kind of cultural anxieties over the change in demographics in the country, and we had this simple statement, do you agree or disagree with the statement, "The idea of an America that is not mostly White bothers me." Right, do you agree or disagree with the statement. And we had a way of directly measuring attitudes on this question and indirectly measuring attitudes in this question. And among White Evangelical Protestants we saw the biggest movement when you allow them a kind of indirect way of answering these questions, and they didn't have to answer it directly to an interviewer.

But basically you asked then this question directly, only 14 percent of them say, yes this bothers me. But if you allow them a way to kind of answer this question indirectly, that number goes to 50 percent, right, from 14 to 50 percent saying

that this is something that is a kind of anxiety. So I think that is underneath the surface, and White Evangelical Protestants are heavily concentrated in the South where a lot of changes have occurred very recently, and I think sort of part of the percolation here.

And I think the other thing is to say about White Evangelical Protestants is that they are not just religious people, they are also political people, right. And so White Evangelical Protestants vote, and nearly 8 in 10 for Republican candidates in national elections, and so that means that they are also being influenced by Republican leadership cues on this as well, and so I think there's a certain -- you know, getting both of those things that are sort of happening at the same time. Let me stop there.

MR. DIONNE: And I would just want to jump right off that.

MR. JONES: yeah.

MR. DIONNE: One observation I did -- I just did want to call to people's attention, and Bill and I -- I'm sorry -- mentioned this in our (inaudible) -- forgive me -- But if you go to page 7, there were two issues where you actually, in terms of priorities, where you see intriguing differences. One I'll just mention, on reducing the budget deficit, if you wondered why the budget deficit is sort of less present as the central issue in the argument. Some of it is because the deficit has gone down, but the deficit is not more a partisan issue than it was before, it's a high priority for 53 percent of Republicans, 38 percent of Democrats with Independents in the middle.

Moving to more break down; and this is where the White Evangelicals come in; where the Independents are a classic middle group on the deficit issue, they are closer to Democrats on the issue of dealing with moral breakdown. This is a really important concern inside the Republican Party in a way that it is not both for Democrats and for Independents which I think has some important implications.

And that leads to my two questions, and I want us to get the audience, so if you could answer briefly. One is to Stella, which is, while there is substantial

support among White Evangelicals for immigration reform that includes path to citizenship, there is a clear disconnect between a lot of their leadership and an awful lot of the rank and file opinion, and I'd love you to talk about that.

And Robert, you basically, you touched on this, but I'm so struck by another disconnect in the survey, which is while Republicans clearly have, in a sense, permission from their followers to support immigration reform, we do have 51 percent, I think it is, of Republicans who support a path to citizenship. The fact that the party split and that it's a relatively low priority probably gives the leadership some room to avoid the issue for some time. And I'd just like you to talk briefly on that, and then I'll turn it over to Bill to moderate the rest of the Panel.

MS. ROUSE: So, yeah. I think it's very interesting, the findings on White Evangelical Protestants. I think Robert touched upon a couple of issues that I didn't -- when I spoke, and it's about this idea of uncomfortableness with our change in demographics.

I'm not sure, it would be very interesting to know what the difference among the leadership versus the rank and file, to sort of get at -- if the opinions were similar, or if there are different -- at the root, there are different opinions about what the anxieties are, but the results are pretty consistent, not only in this survey, but other surveys that I have seen, where White Evangelical Protestants just kind of stand out as far as this idea of -- anxiety about the change in American demographics. And it's not just on immigration, right, it's on these other issues that I mentioned on as well.

You know, dealing with the poor, dealing with, you know, marriage equality for gays and lesbians. And it's interesting, I don't have a great answer about whether it's the leadership, you know, who are putting forward this platform, and the rank and file are just following, or if it's Independent effect by the rank and file in terms of how they feel about these issues.

MR. DIONNE: Thanks. Robert?

MR. COSTA: Briefly on the urgency question and Republicans. I think there's sometimes a misconception out there that Boehner and Cantor don't want to do immigration reform, and I think their actions do speak. However, their power within the House is fragile, and the way that this factor drives their thinking is often just kind of cast aside, but it is often central to have them and their allies proceed on legislation.

