

# **BORDER WARS**

**The Impact of Immigration on the Latino Vote**

**by Richard Nadler**



Americas Majority Foundation  
October, 2007



blank page

# BORDER WARS:

The Impact of Immigration on the Latino Vote

By Richard Nadler  
Americas Majority Foundation  
*Cover art by Bob Parks*

Americas Majority Foundation  
© October 2007

## Projected Impact of "Enforcement Only" on Hispanic Presidential Vote, 2008

Area	Hisp pop.	% of US Hisp pop.	1st scenario: Democrat gains, GOP "enforce-only"	2nd scenario: Democrat gains, Hisp full-weight turnout	Bush minus Kerry totals, from 2004
<b>USA</b>	41,882,446	100.00%	<b>3,514,678</b>	<b>4,756,636</b>	<b>3,158,211</b>
CA	12,534,628	29.93%	1,051,877	1,423,572	(1,235,659)
TX	7,882,254	18.82%	661,460	895,196	1,694,213
<b>FL</b>	3,433,355	8.20%	288,119	<b>389,930</b>	<b>380,978</b>
NY	3,026,286	7.23%	253,959	343,699	(1,351,713)
IL	1,807,908	4.32%	151,715	205,326	(545,604)
AZ	1,679,116	4.01%	140,908	190,699	210,770
NJ	1,312,326	3.13%	110,127	149,042	(241,427)
<b>CO</b>	895,176	2.14%	75,121	<b>101,666</b>	<b>99,523</b>
<b>NM</b>	827,940	1.98%	<b>69,479</b>	<b>94,030</b>	<b>5,988</b>
GA	625,382	1.49%	52,481	71,025	548,105
<b>NV</b>	557,370	1.33%	<b>46,773</b>	<b>63,301</b>	<b>21,500</b>
WA	546,209	1.30%	45,837	62,034	(205,307)
NC	544,470	1.30%	45,691	61,836	435,317
MA	489,662	1.17%	41,091	55,611	(732,691)
PA	488,144	1.17%	40,964	55,439	(144,248)
VA	440,988	1.05%	37,007	50,083	262,217
MI	378,232	0.90%	31,740	42,956	(165,437)
CT	372,718	0.89%	31,278	42,330	(163,662)
OR	360,000	0.86%	30,210	40,886	(76,332)
MD	311,191	0.74%	26,114	35,342	(309,790)
IN	273,004	0.65%	22,910	31,005	510,427
UT	264,010	0.63%	22,155	29,984	422,543
OH	253,014	0.60%	21,232	28,735	118,599
WI	230,715	0.55%	19,361	26,203	(11,384)
OK	218,987	0.52%	18,377	24,871	455,826
KS	218,244	0.52%	18,315	24,786	301,463
MN	185,464	0.44%	15,564	21,063	(98,319)
TN	171,890	0.41%	14,425	19,522	347,898
MO	154,744	0.37%	12,986	17,574	196,542
SC	136,616	0.33%	11,464	15,516	276,275
ID	135,733	0.32%	11,390	15,415	228,137
AR	130,328	0.31%	10,937	14,801	102,945
LA	126,856	0.30%	10,645	14,407	281,870
NE	124,504	0.30%	10,448	14,140	258,486
RI	114,077	0.27%	9,573	12,956	(90,714)
HI	103,764	0.25%	8,708	11,785	(37,517)
<b>IA</b>	102,047	0.24%	8,564	<b>11,590</b>	<b>10,059</b>
AL	98,624	0.24%	8,276	11,201	482,461
KT	65,177	0.16%	5,470	7,402	356,706
DE	50,007	0.12%	4,196	5,679	(28,492)
MS	48,795	0.12%	4,095	5,542	191,215
WY	36,722	0.09%	3,082	4,171	96,853
AK	29,219	0.07%	2,452	3,318	79,864
NH	24,248	0.06%	2,035	2,754	(9,274)
MT	21,970	0.05%	1,844	2,495	92,353
ME	12,407	0.03%	1,041	1,409	(66,641)
SD	12,311	0.03%	1,033	1,398	83,340
ND	11,380	0.03%	955	1,292	85,599
WV	9,760	0.02%	819	1,108	97,237
VT	4,474	0.01%	375	508	(62,887)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>41,882,446</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,514,678</b>	<b>4,756,636</b>	<b>3,158,211</b>

