



New Congressional Leadership Means Uncertain Path for Immigration Policy in the 110th Congress

When the 110th Congress convenes in January it will be under new Democratic leadership. Angry and frustrated by a seeming lack of progress in the war in Iraq, a series of corruption and other scandals, skyrocketing energy costs, the erosion of the middle class, and historically low approval ratings for the president, the public chose to make sweeping changes in the elections of 2006.

See Page 4

Hispanics Did Not Desert GOP Because of Stance on Immigration, Finds Exit Polling

Hispanic voters deserted the Republican Party in large numbers in the recent elections, according to exit polling conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center and the William C. Velasquez Institute. But so, of course, did voters all across the board, resulting in the party losing control of both houses of Congress and many governor's mansions.

See Page 6

Attention Democrats: Mass Immigration Is Harming America's Working Poor

Since the New Deal days of FDR, the Democratic Party has consistently promoted itself as the party that represents the interests of Americans who work for a living. Now that they are back in charge of Congress, they will have a real opportunity to demonstrate whether the Democratic Party of 2007 is still true to its heritage.

See Page 7

Reformer Corner—Marianne Davies

My activism began when I read a local newspaper's glowing account of a local public school district's "multilingual, state-of-the-art, summer camp" benefiting the children of illegal aliens working in local blueberry fields. As a citizen and a taxpayer, I was indignant over the fact that public funds would be used to provide such a program for anyone who wasn't here legally and it motivated me to write a letter to the editor in response.

See Page 8

Around the Country

With the effects of mass illegal immigration ravaging communities from coast to coast, local governments are deciding they can no longer ignore the problem and wait for the federal government to act. Almost weekly, states, counties and cities get aboard the train of jurisdictions deciding to act locally.

See Page 9

Bush Proposes Expansion of Visa Waiver Program

As anyone who has flown on an airplane in the past six months knows, many seemingly innocuous items that we used to carry on board are now strictly prohibited. Last summer, British authorities uncovered a terrorist ring that was planning to board U.S.-bound flights and blow them up over the Atlantic. The terrorists — British citizens all — could have easily boarded those planes without any prior screening by our government because of the Visa Waiver Program (VWP), which allows citizens of 27 nations to enter the U.S. without first obtaining a visa.

See Page 10

Courageous Hazleton Mayor Profiled on *60 Minutes*

After nearly four decades on the air, CBS News' *60 Minutes* remains one of the most watched and influential TV news programs. Over the years, *60 Minutes* has profiled world leaders, business tycoons, movie stars, and any number of other cultural icons. So why would America's most watched news program take the trouble to produce a report about the mayor of a small Pennsylvania city nestled in the Pocono Mountains? Simple. Because Mayor Lou Barletta of Hazleton has stepped out of obscurity and decided he would be the one to slay the dragon of illegal immigration.

See Page 11

ACLU, Illegal Alien Rights Groups Attempt to Block Hazleton, Penn. from Enforcing Local Ordinances

As local communities all across the United States move ahead with local ordinances aimed at preventing illegal aliens from settling in their midst, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and other illegal alien advocacy organizations have predictably gone to court to try to bar local governments from taking action.

See Page 12

Voters in Arizona and Colorado Embrace Immigration Enforcement Ballot Measures

No one knows exactly how much any particular issue plays in voters' decisions to elect people to public office. But one thing about which there is no doubt is that when voters have an opportunity to express their views on the issue of illegal immigration, they overwhelmingly favor strong enforcement.

See Page 13

One Out of Seven Mexicans Work in the U.S.

On December 1, Felipe Calderon replaced Vicente Fox as president of Mexico. But one thing that will not change with the new administration is the Mexican government's insistence that the U.S. open its doors even wider to Mexican workers. According to a new report by the Migration Policy Institute, one out of every seven Mexican workers works in the United States, and 9.4 percent of all people born in Mexico now live north of the border.