It was just in January of 2013 that there was coup attempt at Boehner, Boehner during the shutdown often felt very much like he was losing his footing. It was only because he endured the shutdown, and suddenly emerged as somewhat of a favorite of the House, Conservatives, that he has been able to have a relatively smooth 2014 to disrupt that, to disrupt that, peace within the House, is something that Boehner who was mulling retirement, and Cantor who was certainly trying to be his successor, are not eager to do at the moment.

Immigration is seen as the issue that would tear apart the House GOP in a year where the -- and generally speaking settle the question about how they are going to run the 2014 election, running on jobs, running on very economic issues, well-packaged talking points on the economy. Other than that, they feel like it's murky territory, hostile territory, and that's the urgency question.

I think as much as they believe on a leadership level, the demographics are going to doom the party in 2016, and they probably felt that the Republicans very much don't have a chance, perhaps of winning the White House back, in the near term. Keeping their positions, keeping their power, keeping the peace is always at the top of their list of concerns.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. And now I turn it back to Bill.

MR. GALSTON: Well, and in the interest of time, I'm going to turn it over to you, so the floor is open for questions. Let me put on my distance glasses, which don't

help all that much if truth be known. But I do see a gentleman with his hand raised. Yes, there's rolling microphone that's coming around. When you are recognized, please state your name, and if you care to, and institutional affiliation, if there's one that germane to the discussion. Thank you.

MR. MARING: Gary Maring, Publisher on Social Justice and Public Policy Issues. A particular question for Robert Costa; in 2012 we saw some significant things happen during a lame-duck session. Do you think there's any opportunity for immigration, first of all, and any other substantive issues that might happen in lame duck that wouldn't happen otherwise?

MR. COSTA: Great question. Yes and no. Two factors, one, if Republicans do take the Senate, I very much doubt it, because they are going to try to do comprehensive legislation from the Republican perspective in early 2015. If Republicans do not take the Senate majority, there could be some action, but there's an asterisk with that, and a lot of Democrats are worried about this, and activists, that if Boehner retires the story of the lame duck does not become immigration reform but a leadership race.

And Cantor today with his primary, and others trying to run for whip in Majority Leader, that will consume the House Republicans Conference and you will have a lot of people staking out positions ideologically to the right to make sure they can win those positions in leadership should Boehner step aside. And so it's a possibility but I think it depends on what Boehner does and he has to stay. Because the only one who really has the will to do it, I think it's not Cantor, Kevin McCarthy, the (inaudible) but Boehner himself, and so he has to stay and really put it at the top of his agenda.

MR. GALSTON: Yes. The woman on the row, yes, you.

MS. WILSON: Hi. My name is Ashley Wilson. I work for NETWORK, the National Catholic Social Justice Lobby. So one thing is, I'm really dying for any insight that you have about the role of faith leaders specifically on both people of faith

who are constituents, and on members of Congress who identify as people of faith; if there is any insight as to that.

And then also, another question that I had, is just this idea of the President's drop in approval ratings and any connections that you see to that being the fact the grassroots Immigration Rights Movement has really shifted to identifying the suffering of the immigrant communities as a presidential issue rather than an -- or like, in addition to a congressional one.

MR. COSTA: I'll take the first piece of that. So a year ago we asked about whether -- in this original survey that we called people back. We asked about whether people were hearing about immigration reform in church. And basically the result was, if you were not Latino, the answer to that was no, right. So Latinos reported, you know, significant levels of hearing about this in church. Almost every other demographic group in the country said no, we are not hearing this much from our religious leaders in our churches.

So there's been a kind of low level of actual, on the ground, to talk about the issue there, and the -- I guess the second thing you'd say about that, is in general when you'd ask about this issue -- about issues and how much people look to clergy, and Gallop has found this, and we found this. The influence of clergy has actually dropped significantly, over the last few decades, in terms of trusted sources, authority.

And so it has to do with kind of distrusting institutions in general, as well, and particularly among younger people. And so I think that's part of the picture here as well, is that the bar is now, I think higher for religious leaders to make an impact than it was 20 or 30 years ago.

