



25 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
Suite 335

Washington, DC 20001

202 232 5590

202 464 3590 (fax)

[www.irli.org](http://www.irli.org)

**Board of Directors**

Hon. Elizabeth A. Hacker (Ret.)

Hon. Mahlon F. Hanson (Ret.)

Jeffrey R. Parkin

Daniel A. Stein

**Executive Director  
& General Counsel**

Dale L. Wilcox<sup>1</sup>

**Director of Litigation**

Christopher J. Hajec<sup>2</sup>

**Senior Counsel**

Michael M. Hethmon<sup>3</sup>

**Staff Counsel**

Elizabeth A. Hohenstein<sup>4</sup>

Mark S. Venezia<sup>5</sup>

**Director of Investigations  
& Staff Counsel**

Julie B. Axelrod<sup>6</sup>

**Of Counsel**

Kris W. Kobach<sup>7</sup>

John M. Miano<sup>8</sup>

*IRLI is a nonprofit public interest law firm working to end unlawful immigration and to set levels of legal immigration that are consistent with the national interest.*

*IRLI is a supporting organization of the Federation for American Immigration Reform.*

<sup>1</sup>Admitted in DC & IN

<sup>2</sup>Admitted in DC & PA

Admitted in DC & MD

<sup>3</sup>Admitted in DC & VA

<sup>4</sup>Admitted in DC & VA

<sup>5</sup>Admitted in DC & CA

<sup>6</sup>Admitted in NE & KS

<sup>7</sup>Admitted in DC, NJ, & NY

August 7, 2017

Samantha Deshombres  
Chief, Regulatory Coordination Division  
Office of Policy and Strategy  
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services  
Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Ave N.W.  
Washington, DC 20539

**DHS Docket No. USCIS-2015-0006: Public Comment of the Immigration Reform Law Institute Regarding Rescission of the International Entrepreneur Rule**

Dear Chief Deshombres:

The Immigration Reform Law Institute (“IRLI”) submits the following public comments to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”) of the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) in response to the agency’s Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (“NPRM”) to rescind the International Entrepreneur Parole Final, as published in the Federal Register on July 11, 2017. *See International Entrepreneur Rule: Delay of Effective Date*, DHS Docket No. USCIS-2015-0006, 82 Fed. Reg. 31887-890.

This public comment restates IRLI’s concerns about the unlawfulness of the International Entrepreneur Rule (“IE Rule”) in our public comment on the original NPRM, *see International Entrepreneur Rule*, DHS Docket No. USCIS-2015-0006, 81 Fed. Reg. 60130-68 (Aug. 31, 2016) (“2016 NPRM”), with additional analysis integrating the Trump Administration’s policy objectives to restrict and restrain use of the Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) § 212(d)(5)(A) parole authority as announced in Executive Order 13767, *Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements*, 82 Fed. Reg. 8793 (Jan. 25, 2017).

IRLI is a non-profit public interest law organization that exists to defend the rights of individual Americans and their local communities from the harms and challenges posed by mass migration to the United States, both lawful and unlawful. IRLI works to monitor and hold accountable federal, state, or local government officials who undermine, fail to respect, or fail to comply with our national immigration and citizenship laws. IRLI also provides

expert immigration-related legal advice, training, and resources to public officials, the legal community, and the general public.

IRLI's conclusion that the 2016 NPRM would violate the Administrative Procedure Act as an *ultra vires* action in conflict with controlling statutes, based on an arbitrary and capricious statement of need, has not changed.

IRLI believes that DHS lacks the authority to parole unadmitted "entrepreneurs" and their spouses into the United States or to grant them work authorization based on their status as IE Rule parolees. The scope and content of the IE Rule would extend so egregiously beyond the comprehensive statutory scheme, which regulates both entry under parole and immigration based on employment or entrepreneurial activity, that rescission is the only viable administrative option other than judicial review under the APA.

The Obama administration's interpretation of the "significant public benefit" parole authority in INA §212(d)(5)(B) conflicts with longstanding federal admission and inspection statutes. Regardless of the previous administration's political desire to deem alien entrepreneurs already present in the United States a novel class of significant public benefit parolees under proposed 8 C.F.R. § 219, DHS lacked and continues to lack authority to do so.

**A. INA § 212(d)(5)(A) does not authorize significant public benefit parole for otherwise inadmissible aliens to engage in the entrepreneurial activity envisioned by the IE Rule.**

The novel actions featured in the 2016 NPRM improperly relied for authority on the Obama administrations' claim that, "The Secretary's parole authority is expansive." 81 Fed. Reg. 60134. According to DHS,

Congress did not define the phrase 'urgent humanitarian benefit or significant public benefit,' entrusting interpretation and application of those standards to the Secretary. Aside from requiring case-by-case determinations, Congress limited the parole authority by prohibiting its use with respect to [just] two classes of applicants for admissions: (1) Aliens who are refugees (unless the Secretary determines that parole is required for a particular alien for compelling reasons in the public interest), *see* INA § 212(d)(5)(B), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(B); and (2) alien crewmen during certain labor disputes, *see* INA § 214(f)(2)(A).

*Id.*

Parole under INA § 212(d)(5)(A) is "an administrative practice whereby the government allows an arriving alien who has come to a port-of-entry without a valid entry document to be temporarily released from detention and to remain in the United States pending review of his immigration status." *Ibragimov v. Gonzales*, 476 F.3d 125 (2d Cir. 2007). The sole method provided under the INA by which an unadmitted alien may meet the statutory requirement to "arrive" in a lawful manner is (1) to enter (or be taken) into DHS custody at

a port of entry and (2) while in such custody be inspected regarding admissibility. INA § 235(a)(3). An alien who is “present in the United States” but “has not been admitted” is correctly classified as an “applicant for admission.” INA § 235(a)(1). That applicant for admission is inadmissible if he or she has arrived in an unlawful manner, *i.e.*, “at any time or place other than as designated by the Attorney General.” INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i).

The 2016 NPRM contained conflicting statements about whether the agency intended to grant parole to aliens already present in the United States. The 2016 NPRM summary stated that aliens could apply for international entrepreneur parole or derivative status regardless of whether they are “within the United States or outside the United States.” 81 Fed. Reg. 60142. However, proposed 8 C.F.R. § 219(d), as implemented by the IE Rule, would have read, “Approval of such a request must be obtained before the alien may appear at a port of entry to be granted parole, in lieu of admission.” *Id.* at 60166.

The IE Rule proposal to allow aliens to apply for and receive international entrepreneur parole status while already present in the United States has no authority other than similarity to an extra-statutory agency practice called “parole-in place” or “PIP.” PIP is a controversial bureaucratic practice that has no statutory or regulatory status. IRLI urges DHS to discontinue parole-in-place as an illegitimate practice pursuant to Executive Order 13767, and to discontinue its use by the agency.