See Page 14

John Tanton, Founder of FAIR, Profiled by Washington Post

It is not unusual for FAIR spokespeople to be quoted in the *Washington Post* or any of the nation's other leading newspapers. But in a feature story in the Sunday, November 26th, edition of the paper, the *Post* took the unusual step of examining the roots of the modern immigration reform movement in the United States by profiling Dr. John Tanton, the Michigan ophthalmologist who founded FAIR 28 years ago.

See Page 15

State Policies that Turn a Blind Eye to Illegal Immigration Kill Marine and Companion

It was Eduardo Raul Morales-Soriano who killed Marine Corporal Brian Mathews and Jennifer Bower on a Maryland highway on Thanksgiving night, but it was the willful policies of two states — North Carolina and Maryland — that put the murder weapon in Morales-Soriano's hands.

See Page 16

New Congressional Leadership Means Uncertain Path for Immigration Policy in the 110th Congress

Many Newly Elected Democrats Ran on a Platform of Immigration Enforcement, Not Amnesty

When the 110th Congress convenes in January it will be under new Democratic leadership. Angry and frustrated by a seeming lack of progress in the war in Iraq, a series of corruption and other scandals, skyrocketing energy costs, the erosion of the middle class, and historically low approval ratings for the president, the public chose to make sweeping changes in the elections of 2006.

With both Houses of Congress now led by the Democrats there is likely to be a change in direction in how just about every issue of importance to the American public is handled, and immigration will be no exception. While some pundits immediately interpreted the results of the elections as a green light to proceed with legislation to enact an illegal alien amnesty and increases in overall immigration, early signs indicate that the Democrats are not as eager to venture into that snake pit as the open borders lobby might hope.

Changes in the House

Shortly after the elections, incoming House Speaker Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) disclosed a long list of priorities that she expects to address in the early days of the new Congress. Notably absent from that list is any sweeping legislation dealing with immigration policy. While the new Speaker and many of the Democrats in key leadership positions may be ideologically committed to amnesty for illegal aliens, she proved in the last election to be an astute politician. Having finally wrested power back from the Republicans after 12 years, it is far from certain that Pelosi and others in the Democratic leadership are prepared to risk it all on an illegal alien amnesty and immigration expansion that is certain to anger the very voters who returned them to power.

The willingness of the public to place its confidence in Democratic leadership has been widely attributed to decisions by Pelosi and Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee Chairman Rahm Emanuel (D-Ill.) to recruit centrist candidates in this election cycle. Emanuel himself is a veteran political strategist who helped position Bill Clinton as a centrist Democrat when he first ran for president in 1992.

The political difference between the Democratic Class of 2006 and the old guard Democrats in the House is illustrated by their approaches to immigration policy. There can be little doubt that Pelosi and the new House Judiciary Committee Chairman John Conyers (D-Mich.) personally favor amnesty for tens of millions of illegal aliens. However, the newly elected members who put the Democrats in the majority nearly all ran on a platform of immigration enforcement. Not a single Democrat representing a district that changed hands in the last election ran for office promising amnesty, guest worker programs and higher levels of immigration. In fact, nearly all of them promised voters that when they got to Washington they would work to enforce our borders and crack down on illegal immigration. These new Democratic members will join an already existing corps of Democratic House members, often referred to as the Blue Dogs, who have supported immigration enforcement efforts and opposed amnesty and guest worker schemes.

FAIR has already begun reaching out to incoming House members and developing relations with them and their staffs. Working with these new members and existing Democratic allies will be critical to FAIR's strategy in the 110th Congress, as many in leadership positions are likely to be less sympathetic to efforts to secure our borders and enforce immigration laws.

Even as we prepare and look forward to working with many of the new members of the House, FAIR would like to pay tribute to those who advanced the cause of true immigration reform over the past several years, especially out-going Judiciary Chairman James Sensenbrenner (R-Wis.), who was responsible for passage of landmark legislation in the House.

While Sensenbrenner and other Republicans (too numerous to list) will be in the minority in the upcoming Congress, their presence and influence will continue to be significant when immigration legislation is taken up.

