



# The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 50, NO. 10

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

MAY 2017

## How to Pay for the Wall

When President Trump signed a stopgap spending bill that funds the government through September 30, the media trumpeted the news that the bill doesn't include money to begin building a wall on our southern border. Nancy Pelosi gloated that "the omnibus does not fund the immoral and unwise border wall," and she called that omission "a defeat for President Trump." Even some of his most ardent supporters expressed disappointment at the lack of progress on Trump's signature campaign issue.

The critics spoke too soon, because adequate funding sources are hiding in plain sight. And yes, Mexico will indirectly pay for it, just as President Trump promised.

"We'll build the wall," the president assured the 80,000 people who attended this year's convention of the National Rifle Association in Atlanta. "Don't even think about it. That's an easy one." The positive reaction of NRA members was illustrated by Kathleen Mahn, a 45-year-old stay-at-home mom and fitness instructor from Peachtree City, Georgia. "So far, I think he's done better than he's been given credit for in the media," she told USA Today after cheering Trump's remarks.

Attorney General Jeff Sessions dropped a clue in his Sunday morning TV appearance on April 23, telling George Stephanopoulos, "We're going to get paid for it one way or the other. There are a lot of ways we can find money to help pay for this.

"I know there's \$4 billion a year in excess payments, according to the Department of the Treasury's own inspector general several years ago, that are going to payments to people — tax credits that they shouldn't get. Now, these are mostly Mexicans. And those kind of things add up — \$4 billion a year for 10 years is \$40 billion."

The attorney general was referring to a July 2011 report by the Treasury inspector general for tax administration (TIGTA) who said that individuals not authorized to work in the U.S. received \$4.2 billion in refundable tax credits

in 2009. Not all illegal aliens are Mexicans, of course, but most of them either came from or passed through Mexico on their way to the United States.

Low-wage workers are eligible for both the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), which requires a valid Social Security number, and the Additional Child Tax Credit (ACTC), which does not. Illegal aliens have learned how to cheat the system by claiming the ACTC to receive a "refund" of up to \$1,000 per child.

As a presidential candidate in 2015, Donald Trump cited the \$4.2 billion figure as part of his plan to enforce U.S. immigration law. Even the leftwing Politifact had to admit that the inspector general's report "corroborates" Trump's claim that \$4.2 billion a year can be saved by stopping those illegal refunds.

As the official report shows, that gaping hole in the tax collection system grew from \$1 billion a year in 2005 to \$4.2 billion in 2009, as more and more illegal aliens learned about the strategy or were helped by unscrupulous tax preparers. The revenue losses are surely higher today, but the TIGTA report was never updated during the eight years of the Obama administration.

The potential for illegal refunds has existed since the tax credit was first enacted in 2001, but a new member of Congress is determined to end the ripoff. The first bill introduced by newly elected Rep. Drew Ferguson (R-GA) would close the loophole by simply requiring a valid Social Security number to claim the refundable credit. (H.R. 1919)

Stanching the flow of illegal tax refunds would be enough to pay for the wall by itself, but even that's not the biggest source of indirect funding to build the wall. It would also relieve the burden that illegal aliens place on many other programs that make up our taxpayer-funded social safety net for low-income households.

Dr. Steven Camarota explained how this works in

his April 27 testimony before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. The key point is that most of the people who would be stopped by the border wall lack the skills or education that enable them to earn enough to support themselves.

Based on data from the National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Camarota testified that the vast majority of illegal immigrant border-crossers never finished high school, a level of education that is far less than Americans as a whole or even immigrants as a whole. No matter how hard-working they may be, high-school dropouts just can't make it in America without relying on tax-funded programs for food, housing, and medical care.

Dr. Camarota also relied on the monumental 2013 report by Robert Rector, who has long been the leading authority on the 72 means-tested programs which are collectively known as welfare. Rector calculated that the average illegal immigrant imposes a lifetime fiscal cost (benefits consumed minus taxes paid) of \$74,722.

In other words, for every 100,000 people stopped by the wall on the southern border, our nation saves \$7.5 billion in what we would otherwise have to shell out to support them and their families. With that staggering savings, the border wall would clearly pay for itself. It would be the most cost-effective infrastructure we could build.

## **Sessions Warns Sanctuary Cities**

The sanctuary city movement, which gained momentum and arrogance during the eight years of the Obama administration, has finally met its match. Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced on March 27 that cities, counties and states will soon lose billions of dollars of federal assistance if they refuse to assist federal officials charged with enforcing our immigration laws.

The new policy was no surprise, because Donald Trump often spoke out against sanctuary cities throughout his 18-month campaign for president. By announcing the new policy at the White House, using the same podium used for daily press briefings, Sessions confirmed that the president supports his determination to end the lawlessness of local officials.

“Sanctuary cities” are Democrat-controlled places that harbor dangerous illegal aliens and fail to detain them for deportation by the federal government. At least 118 jurisdictions in the United States consider themselves to be sanctuary cities for illegal aliens, and many other cities fail to cooperate with the federal government when a violent illegal alien is apprehended. “Such policies cannot continue,” Sessions announced with the full support of President Trump. “They make our nation less safe by

putting dangerous criminals back on our streets.”

