

REPORT FROM THE TRENCHES: NEW HAMPSHIRE.

- **METHODIST CHURCH, CATHOLIC BISHOPS, IMMIGRATION LAWYERS OPPOSE MAKING HUMAN SMUGGLING A CRIME.**
- **REP. TIMOTHY ROBERTSON (D-KEENE) TELLS WITNESS WITH WHOM HE DISAGREES: "YOU'RE NOT ALLOWED BACK."**

As the tidal wave of illegal aliens overwhelms all corners of the United States, most Americans stubbornly adhere to a concept of sovereignty that says it should be they, not Vicente Fox, who make immigration policy. They recognize they are deprived of a voice in Washington by the members of the House of Lords, and a president who is deaf to their wishes and cares nothing for the erosion of economic and physical security that he and his dominant partner, President Fox, are imposing on American citizens.

As a result of the domination of the Senate by the likes of John McCain (the Manchurian Senator receives 85% of his campaign contributions from outside the state he allegedly represents); Americans are now acting through their state legislatures and municipal officials. The tide is shifting, putting the open borders lobbyists on the defensive. They are scared and as they become more desperate the lies they spread in their attempts to fight these bills become more outrageous.

New Hampshire legislators recently introduced House Bill 1642, making human smuggling a crime under state law. Lobbyists representing the Catholic Bishop of New Hampshire, the New England Conference of the United Methodist Church and the American Immigration Lawyer's Association (AILA) testified in opposition to the bill.

It will come as no surprise whatever that AILA favors human smuggling, but it did seem a little strange that the Catholic and United Methodist Churches have, in effect, formally expressed their support for the smuggling human beings. Perhaps it is that these two lobbying groups, like the AILA lawyers, are now so in need of new customers that the deaths of some recruits abandoned by smugglers in locked semi-trailers in the desert, the enslavement of others, or the gang rape of still others, no longer bothers them.

New England, birthplace of the first Minuteman Movement (the one that turned the world upside down for an earlier and equally tone-deaf George) is home to Chief Garrett Chamberlain of the New Ipswich, NH police department, the man who launched a second Boston Tea Party by arresting an illegal alien and charging him with violating state trespassing law for being in New Hampshire while in violation of immigration law. The Chief's efforts were thwarted by a low level state judge playing at interpreting the US Constitution, who threw out the charge as a violation of the rights granted by that document to illegal aliens. The judge was then, in effect upheld, by the illegal alien-friendly State Attorney General who refused to appeal, thus frustrating Chief Chamberlain's attempt to help secure America's borders.

Now, members of the state's House of Representatives are fighting back. Several Representatives have introduced House Bill 1137 that will alter state law so that illegals in the state will be guilty of trespassing. This will give Chief Chamberlain and other N.H. police officers clear statutory authority for arresting illegals and will force Attorney General, Kelly Ayotte, to pursue an appeal.

HB 1137 is part of a package of bills. In addition are HB 1318 (modeled after Arizona's Prop 200) prohibiting provision to illegals of non-emergency, non federally mandated public services; HB 1151, prohibiting employment of illegal aliens; HB 1666, authorizing a memorandum of understanding between New Hampshire and the US Department of Homeland Security to enable state and local peace officers to enforce immigration law;

and HB 1229-FN, and HB 1482, increasing penalties for use of false documents in registering motor vehicles and obtaining state services.

The Representatives who introduced these bills deserve the thanks of all who want our borders secured. They are: Andrew Renzullo, David Buhlman, Daniel Itse, .Paul Mirski, Robert Rowe, Lee Slocum Jordan Ulery, and Maurice Villeneuve,

On January 11, I traveled with Joan Molinaro to Concord to testify in support of these bills in the Criminal Justice Committee of the House. (Joan, a fellow member of 9/11 Families for a Secure America, lost her son Carl, a NYC fireman, in the September 11 attacks). Naturally, the usual suspects were there to oppose these bills: representatives of the American Immigration Lawyers Ass'n, the New England Conference of the United Methodist Church, the Catholic Bishop of New Hampshire, along with other lobbying outfits.

The experience of our members in a dozen states while fighting bills that would grant drivers' licenses to illegal aliens shows that the claims the Open Borders Lobby will allege in opposing secure borders legislation do not vary from state to state. What the lobbyist for Catholic Church says in New Hampshire will be repeated by the Immigration Lawyers' lobbyist in Kansas, the ACLU in Tennessee, the Chamber of Commerce in Illinois, La Raza in North Carolina, and the Methodist Church in New York.

Therefore what the open borders lobbyists stated in their testimony in New Hampshire will no doubt be repeated everywhere else. To prepare fellow secure border activists for the legislative battles in other states, here are the objections raised by the Open Borders Lobby (*in italics*) along with some suggested responses. (UNDERLINED).