Changes in the Senate

Democrats will also take control of the Senate in January, but the impact on immigration policy in that body will not be as significant. Unlike the House, which under Republican leadership passed a strong immigration enforcement bill, the Senate backed President Bush's plan for a massive illegal alien amnesty and guest worker program. Like his predecessor, Arlen Specter (R-Penn.), the expected new Senate Judiciary Chairman Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) is a strong proponent of an illegal alien amnesty and will likely favor legislation that favors that approach.

What has changed significantly since the election is the position of many Republican members. In 2006, many GOP senators came under strong pressure from the White House to back the president's guest worker amnesty bill, against their own better judgment. With Bush now the lamest of lame ducks — entering the final two years of his presidency and soundly repudiated by the voters — many Republicans are likely to feel less constrained in opposing ill-advised immigration policy directives from the White House.

Like many of the freshmen House Democrats, many of the incoming new Senate Democrats also took strong pro-enforcement positions during their campaigns for office. This new class will be joining a significant minority of incumbent Democrats, like Byron Dorgan (N.D.), Robert Byrd (W.V.), and Ben Nelson (Neb.), who were vocal opponents of the guest worker amnesty bill in the last Congress. Together with newly emancipated Republicans, they could form the nucleus of a pro-enforcement bloc in the Senate.

Overall Outlook

Given the changes in congressional leadership, there will be new challenges for FAIR and the immigration reform movement to confront. The pro-amnesty and open borders lobby is certain to press their agenda even harder in the coming session, but as noted above, they, too, face many obstacles to achieving their objectives.

FAIR believes that with strong public support, we can muster the political coalition not only to block efforts to legalize millions of illegal aliens and throw open America's borders, but to enact positive legislation in the 110th Congress. It is unlikely that we will see the kind of sweeping legislation that was approved by the House in the last session, but efforts to secure our borders and crackdown on employers who hire illegal aliens is well within the realm of possibility.

What is certain is that all of us will need to redouble our efforts. Overwhelming public opposition prevented Congress and the Bush Administration from approving a guest worker amnesty bill in 2006, and the same sort of public pressure will be necessary again in 2007. FAIR pledges to work tirelessly to thwart the opposition's efforts, while at the same time moving forward on the sort of immigration reforms that the vast majority of Americans support, no matter which party is in power. Once again, it promises to be a difficult battle, but with your support the public interest can prevail.

Hispanics Did Not Desert GOP Because of Stance on Immigration, Finds Exit Polling

Hispanic voters deserted the Republican Party in large numbers in the recent elections, according to exit polling conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center and the William C. Velasquez Institute. But so, of course, did voters all across the board, resulting in the party losing control of both houses of Congress and many governor's mansions. According to exit polls — surveys taken of actual voters as they left their polling places — Democrats received 69 percent of votes cast by Americans of Hispanic heritage, versus just 30 percent for Republicans. This result compares to a 58 to 40 percent edge enjoyed by the Democrats in the 2004 elections.

The illegal alien advocacy network and many pundits immediately spun the results as a repudiation of congressional Republicans' stance on immigration, especially of the passage by the House of a tough immigration enforcement bill in the last session. As is often the case, however, the conventional wisdom turns out to be wrong. According to the analysis done by the Pew Hispanic Center, immigration policy was of little consequence in the voting decisions made by Hispanic voters. "It is important to note that immigration in the Latino population is never a top-tier issue," said Gabriel Escobar, associate director of the Pew Hispanic Center.

The findings of the Pew Hispanic Center's exit polling indicate that Hispanic voters turned away from the Republicans for the identical reasons that many non-Hispanic voters did in this election. Dissatisfaction with the handling of the war in Iraq, insecurity about the economy and their own middle class jobs were the driving forces behind the voting decisions of Hispanics, much as they were for voters of all racial and ethnic backgrounds. "It may be that this election was more a reflection of this Democratic wave than any sort of fixed tack to the right or left by the Latino voters," Escobar said.