# Table of Contents

Preface, *by Richard Nadler*

– page 4

Executive Summary & Key Findings

– page 6

Chapter 1: On the Border

– page 10

Chapter 2: Hispanic Precinct Study

– page 20

Chapter 3:

-- How “Enforcement-Only” Will Effect the Latino  
Presidential Vote in 2008

– page 46

# Preface

A sustained battle rages within our nation over immigration reform. Advocates of “enforcement only” envision a future in which most of the 12 million aliens illegally resident in the U.S. are removed, by means coercive, voluntary, or some combination thereof. Advocates of “comprehensive immigration reform” (CIR) prefer to combine border security with amnesty<sup>1</sup> for most of the undocumented.

The impact of the immigration debate on the Hispanic vote has engendered much speculation. Pundits of the Left point to the steep drop in Latino support for GOP candidates recorded in the 2006 exit polls. Pundits of the Right point to the relatively low priority that Latino citizens place on the subject of immigration vis-à-vis other issues, and their documented support for border security.

A great deal of research has focused on what Hispanics say about immigration. Considerably less has assessed how they *vote* on it. This is not wholly surprising. Hispanics have had little opportunity to cast ballots on “enforcement only.” Advocates of that approach do not, by and large, live where Hispanics do. Tom Tancredo’s congressional district has fewer than 6% Hispanics; Jim Sensenbrenner’s, barely 2%.

And where Latinos do live, “enforcement only” has been marginalized politically. There are nine congressional districts that straddle the U.S.-Mexico border, from California’s 51<sup>st</sup> to Texas’ 27<sup>th</sup>. In Chapter 1, we examine the immigration politics of each. The districts are extremely diverse, both ethnically and politically. But they share some features. All nine suffer problems associated with immigration. All nine enjoy benefits associated with immigration. And all nine elect congressmen who support CIR as the framework to mitigate the former while preserving the latter.

But 2006 provided a rare opportunity to assess how, and to what extent, “enforcement only” would affect Hispanic voters. In three districts of the southwest, two of them on the U.S.-Mexico border, Republican candidates publicly advocated a policy of “enforcement first,” including stiff criminal penalties for the undocumented and those who employed them, and deportation of illegals by actions both direct and indirect. Two of the three explicitly repudiated “comprehensive immigration reform” as amnesty; the third voted for H.R. 4437, which enacted enforcement without addressing amnesty.

How did Hispanic voters react to such policies? And were their reactions strong enough to distinguish from general electoral trends?

---

<sup>1</sup> This author will dodge neither this word, nor its opposite: deportation. If, at the end of reform, the illegals remain, amnesty has been granted. If, at the end of reform, the illegals are removed, then deportation has occurred.

Chapter 2 of this analysis -- the “Hispanic Precinct Study” – examines results. With the help of *Aristotle Consultants*, an election data-management firm, we isolated 145 heavily Hispanic voting blocks – generally precincts -- in three Congressional districts of the Southwest where an enforcement-only candidate faced off against an advocate of CIR. To distinguish trends apparent in these precincts from national Latino voting patterns, we separately analyzed canvas results from Hispanic areas of three Congressional districts where the CIR consensus was unchallenged.

All in all, we recorded 113,980 votes from the 2004 election, and 71,147 from 2006.

Aristotle’s Dan Blackwell describes the process through which the target precincts were selected:

“My process for determining high (greater than 66%) Hispanic percentage precincts was first, to output a list of all census blocks in the given congressional district. This output gave me registered voters in each census block as well as percent Hispanic population in each census block. This Hispanic percentage data was taken from the 2000 US Census. I then grouped these census blocks by their respective precincts and took the weighted average of Hispanic population in the entire precinct by using a weighted average formula.