MR. GALSTON: Mm-hmm. But I'd just say, not because I'm Catholic, or because you are from NETWORK, but I do believe that if you are looking forward, the Bishops have stated out a really quite strong position on this, they went to the border,

they have a great picture of Cardinal O'Malley having communion through the fence. It seems to be that's the place where you could see a difference, because a lot of Conservatives are Catholic. And a lot of Conservative members of Congress, including (inaudible) suggests Speaker Boehner, are Catholic.

And so I think there may be some influence on (inaudible), but I think the opportunity is probably greatest for Catholics. But as Robbie said, it's not exactly clear, the linkage between the leadership and the flock, if you will; but that's where I would see it.

There was a second question you asked that I thought was good too. Stella is going to answer it. I'm sorry?

MR. COSTA: I was going to answer it.

MS. ROUSE: I'm happy for everyone else to join in, but I just wanted to mention -- you mentioned about the debated sort of shifting to the presidential level instead of the congressional, and I think that has a lot to do with Obama's in deportations over the last several years. And, you know, his lack of trust with Congress, you know, it doesn't seem to matter what he does, on the immigration front, there a lack of trust for getting anything done.

And there comes this issue of lack trust among the immigrant community because of the increase in deportations under his administration compared to George W. Bush. Another issue that I think is looming that's very interesting, just over the past few, it's all the immigrant children that they've now rounded up in the U.S., and this increase in immigrant minors, unaccompanied, undocumented minors entering the country. And how the Obama Administration deals with that, whether it becomes more of a congressional issue, or whether it stays a presidential issue, I think is going to be important and it may play a role in the midterm elections.

MR. GALSTON: I agree with that. And I think he's stuck in crossfire, if

he doesn't end deportations, those Latino numbers may be further endangered, and if he does end them, he will run into trouble with Republicans and Congress. He is in a very tough political place.

Just, for those worried about geographical fairness, I'm going to take one more question on this side, and then shift over the other side. You, sir; you've been very patient.

MR. SMITH: Ian Smith, not affiliated. I guess this is for Mr. Jones. Is it hard to pull attitudes amongst the working class, in terms of their attitudes towards amnesty? I've never really seen any polls that I can think of regarding their attitudes in general. You know, White, Black, Hispanic, I think that would be most illuminating considering they are the ones who will have to compete with any amnesty of illegal. Thank you.

MR. GALSTON: He is glad you asked that question.

MR. JONES: Yeah. Give me just a second. The first question is, just to kind of reiterate. So this poll is a random sample of all American, so we have everyone, right. So we'll have all education all races all classes in the survey, and you know, on certain sense of issues it is, I don't think it's on this issue, so difficult to ask the questions of people. It's actually -- usually if there are question that people -- the hardest question to ask of people, are things that people haven't thought about. This is not something most people haven't thought about, right.

You know, we see some concerns, I think, over where we see the education levels particularly, and that's one of the most common ways of measuring where White working classes serve non-college, non-White, non-Hispanic, non-college group, is a typical definition of White working class. And there we do see, as you go to lower education, lower income level, you do see higher concerns over jobs, for example. But, you know, I'll give you the number, it may take me a minute, I'll have to circle back to

it, I'll look it up.

But I can give you the number, for example, looking at, like, lower education level by support for path to citizenship and that will give you an idea. Just give me a minute to track it down.

MR. GALSTON: Great. And I am now, in the interest of total fairness, since I started in the back and worked forward, I'm going to start in the front and work backward on this side. Yes, sir. Please.

MR. DOANE: My name is Robert Doane. I am retired from the private sector; a lifelong Presbyterian with some knowledge of how that church works on the issue of the extent to which religious leaders and candidates have some impact. There is -- with reference to Evangelicals, new churches have risen, and in the case of the Presbyterian Church, this has involved actual splits in the church. The establishment of new churches, new denominations which have shrunk, a mainline Presbyterian Church, but has involved votes of the congregation.

So in that area you have people who are paying attention. Another point that not many people realize, I hope, it is about to be changed, but immigrants have, notwithstanding the implication of deportation, have no right to counsel. And there is some sense information came out during the past week, that there may be some change in administration to provide counsel. Because I think that would have an impact on how some of the deportation issues are addressed. And I just wanted to provide those two points of information.