An internal 2013 USCIS policy memorandum incorrectly claimed that the legal authority for granting PIP originated with then-Immigration and Nationality Service (INS) General Counsel Paul Virtue in a 1998 agency memorandum.<sup>1</sup> The 1998 memorandum asserted that two Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (“IIRIRA”) amendments could, if read together, authorize parole for unadmitted aliens already present in the United States. According to Mr. Virtue, IIRIRA § 302(a) had amended INA § 235 to include aliens present in the United States without admission or parole within the definition of “applicant for admission,”<sup>2</sup> while IIRIRA § 301(c) made aliens who have not been admitted or paroled inadmissible.<sup>3</sup> His memorandum concluded that the amendment to the definition of “applicant for admission” had thus added unadmitted aliens in the United States, who are not “arriving aliens” as defined in INA § 235(a)(1), to the classes of aliens eligible for parole under § 212(d)(5)(A).<sup>4</sup>

This arbitrary interpretation directly conflicted with the intent of Congress and should be specifically withdrawn by DHS as part of the rescission of the IE Rule. As a DHS Chief

---

<sup>1</sup> USCIS, Policy Memorandum PM-602-0091, *Parole of Spouses, Children and Parents of Active Duty Members of the U.S. Armed Forces, the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve, and Former Members of the U.S. Armed Forces or Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve and the Effect of Parole on Inadmissibility under Immigration and Nationality Act § 212(a)(6)(A)(i)*, (Nov.15, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> See INA § 235(a)(1), 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(1).

<sup>3</sup> See INA § 212(a)(6)(A)(i), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(A)(i).

<sup>4</sup> PM-602-0091, at 2, citing Virtue, *Authority to Parole Applicants for Admission Who Are Not Also Arriving Aliens*, HQCOU 120/17-P, Legal Opinion 98-01 (Aug. 21, 1998), available at 1998 WL 1806685.

Counsel noted in 2007, PIP provided an administrative expansion of immigration benefits that conflicts “with the overall structure of IIRIRA, which was designed to reduce—not increase—the opportunities available to aliens present without inspection.”<sup>5</sup> While parole is a form of relief from immigration detention, it is not a form of relief from removal proceedings. *Zheng Zheng v. Gonzales*, 422 F.3d 98, 117 (3d Cir. 2005). By default, any alien “not clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted ... shall be detained for a [removal] proceeding under section 240.” INA §235 (b)(2)(A).

The plain language of the parole statute makes it clear that no parolee can ever be “entitled to be admitted.” All applicants for admission, whether they are at a port of entry or physically present inside the country without having been admitted, “shall be inspected by immigration officers” who will determine their admissibility. 8 U.S.C. § 1225(a)(3). By contrast, aliens paroled into the United States per INA § 212(d)(5)(A)—including the proposed international entrepreneurs—are by definition *not* inspected and admitted. No provision of law entitles any alien to be “admitted” based merely on the agency’s discretionary decision that a humanitarian emergency exists, or a significant public benefit would accrue.

A parolee thus can never demonstrate that he or she is “clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to be admitted,” which is the statutory standard for admission. *See* INA § 235(b)(2)(A). By statute, the burden of proof to show such entitlement is always on the applicant for admission, and may not be assumed by the government. *See* INA § 291.<sup>6</sup> INA § 291 expressly prohibits such burden-shifting. Parole can only return the alien to the exact immigration status he or she held at the time advance parole was granted. *In re Arrabally*, 25 I&N Dec. 771, 778 (B.I.A. 2012). By law, INA § 212(d)(5)(A) parolees thus remain locked in the status they held at the time of parole, *i.e.*, an inadmissible applicant for admission.

**B. The legislative record is unambiguous that DHS parole authority has been progressively restricted by Congress.**

The agency’s view of the intent and actions of Congress as expressed in the 2016 NPRM was arbitrary and inaccurate. The legislative history establishes that Congress enacted a statutory prohibition on pre-IIRIRA practices of the categorical exercise of agency

---

<sup>5</sup> Gus P. Coldebella, Memorandum, *Clarification of the Relation Between Release Under Section 235 and Parole Under Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act*, at 4–5 (Sept. 28, 2007), available as AILA Infonet Doc. No. 09121790; *see also* discussion of the restrictive parole language in IIRIRA § 602(a).

<sup>6</sup> “Whenever any person ... makes application for admission, or otherwise attempts to enter the United States, the burden shall be upon such person to establish that he... is not inadmissible under any provision of this act, and, if an alien, is entitled to the [immigration] ... status claimed, as the case may be.... nor shall such person be admitted to the United States unless he establishes to the satisfaction of the Attorney General that he is not inadmissible under any provision of this Act.... If such burden of proof is not sustained, such person shall be presumed to be in the United States in violation of law.” 8 U.S.C. § 1361.

discretion out of concern that parole under pre-IIRIRA § 1182(d)(5)(A) was being used by the executive to circumvent congressionally established immigration policy. *Cruz-Miguel v. Holder*, 650 F.3d 189, 198–200 (2d Cir. 2011) (citing H.R. Rep. No. 104-169, pt.1, at 140–41 (1996)).

First, it is not in dispute that DHS has been barred by law since enactment of the INA in 1952 from treating parole as an admission to the United States or its equivalent.<sup>7</sup> *See* 81 Fed. Reg. § 60134; INA § 101(a)(13)(B); 8 C.F.R. § 1.2.

Second, more than 45 years of relevant federal legislation has shown a consistent intent by Congress to restrict the use of parole on a categorical basis. The Supreme Court permits examination of this legislative history at stage one of the *Chevron* test, as a check on novel agency interpretations which claim to be derived from text and structure. *Gen. Dynamics Land Sys., Inc. v. Cline*, 540 U.S. 581, 596 (2004); *FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 529 U.S. 120, 133, (2000) (using later congressional Acts which spoke “more specifically to the topic at hand” to determine whether a statute evidenced a clear congressional intent in *Chevron* step one).

In 1962, Congress added “parole” language to § 1255(a) as part of a joint resolution authorizing the parole of certain refugees into the United States. H.R.J. Res. 397, 86th Cong., Pub. L. No. 86- 648, § 10, 74 Stat. 504, 505 (1960). Between 1952 and enactment of the Refugee Act in 1980, the INA authorized the Attorney General to parole aliens into the United States without a grant of admission, only for (1) “emergent” reasons or (2) reasons “deemed strictly in the public interest.” INA § 212(d)(5)(A), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(A) (1979). Even in that era, Congressional intent was always unambiguous:

The parole provisions [of the INA] were designed to authorize the Attorney General to act only in emergent, individual, and isolated situations, such as the case of an alien who requires immediate medical attention, and not for the immigration of classes or groups outside of the limit of the law.

Senate Rep. No 89-748, at 17 (1965); *accord* H.R. Rep. No. 89-745, at 15–16 (1965).<sup>8</sup>

However, in practice the INS resisted this Congressional action to limit the agency’s bureaucratic prerogatives. Emphasizing the lack of express statutory prohibitions on categorical grants of parole, between 1959 and 1961, for example, the INS paroled more than 20,000 Cubans into the United States.