“My weighted average function for each Precinct:

$$\text{Sum } (\% \text{ Hispanic of census block} * \text{total voters in census block}) / (\text{total number of voters within the precinct})$$

“I then correlated these high Hispanic Precincts with the election results published by the appropriate Secretary of State for the 2004 and 2006 Congressional races in their respective districts.”

Chapter 2 documents the results. We found that the adoption of “enforcement only” by Republican congressional candidates in 2006 was associated with steep declines in their party’s Hispanic vote share compared to 2004.

In Chapter 3, we use the findings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> chapter to project, state-by-state, the impact that “enforcement only” could have on the Latino vote in the upcoming presidential election.

The study that follows is a heavily charted recitation of recent Latino voting patterns, with the most objective analysis I can muster in an environment fraught with variables.

But I will state my subjective conclusion here. *Any policy that induces mass fear in illegal aliens will induce mass anger in legal aliens.*

Does this sound extreme? Does it sound like a non-sequitur? It is neither. The implicit moral hazard associated with decades of non-enforcement of immigration laws becomes explicit with enforcement-only. Ties of family, culture, and a shared media will communicate the fears of the group directly threatened – the illegals -- to other Latinos who are not. The profiling inevitable with the enforcement of previously flouted immigration laws will intensify the attendant emotions. To the authorities, every Latino becomes a potential criminal. To Latinos, every interaction with the authorities becomes, or symbolizes, an existential threat.

*Any policy that induces mass fear in illegal aliens will induce mass anger in legal aliens.*

Participants in the immigration debate needn’t like this conclusion. But they had better understand it.

# Executive Summary & Key Findings

## **Chapter 1: On the border.**

The nine congressional districts on the U.S.-Mexican border are ethnically diverse, with Hispanic resident populations ranging from a low of 18.2% to a high of 77.7%, and Hispanic vote-share percentages ranging from a low of 7.6% to a high of 56.4%. The nine are politically diverse as well. In 2004, five favored George W. Bush for President, and four favored John Kerry. The congressmen of these border districts universally support comprehensive immigration reform (CIR) – heightened border security to stop illegal crossings, but amnesty in some form for illegals already here.

A wide variety of border security proposals are endorsed by border congressmen. Among them, we find advocates of physical fences, electronic fences, more border patrol agents, more holding cells for illegals caught on the border, employer sanctions, biometric workplace ID systems, and expedited deportation procedures for violent criminals and gang members.

Among these nine congressmen we do not find advocacy for:

- policies that would terminate guest worker programs;
- measures to deport large numbers of resident illegals;
- laws that replace civil penalties with criminal penalties for common frauds associated with work by the undocumented.

## **Chapter 2: The Hispanic Precinct Study**

A compilation of votes in Hispanic areas of 6 congressional districts demonstrates a major preference among Hispanic voters for comprehensive immigration reform, and a major revulsion to “enforcement only.”

### **Anti-“Comprehensive Immigration Reform” Republicans**

In two districts of the Southwest, AZ 08 and AZ 05, Republican candidates explicitly repudiated CIR, supporting in its stead an “enforcement first” policy toward illegals. In a third case (TX 23), an incumbent Republican congressman who had hired an illegal alien was taken to task for supporting an “enforcement only” policy that placed criminal penalties on illegals and their employers.

In each of the three districts, the 2004 incumbent had supported guest worker programs that, absent immigration law enforcement, provided de facto amnesty to many illegals. In 2006, that changed. The incumbent in the Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> retired. The incumbent of the Arizona 5<sup>th</sup> explicitly repudiated his previous

pro-CIR views. And in the Texas 23<sup>rd</sup>, the incumbent, without explicitly renouncing previous views, voted for H.R. 4437, which, had it passed, would have 1) enforced existing laws against illegal hire, and 2) increased the accruing penalties from civil to criminal status.

#### Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

- **2004 result:** Republican Jim Kolbe defeats Democrat Eva Bacal, 60.4% to 36.2% .
- **2006 result:** Democrat Gabrielle Giffords defeats Republican Randy Graf, 54.3% to 42.1%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 9 in Cochise County, with Latino population ranging from 70.3% (Douglas) to 97.1% (Calvary).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 3,597 and 2,873 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Eva Bacal defeated Republican Jim Kolbe, 54.77% to 42.56%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Gabrielle Giffords defeated Republican Randy Graff, 79.32% to 18.13%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 48.98 per 100 cast.<sup>2</sup>

#### Texas 23<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District

- **2004 result:** Republican Henry Bonilla defeats Democrat Joe Sullivan, 69.3% to 29.4% .
- **2006 result (runoff election, redistricted seat):** Democrat Ciro Rodriguez defeats Republican Henry Bonilla, 54.3% to 45.7%
- **Hispanic Counties in study:** 4 counties, with Latino population ranging from 75.5% (Val Verde) to 95.0% (Maverick). These counties were part of the 23<sup>rd</sup> in both 2004 and 2006.
- **Canvas size:** In the deciding congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these four counties accounted for 28,005 and 10,297 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Henry Bonilla defeated Democrat Joe Sullivan, 58.81% to 39.88%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Ciro Rodriguez defeated Republican Henry Bonilla, 69.69% to 30.31%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 58.31 per 100 cast.

#### Arizona 5<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

- **2004 result:** Republican J.D. Hayworth defeats Democrat Elizabeth Rogers, 59.5% to 38.2% .
- **2006 result:** Democrat Harry Mitchell defeats Republican J.D. Hayworth, 50.4% to 46.4%
- **Hispanic Influenced Precincts in study:** 8 in Maricopa County, with Latino population ranging from 32.8% (Mesa 051) to 60.9% (Diamond). (*AZ 05 is substantially less Hispanic than the other districts in this study, and is excluded from the trend calculations in chapter 3.*)
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 6,119 and 4,119 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic-influenced precinct result:** Democrat Elizabeth Rogers defeated Republican J.D. Hayworth, 48.41% to 48.15%
- **2006 Hispanic-influenced precinct result:** Democrat Harry Mitchell defeated Republican J.D. Hayworth, 58.73% to 36.25%
- **Net vote shift in Hispanic-influenced precincts, 04-06:** Democrats gained 22.22 per 100 cast.

---

<sup>2</sup> The “net Hispanic vote shift” subtracts the Republican percentage change (generally a double negative) from the Democratic percentage change (generally a positive), yielding the sum of the spread that has opened between the two since the last election. Thus, an election in which a previous Dem-to-Rep 50-50 partisan split is now 70-30, the net shift is: (+20) (-) (-20) = 40.

**Average Democratic Hispanic area gain across 3 Districts (including AZ 05): 21.56 votes/100 cast**  
**Average Republican Hispanic area loss across 3 Districts (including AZ 05): 21.61 votes/100 cast**  
**Average Democratic Hispanic area gain across 2 Districts (excluding AZ 05): 26.47 votes/100 cast**  
**Average Republican Hispanic area loss across 2 Districts (excluding AZ 05): 27.18 votes/100 cast**

### **Pro-“Comprehensive Immigration Reform ” Republicans**

The incumbents in NM 01, NM 02, and AZ 06 all advocated tightened border security going forward, and some combination of guest worker status or earned visas for resident illegals. All were re-elected in 2006.

In two of these districts, Republican vote share in Hispanic areas declined in 2006, though by percentages lower than those recorded in AZ 08, TX 23, and AZ 05. In one of these districts, NM 02, GOP vote-share in Latino precincts increased.

### **New Mexico 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District**

- **2004 result:** Republican Heather Wilson defeats Democrat Richard Romero, 54.7% to 45.3% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Heather Wilson defeats Democrat Patricia Madrid, 50.2% to 49.8%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 38 in Bernalillo County, 4 in Sandoval County, and 5 in Valencia County, with Latino population ranging from 75.9% (Bernalillo 41) to 90.4% (Bernalillo 135).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these 47 precincts accounted for 30,916 and 22,610 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Richard Romero defeated Republican Heather Wilson, 56.34% to 43.60%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Patricia Madrid defeated Republican Heather Wilson, 65.03% to 34.97%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 17.32 per 100 cast.