The illegal alien advocacy lobby believed that opposition to the House enforcement bill and their own demands for a sweeping amnesty would be a catalyst to register 1 million new voters before the 2006 elections. Not only were those goals not met, but the massive illegal alien rallies last spring generated strong general opposition to an illegal alien amnesty, and resulted in the emergence of an American Hispanic voice calling for immigration enforcement. The results of the exit polling, together with development of organizations like You Don't Speak for Me!, which works closely with FAIR, provides strong evidence that there is a large gap between the claims of the illegal alien advocacy network and how actual Hispanic citizens in this country exercise their votes.

Attention Democrats: Mass Immigration Is Harming America's Working Poor

Since the New Deal days of FDR, the Democratic Party has consistently promoted itself as the party that represents the interests of Americans who work for a living. Now that they are back in charge of Congress, they will have a real opportunity to demonstrate whether the Democratic Party of 2007 is still true to its heritage.

A report issued in November by the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University finds that millions of American workers are being severely harmed by the unprecedented wave of legal and illegal immigration over the past decade or so. In addition to the immediate economic impact on younger and less skilled Americans, the phenomenon will likely have long-term negative consequences for American society. The report was authored by economists Andrew Sum, Paul Harrington and Ishwar Khatiwada.

According to Harrington, the biggest losers in the phenomenon of unchecked immigration are poorer and less educated Americans and other immigrants. "When you bring in large numbers of illegal immigrants, what you do is break down the labor standards and create environments Americans don't want to work in," he stated. The data that he and his colleagues present in the report back up this contention. Since 2000, the number of native-born men in the U.S. labor force has declined by 1.7 million, even though the number of such men of working age increased during this time period. The decline in employment for native-born men coincided with a period of economic expansion, when their services should have been required and should have provided leverage for wage gains.

Instead, American businesses turned to immigrants — legal and illegal — to fill their domestic labor needs. While native-born men were being pushed out of the labor market in their own country, some 4.1 million new immigrants entered the U.S. labor force and perhaps as many as half of them were illegal aliens. In addition to the economic impact, the Northeastern researchers note that mass immigration is delaying the entry of many young American workers to the labor force, a phenomenon that they contend will haunt these workers throughout their adult life.

While illegal immigration has a greater adverse impact on the fortunes of American workers, the issue is also one of basic supply-and-demand. Thus, the illegal alien amnesty, expanded guest worker program, and overall increases in immigration favored by many congressional Democrats and by President Bush, would not ease the burden on American workers. The loss of job opportunities and real wages to American workers can only be reversed by strict enforcement of employer sanctions laws and reductions in immigration admissions.

The phenomenon documented by the Northeastern University report confirms the findings of FAIR's own research on the impact of mass immigration on the American labor force. An April 2004 report by FAIR, entitled [Immigration and Income Inequality](#) comes to many of the same conclusions that mass immigration is benefiting a small number of businesses and wealthier Americans at the expense of the vast majority of people in this country who work for a living. The report published by Northeastern, coinciding with the Democrats taking control of Congress, presents a real challenge to the new leadership and will test their professed commitment to looking out for the interests of American workers.

Reformer Corner

Marianne Davies

My activism began when I read a local newspaper's glowing account of a local public school district's "multilingual, state-of-the-art, summer camp" benefiting the children of illegal aliens working in local blueberry fields. As a citizen and a taxpayer, I was indignant over the fact that public funds would be used to provide such a program for anyone who wasn't here legally and it motivated me to write a letter to the editor in response. With the aid of statistics and research from FAIR, I warned local readers about the "hidden cost of locally grown blueberries". My letter was printed and I learned very quickly that I was not alone in my indignation. I received phone calls and e-mails in support of my letter and realized that I had a struck a nerve. I met some very passionate local Pennsylvania immigration reform activists and joined C4ICE (Citizens of Pennsylvania for Immigration Control and Enforcement).