In the 1980 Refugee Act Congress reacted to what was perceived as a pattern of agency abuse of discretion, by prohibiting the discretionary exercise of parole for any “alien who is a refugee,” unless the Attorney General determined that “compelling reasons in the public

---

<sup>7</sup> *See* INA, Pub. L. No. 82-414, 66 Stat. 188 (1952).

<sup>8</sup> When Congress intends to create loopholes or exceptions to its bar on the INA § 212(d)(5) parole of groups of excludable aliens, it knows how to do so. *See, e.g.*, P.L. 86-648, § 3, 74 Stat. 504-5 (July 1, 1960) (authorizing parole of a quota of “refugee-escapees” subject to the proviso that such parole would terminate after two year’s presence in the United States.)

interest with respect to that particular alien require that the alien be paroled into the United States rather than be admitted as a refugee under section 207.” INA § 212(d)(5)(B), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(d)(5)(B) (1980).<sup>9</sup>

In 1996 Congress acted yet again to rein in agency abuse of discretion to parole aliens into the United States. Congress adopted the phrase “for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit language” in IIRIRA to *narrow* the circumstances in which aliens could qualify for “parole into the United States” under § 1182(d)(5)(A). *Ortega-Cervantes v. Gonzales*, 501 F.3d 1111, 1119 (9th Cir. 2007). IIRIRA expanded the prohibition on blanket or categorical parole from refugees to all aliens. IIRIRA § 602 amended INA § 212(d)(5)(A) to authorize discretionary grants of parole by the agency “only” where multiple conditions have been met. Since 1996, parole may only be granted: (1) Temporarily, (2) “on a case-by-case basis,” (3) for no other purpose than “urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit,” (4) if the parolee was in the “custody” of DHS at the time of the grant of parole, and (5) if the grant of parole is never (“shall not be”) “regarded as an admission of the alien.” IIRIRA § 602, Pub. L. No. 104-208 (1996).

Each of these new elements restricted the agency’s parole power as it may have operated pre-IIRIRA. Pre-IIRIRA, “emergent reasons” had meant merely unexpected needs for entry. The deletion of this phrase by Congress eliminated the agency’s prior discretion to grant parole based solely on sympathy or concern about an alien’s unplanned inability to qualify for entry on statutory grounds. The addition of “temporarily” by IIRIRA clearly added a requirement that a specific time limit be placed on all grants of parole, making previous practices, of paroling aliens until the agency chose to terminate parole in an exercise of discretion, no longer authorized. Post-IIRIRA, the only reasonable construction of the phrase “case-by-case” is that it bars any categorical grant of parole. The prohibition against “regard[ing]” parole as an admission disfavors, agency interpretations, like the Virtue memorandum, that might increase or liberalize use of the parole power or permit any change in an alien’s status while the alien is present as a parolee.

Furthermore, the mere fact that a statute gives DHS discretion whether to grant relief after application does not by itself give DHS the discretion to define eligibility for such relief. *See INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca*, 480 U.S. 421, 443 (1987) (distinguishing between the Attorney General’s discretion to make the ultimate decision to grant relief and the non-discretionary process and criteria for eligibility for relief). The amendments made by IIRIRA to INA § 212(d)(5)(A) represent a direct statement by Congress “to the precise

---

<sup>9</sup> Pub. L. No. 96-212 §203(f). For certain favored ethnic groups, including Soviet Jews, Laotians, and Cambodian, in 1990 Congress did provide a “public interest parole,” popularly known as the Lautenberg Amendment, which allowed members of these ethnic groups who did not qualify as refugees under the 1980 Act to be paroled into the United States and granted adjustment of status, as if they had been admitted as refugees. Pub. L. No. 101-167 (1990). This limited statutory loophole, which has no relation whatsoever to INA § 212(d)(5)(A) significant public benefit parole, has been extended on annual basis as part of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. *Kurzban*, at 615.

question at issue”—whether the exercise of this parole power by DHS is subject only to agency discretion.<sup>10</sup>

The restrictive intent of IIRIRA is fully consistent with all prior legislative amendments to the parole power since enactment of the INA. That “is the end of the matter; for the court as well as the agency must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress.” *Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. NRDC*, 467 U.S. at 843.

**C. The radical redefinition of the “significant public benefit” parole category by the Obama administration conflicts with the comprehensive statutory scheme for employment-based temporary and permanent immigration.**

Not only does the IE Rule in the 2016 NPRM conflict with the plain language and legislative history of the parole statute, INA § 212(d)(5)(A), it ignored the controlling body of immigration statutes regulating the entry of aliens to perform work. As a matter of law, the INA § 212 parole provision cannot operate without reference to the comprehensive legislative scheme for employment-related immigration found, *inter alia*, in INA §§ 101(a)(15), 203(b), 204(b), 213A, and 214.

DHS lacks the authority it claimed to be exercising in the 2016 NPRM—to parole an alien into the United States in order to engage in entrepreneurial employment. By law, aliens may only engage in entrepreneurial work after lawful admission, pursuant to an approved immigrant or nonimmigrant visa. Where Congress has intended to promote employment of alien entrepreneurs in a given provision of immigration law, it has expressly indicated that intent in the statutory language.

Multiple express provisions of immigration law provide detailed statutory guidance on the prerequisite conditions for an alien to enter the United States for employment or entrepreneurial purposes. *See, e.g.*, INA §§ 101(a)(E)(ii), and 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(b) (employment-based nonimmigrants); INA §§ 203(b)(2)(B)(i), 203(b)(3)(A)(i), and 203(b)(5) (employment-based immigrants). Entry under one of these visa categories are the options provided by Congress for the admission of aliens under a nonimmigrant or immigrant visa “to establish and grow” start-up entities in the United States, rather than abroad, in the expectation that such admissions would “promote entrepreneurship and investment; facilitate research and development and other forms of innovation; support the continued growth of the U.S. economy; and lead to job creation for U.S. workers” as proposed in the 2016 NPRM. *See* 81 Fed. Reg. 60135.

For specialty occupations in *nonimmigrant* visa categories—including the STEM fields which the 2016 NPRM identified as frequently associated with high-growth start-up entities, *see* 81 Fed. Reg. 60,158—international entrepreneurs who are the sole owners of a corporation which also employs them may direct a start-up entity to petition for an H-1B

---

<sup>10</sup> Moreover, DHS cannot argue that “the precise question at issue is not a pure question of law. As such it is not within the jurisdictional bar of 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B).” *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. 678, 688 (2001).

visa on their behalf. Nothing prevents entrepreneurs admitted in H-1B status from holding up to a 50% interest in their corporate sponsor, and H-1B workers may routinely extend their authorized stay for six years. 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(h)(4)(ii); *see e.g., Matter of Aphrodite*, 17 I&N Dec. 530 (Comm’r 1980). Aliens from more than eighty “treaty” nations may (along with accompanying spouses and children) also be admitted in E-2 status “to develop and direct the operations of an enterprise in which the alien has invested, or is actively in the process of investing, a substantial amount of capital” in a *bona fide* enterprise. 22 C.F.R. § 41.51.