### **New Mexico 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional District**

- **2004 result:** Republican Steve Pearce defeats Democrat Gary King, 60.5% to 39.5% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Steve Pearce defeats Democrat Albert Kissling, 59.9% to 40.1%.
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 6 in Chavez county, 34 in Dona Ana County, 4 in Eddy County, 8 in Grant County, 3 in Guadalupe County, 4 in Luna County, 3 in Socorro County, and 8 in Valencia County, with Latino population ranging from 75.2% (Dona Ana 47) to 98.5% (Dona Ana 80).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these 70 precincts accounted for 35,767 and 24,409 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Gary King defeated Republican Steve Pearce, 56.97% to 43.03%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Albert Kissling defeated Republican Steve Pearce, 55.44% to 44.48%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Republicans gained 2.98 per 100 cast.

### **Arizona 6<sup>th</sup> Congressional District**

- **2004 result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeats Libertarian Craig Stritar, 79.4% to 20.6% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Jason Blair, 74.8% to 25.2%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** Due to realignment, the precincts were not identical in 2004 and 2006. In 2004, 4 heavily Hispanic precincts were identified in Maricopa County, and 1 in Pinal County. In 2006, 5 heavily Hispanic precincts were identified in Maricopa County, and 2 in Pinal County. In both years, the Latino population ranged from 62.7% (Western Skies) to 97.2% (Higley).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 9,576 and 6,839 votes cast respectively.

- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Craig Stritar, 79.26% to 20.74%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Jason Blair, 75.45% to 24.55%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Libertarians gained 7.62 per 100 cast.

**Average Republican Hispanic area loss across 3 Districts: 3.66 votes/100 cast**

**Average Non-Republican Hispanic area gain across 3 Districts: 3.66 votes/100 cast**

### **Chapter 3: How ‘Enforcement-Only’ Will Effect the Latino Presidential Vote in 2008**

To extrapolate the results of the Hispanic Precinct Study to the upcoming presidential contest, we applied the 2004-to-2006 Hispanic precinct vote-shift rates associated with “enforcement only” Republican candidacies, *minus* the 2004-to-2006 Hispanic precinct vote-shift rates associated with CIR Republican candidacies.<sup>3</sup> Republicans will lose between 3,514,678 and 4,756,636 Latino votes in the 2008 presidential contest, **IF**:

- The G.O.P. presidential ticket adopts an anti-CIR stance, **AND**
- Democrats focus their Hispanic turnout efforts in states where such efforts may prove decisive.

Holding other factors constant: Democrats are poised to win the electoral votes of the following “Red” states with enhanced Hispanic vote-share and turnout:

- New Mexico
- Nevada
- Colorado
- Iowa
- Florida

---

<sup>3</sup> The pro-Democrat vote-share shifts that happened *absent* a policy change from CIR to “enforcement only” are assumed to be attributable to other causes that influenced the general pro-Democratic trend in the Congressional elections of 2006.

# Chapter 1: Along the Border

Nine congressional districts straddle the U.S.-Mexican border: one in California (district 51), two in Arizona (districts 7 and 8), one in New Mexico (district 2), and five in Texas (districts 16, 23, 28, 25, and 27). Historically, they are politically diverse. In 2004, Democrats represented six; Republicans, three. Five of the nine districts supported Bush in the presidential contest, and four voted Kerry. But in 2006, Democrats picked up seats in Texas 23 and Arizona 08.

In both districts, immigration played a key role.

In only one of the nine do Hispanics constitute a voting majority; but in seven, Latinos comprise a majority of residents, due to the influx of illegal aliens. Politically, four of the nine lean Republican, and five, Democrat, according to Charles Cook's Partisan Voter Index.

The table below charts the border districts: their current Congressional representatives, their partisan leanings<sup>4</sup>, and the percentage of Latino residents and voters in each.