Sessions declared that there will be a new policy of lawfulness concerning sanctuary cities, and that state and local jurisdictions must certify that they are complying with immigration laws in order to continue receiving funding from the federal government. Cities that fail to comply could receive an invoice from the federal government demanding a refund of grants they previously received.

As head of the Department of Justice, Sessions has the authority and means to enforce our immigration laws which have been ignored for so long. The Justice Department doles out billions of dollars of grants to assist local law enforcement, and that money should not be given to local governments that defy federal law. Most sanctuary cities would go bankrupt without the federal subsidies they receive. There is no constitutional right for cities to continue taking handouts from federal taxpayers while also defying federal law.

Despite the clear legality of Attorney General Sessions' statement, the mayors of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco all issued statements reaffirming their sanctuary policies. “President Trump's latest threat changes nothing,” New York Mayor Bill de Blasio declared, vowing that he “won't back down” from his promise to protect illegal residents “from an overzealous administration fixated on xenophobia and needless division.”

In 2016, approximately 279 counties and cities were uncooperative with the federal government in detaining illegal aliens to allow deportation of them, as confirmed by the Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). President Trump has ordered the release of this information, and on the list for lack of cooperation in early 2017 are jails in Boulder County, Colorado; Sioux County, Iowa; Hennepin County, Minnesota; and Chester County, Pennsylvania.

Many of the non-compliant jails are located in Texas, to the dismay of its Republican Governor, Greg Abbott. “I applaud today's bold action by Attorney General Sessions that aims to end sanctuary city policies that endanger American lives,” Governor Abbott declared.

But mayors are preparing lawsuits, with the help of the American Civil Liberties Union, against the U.S. Attorney General. The ACLU recently conducted a nationwide campaign of “Resistance Training” with the goal of turning cities into “safe havens” for illegal aliens and refugees.

The federal courts are packed with activist judges appointed by Democratic presidents, and one of them could order the federal government to continue funding sanctuary cities. This could lead to a showdown that ends

the overreach in power by the federal judiciary, as the Trump Administration could simply stop signing checks payable to the defiant cities.

While liberal mayors defend sanctuary policies, Americans are overwhelmingly opposed. In a survey of 2,148 registered voters by the Harvard-Harris Poll, 80 percent of Americans agreed with the statement: “Cities that arrest illegal immigrants for crimes should be required to turn them over to immigration authorities.”

The Rasmussen survey phrased the question somewhat differently by asking 1,000 likely voters if they wanted their own city to become a sanctuary city. It’s no surprise that a majority said no, and 52 percent also said that sanctuary cities should have their federal funds cut off.

The Harvard-Harris survey also found that most Americans still support a temporary ban on visitors from seven “Muslim majority countries” even after Trump’s executive order was blocked by an activist federal judge. Most of those polled said the federal judge’s ruling made the nation less safe and the number of refugees we accept should be reduced.

## **New Deportation Policies Advance Trump’s Agenda**

General John F. Kelly, as Secretary of Homeland Security, launched a new immigration enforcement agenda with a pair of memos dated February 21. These documents demonstrate that President Trump is serious about halting illegal immigration. Contrary to the liberal hysteria sparked by these memos, they outline in a measured tone the sensible steps to be taken to deport illegal aliens who are dangerous to our citizenry. The era of “big immigration” is officially over.

A six-page memo entitled “Enforcement of the Immigration Laws to Serve the National Interest” was accompanied by its thirteen-page counterpart, “Implementing the President’s Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements Policies.” Signed by Secretary Kelly, these documents provide a blueprint for rolling back the harmful policies of the Obama Administration that weakened our immigration laws.

The number of illegal aliens sent home by the Obama Administration in 2015 was only 333,000, the lowest in a decade and more than 20% below the number of deportations a few years earlier. It was for political reasons that Obama cut back on deportations, in order to appease the liberal base who view illegals as future Democratic voters. Trump’s new guidelines do not change the law, but merely enforce immigration statutes that Obama refused to.

Secretary Kelly’s memos expand deportation to include illegal aliens who have been charged with the commission of a crime regardless of whether they have been convicted. If someone is in this country illegally, then that by itself is contrary to our laws, and our overburdened criminal justice system should not have to obtain a conviction against him before he is sent back to where he came from.

Often persons charged with crimes are free to commit more crimes before they are convicted, as convictions can take many months or years to obtain, and taxpayers should not have to fund criminal defense attorneys to represent illegal aliens in our court system. Sometimes wrongful acts are committed by illegal aliens that do not result in criminal charges, such as obtaining money by fraudulent means. These illegals should also be deported, and Trump’s new policy allows for that.

Illegal aliens who pose a risk to others or to the security of our nation should also be deported immediately without awaiting formal criminal charges or convictions. Secretary Kelly’s new policy sensibly authorizes government officials to make such determinations about illegal aliens and take prompt action to safeguard our country against them. But most deportations still require hearings, and there is a backlog of a year-and-a-half for holding hearings on deportations that are already scheduled.