U.S. *immigrant* visa categories are also available for international entrepreneurs. The EB-2 second preference immigrant sub-category is specifically designed for international entrepreneurs holding advanced degrees or whose exceptional ability in the sciences, arts or business “will substantially benefit prospectively the national economy ... or welfare of the United States....” INA § 203(b)(2)(A). This immigrant classification is especially favorable for talented entrepreneurs investing in U.S. start-up entities, who are eligible for a national interest waiver (NIW). INA § 203(b)(2)(B)(i). The 2016 NPRM specifically stated that extending immigration benefits to start-up entities with the potential to show a high level of growth or innovation will prospectively benefit the national economy because they are “vital to economic growth and job creation in the United States” with a record of having “generated a cohort of high-growth firms that have driven a highly disproportionate share of net new job creation.” 81 Fed. Reg. 60153–54.

The EB-5 fifth preference immigrant category offers conditional permanent residence to aliens and their spouses and children who will “engag[e] in a new commercial enterprise ... in which the alien has invested ... capital in the amount of [\$1 million or in certain instances \$500,000] ... which will benefit the United States economy and create full-time employment for not fewer than 10 United States citizens or [LPRs]....” INA § 203(b)(5); INA § 216A.

The 2016 NPRM was clearly intended to nullify the caps and other detailed restrictions on the admission of aliens under these entrepreneurial and employment-related visa categories. While the 2016 NPRM asserted that international entrepreneur programs operated by foreign nations are “competing” with U.S. programs, notably it did not identify a single parole-type program implemented by these foreign states, for the sound reason that the defects of a parole-based approach are systemic and fundamental.

For each of the above nonimmigrant and immigrant categories, Congress has enacted quotas on the number of annual admissions. The statutory conditions enacted for each visa category also differ from the related criteria proposed for international entrepreneur parole eligibility in the 2016 NPRM, typically by requiring some combination of a higher level of occupational or professional credentialing or experience, or higher amounts of at-risk investment capital. In the 2016 NPRM, DHS proposed to treat such statutory conditions as “barriers” to entry, *see, e.g.*, 81 Fed. Reg. 60135, which would either “significantly delay” a parolees’ proposed entrepreneurial employment, *id.* at 60153, or cause the potential entrepreneur to choose a third country in which to work and invest that would allegedly offer lower requirements to enter or immigrate for purposes of entrepreneurial employment. *Id.*

The agency's refusal to accept congressional mandates as to the scope of these statutory programs simply underlines the clarity and directness of the legislative scheme for employment-based immigration.

Rescission is thus mandated because the IE Rule under the 2016 NPRM cannot meet the first prong of the *Chevron* test for deference to an agency's statutory construction:

When a court reviews an agency's construction of the statute which it administers, it is confronted with two questions. First, always, is the question whether Congress has directly spoken to the precise question at issue. If the intent of Congress is clear, that is the end of the matter; for the court, as well as the agency, must give effect to the unambiguously expressed intent of Congress.

*Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. NRDC*, 467 U.S. 837, 842–43 (1984). Whether DHS possesses discretion to grant significant public interest parole for aliens to engage in entrepreneurial employment notwithstanding the legislative scheme of employment and investment-related immigrant and non-immigrant visas is a pure question of law. If the IE Rule were implemented under the terms of the 2016 regulation, judicial review would thus be available to many injured parties, and not be barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B), the IIRIRA jurisdiction-stripping statute. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. at 688.

If the IE Rule were implemented under the terms of the 2016 regulation, judicial review would thus be available to many injured parties, and not be barred by 8 U.S.C. § 1252(a)(2)(B), the IIRIRA jurisdiction-stripping statute. *Zadvydas v. Davis*, 533 U.S. at 688.

**D. The IE Rule proposal to radically redefine the “significant public benefit” parole category by regulation is arbitrary and capricious, and should be rescinded.**

The 2016 NPRM stated that the regulatory purpose of the IE Rule was to

establish general criteria for the use of parole with respect to entrepreneurs of start-up entities whose entry into the United States would provide a significant public benefit through the substantial and demonstrated potential for rapid growth and job creation.

81 Fed. Reg. 60131.

The NPRM asserted that “DHS and the former ... [INS] have long extended parole ... exercised ... through policy guidance or regulations identifying classes of individuals to be considered for parole through individualized case-by-case adjudications.” 81 Fed. Reg. 60134. In support of this claim the agency misleadingly argues that “[8 C.F.R. 212.5] regulations provide that parole from immigration custody generally would be ‘justified’ on a case-by-case basis if an individual falls within one of several specific categories....” *Id.* at 60135.

1. The sudden change to the parole regulation was arbitrary and capricious.

Parts A and C of this public comment outlined the conflicts with federal statutes that invalidate the IE Rule, and support its rescission. The Homeland Security Act mandates that the authority of the Secretary to issue regulations “shall be governed by” the procedures and requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 500, *et seq.* 6 U.S.C. § 1129(e) (“APA”). However, no existing or prior federal *regulation* supports or ever countenanced parole of international entrepreneurs for the purpose of employment by start-up entities in the United States.

Agency action that is “arbitrary or capricious,” “otherwise not in accordance with law” or “in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or short of statutory right” is to be “h[e]ld unlawful and set aside.” 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A, C). “It is central to the real meaning of the rule of law, and not particularly controversial that a federal agency does not have the power to act unless Congress, by statute, has empowered it to do so.” *Succar v. Ashcroft*, 394 F.3d 8, 20 (1st Cir. 2005), *citing Transohio Sav. Bank v. Dir., Office of Thrift Supervision*, 967 F.2d 598, 621 (D.C. Cir. 1992).

The application of APA standards to agency action based on federal immigration law was unanimously affirmed by the Supreme Court. *Judulang v. Holder*, 565 U.S. 42 (2011). In *Judulang*, the Supreme Court unanimously invalidated a BIA rule for determining whether noncitizens in deportation proceedings qualified for a retroactive discretionary waiver under former INA § 212(c). For failing to “provide a reasoned explanation of its action” as required “when an administrative agency sets policy,” the Court concluded that the policy adopted by the agency was unlawfully “arbitrary and capricious.” 565 U.S. at 45. The majority opinion in *Judulang* by Justice Kagan also rebuked the government’s alternative argument, that because DHS itself did not consider the regulation at issue to be an “abrupt departure from its prior practice,” it somehow constituted a permissible agency interpretation of its governing statute under the APA. *Id.* at 61. “We think this is a slender reed on which to support a significant government policy” the Court explained, “[L]ongstanding capriciousness receives no special exemption from the APA.” *Id.*

The IE Rule, if implemented, would be unlawfully arbitrary under APA standards. Coming twenty years after the last amendment to the INA parole statute in 1996, the 2016 NPRM represents a radical change in policy, with no explanation of why the change was suddenly occurring. Significantly, the 2016 NPRM proposed no changes to the § 212.5 regulation, making its official justification of “significant public benefit” in proposed new § 212.19, particularly arbitrary. The existing “specific” parole categories are found in 8 C.F.R. § 212.5. None of these parole categories is even remotely relevant to employment of aliens by or entrepreneurial investment in U.S. entities.

