



The Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 51, NO. 5

P.O. BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002

DECEMBER 2017

Dream on, Establishment

If money talks, the loudest noise in America would be an article entitled “Congress must act on the dreamers.” Legislation to protect the 690,000 illegal aliens known as Dreamers, the article insists, “is a political, economic and moral imperative.”

A movement is afoot either to slip this into a final 2017 bill when few are watching, or to make it a litmus test for candidates seeking to raise campaign cash for races next year. Just before Christmas, a bipartisan deal was negotiated to put Dreamers into the spending bill that must be passed before January 19, 2018, to avert a government shutdown.

“Delay is not an option,” the authors wrote on December 14, ignoring the backlog of unfinished business in Washington. “Congress must act before the end of the year.”

The joint op-ed was signed by Charles Koch, who shares a \$97 billion fortune with his brother David. The Koch brothers are aligned with the “never Trump” Republicans who have undermined much of President Trump’s agenda.

Charles Koch is a businessman, and he likes to get his money’s worth when he spends it. After striking out the past two years with their political agenda, the Koch network of mega-donors could be making support of DACA a litmus test for Republican primary candidates in the 2018 election cycle. Republican candidates would be wise to decline, just as candidate Trump declined support by the Koch network, and won anyway on a platform of opposing illegal immigration.

Koch was joined by co-author Tim Cook, who succeeded the late Steve Jobs as CEO of Apple. Cook supports many liberal causes, and was criticized by candidate Trump for how Apple would not cooperate in unlocking the iPhone of a terrorist who went on the killing rampage in San Bernardino two years ago.

Cook’s corporate practices at Apple hardly commend him to lecture about what is best for America. Apple stashes hundreds of billions of dollars – that’s billions,

not millions – of its profits overseas in order to avoid paying taxes in the United States, and thereby avoid investing it in American workers here. Apple’s claim of employing a few hundred Dreamers – far less than 1% of its workforce – in mostly low-skill jobs would not ordinarily attract the attention of a CEO. But Cook and Koch would give America’s entitlements not just to the Dreamers, but to all illegal aliens and millions more who want to come here from other countries.

Cook and Koch declare in supporting DACA, “If ever there were an occasion to come together to help people improve their lives, this is it.” But where is the compassion for helping Americans improve their lives, which ending benefits for illegal aliens would do?

Senator Jeff Flake was a frequent attendee at the Koch conferences of donors, and he has remained anti-Trump to this day. All that got him was a disapproval rating so high in his home state of Arizona that he resigned at a young age rather than even try for reelection. Now Senator Flake is leading a group of other anti-Trump senators, including Lindsey Graham (R-SC), to try to forge a deal with Democrats to protect these illegal aliens.

The day after the Koch-Cook article appeared in the *Washington Post*, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) issued a report throwing cold water on the bum’s rush to protect the Dreamers. The CBO estimates that legalizing Dreamers would cost taxpayers \$25.9 billion over the next decade. The CBO explains why the costs of Dreamers would far exceed any benefit that Americans would ever see. Once legalized, the Dreamers would become eligible for the full array of benefits for the working poor including Obamacare, Medicaid, food stamps, and much more.

Dreamers would consume more benefits and pay less taxes than the average American because their skills and education are so much lower. Even though most Dreamers are now in their twenties or thirties, for

example, more than half of them never finished high school. Part of the skills gap is because Dreamers were never required to demonstrate English fluency, and many are functionally illiterate. Of those who signed up for DACA, many required the help of a translator to fill out the form.

The CBO estimates the cost of all those federal benefits at \$27 billion over 10 years, while only \$1 billion of new tax revenue would be generated from Dreamers moving “out of the shadows” to regular employment. Combining those two amounts produces a net cost of \$26 billion.

Even in Washington, where the federal budget is measured in trillions, \$26 billion is real money. And that number almost surely understates the true cost by a wide margin. Once they are legalized, Dreamers would have the right to legalize their relatives in a never-ending process called chain migration. The relatives are not vetted and typically have even lower skills than the immigrant who sponsors them.