As an American of Hispanic roots, whose parents immigrated here legally over 50 years ago, I felt that the push for amnesty by President Bush and many in the Senate was a slap in the face to all law-abiding naturalized citizens who willingly and eagerly complied with our federal immigration laws to earn the privilege of calling this great nation their new "homeland." I could not sit idly by and watch this unfold.

My concern for my family's safety and that of our homeland was also a key motivating factor in prompting me to get involved in this issue. As the spouse of a commercial airline pilot, our family's sense of security has changed dramatically since 9/11. Realizing that all 19 of the hijackers in one way or another took advantage of our lax immigration laws to plan and execute the attacks on our soil, and realizing that not much had changed since, I was determined to support any efforts to make our homeland safer.

Then along came Colonel Al Rodriguez! When Col. Rodriguez called and asked me to join him in You Don't Speak for Me!, I was thrilled to realize that there were other American Hispanics who stood with the majority of Americans in opposing illegal immigration and any measures that would reward illegal aliens with citizenship. At YDSFM's first press conference in Washington, D.C., where we were joined by several members of Congress, our voices were heard and well-received and covered by the national media. YDSFM seeks to dispel the myth that American Hispanics support amnesty for illegal aliens.

With more than 5,000 members, YDSFM is now in the process of forming local chapters across the country. We seek to work with other immigration reform groups and state, local and federal government officials to provide support and assistance in implementing policies and measures to address illegal immigration locally. Above all, we seek to send the message to the president and the newly elected officials in Congress that a vote for amnesty in any form will be a vote out of office for those who support it.

I have also remained active in Pennsylvania. State Rep. Daryl Metcalfe's bipartisan legislation, "National Security Begins at Home," is an example of what we have been able to accomplish at the local level. I testified regarding the effects of illegal immigration when the Pennsylvania House Republican Policy Committee held hearings on immigration this past summer. I have been busy meeting with members of Congress both in Washington and in Pennsylvania, and supporting those candidates who advocate true immigration reform. be a difficult battle, but with your support the public interest can prevail.

Around the Country

GEORGIA

In 2006, the Georgia legislature enacted a comprehensive set of laws aimed at discouraging illegal aliens from settling in the state. But local communities around Georgia are not waiting for state authorities to begin implementing these new laws; many are moving forward with their own efforts to deal with the problems of illegal immigration at the local level. Both Cobb and Cherokee Counties moved forward in December with ordinances similar to those adopted by Hazleton, Pennsylvania. This modern day march across Georgia is being led by a coalition of immigration reform activists and groups with close ties to FAIR. D.A. King, who was the most visible advocate pushing for enactment of statewide laws, was among those leading the effort to enact local ordinances to deal with illegal immigration.

COLORADO

Like Georgia, the Colorado Legislature passed a series of tough measures to cope with a growing illegal immigration crisis in 2006. Among the package of bills that were approved was one that allows the state to prosecute and fine people engaged in document fraud. However, state legislators appear to be borrowing a page from the playbook of their colleagues in Washington, D.C., who want to make people think they're more serious about dealing with an issue than they really are. Colorado Attorney General John Suthers, who is responsible for prosecuting document forgers, claims he has been unable to carry out this task because the legislature has not provided the funding to enforce the new law.

CALIFORNIA

The Orange County city of Costa Mesa is believed to be the first in the nation to establish publicly funded day labor hiring centers and, under the leadership of Mayor Alan Mansour, the first to do away with them when it became apparent that they were simply a magnet for illegal aliens. Now the city is becoming one of the first to request that the federal government permanently post an immigration official at their city jail. Costa Mesa is also requesting federal training for city police officers to qualify them to enforce immigration laws.