MR. GALSTON: Thank you. Yes, please; the check shirt, on the row, you.

MR. GRAVES-FITZSIMMONS: Thank you. My name is Guthrie Graves-Fitzsimmons. I'm with Bibles, Badges and Business for Immigration Reform, an advocacy group. And my question is -- let me first just say this is my favorite poll of the

year, and I've been looking forward to it all since the Panel last year. The Panel last year really heralded the support of White Evangelical Protestants for immigration reform, and sort of the top line and news reports coming out today, and the Panel seems to be a bit disparaging towards White Evangelical support.

Yet, the numbers, this 8 percent drop is not -- when only that number is highlighted the listener then thinks, well those people are against immigration reform, and all of that support is actually moving towards legalization. And the Leading Evangelical Coalition on Immigration Reform calls for citizenship or path to legal status, and the survey finds that two-thirds of White Evangelical Protestants, not to mention the rapidly-growing Latino Evangelical population supports the path to citizenship, or legalization.

And then, I don't see the numbers for this year, but last year your survey found that only 3 percent of White Evangelical Protestants thought the immigration system was generally working, not even working well, but even generally working. So there's clearly a call among grassroots, Evangelical Protestants for Immigration Reform. I just wonder if you all could talk a little about that.

MR. JONES: Yes. Thanks for bringing that back up. You know, I do want to be careful around these findings, because it is true that we've seen an 8 percentage point drop, but just to make sure we have the numbers right. So a year ago, here were the numbers, 56 percent support the path to citizenship, 11 percent supported permanent legal status but not citizenship, and 30 percent said identify and deport, was their preferred policy; so, 56, 11, 30.

This year the numbers are 48 percent support the path to citizenship, 18 percent support permanent legal residency but citizenship, and 31 percent support deportation, right. So basically what you see is that there's been no increase, so one other way of saying it, to your point, is there's been no increase in the number of Evangelicals supporting the deportation option.

What there has been, is a shuffling a bit between -- it went from 56 to 48 on path to citizenship, and went from 11 to 18 on permanent legal residency, right. So if you put those two things together, if you want to package it that way, it's, yeah, basically still two-thirds, 64 percent supporting either path to citizenship or permanent legal residency, versus last year, it was 67 percent, supporting one of those two options. So, depending on how you want to slice it, yeah.

But I think the bottom line is, there's been no uptick in support for deportation among White Evangelical Protestants.

QUESTIONER: (Inaudible) that Evangelicals support reform, could you comment on the two-thirds number?

MR. GALSTON: Well, just very briefly, I think that the reason that the Panel -- I don't think we were disparaging their support, I think we were just comparing them with other religion groups, where it's still lower. And I think that we talked about this at a session earlier, that a lot of White Evangelicals are Conservatives; some significant membership in the Tea Party, a certain Teangelicals, as David Birdie calls them.

And so that holds their overall number down, and the only comment I made was, there does seem to be a contrast between rather strong support for immigration reform among leadership, and much more of the split among White Evangelicals. And a lot depends on how you read that middle option. I always find that reading middle options in polls is very difficult.

MS. ROUSE: I just wanted to -- just to follow up really quickly. Yeah, I think if I downplay the fact that across all groups there's support, increasing support for immigration reform. I think that the thing I was trying to point out was the difference between White Evangelicals and other groups, but I think certainly, even among White Evangelicals there's really strong support for a path to citizenship. And what I would find interesting is putting that in some kind of sort of multi-variant model that would maybe

show what the effect is for White Evangelicals versus other things as had been pointed out. You know, these are also Conservative Republicans, Tea Party members, and so it's very difficult just from the poll to tease out those particular effects, which might actually influence how -- opinions about immigration,

MR. GALSTON: Yes. The young woman on the aisle, black and white.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. My name is Angelica Heida, I just finished my M.A. at SAIS across the street.

MR. GALSTON: Congratulations.

QUESTIONER: Thank you. So my question concerns more the general way in which the immigration debate is conducted. Not only here in the U.S., but also in Europe, for example. Immigration, Stella, you mentioned that, is such a loaded, emotional topic that's often abused by, you know, politicians throughout the political spectrum to just, basically, mobilize voters or scare people off, whatever their motives might be.