The only actual example in the 2016 NPRM of what DHS claims to have been an employment-related prior significant public benefit parole action was the agency’s misleading citation to a “policy on the use of parole into the CNMI [Commonwealth of the North Marianas Islands] for certain foreign workers, as well as visitors from [Russia and China]... justified on the economic benefit such workers and visitors would provide to the U.S. territory.” 81 F.R. 60135. That regulation, 8 C.F.R. § 214.2(w)(1)(v), is irrelevant to

INA § 212(d)(5)(A) parole. It was issued pursuant to the Consolidated Natural Resources Act of 2008 (CNRA), in particular certain transitional territorial immigration provisions codified under 48 U.S.C. § 1806(e). CNRA transitional rule parole has no relation whatsoever to significant public benefit parole under INA § 212(d)(5)(A).

It was also incorrect for the agency to claim that an IE Rule parolee would be entering to work “incident to status.” The most prominent condition of the proposed entrepreneur parole program is that the alien work for a single designated entity. The IE Rule would parole otherwise inadmissible aliens into the United States for the sole purpose of employment in a managerial and skilled technical capacity at certain small firms (“startup entities”) in which the paroled alien controls a small but significant equity share. *See, e.g.*, 81 Fed. Reg. 60165 (proposed 8 C.F.R. § 212.19(b)(2)).

2. DHS failed to collect data required to establish a reasonable basis for the radical change in regulation of significant public interest parole.

The IE Rule should also be rescinded as arbitrary agency action because, for 16 years, the agency has defied IIRIRA by refusing to comply with the direct mandate of Congress to collect and report the most directly relevant data for evaluating the policy change.<sup>11</sup> The agency relies instead on non-peer reviewed online articles, even while admitting that for key aspects of the NPRM, these highly selective sources only confirm that the potential effect of the rule is “unknown.” *See, e.g.*, 81 Fed. Reg. 60136.

The 1996 IIRIRA reforms to the INA § 212 (d)(5) parole authority not only restricted its categorical and routine use, but mandated detailed reporting of agency use of parole, in particular by country of origin and “numbers and categories of aliens paroled, the duration of parole, the current status of aliens paroled, and the number and categories of aliens returned to the custody from which they were paroled....” IIRIRA § 602(b).

Congress unambiguously stated the importance of this data for evaluating the agency’s exercise of discretion, in particular the evaluation of agency-defined parole categories, and outcomes by category. *Id.* IIRIRA mandated that the Attorney General (now the Secretary of Homeland Security) provide this report “not later than 90 days after the end of each fiscal year to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and ... the Senate....” *Id.*

Defying Congress and the public for reasons of bureaucratic self-interest and agency capture by its own “clients,” the former INS issued just two “annual” reports. *See Report to Congress: Use of the Attorney General’s Parole Authority Under the Immigration and Nationality Act Fiscal Years 1997–1998*. DHS has never issued a required annual report since its creation in 2002.

---

<sup>11</sup> *E.g.*, Mailman, *et al.*, *Immigration Law & Policy*, § 62.01[3], n.52 (Rel. 139 2012): “The level of information in the [1998] report falls short of the detailed data Congress mandated.”

The findings in the 1998 Report are diametrically in conflict with the statements regarding agency policy in the 2016 NPRM. An entire section of the 1998 Report “discusses the purposes of parole and introduces the six categories into which parolees are classified.” *Id.* That section of the 1998 Report reads:

In general, the parole authority in section 212(d)(5) allows the INS to respond in individual cases that present problems that are time-urgent or for which no remedies are available elsewhere in the Immigration and Nationality Act. The prototype case arises in an emergency situation. For example, the sudden evacuation of U.S. citizens from dangerous circumstances abroad often includes household members who are not citizens or permanent resident aliens, and these persons are usually paroled. When aliens are brought to the United States to be prosecuted or to assist in the prosecution of others, they are paroled. Parole is sometimes used to reunite divided families....

Since FY 1992, the INS has used six categories to classify parolees. A brief description of each follows.

1. Port-of-entry parole is the single category used most often. It applies to a wide variety of situations and is used at the discretion of the supervisory immigration inspector, usually to allow short periods of entry. Examples include allowing aliens who could not be issued the necessary documentation within the required time period, or who were otherwise inadmissible, to attend a funeral and permitting the entry of emergency workers, such as fire fighters, to assist with an emergency.
2. Advance parole may be issued to aliens residing legally in the United States in other than lawful permanent resident (LPR) status who have an unexpected need to travel abroad and return, and whose conditions of stay do not otherwise allow for readmission to the United States if they depart.
3. Deferred inspection parole may be conferred by an immigration inspector when aliens appear at a port-of-entry with documentation, but after preliminary examination, some question remains about their admissibility which can best be answered at their point of destination.
4. Humanitarian parole responds to the “urgent humanitarian reasons” specified in the law. It is used in cases of medical emergency and comparable situations.
5. Public interest parole *refers to the “significant public benefit” language in the law. It is generally used for aliens who enter to take part in legal proceedings (emphasis added).*
6. Overseas parole is the only category of parole that is designed to constitute long-term admission to the United States. In recent years, most of the aliens the INS has processed through overseas parole have arrived under special legislation or international migration agreements...

## 5. Public Interest Parole

The *public interest parole* category invokes the “significant public benefit” language in the law. It is primarily used with aliens entering in conjunction with a legal proceeding. These aliens may have been brought to the United States for prosecution under our laws, or they may be assisting U.S. officials in a prosecution (emphasis added). The authority for public interest parole rests with the INS Headquarters Office of International Affairs.

Public interest parole has been the least used type of parole in recent years, accounting for about 2 percent of all paroles in both FYs 1997 and 1998. Canadian and Mexican nationals were again the most common in this category, as shown in Table 6. They accounted for 65 percent of all public interest paroles in 1997 and 72 percent in 1998. The increase in the absolute number from Mexico accounted for all of the increase in public interest parole between 1997 and 1998. *On average in FY 1997, public interest parole was given for 7 weeks* (emphasis added).

**Table 6**

Aliens Granted Public Interest Parole by Selected Country of Citizenship\* FYs 1997 and 1998

Country	FY 1997	FY 1998
All countries	3,593	5,173
Mexico	1,299	3,193
Canada	1,050	555
Haiti	128	13
United Kingdom	87	100
China (PRC)	75	111
Percent of yearly total	73.4%	76.8%
*Countries were selected if they had at least 100 public interest parolees in either year.		