## The Border Districts, West to East

District	Representative	Cook P.V.I	population, % Hispanic	2006 Votes, % Hisp.**
CA 51 (supported Kerry in '04)	Bob Filner (D)	D (+) 7	53.3%	29.8%
AZ 07 (supported Kerry in '04)	Raul Grijalva (D)	D (+) 10	50.6%	27.6%
AZ 08 (supported Bush in '04)	Gabrielle Giffords (D)	R (+) 1	18.2%	7.6%
NM 02 (supported Bush in '04)	Steve Pearce (R)	R (+) 1	47.3%	25.0%
TX 16 (supported Kerry in '04)	Sylvestre Reyes (D)	D (+) 9	77.7%	56.4%
TX 23 (supported Bush in '04)*	Ciro Rodriguez (D)	R (+) 13*	55.0%	31.2%
TX 28 (supported Bush in '04)	Henry Cuellar (D)	D (+) 1	64.5%	40.3%
TX 25 (supported Kerry in '04)	Lloyd Doggett (D)	D (+) 14	68.6%	44.8%
TX 27 (supported Bush in '04)	Solomon Ortiz (D)	R (+) 1	68.1%	44.2%

\* - TX 23 has been redistricted more favorably to Democrats than the 2006 P.V.I. would indicate.

\*\* - extrapolated from "The Latino Electorate: An Analysis of the 2006 Election," Pew Hispanic Center, July 24, 2007

<sup>4</sup> Partisan leaning, designated PVI, is based on the Partisan Voting Index of political handicapper Charlie Cook as reported in the 2006 edition of the Almanac of American Politics, by Michael Barone and Richard C. Cohen., published by National Journal.

But whether a border congressman's district supported Bush or Kerry, whether its voters are Hispanic or Anglo; and whether his district leans Democrat or Republican, one thing is constant: The Congressman supports "comprehensive immigration reform" (CIR). We define "comprehensive immigration reform" as an approach that grants legal status – i.e., amnesty -- to most illegal aliens, but that also includes measures to secure U.S. borders against illegal entry going forward.

All congressmen on or near the border advocate stricter border controls. Democrats and Republicans in these districts argue about whether a physical fence or an electronic fence should provide the primary mechanical barrier to illegal entry. They argue about whether states and localities should go it alone on enforcement, or demand more of the federal government first; and over the role of employers in enforcement. But they don't argue about whether the uncontrolled flow of illegals creates problems of vandalism, violence, drug smuggling, human trafficking, and strained social networks. They know better.

But border voters, and the men and women they elect, are consistently pro-immigrant. For centuries before "multi-cultural" was a word, these districts were that. The proposition that all or most resident illegals should be deported, either directly by government action, or indirectly by workplace sanctions, is advocated by no border incumbent. Democrats and Republicans on the border argue vehemently about immigration. They argue about whether an amnesty should, or should not, include a path to citizenship. They argue about whether illegals should or should not vote in workplace elections for unionization, and about whether family ties, economic demand, or budget constraints should control immigration decisions going forward. But the combined impact of cultural affinity and economic co-dependence served to remove mass deportation from the lexicon of border politics – or so it seemed, until 2004.

Here, West to East, is a summary of the immigrations views of border Congressmen, and a statement by each on comprehensive immigration reform:

### **Rep. Bob Filner (D) – CA 51**

#### **Immigration Policy:**

Rep. Bob Filner's career record on immigration exemplifies some of the pressures that congressional liberals face in reconciling Hispanic and labor constituencies. Filner has backed some of the most sweeping amnesties of recent years, including several proposals to legalize the status of undocumented aliens who resided in the U.S. for five-or-more years. However, he has frequently opposed guest worker programs, including L-1 visas that allow transnationals to transfer foreign employees to the U.S., and H-1B visas for high tech workers. Filner has, at various times, endorsed and opposed major increases in work permits for foreign agricultural workers.

He has consistently backed family unification measures for immigrants and legal residents, and has generally supported refugee status for asylum seekers from war zones.

Like most Democrats, he has supported the right of illegals to vote in union elections.

The California Democrat has voted against border fencing, the use of military personnel in border enforcement, and the funding of programs that require local governments to assume immigration-control responsibilities.

Nonetheless, he has supported some border control measures, including funding for employment verification systems, criminal background checks, and harsh penalties for those who finance, construct, or utilize illegal border tunnels.

