



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on May 12, 2015

Jeb Bush Would Not Rescind Obama's Executive Amnesty if Elected President

During a recent interview with Megyn Kelly on Fox News, former Florida Governor Jeb Bush (shown) said that — were he to be elected president — his first order of business would not be to repeal President Obama's executive action granting amnesty to four million illegal aliens. Bush, who has not yet announced himself as a candidate for the Republican nomination in 2016, said that although he did not support the Obama administration executive action — which he called unconstitutional — he would not remove it (presumably by another executive action) immediately after assuming the presidency. Bush said he would rather rectify the action as part of “meaningful” immigration reform legislation passed by Congress.



Kelly told Bush that she had talked to Senator Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who was one of the “Gang of Eight” that drafted the bipartisan “immigration reform” bill that passed the Senate in 2013 but was never voted on by the Republican-led House because it provided amnesty to illegal aliens. She said that Rubio told her: “It’s going to be very difficult to undo [the executive action] once all these folks are here, if that legal challenge to his action does not succeed.”

The “legal challenge” that Kelly referred to is a temporary injunction that U.S. District Judge Andrew S. Hanen of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Texas in Brownsville issued last February, blocking implementation of the Obama plan. Hanen’s decision was in response to a suit (*State of Texas et al v. United States of America et al*) filed against the administration by a group of states led by Texas. The administration has appealed that injunction to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, which heard arguments from both sides in the case on April 17, but has not yet issued a decision.

Bush replied: “By the way, I think [the legal challenge] will succeed.”

When Kelly asked Bush how he would go about undoing the executive actions (presuming they were still intact should he become president), the former governor replied: “Passing meaningful reform of immigration and make it part of it.”

Kelly then asked Bush if he would have “supported that Senate bill that did not pass.”

Bush replied: “I would have had a different bill that was based on the, you know, my deeply held views on this. But I would have supported that to get beyond this, sure.”

Bush, apparently, is not opposed to granting amnesty to a large number of illegal aliens and differs with Obama solely on the president’s methodology. And his differences with the president are not sufficiently



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on May 12, 2015

important that he would make it a priority of his, if elected to succeed Obama, to undo the action.

Bear in mind what Senator Ted Cruz (R-Texas) said about the Gang of Eight bill in a national petition e-mailed to his supporters in June 2013, one week before the Senate passed it on a 68-32 vote:

This is urgent. We must stop this Gang of 8 immigration bill, which would give amnesty to an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants with no guarantee of a secure border.

The Senate debate is in the final stages and we need to send Washington a strong signal of the overwhelming grassroots opposition to this amnesty bill from Americans across the country.

Senator Rand Paul (R-Ky.) also opposed the bill, stating: “If [the immigration bill] got stronger, I could consider it, but since they rejected my call to have Congress involved with determining whether the border is secure, I can’t imagine how they can get me back unless they come back to me and say, ‘We’ve changed our mind.’”

Bush offered this explanation to Kelly about why he was opposed to deporting some illegal aliens, especially those who had been in the country for some time and are therefore eligible for amnesty under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program: “If you’ve been here for an extended period of time, you have no nexus to the country of your parents. What are we supposed to do? Marginalize these people forever?”

Presumably, since every president takes an oath to “faithfully execute the Office of President” and to “preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States,” and that the Constitution requires that “he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed,” it might be presumed that what Bush *should* do — were he to be elected president — is to enforce the law.

It is not the laws that “marginalize” people. Those who break the law marginalize themselves and must be required to come into compliance. It is up to Congress to pass laws to accomplish this, and to the president to enforce these laws. Among the steps required by existing law are border enforcement, apprehension of those who have entered our nation illegally, and deportation of those apprehended.

Unlike Hillary Clinton, who recently advocated “nothing less than a full and equal path to citizenship,” for illegal aliens and who was critical of those Republican presidential candidates who favor granting legal status for some illegal aliens, but still oppose citizenship, Bush said he backs legal status — but not citizenship — for those who have entered the country illegally. “A practical solution of getting to fixing the legal system is also allowing for a path to legalized status, not necessarily citizenship,” said Bush.

Bush has a history of attempting to straddle the fence on the issue of immigration, often bending language to make amnesty not sound like amnesty. During an interview on MSNBC’s *Morning Joe* program in March 2013, Bush revealed that he would support legislation that provided a “path for citizenship” for illegal immigrants. During the interview, which coincided with the release of *Immigration Wars*, the book Bush coauthored with Clint Bolick, Bush said he favored a “path to legalization.”

When *Morning Joe* co-host Joe Scarborough asked Bush: “What’s the difference between a path to legalization and a path to citizenship?” Bush replied: “The principal difference ... the principle underlying what we’ve proposed is that if you don’t have a difference between a path to citizenship or a path to legalization, you’re going to create a magnet going forward for more illegal...”

Scarborough interjected: “You’re going to repeat what happened in today’s ... Reagan amnesty.”



Written by [Warren Mass](#) on May 12, 2015

Bush continued: “So going forward — we wrote this last year — going forward if there is a difference, if you can craft that in law where you can have a path to citizenship where there isn’t an incentive for people to come illegally I’m for it. I don’t have a problem with that.”

Near the conclusion of the interview, Bush replied to a question from political analyst Mark Halperin, who asked: “Governor, just to clarify an important point of a path to citizenship, if there was a piece of legislation that had a pathway to citizenship ... people who came here illegally eligible to become citizens without touching back in their home countries, would you support that?”

Bush replied: “I would support it if it didn’t create an incentive for people to come illegally at the expense of coming legally.”

“If you change the system so that there is a legal path and you have a different term for people that are here already illegally so that the incentive isn’t to continue to have that process, then I would support that for sure,” Bush continued.

We *think* what Bush meant, amidst all that doubletalk, is that if you legalize illegal immigration, then illegal aliens would no longer be here illegally!

However, we would not guarantee that.

Photo of Jeb Bush: Gage Skidmore

Related articles:

[Jeb Bush’s Position on Immigration Gets Scrutiny](#)

[Jeb Bush Now Supports Path to Citizenship](#)

[Jeb Bush Said He Would Have Authorized the Iraq Invasion, Too](#)

[Jeb Bush’s Ties to Insider Financial Interests Are Confirmed](#)

[Boos, Walkout Greet Jeb Bush at CPAC Conference](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



[Subscribe](#)

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.