By the way, during the hearing Representative Timothy Robertson (D-Open Borders Lobby, and town of Keene), evidenced a rather peculiar concept of freedom. He stated that these bills would be the subject of future discussions. I responded that "I'd be happy to come back and speak again." His answer: "You're not allowed back." Observers, including the Chairman expressed amazement at this. Clearly, Representative Robertson would like to create a system of laws in New Hampshire which welcomes illegal aliens but bars entry to those who disagree with his views...even if they are citizens.

Claims made by lobbyists for Catholic Church, Methodist Church, AILA, etc are in italics.

THE FACTS ARE STATED IN UNDERLINED CAPITAL LETTERS

1. *"Homeless illegals would be thrown onto the streets on cold New Hampshire winter nights if these laws are enacted."*

NO ONE IS EVEN SUGGESTING THAT ANY FORM OF EMERGENCY HUMANITARIAN AID EVER BE DENIED ANYONE REGARDLESS OF ILLEGAL PRESENCE IN THE US.

2. *"People who are ill, even little children, would be denied emergency medical treatment if these laws are enacted."*

FEDERAL LAW REQUIRES THAT ANYONE WHO GOES TO AN EMERGENCY ROOM BE GIVEN TREATMENT. THE EXISTENCE OF THIS LAW IS KNOWN BY ALL THOSE WHO HELP ILLEGAL ALIENS. IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO BELIEVE THAT THE LOBBYISTS MAKING THIS CLAIM DON'T KNOW THAT THEY ARE LYING.

3. *"Taxi drivers, bus drivers, etc would be prosecuted for aiding illegal aliens if they picked up a passenger who was illegal."*

ONLY PEOPLE WHO KNOWINGLY PROVIDE AID TO ILLEGALS WOULD BE SUBJECT TO PROSECUTION.

4. *“Enforcement of these laws would require New Hampshire to create an entire bureaucracy to determine who is legal and who is legal to determine who can get government services.”*

A SIMPLE PHONE CALL TO A TOLL FREE PHONE SERVICE PROVIDED BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ALREADY EXISTS TO IDENTIFY WHO IS LEGAL AND WHO ISN'T. NO “NEW BUREAUCRACY” IS NEEDED.

THESE LAWS WILL SAVE N.H. TAXPAYERS LARGE SUMS BECAUSE SERVICES WON'T BE PROVIDED TO THOSE WHO ARE NOT ENTITLED TO THEM BECAUSE THEY ARE ILLEGAL ALIENS.

5. *“If a locality or the state mistakenly denies services to a person who is legally in this country, the immigration lawyers will file suit and cost the towns millions in damages.”*

ARIZONA'S PROP 200 HAS ALREADY WITHSTOOD FEDERAL CHALLENGE. UNLESS LOCAL OFFICIALS INTENTIONALLY DENY BENEFITS TO CITIZENS AND LEGAL RESIDENT ALIENS, THEY NEED NOT BE CONCERNED.

6. *Lobbyists for the Catholic Church and the Methodist Church claimed that the “beliefs of their religion require members to violate laws on immigration and also require them to lobby for changes in the law.”*

-IT IS NOT THE PRIVILEGE OF ANY CHURCH TO CHOOSE WHICH LAWS TO OBEY AND WHICH TO VIOLATE.

- BECAUSE OF THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE IT IS NOT THE PLACE OF THE STATE LEGISLATURE TO ENACT INTO LAW THE TENETS OF ANY RELIGION.

- IF THESE CHURCHES USE THEIR PULPITS TO LOBBY FOR OR AGAINST LEGISLATION, THEIR PRIVILEGES AS NON-PROFIT TAX EXEMPT 501C3 CORPORATIONS SHOULD BE REVOKED.

3. *The paperwork required to become a citizen is “too hard” and there is too much of it.*

OVER 1,000,000 LEGAL IMMIGRANTS PER YEAR COMPLETE THAT PAPERWORK AND BECOME CITIZENS. IT IS APPARENTLY NOT “TOO HARD” FOR THEM.

4. *“Enactment of laws that secure our borders will “tear families apart” by keeping people from illegally entering the USA.”*

THIS ARGUMENT WAS MADE BY REV. WE CHANG OF THE METHODIST CHURCH, HIMSELF A LEGAL IMMIGRANT.

MR. CHANG SPOKE OF HIS SEPARATION FROM HIS UNCLE. THE FACT IS, MR. CHANG WAS NOT FORCED TO LEAVE KOREA OR TO COME TO THE US IN CHAINS. HE VOLUNTARILY MADE THE DECISION TO LEAVE HIS COUNTRY AND HE MADE THE DECISION TO SEPARATE HIMSELF FROM HIS UNCLE. THE SAME IS TRUE OF ALL ILLEGALS. THEY VOLUNTARILY DECIDE TO SEPARATE THEMSELVES FROM THEIR FAMILIES BY SNEAKING INTO THE US.

ALL ILLEGAL ALIENS, AND MR. CHANG, CAN EASILY CHOOSE TO REUNITE WITH THEIR FAMILIES BY GOING BACK TO THEIR HOME COUNTRIES.