Persons paroled in a law enforcement context present a special complication for data collection, since in addition to entry into the United States, the parole may represent

entry into or out of detention, or transfer to the custody of another law enforcement agency, and the ultimate disposition of these cases is not tracked in the NIIS. If convicted of the crime for which they were being prosecuted, public interest parolees may remain for substantial periods of time while serving their sentences in U.S. prisons.

*Id.*, available at <https://www.ilw.com/immigrationdaily/news/2001,0329-Parole.shtm> (last visited August \_\_, 2017).

In considering the reasonableness of the agency's evocation of the "significant public benefit" prong of INA § 212(d)(5)(A) as authority for the proposed new 8 C.F.R. § 212.19 regulation creating "international entrepreneur" parole, it is highly significant that the Clinton administration, which had the duty of preparing the original regulations to implement IIRIRA and issued the 1998 Report, did not recognize use of *any* parole category to enable the employment of alien entrepreneurs or investors. Equally indicative that the parole category which the NPRM proposes to create is an entirely arbitrary bureaucratic creation is the fact that for the fiscal years from 1999 to the present, the Secretary has completely failed, without any publically available explanation, to file the required annual Reports. There is thus—as a matter of law—no primary documentation in the record of the need for the proposed new parole category.

Further confirmation that the radical change in DHS policy announced in the 2016 NPRM is unlawfully arbitrary is found in a 2008 DHS internal agency Memorandum of Agreement, which formally reaffirmed the agency's original construction of IIRIRA § 602(a) as retaining the longstanding policy and practice of strictly limiting the applicability of significant public benefit parole for aliens located outside the United States or who present themselves at a U.S. port of entry upon initial approach to the United States:

As [agency] practice has evolved, DHS bureaus have generally construed "humanitarian" paroles (HPs) as relating to urgent medical, family, and related needs and "*significant public benefit paroles*" (SPBPs) as limited to persons of law enforcement interest such as witnesses to judicial proceedings. Categorizing parole types helps prospective parole beneficiaries direct their applications to the appropriate bureau and facilitates DHS tracking.

See USCIS, ICE and CBP, *Memorandum of Agreement, Coordinating the Concurrent Exercise by USCIS, ICE, and CBP, of the Secretary's Parole Authority under INA § 212(d)(5)(A) With Respect to Certain Aliens Located Outside of the United States*, at 2 (Sep. 29, 2008), available at <https://www.ice.gov/doclib/foia/reports/parole-authority-moa-9-08.pdf> (last viewed August \_\_, 2017) (emphasis added).

The MOA clarified that all three immigration bureaus of the DHS—ICE, USCIS and CBP—agreed in 2008 that the correct construction of the discretionary parole power under INA § 212(d)(5)(A) was as

an extraordinary measure, sparingly used only in urgent or emergency circumstances, by which the Secretary may permit an inadmissible alien temporarily

to enter or remain in the United States. *Parole is not to be used to circumvent normal visa processes and timelines.*

*Id.* (emphasis added). The agency’s position in 2008 was not only administratively consistent, but in constitutional terms was a restatement of Supreme Court construction of the parole power that is more than 100 years old:

The parole of aliens seeking admission is simply a device through which needless confinement is avoided while administrative proceedings are conducted. It was never intended to affect an alien’s status, and to hold that petitioner’s parole placed her legally “within the United States” is inconsistent with the congressional mandate, the administrative concept of parole, and the decisions of this Court.

*Leng May Ma v. Barber*, 357 U.S. 185, 190 (1958); *see, e.g., United States v. Ju Toy*, 198 U.S. 253, 263 (1905) (“The petitioner, although physically within our boundaries, is to be regarded as if he had been stopped at the limit of our jurisdiction”).

IRLI concludes that never in the history of U.S. immigration law has *any* statutory parole power been used to promote the entry and employment of alien entrepreneurs, who are simply inadmissible under the INA’s comprehensive legislative scheme for employment-related permanent and temporary immigration. The proposed rescission of the IE Rule is the only option available to DHS that would bring the agency back into APA compliance.

**E. The comprehensive legislative scheme for employment-based temporary and permanent immigration bars DHS from issuing work authorization documents to aliens paroled for the *ultra vires* purpose of engaging in entrepreneurial employment.**

The 2016 NPRM asserted that “[u]nder current regulations, once paroled into the United States, a parolee is eligible to request employment authorization from USCIS by filing ... Form I-765. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(11).” 81 Fed. Reg. 60134. Under the IE Rule, “An entrepreneur ... would be authorized for employment incident to his or her parole with the new start-up entity. (*See* proposed new 8 C.F.R. § 212.19(g)) [emphasis added].” 81 Fed. Reg. 60144. DHS

further proposes that ... employment authorization ... be “automatic”... so that the entrepreneur can pursue ... parole related activities with the start-up entity without delay.... Delay resulting from the need to apply for and receive EADs (up to 90 days or more) could be detrimental to the success of the start-up entity.

*Id.* In the 2016 NPRM, DHS proposed to amend the introductory provision of 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(b)—which lists the classes of foreign nationals authorized for employment incident to status with specific employers—by adding a reference to IE Rule parolees. 81 Fed. Reg.

at 60144. The regulation currently refers only to employment-authorized “nonimmigrants.” See proposed 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(b) and 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(b)(37)).<sup>12</sup>

A critical element of any DHS action to rescind the IE Rule should be to clarify that the prior administration’s claim of sweeping executive branch discretion to grant work authorization on a categorical basis had no basis in law, and is thus repudiated as policy by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

The 2016 NPRM repeated the novel and unfounded claim of the Obama administration that Congress has delegated the power to authorize *any* alien to engage in employment to DHS, except where Congress has explicitly prohibited it. The 2016 NPRM summary incorrectly claimed that the source of this alleged agency authority is two INA provisions, INA §§ 103(a), 8 U.S.C. § 1103(a), and § 274A(h)(3), 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(h)(3). See 81 Fed. Reg. 60131. The former defines the duties of the Secretary of Homeland Security and makes no mention of authority to grant employment. The latter is the definition of the term *unauthorized alien* (*i.e.*, those aliens employers may not hire) but is limited in scope by the text to § 274A.

1. INA § 103(a) does not authorize unlimited discretionary grants of work authorization.

First, subsection 103(a) currently defines the powers and duties of the Secretary of Homeland Security. This provision was originally created in the INA, § 103, 66 Stat. 173–74. That provision (both as originally created and as it reads now) makes no mention of authorizing alien employment. *Id.* and § 1103(a) (2014). Congress could not have conferred unlimited authority on DHS to grant aliens employment when it created § 103(a) in 1952, as the Act then required all aliens entering the job market (with exceptions not relevant here) not to affect American workers adversely.