Many law enforcement programs for dealing with illegal aliens were suspended or not enforced during the Obama Administration. That tied the hands of local police in cities and towns across America that want to rid their communities of the crime brought in by illegal immigration.

Secretary Kelly indicated that the Trump Administration will restore the Secure Communities and 287(g) programs, which facilitate cooperation between local and federal law enforcement with respect to apprehending and removing illegal aliens. The 287(g) program allows local police to act like immigration agents under appropriate federal regulation and supervision, while Secure Communities allows aliens suspected of having committed crimes to remain in local custody before they are handed over to federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents.

Within hours of the announcement of Secretary Kelly’s new policies, ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations criticized New York City for releasing from confinement an illegal alien who is a self-described member of a violent street gang. Fortunately ICE was able to track down and arrest him again for deportation.

## Missile Defense Needed Against North Korea

North Korea is under the thumb of a communist dictator who has nuclear weapons that threaten to strike our West Coast and our allies in South Korea and Japan. Among many crises dumped by Obama on President Trump, this may be the worst.

The optimal approach for dealing with the rogue state of North Korea is as obvious as building a border wall to stop illegal aliens from pouring into our country from Mexico. The equivalent of a wall, an effective missile defense system, should be installed around North Korea.

We have long had the ability to develop this, more so with each passing day as our technology improves. So why don't we have a combat-ready missile defense system to install immediately to shut down the frightening threat posed by Kim Jong-un of North Korea?

It is not due to a lack of resources or high-tech know-how that our missile defense system is not as advanced as our iPhones, Androids, and driverless cars. Our annual spending on defense (including pensions and veterans benefits) approaches a trillion dollars a year, more than the market value of Apple Computer or any other company in Silicon Valley.

The United States announced on May 2 that our Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system was successfully installed and is "operational" in South Korea, but THAAD may not intercept the intermediate-range missiles that North Korea has been deploying. Relying on THAAD is like continuing to use an outdated flip cell phone.

A high-tech missile defense system that intercepts enemy missiles in the boost phase, as envisioned by the "Brilliant Pebbles" system developed in the late 1980s at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, would cost only about \$20 billion today. Brilliant Pebbles was cancelled by President Bill Clinton in order to pander to globalism.

Globalists have long opposed using American technology to build missile defense, just as they oppose building a border wall to stop illegal immigration. Globalism favors a less sovereign United States, one that is more dependent on the United Nations and international power brokers.

Globalists have interfered with missile defense development for a half-century, dating back to 1966, when Phyllis Schlafly advocated for the Nike X missile defense system. Nike did not stand for an athletic shoe then, but for the Greek goddess representing victory in both war and peace.

In her best-selling book *Strike from Space*, first

published in 1965, Phyllis pointed out that development of a missile defense system would weaken the resolve of the Soviet Union and could have dissuaded them from continuing to fund the war of attrition in Vietnam. Nearly two decades later in 1983, again at the urging of Phyllis, President Ronald Reagan promoted the development of a similar program to win the Cold War.

In a speech delivered in October 1966 – more than 50 years ago – Phyllis Schlafly urged globalist Robert McNamara to drop his opposition to the Nike X missile defense program. McNamara was the longest-serving Secretary of Defense in American history, dictating policy under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations. Phyllis explained that "American technological genius has developed a marvelous new weapon which can give us the anti-missile defense we need. It is called the Nike X. It has been developed, and thoroughly tested, so that we know it is reliable and ready to go into production."

Arguments against missile defense are almost too silly to repeat. On one hand critics insisted that it is impossible to build, but then on the other hand they contradicted themselves by asserting that it would be destabilizing to construct one successfully.

President Reagan persevered against the naysayers, and his refusal to abandon this program was a major cause of the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union, as the Soviets realized they could not keep up with our technological advances. When the Gulf War broke out during the presidency of the first George Bush in 1991, the newly developed "Patriot" missile defense system played a spectacular role in shooting down missiles launched by Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein.

Phyllis Schlafly referred to opponents of missile defense as "the gravediggers," because their senseless opposition to defending us against enemy attack was akin to digging graves for us. It is inevitable that an attention-seeking dictator will get control of a nuclear arsenal and start launching missiles far and wide. That day may arrive soon, in the form of North Korean dictator Kim Jong-un.

With so many technological advances in every other walk of life, now is the time for a new "Manhattan Project" to upgrade and perfect our missile defense systems.

### The Phyllis Schlafly Report

PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002

ISSN0556-0152

Published monthly by the Eagle Trust Fund, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Periodicals Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, PO Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Phone: (618) 462-5415.

Subscription Price: \$20 per year. Extra copies available: 50¢ each; 10 copies \$4; 30 copies \$8; 100 copies \$15; 1,000 copies \$100.

[www.phyllisschlafly.com](http://www.phyllisschlafly.com)

[www.pseagles.com](http://www.pseagles.com)