Democrats are acutely aware of the value of \$26 billion, whether or not they are willing to admit it where the Dreamers are concerned. Trump’s border wall, which Democrats consider exorbitantly expensive, would cost only \$21.6 billion according to a study conducted by the Department of Homeland Security in February of this year.

Rather than spending \$26 billion on keeping illegal immigrants here, perhaps we should be spending that money to build the wall and keep illegals out.

No Peace at the Border

On the first day of Thanksgiving week, U.S. Border Patrol agent Rogelio Martinez died and an unidentified second agent was seriously injured as they patrolled a lonely stretch of Interstate 10 in west Texas, near the Mexican border. The agents’ injuries were apparently caused by grapefruit-sized rocks thrown by men who had illegally crossed the border in an area where, as the *New York Times* reports, “drug and human trafficking are common.”

U.S. Border Patrol has tallied 720 assaults on border officers in the last fiscal year, and 38 agents have been killed in the line of duty since 2003. You’d think the dangerous assaults on federal agents would have given pause to the federal judge in San Francisco who was considering a lawsuit challenging President Trump’s crackdown on sanctuary cities, but no. Judge William Orrick went right ahead that same night with his 28-page order declaring a nationwide permanent injunction against the president’s effort to punish sanctuary cities with the loss of federal funds. Judge Orrick was named

to the federal bench in 2013 after he bundled at least \$200,000 for Obama and donated another \$30,800 to groups supporting him.

As U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions said in his address last month to the Federalist Society, “an increasing number of district courts are taking the dramatic step of issuing nationwide injunctions that block the entire U.S. government from enforcing a statute nationwide. In effect, single judges are making themselves super-legislators for the entire United States.”

“The Supreme Court has consistently and repeatedly made clear that courts should limit relief to the parties before them,” General Sessions continued. “So if lower courts continue to ignore that precedent, then the Supreme Court should send that message again.” The Supreme Court did send that message again on December 4, ruling 7-2 that the injunctions issued by federal judges in Hawaii and Maryland cannot be enforced until the Supreme Court has a chance to review them.

In October, California became a sanctuary state when Governor Jerry Brown signed a law that limits what state and local officials can say to federal immigration officers about people detained by police or awaiting trial. It also prohibits law enforcement from inquiring about a person’s immigration status. The law, known as SB 54, was championed by state senate president pro tem Kevin de León, who is running to replace Dianne Feinstein in the U.S. Senate. If elected, he would represent a state that is home to more than 2.3 million illegal aliens – a state where 45 percent of the population told the Census Bureau that a language other than English is spoken at home.

The harm of sanctuary policies is illustrated by the case of Nery Israel Estrada-Margos, who was arrested by Santa Rosa, California police on August 18 after allegedly beating his girlfriend, Veronica Cabrera Ramirez, to death. The illegal alien had been arrested two weeks earlier, on August 2, for domestic violence, but released because he had no prior convictions.

The sheriff of Santa Rosa County, which has its own sanctuary policy, defended the prior release by claiming he gave a heads-up to agents of the federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). In fact, local officials gave ICE only 16 minutes to travel over 60 miles, and the man was gone by the time ICE got there.

Similar atrocities have occurred in other sanctuary jurisdictions, which are mostly found in the 20 so-called blue states that voted for Hillary Clinton for president. In the Maryland suburbs near Washington, D.C., Montgomery County officials ignored a detainer from ICE in order to release Mario Granados-Alvarado, who broke into an unmarked police car and stole an AR-15

and ammunition from the officer's trunk.

Near the town of Brentwood on New York's Long Island, three more young bodies were found bearing the marks of ritual killing by the gang called MS-13. They were Angel Soler, 15, from Honduras, who had been hacked to death with a machete; Javier Castillo, 16, from El Salvador; and Kerin Pineda, 19, from Honduras.