Both the House and Senate reports on the 1952 Act directly contradict the claim that the INA has ever included a grant of independent employment authority to the Executive. See S. Rep. 82-1137 at 11 (Jan. 29, 1952) and H.R. Rep. 83-1361 at 51 (Feb. 14, 1952). Both reports state the INA excludes the admission of aliens to perform labor if the Secretary of Labor determines American workers are available or that such foreign workers will adversely affect American workers. *Id.*<sup>13</sup> Both reports also state the provision is applicable

---

<sup>12</sup> The 2016 NPRM further proposed to extend eligibility for employment authorization to the accompanying spouses (but not the children) of entrepreneur parolees. 81 Fed. Reg. 60145. See proposed 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(34). Spouses would apply for an EAD pursuant to § 274a.12 (c)(34), “consistent with current parole policy that allows parolees to apply for employment authorization... [and] may ... ensure that they satisfy the proposed condition on their parole that they maintain household income that is greater than 400 percent... and may further incentivize a foreign entrepreneur to bring a start-up entity to the United States rather than create it in another country.” *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> The Immigration Act of 1965 changed this provision, making a certification by the Secretary of Labor a precondition for admitting foreign labor. Pub. L. No. 89-236, § 10, 79 Stat. 911, 917–18.

to “all aliens” except those determined to be needed in the United States and certain admissions for permanent residency. *Id.* This requirement that foreign labor may not be admitted if the Secretary of Labor determines it would have an adverse impact on American workers precludes the interpretation that enactment of § 1103(a) conferred on the Executive unfettered authority to authorize employment to otherwise inadmissible alien entrepreneurs.

2. INA § 274A(h)(3) does not authorize unlimited discretionary grants of work authorization.

Second, subsection 274A(h)(3) is merely a definitional provision, limited to a single section of the INA.<sup>14</sup> It provides no authorization for anyone to do anything. INA § 274A was created by the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-603, § 101, 100 Stat. 3445 (IRCA). It imposes civil and criminal penalties on employers who employ *unauthorized aliens*—*i.e.*, those not authorized to work in the United States. Subsection 274A(h)(3) defines the term *unauthorized alien* solely for the purposes of that section (“as used in this section”).

The agency’s position in the 2016 NPRM is untenable because its radical interpretation—that USCIS already has discretionary authority to authorize employment to any alien under INA §§ 103 and 274A—would make all discretionary authority for the Executive to grant work permits to aliens meaningless surplusage. The 2016 NPRM’s proposed interpretation directly conflicts with Supreme Court doctrine holding that “no words are to be treated as surplusage or as repetition.” *Platt v. Union P. R.*, 99 U.S. 48, 59 (1879). The agency’s theory cannot explain why Congress included provisions in IRCA granting the Secretary of Homeland Security authority to provide certain aliens with work permits, nor explain subsequent similar grants of authority—all of which would become surplusage under proposed 8 C.F.R. § 212.19(g), 8 C.F.R. 274a.12(b)(37), and 8 C.F.R. § 274a.12(c)(34).

Applied to the required elements of work authorization in § 274A, the definition of *unauthorized alien* in § 274A(h)(3) allows employers to hire three groups of aliens without penalty: (1) permanent residents; (2) those authorized to be employed by the INA (*e.g.*, H and L guestworkers); or (3) those authorized by the Attorney General (now the Secretary of Homeland Security). The first two categories provide no difficulty in interpretation, and in any case were not evoked by the 2016 NPRM as employment authorization for international alien entrepreneur parolees.

Identifying the legislative intent behind the inclusion of the phrase “or by the Attorney General” in the definition requires additional analysis. The Immigration Act of 1965 amended the alien employment provisions to require an affirmative certification by the Secretary of Labor that American workers were not available and that the alien labor would not adversely affect American workers prior to the admission of foreign labor, and changed the “shall only apply” restriction to “shall apply.” Pub. L. No. 89-236, § 9, 79 Stat. 911,

---

<sup>14</sup> Other definitions using similar language in regard to employment include, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(n)(5)(E) (“or by the Attorney General”) and 8 U.S.C. § 1182(t)(4)(D) (“or by the Secretary of Homeland Security”).

917–18. The courts subsequently applied this restriction to nonimmigrant categories. *See, e.g., International Union of Bricklayers & Allied Craftsmen v. Meese*, 761 F.2d 798, 800 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

IRCA contained seven specific grants of authority to the Attorney General to authorize classes of aliens without visas to engage in employment. *See* § 201, 100 Stat. 3397, 3399 [two], § 301, 100 Stat. 3418, 3421 [two], 3428. The Senate report on IRCA stated that such aliens shall “be considered to be authorized by the Attorney General to be so employed during the period of time indicated on such documentation.” S. Rep. 99-132 at 43 (Aug. 28, 1985). Had Congress omitted the phrase “or by the Attorney General” from § 1324a(h)(3), aliens could have possessed work permits provided for by IRCA but still remained unemployable, as their employers would still have been subject to the civil and criminal penalties contained in § 1324a.

The Immigration Act of 1990 (“IMMACT90”) moved the restriction that foreign labor is inadmissible unless the Secretary of Labor certified that no Americans are available and that the foreign labor would not adversely affect American workers, from INA § 212(a)(14) to § 212(a)(5). Pub. L. No. 101-649, § 601, 104 Stat. 5072. Another provision, § 162, limited this worker protection to EB-2 and EB-3 green card petitions. 104 Stat 5011. However, the next year Congress enacted the Miscellaneous and Technical Immigration and Nationalization Amendments of 1991, Pub. L. No. 102-232, 105 Stat. 1733. This Act repealed IMMACT90’s restriction of labor certification to EB-2 and EB-3 green cards, and returned the applicability of the provision from “any alien who seeks admission or status as an immigrant under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 203(b)” back to “any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor.” § 302, 105 Stat. 1746. The current labor certification language in INA § 212(a)(5)(i) thus clearly applies to the IE Rule alien entrepreneurs, who as parolees are seeking “to enter” despite their inadmissibility under other INA § 212 provisions, noted above.

Subsequent enactments confirm that the phrase “or by the Attorney General” refers only to specific circumstances where the Executive branch has been granted authority to authorize employment. For example, in 1996 IIRIRA granted discretion to the agency to extend employment authorization to asylum applicants through regulation. Pub. L. No. 104-208, § 604, 110 Stat. 3009, 3009-693. In 2006 the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (VAWA) granted DHS discretion to provide employment authorization to VAWA petitioners. Pub. L. No. 109-162, § 814, 119 Stat. 2960, 3059 (2006). The same section also provided that DHS “may authorize” battered spouses “to engage in employment.” *Id.* The Haitian Refugee Immigration Fairness Act of 1998, Pub. L. No. 105-277, § 908, 112 Stat. 2681-538 (HRIFA), a statutory overseas parole program distinct from INA § 212(d)(5)(A) parole, provided that the Attorney General, “may authorize” employment to certain Haitian nationals.