TEXAS

Like other border states, Texas is saddled with enormous costs owing to the federal government's failure to control illegal immigration — \$4.7 billion a year according to FAIR's estimates. One of the major burdens that many state and local governments do not account for is the cost of providing benefits and services to the U.S.-born children of illegal aliens. Under the current interpretation of the law, these "anchor babies" are considered U.S. citizens. While efforts in Congress to end automatic birthright citizenship have stalled, Texas State Representative Leo Berman has decided that local governments literally cannot afford to wait for federal action. Under legislation introduced by Berman, Texas would no longer recognize anchor babies as U.S. citizens — a move that would force the courts to rule on the current interpretation of the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Bush Proposes Expansion of Visa Waiver Program

As anyone who has flown on an airplane in the past six months knows, many seemingly innocuous items that we used to carry on board are now strictly prohibited. Last summer, British authorities uncovered a terrorist ring that was planning to board U.S.-bound flights and blow them up over the Atlantic. The terrorists — British citizens all — could have easily boarded those planes without any prior screening by our government because of the Visa Waiver Program (VWP), which allows citizens of 27 nations to enter the U.S. without first obtaining a visa.

In testimony before Congress and in the report of the 9/11 Commission, homeland security experts have stated unequivocally that the VWP is a weak link in our defense against international terrorists. In many, if not most, of the countries that fall under the VWP, radical Islamic terror cells exist and the terrorists carry passports of those countries. In addition, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), in a report released in September, worried that “stolen passports from visa-waiver countries are prized travel documents among terrorists, criminals and immigration-law violators.”

Rather than eliminate the VWP, President Bush in late November proposed expanding the scope of the VWP to include many Eastern European countries. These former Soviet bloc nations, though having made enormous strides since the collapse of communism, are known to have thriving black markets for just about everything, including bogus documents. Moreover, just as is the case in Western Europe, radical Islamic terrorist groups have taken root in Eastern Europe. As President Bush himself may recall, just a few years ago his own administration alleged that agents of Saddam Hussein’s government met with an al-Qaeda cell in Prague, capital of the Czech Republic.

After the attacks of 9/11, and after the failed attempt by the “shoe bomber,” Richard Reid, to bring down a trans-Atlantic flight, FAIR publicly called for the elimination of the VWP. In an in-depth report on the third anniversary of the 9/11 attacks, *International Terrorism: Serious Solutions for Immigration Controls*, FAIR examined in detail the security threats posed by the VWP.

The Administration’s efforts on behalf of the tourism and hospitality industry would unnecessarily place short-term financial interests above those of national security. There is no evidence that the requirement to obtain a visa in advance deters legitimate travel to the U.S. Moreover, should another terrorist attack take place on our soil, it would place a far bigger crimp in the tourism and hospitality industry than the elimination of the VWP.

Courageous Hazleton Mayor Profiled on *60 Minutes*

After nearly four decades on the air, CBS News' *60 Minutes* remains one of the most watched and influential TV news programs. Over the years, *60 Minutes* has profiled world leaders, business tycoons, movie stars, and any number of other cultural icons. So why would America's most watched news program take the trouble to produce a report about the mayor of a small Pennsylvania city nestled in the Pocono Mountains? Simple. Because Mayor Lou Barletta of Hazleton has stepped out of obscurity and decided he would be the one to slay the dragon of illegal immigration.

As we reported in the November issue of the FAIR Immigration Report, when Mayor Barletta showed up to deliver the keynote address at FAIR's annual meeting in September, he was accompanied by a *60 Minutes* camera crew that was assembling film clips for the report. That report, entitled "Welcome to Hazleton," was aired on Sunday evening, November 19. The report documented the growing costs and crime that are associated with the influx of illegal aliens to this city of about 30,000 and the decision of Barletta to act locally, rather than pass the buck and wait for the federal government to do something about it.

The *60 Minutes* report also looked at how Hazleton residents feel about their mayor's actions to thwart illegal immigration to their city. "Most of the people," stated reporter Steve Kroft, "think it's a great idea." And so do nearly all of viewers around the country who posted comments about the story on the *60 Minutes* web site. Public support, both in Hazleton and nationwide, for the actions initiated by Barletta belie the usual proclamations from the political pundits that immigration enforcement is a "controversial" issue. Public support for immigration enforcement is, in fact, very strong and widespread as evidenced by the fact that in the recent elections, voters in Arizona and Colorado overwhelmingly approved strong local immigration enforcement ballot measures, and that since Hazleton led the way, more than 30 other cities around the country have moved ahead with similar ordinances.