In Massachusetts, the popular columnist and talk-show host Howie Carr identified an assortment of violent crimes recently committed by "Third World illegal-alien criminals." Over the course of just a few weeks, a Cambodian, an African, a Salvadoran, a Dominican, a Vietnamese, a Chinese, and a Liberian were charged or convicted of murder, assault, drug trafficking, identity fraud and resisting a federal officer.

Pardon Shuts Down Judicial Activism

In pardoning Sheriff Joe Arpaio, President Trump illustrated why he is a cut above other politicians. Without waiting for judicial activism to drag on for years in the Ninth Circuit, Trump used his constitutional authority to stop the long-running witch-hunt against a good man who has devoted 50 years to law enforcement.

Trump's pardon of Sheriff Joe was the kind of Trumpesque move that millions of Americans have been waiting for. Trump acted on his own instincts, and perhaps even against his legal advisers who have been urging him to adapt to business-as-usual in D.C., rather than changing it.

Trump's audacious pardon confirmed why Phyllis Schlafly saw in Donald Trump something she had not seen in any other presidential candidate since she wrote her classic *A Choice Not An Echo* more than 50 years ago. Sheriff Joe is hated by the kingmakers who want open borders, and Trump's pardon delivered a stunning setback to their globalist agenda.

In 2012, Phyllis wrote about how the pro-amnesty crowd waged an expensive campaign that year to defeat Sheriff Joe, but he won his reelection at the age of 81. Sheriff Joe stood up against Obama, and liberals have been determined for years to punish Joe.

A decade ago, Phyllis and others repeatedly urged President George W. Bush to pardon two courageous border patrol agents, Ignacio Ramos and Jose Alonso Compean, who had been unjustly sentenced to 11 and 12 years in prison for doing their job in shooting a drug smuggler near the Mexican border. The smuggler was merely wounded in his buttocks, while our border patrol agents were sent to prison for more than a decade.

George W. Bush would not pardon the agents, even after one of them suffered a beating in prison at the hands of convicts hostile to law enforcement agents. Instead,

GWB waited until his last full day in office, and then merely commuted their sentences, leaving the agents to linger for additional weeks in prison and be hampered in finding good jobs after they were finally released.

President Trump's decisive pardon of Sheriff Joe is in welcome contrast to the effete leadership of the past. Sheriff Joe was elected six times by the fourth largest county in America, Maricopa County in Arizona, a hotbed of illegal immigration and widespread crime caused by the illegals whom Joe worked overtime to arrest.

Trump's pardon of Sheriff Joe was a necessary step to curb the misuse of the federal courts, which are now stacked with Obama and Clinton appointments who repeatedly rule in favor of liberal groups and against the will of the American people. In what took GWB years to do only incompletely on his last full day in office, it took only a few days for Trump to do completely at the first opportunity.

The ACLU did not like Sheriff Joe's approach to illegal immigration, and they used the federal courts to take punitive action against him. Without the benefit of a jury trial, a federal judge held that the publicly elected Sheriff Joe was in criminal contempt in how he did his job in protecting the American people against illegal aliens.

The court ruling was contrary to the testimony of every witness in Sheriff Joe's civil case, which had been brought by the ACLU. Sheriff Joe, now age 85, faced six months in jail and further litigation that would bankrupt him. Presidents should not wait for the legal system to destroy anyone before issuing a pardon to cut off the abuse. The justice in President Trump's pardon is not merely that he exonerated Sheriff Joe, but that President Trump did it quickly to prevent further injustice against this hero.

Although the presidential power to pardon is clear, criticism of Trump has ranged from the inane to the absurd. Some even objected that President Trump issued his pardon of Sheriff Joe during Hurricane Harvey, as though a president should allow a natural disaster to block his decision-making on all other important issues. Trump pointed out to a hostile press corps that President Clinton issued many pardons of shady characters. Obama, for his part, granted a record number of commutations while he was president, none as distinguished as Sheriff Joe.

Prior Republican presidents would have been too cowardly to pardon Sheriff Joe, and Republican leadership in Congress pathetically criticizes Trump now. But the need to check judicial supremacy requires acting promptly to block the overreach, and Trump's pardon of Sheriff Joe proved why he was Phyllis Schlafly's choice, not an echo.