The claim in the 2016 NPRM that DHS has unlimited discretion to authorize employment to aliens is thus unsupported by law. No statute explicitly grants such authority.

Moreover, there is no judicial authority as to how Congress may have *implicitly* granted such power. For example, in its Supreme Court brief in *U.S. v. Texas*, the government argued

that “Section 1324a(h)(3) did not create the Secretary’s authority to authorize work; that authority already existed in Section 1103(a).” If Congress had conferred such *sweeping authority* on the Executive, it is striking that there is no agreement where Congress actually did it. *See King v. Burwell*, 135 S. Ct. 2480, 2489 (2015) (“[H]ad Congress wished to assign [‘a question of deep economic and political significance’] to an agency, it surely would have done so expressly.”). “Congress [] does not alter the fundamental details of a regulatory scheme in vague terms or ancillary provisions – it does not, one might say, hide elephants in mouseholes.” *Whitman v. Am. Trucking Ass’ns*, 531 U.S. 457, 468 (2001). One would expect a grant to DHS of dual authority with Congress to define classes of aliens who may work in the United States to have a clear statement somewhere; something like: *The Secretary may through regulation extend employment to aliens who \_\_\_\_\_*. Yet, no such provision exists.

DHS may not administratively create a missing statutory authorization of work authorization discretion through an extra-statutory initiative like the 2016 NPRM. Because DHS cannot identify an alternative statutory means to parole international entrepreneurs in the United States, the IE Rule must be rescinded.

**F. The 2016 NPRM failed to provide a reasonable factual basis for the novel claim that parole for an uncapped number of inadmissible alien entrepreneurs would produce “substantial and positive contributions to innovation, economic growth, and job creation.”**

As noted, DHS has unlawfully failed to provide the data and analysis that Congress established as essential to assessing the scope and function of the IIRIRA changes to the agency’s INA § 212(d)(5) parole power. Instead, in the 2016 NPRM DHS proffered references to a handful of special interest communications, none of which provide peer-reviewed data establishing the agency’s policy justification for the NPRM: “Allowing certain qualified entrepreneurs to come to the United States as parolees would produce a significant public benefit through substantial and positive contributions to innovation, economic growth, and job creation [emphasis added].” *See* 81 Fed. Reg. 60136.

Even presuming *arguendo* that these special interest communications are entirely correct, they do not establish the extraordinary chain of causation which the 2016 NPRM asserted will propel the proposed parole program. For example, Glaeser *et al.* (2013) only claim that “increasing the proportion of startup employment within a region increases the overall growth rate of employment and wages.” 81 Fed. Reg. 60135 n.12. Haltiwanger *et al.* (2010) only claim that domestic “business startups and young businesses” play an “important role” in U.S. job creation. The words immigrant or immigration never appear in this study. *Id.* Kane (2010) only “show[s] the importance of startups for net job growth....” Even the CEA 2015 report, by an entity whose *raison d’etre* is to prepare supportive policy analysis for the White House, only argued that “high-skilled immigration has positive effects on innovation (as measured by patenting) and on total factor productivity.” *Id.* As with the Haltiwanger study for the U.S. Census Bureau, the SBA study by Plehn-Dujowich (2013) on product innovation by start-up firms is entirely domestic in orientation, and the words immigrant or immigration never appear in its text. *Id.* n.12.

The 2016 NPRM notably omitted the disturbing conclusions of its cited expert Robert Litan (2015), whose article in *Foreign Affairs* magazine actually states that “although individual entrepreneurs deserve applause, they do not benefit the economy the way larger firms do....” 81 Fed. Reg. 60135, n.13 and n.14. In particular,

Even if the United States successfully boosts the formation of new companies, it will have to contend with the dark side of innovation: the wealth inequalities that sometimes accompany technological change.... Some economists believe that *the revolution in information technology may end up benefitting only those workers whose salaries place them in the top ten to 20 percent of the income spectrum*, thus widening the already substantial income gap between the wealthy and the poor.

*It is not yet clear what the impact an influx of startups would have on this problem—but there is reason to suspect it could make things worse.* In recent years, hugely profitable start-ups have created relatively few new jobs and done little to spread the wealth.... If the majority of companies resemble these successful technology firms, then *any start-up renaissance will only magnify inequality.*

*Id.* (emphases added).

Fairlee (2012) claimed that “immigrants were twice as likely to start new businesses in 2011,” but the 2016 NPRM conveniently omits his conclusion that home ownership is the most important factor in immigrant entrepreneurship in the United States, a criterion which has little to no alignment with the profile that the NPRM speculated will be typical of parolee entrepreneurs. *See* 81 Fed. Reg. 60135, n.13. As for the DHS claim at 81 Fed. Reg. 61035 that “the need to create conditions that reduce barriers to entry and attract has become a policy goal for a number of ... nations,” Litan identifies just one such nation, Chile, and describes a Chilean program that resembles the U.S. EB-2 legal permanent immigrant program, not parole under the IE Rule. *Id.* n.14. Similarly the 2016 NPRM cited an “expert” report from the Migration Institute—a highly partisan lobby group for increased migration of all kinds—that is merely an informal overview of investment-based immigrant visa programs among certain OECD nations, none of which operate under the assumptions or parameters of the proposed parole program. *See* Sumption (2012), *Id.* at n.14.

The 2016 NPRM’s reliance on tracts by employer advocates Stuart Anderson (2006, 2010, 2013) and Vivek Wahda (2012), *etc.*, to support the proposition that “foreign-born entrepreneurs are critical forces in the U.S. economy” was also a significant error. Anderson and Wahda improperly substituted the “foreign-born” as statistical surrogates for immigrants, to artificially boost the productivity and participation rates of the later. This distortion is particularly chronic as it was proposed in the 2016 NPRM as a surrogate for any data actually showing the predicted superior performance of entrepreneurial parolees. 81 Fed. Reg. 60136, footnotes 17-22.

While this “slender reed” of a record, if read in the most favorable and uncritical light, may suggest that permanent legal residents who engage in self-employment have less negative impact on the native work-force than other immigrants, it does not document that fact. In particular, nothing in the research cited by DHS even establishes that temporary parole of

younger and less affluent aliens and their families as “entrepreneurs” would have the same effects as the permanent immigration of skilled entrepreneurs under the statutory scheme.

**G. Conclusion.**

Given the unlawful effect and unsubstantiated factual record in the 2016 NPRM, IRLI respectfully urges USCIS to rescind the IE Rule. In particular, the justification for rescission should recognize that the use of parole to meet the employment and investment needs of U.S. start-ups would be unlawful, as would the categorical grant of work authorization to IE Rule parolees and family members. Finally, the notice of rescission should recognize that the factual justification for the IE Rule in the 2016 NPRM failed to document any verifiable net benefit to the U.S. economy that would offset its adverse effects on the U.S. workforce.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "M. Hethmon", is written over a horizontal line.

Michael M. Hethmon, Esq.  
DC Bar No. 1019386  
Counsel for IRLI