ACLU, Illegal Alien Rights Groups Attempt to Block Hazleton, Penn. from Enforcing Local Ordinances

Mayor Barletta and Legal Team Confident that Local Rules Will Be Upheld

As local communities all across the United States move ahead with local ordinances aimed at preventing illegal aliens from settling in their midst, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and other illegal alien advocacy organizations have predictably gone to court to try to bar local governments from taking action. Hazleton, Pennsylvania, which was the first local government to institute local ordinances that punish landlords who rent to illegal aliens and businesses that employ them, is the first target of the ACLU and the well-funded illegal alien rights network.

The Hazleton ordinances, which were scheduled to take effect on November 1, were temporarily enjoined by Judge James Munley of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. The judge, who issued his 13-page opinion within minutes of the ACLU filing suit, temporarily halted Hazleton from implementing its local policies, stating that they could inflict “irreparable harm” to those who would be affected by them.

The injunction was neither unexpected, nor did it dampen the determination of the city and Mayor Lou Barletta from moving forward with a legal defense of their actions. “Hazleton assembled one of the finest legal teams in the country. Hazleton is prepared to fight. We will take this challenge to the highest court in the U.S. if that’s what it takes to protect our legal citizens and preserve our quality of life. I believe we will prevail,” Mayor Barletta responded to the injunction.

FAIR’s legal arm, the Immigration Reform Law Institute (IRLI), worked closely with Mayor Barletta and city officials to help craft ordinances that comply with federal immigration law and do not infringe on the federal government’s exclusive authority in this area. IRLI’s director, Michael Hethmon, along with University of Missouri at Kansas City Law School Professor Kris Kobach, will be part of the legal team referred to by Mayor Barletta.

While the delaying tactics of the ACLU and the illegal alien rights advocacy network may be frustrating, they are a necessary part of establishing a legal precedent that will allow other local communities to move forward with similar ordinances. FAIR is confident that the right of local governments to impose regulations on how landlords and businesses within their jurisdiction operate, including punitive action if they rent to or employ illegal aliens, will ultimately be upheld by the courts.

While Judge Munley has temporarily prevented Hazleton’s ordinances from formal implementation, they are already having an effect. Mayor Barletta reports that since the city council first approved these local rules, illegal aliens have been departing Hazleton in large numbers, proving that even the threat of enforcement can have a significant deterrent effect.

Voters in Arizona and Colorado Embrace Immigration Enforcement Ballot Measures

No one knows exactly how much any particular issue plays in voters' decisions to elect people to public office. But one thing about which there is no doubt is that when voters have an opportunity to express their views on the issue of illegal immigration, they overwhelmingly favor strong enforcement.

Voters in Arizona and Colorado were asked to weigh in on a series of immigration-related ballot measures in November, and in each case the initiatives were approved by wide margins. Arizona had four immigration initiatives on the ballot, ranging from limiting illegal aliens' access to publicly funded programs, to denial of bail to illegal aliens who are arrested, to making English the official language of the state. Every one of these measures received between 70 percent and 80 percent support from the voters.

The results of the Arizona ballot initiatives also refute claims that Hispanic voters are offended by such measures. A CNN exit poll reported that 48 percent of Hispanic voters supported making English the official language in Arizona, which was significantly higher than the level of Hispanic support for President Bush's re-election two years ago.

The landslide wins for pro-immigration enforcement ballot measures in Arizona and Colorado provide further evidence that the defeat of several strong supporters of immigration reform, like Rep. J.D. Hayworth (R-Ariz.), was the result of a strong anti-Republican tide that swept across the nation, not a rejection of their positions on immigration.