And William, you mentioned that there -- in the findings of the survey, there seems to be more consensus than divide on topics of immigration. So my question is, what do you think either Stella, William, or any other panelists, what do you think has to happen to move away from this emotional very subjective debate, to a more content-based, you know, numbers? How can we -- how can we actually move forward a reform? What do you think has to happen to move away to a more substantive objective debate away from emotions?

MR. GALSTON: Prayer.

MS. ROUSE: So, certainly, as was pointed out earlier on, right, polarization plays a huge role in the lack of ability to probably have a substantive and maybe reasonable debate about immigration, and about a lot of issues, but in particular immigration. There's a lot of misinformation that's put out about immigration as the

survey showed, right. In terms of difference of what people believe the actual deportation rates are right now, and the level of immigration that's coming into the country.

So, just, and it has to do with media to some extent, and so the role of media makes it very difficult to have a substantive, objective debate about it. I think one thing to keep in mind is that the changing demographics are going to be very difficult to ignore moving forward into the future. And I think that will put some pressure, to have a more -- perhaps more, maybe not very good substantive debate, but at least a more substantive debate.

We can't ignore the change in demographics; we can't ignore the fact that in 40 or so years, White Americans are going to be a minority in this country. And so those change in demographics, I think, if I have to point to one thing, because I see no hope of the polarization subsiding any time soon, that maybe that will bring forward more of a substantive debate about immigration.

MR. GALSTON: Well, my answer to your question will also have to serve as the last comment for the session today, because we've reached the witching hour.

My belief is that there will be a substantial emotional component to the immigration debate that will not go away, and there's a reason for that. And that is, these are not just questions of policy; these are questions of individual group identity. You know, although I haven't done any reporting from Mississippi, the way the other two gentlemen, on the left and the right, have.

I have been listening very carefully to what Mr. McDaniel is saying. And I picked up a theme, and the theme is, the country is changing. We hate those changes, we want things to go back to the way they were before, and I am the candidate who stands for an older, better America. That is the symbolic and emotional heart of his campaign, and it may very well carry him to victory in the primary, and Mississippi being

Mississippi, the general election as well.

So finally Mr. Cruz will be outflanked. And you know -- and I guess in a concluding historical note, we have seen this movie before in the United States of America between -- in the 40 years from the 1880s to the mid 1920s there was an enormous surge of immigration. At the peak in the early 1920s, fully 15 percent of the population composed of immigrants, not the children of immigrants, immigrants.

Okay. In 1924 we slammed shut the immigration gates, quite literally, and you know -- and those doors remained shut until the mid-1960s. During that period the percentage of immigrants as a share of the total population fell from 15 percent to 5 percent, and then we changed courses 180 degrees, and now half-a-century later, we are back up close to 15 percent. And when you consider the enormous reaction that occurred in the mid-1920s, the debate that we are having now, is relatively mild by comparison, in all seriousness.

QUESTIONER: No, that's true.

MR. GALSTON: Right? And there are reasons for that, American culture has changed. We are, you know, through fits and starts we have become a more inclusive and tolerant society, you know, just ask people who pounded on the door for decades for gay rights and same-sex marriage. And suddenly, you know, like the walls of Jericho falling with the sounding of the trump, boom. So I think that while there is no cause for optimism in the near term, there is no cause for despair in the long term.

The country is changing inexorably as more and more of the young adults who are disproportionately Latino as -- you know, as Mr. Jones has informed me (inaudible). As that process -- as that process proceeds, I think inevitably the center or political gravity will shift.

I personally believe, and this will be my closing pugnacious note, Mr. Costa may have a different view. I personally believe that whatever may be true in

midterm elections, in a national election the Republican Party's stance on immigration hurts their nominee dearly. I think it did not help Mr. Romney in 2012, and unless the Republicans can get this monkey off their backs, either by dealing with the issue legislatively, or by nominating a candidate, like Jeb Bush, who cannot be accused of intolerance or hostility to immigrants, I think it's going to have the same effect in 2016.

And with that, I conclude this session, and drop the gavel. Thank you very much for attending. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

)Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016