Amid More Terrorism, Question Diversity

“There have now been two terrorist attacks in New York City in recent weeks carried out by foreign nationals here on green cards,” President Trump told an impromptu news conference shortly after a pipe bomb attack by a Bangladeshi Muslim immigrant. “The first attacker came through the visa lottery and the second through chain migration.”

“We’re going to end both of them – the lottery system and chain migration,” the president declared. “We’re going to end them – fast.”

The first terrorist attack occurred on Halloween when Sayfullo Saipov, a Muslim immigrant from Uzbekistan, drove a rented truck through a crowd of pedestrians and cyclists, killing 8 and injuring 12. Saipov had sworn allegiance to ISIS and reportedly asked to display the ISIS flag in his hospital room where he was recovering from a gunshot wound.

Saipov came to the United States in 2010 after winning the annual lottery for 50,000 visas which our government foolishly grants to people from the most diverse countries, defined as those that sent fewer than 50,000 immigrants to the United States during the previous five years. Over a million people without skills have received one of these so-called diversity visas since the program began, and the average recipient brings three relatives to settle here permanently.

In the latest attack, Akayed Ullah, a Muslim immigrant from Bangladesh, set off a pipe bomb in the crowded tunnel that links Times Square to the nation’s busiest bus terminal, which serves over 200,000 passengers each weekday. Ullah reportedly told police that he chose that location partly because he was triggered by nearby Christmas posters.

Ullah came to the United States in 2011 after qualifying for an F43 visa as the child of a sibling of a U.S. citizen (his uncle) through what’s called “extended family chain migration.” He was one of 141,501 immigrants who have entered the U.S. from Bangladesh through chain migration since 2005, an astounding number equal to the population of Dayton, Ohio.

The same day the President vowed to end the visa lottery and chain migration, Attorney General Jeff Sessions said the men who committed the two New York attacks were in the United States “as a result of failed immigration policies.” As Sessions explained, this “20-year-old son of the sister of a U.S. citizen should not get priority to come to this country ahead of someone who is high-skilled, well educated, has learned English, and is likely to assimilate and flourish here.”

President Trump points out that the United States “must fix its lax immigration system, which allows

far too many dangerous, inadequately vetted people” into our country. Trump was elected president in large part because Americans applauded the strength of his commitment to put Americans first and protect our borders against politically correct notions of multiculturalism and diversity.

Congressman Steve King echoed an observation made by the prime minister of Hungary that diversity can lead to a lower quality of life, not a higher one. What is needed is not diversity as much as assimilation, in order to remain a secure and prosperous nation. “Assimilation has become a dirty word to the multiculturalist Left,” King wisely observed. “Assimilation, not diversity, is our American strength.”

Supporters of diversity insist that immigrant terrorists became radicalized after they arrived in the United States. Even if true, that’s all the more reason to oppose such immigrants because they are not assimilating themselves into our society, and instead are trying to destroy it.

The Boston Marathon bomber, Tamerlan Tsarnaev, is cited as an example of someone who supposedly became a terrorist after coming to America, but Tsarnaev was probably trained by his trip to the Chechen region of Russia in 2012. He was then allowed back into the United States despite his highly suspicious stay abroad, and the House Homeland Security Committee Chairman, Michael McCaul, expressed dismay at why the FBI did not pick up on this.

Akayed Ullah repeatedly traveled to Bangladesh in recent months before initiating his attack here. Is this the same mistake, which was made in letting Tsarnaev back in after a suspicious trip abroad, being made again and again?

One of the first executive orders by President Trump was to issue his so-called travel ban to restrict immigration from certain countries associated with terrorism. Liberals then filed multiple lawsuits to block his Executive Order from going into effect. On December 4th the Supreme Court ruled 7-2 that President Trump’s modified travel ban can be enforced while liberals challenge it in lower courts.

It took nearly all of 2017 for the courts to allow the ban that President Trump first issued back in January to be enforced in a revised form. Better late than never.

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

www.pseagles.com