FAIR's own analysis of the 2006 election results leads to the same conclusions. In a race-by-race analysis of newly elected members, many of the incoming Democratic members adopted tough immigration enforcement positions in their campaigns for office. Where there were no sharp differences between candidates on immigration, voters based their decisions on other issues. FAIR's election analysis can be found [here](#).

One Out of Seven Mexicans Work in the U.S.

On December 1, Felipe Calderon replaced Vicente Fox as president of Mexico. But one thing that will not change with the new administration is the Mexican government's insistence that the U.S. open its doors even wider to Mexican workers. According to a new report by the Migration Policy Institute, one out of every seven Mexican workers works in the United States, and 9.4 percent of all people born in Mexico now live north of the border.

In raw numbers, 7 million Mexican citizens now work in the U.S. — an increase of 2 million since 2004. This expatriate labor force sends nearly \$20 billion a year back to Mexico, making the exportation of workers as profitable for the Mexican government as the exportation of oil.

So long as the United States willingly provides this safety valve for Mexico, there is little reason for the government in power — no matter who the president happens to be — to institute major economic, social and political reform. By continuing to accommodate mass migration out of Mexico, the United States is unwittingly playing a role in perpetuating the very conditions that give rise to illegal immigration.

John Tanton, Founder of FAIR, Profiled by *Washington Post*

It is not unusual for FAIR spokespeople to be quoted in the *Washington Post* or any of the nation's other leading newspapers. But in a feature story in the Sunday, November 26th, edition of the paper, the *Post* took the unusual step of examining the roots of the modern immigration reform movement in the United States by profiling Dr. John Tanton, the Michigan ophthalmologist who founded FAIR 28 years ago.

Taking a step back from the daily coverage of the ongoing national debate about immigration policy, the *Post* feature explored how Dr. Tanton's vision and dedication led to the creation of FAIR and a national movement committed to reforming U.S. immigration laws in the public interest. Crediting him as the founder of the immigration reform movement, the *Post* feature creates an important public record of how and why this popular movement developed, and illustrates how one man can make a real difference in the life of a nation.

Outrage of the Month

State Policies that Turn a Blind Eye to Illegal Immigration Kill Marine and Companion

It was Eduardo Raul Morales-Soriano who killed Marine Corporal Brian Mathews and Jennifer Bower on a Maryland highway on Thanksgiving night, but it was the willful policies of two states — North Carolina and Maryland — that put the murder weapon in Morales-Soriano's hands. The weapon was a Nissan Sentra that Morales-Soriano was driving with a blood alcohol level of .32 — the highest level that the Chesapeake regional director of Mothers Against Drunk Driving has ever heard of.

Morales-Soriano, as best anyone can determine, is an illegal alien. But that fact did not prevent North Carolina from issuing him a driver's license, or convince Maryland authorities to revoke the license after he was stopped for drunk driving earlier this year, or even turn him over to federal immigration authorities. As much as Morales-Soriano's criminally irresponsible behavior, federal and local willful blindness to illegal immigration were responsible for the tragic deaths of Cpl. Mathews, who had recently served an eight-month stint in Iraq, and Ms. Bower.

In February, Morales-Soriano was stopped in Howard County, Maryland, by police who reported that he was "unable to maintain his balance." The suspect refused to take a Breathalyzer test at the time. Nevertheless, Morales-Soriano was released to the custody of a relative on the spot and the forms that should have automatically revoked his driver's license were never filed. Nor was Morales-Soriano turned over to federal immigration authorities, despite reasonable doubt about his immigration status.

Fortunately, due to efforts by local activists in North Carolina, most notably NC Listens, that state tightened its driver's license issuance policies earlier this year — too late, of course, for Cpl. Mathews and Ms. Bower. Many jurisdictions in Maryland continue to maintain policies that shield illegal aliens from federal immigration enforcement. Yet the apologists for illegal immigration continue to maintain that it is a victimless crime and that local governments should play no role in enforcing immigration laws. Tell that to the Mathews and Bower families.