### **Filner website statement against a border fence and for comprehensive immigration reform:**

“While Republicans were in control of Congress, they approved the construction of a 700 mile long fence in the name of Homeland Security. The fence is expected to cost around \$9 billion to complete, a far cry from the \$1.2 billion down payment the Republicans put forth in the legislation.

“... Bob is fighting for comprehensive immigration reform because he believes all elements of this problem must be addressed together or none of them will be solved. \$9 billion dollars can do much more than build fences – it can ensure our country has enough personnel to process immigration files, improve monitoring and prosecuting of businesses who knowingly hire illegal immigrants and increase personnel to find illegal activity such as smuggling and drug trafficking.

-- At <http://www.house.gov/filner/issues/border.htm>

### **Rep. Raul Grijalva (D) – AZ 07**

#### **Immigration policy**

Rep. Grijalva is as close an example as the border provides of an “open borders” man. He is the representative whom immigration limitation groups most love to hate (see chart, page 19.) It is therefore highly instructive to see how much border security he is willing to mix with an extremely permissive immigration policy.

The congressman from the Arizona 7<sup>th</sup> District was a co-sponsor of “STRIVE” – the acronym for H.R. 1645, the Security Through Regularized Immigration and a Vibrant Economy Act of 2007,” an immigration bill co-authored by G.O.P. conservative Jeff Flake.

The STRIVE Act proposed provisions that would legalize virtual the entire illegal alien workforce. In addition, it expanded immigration or visa caps in numerous categories, including high tech workers, agricultural workers, “guest workers,” workers in “shortage occupations,” refugees, corporate transferees, and family members of legal non-citizens.

It set various conditions on illegals seeking permanent resident status, including fines, back taxes, English language proficiency, and U.S. history and civics requirements.

Employer verification provisions were included. STRIVE conditioned its pro-immigration proposals on certification by the Department of Homeland Security that it could issue secure ID for aliens seeking employment. Going forward, STRIVE would make it unlawful to knowingly hire, recruit, or refer-for-a-fee an undocumented alien.

Expansion of the guest worker program was also conditioned on Department of Homeland Security certification to Congress of its own compliance with the 5-year Border Security Initiative, which required:

- Additional agents to patrol the border, secure ports of entry, and enforce immigration laws;
- Expanded detention and removal capabilities to halt “catch and release” of illegal aliens;
- A comprehensive upgrade of border control technology, including sensor equipment, UAVs, and manned aerial assets;
- Additional border infrastructure (which, to this administration, means border fence and manned checkpoints);
- Increased interior enforcement of immigration laws, including worksite enforcement.

Rep. Grijalva has voted against many of these enforcement provisions as “stand-alones.” But he was willing to sponsor them as part of a comprehensive program.

### **Statement by Rep. Grijalva on comprehensive immigration reform:**

Mr. GRIJALVA: “[C]omprehensive, reality-based immigration reform...acknowledges the economic value, necessity, and, yes, the codependency of our economy on the immigrant workforce; and also recognizes the inherent value of human beings and reaffirms the process of rigorous examination and process to attain permanent legal status and eventually citizenship. And it reaffirms the need for security in this country by assuring that the people that work here, that function here, are not hidden in the shadows...

“We have, as a Congress, a choice on immigration reform. We should not continue on the path set by this Congress in the Sensenbrenner bill, a bill that asks us to criminalize 11 million human beings in this country, that raises the specter of mass deportation and that ignites a flame of intolerance and division that this country is not about. We don’t need a path to create second-class citizens. We don’t need a path that hides from our economic reality. We don’t need a path that ignores the business interests...

“We can create a situation for the people of this country... that understands security is a priority issue, but that also understands comprehensive reform is the most important way to deal with this issue.”

-- Congressional record: March 28, 2006, Page H1170

### **Rep. Gabrielle Giffords -- AZ 08**

#### **Immigration Policy**

Rep. Giffords predecessor, Republican Jim Kolbe, was one of the architects of the “comprehensive immigration reform” championed by the Bush administration, embodied in S. 1639, and killed on cloture (June 28, 2007).

Giffords is considerably less restrictionist than State Representative Randy Graf, whom she defeated in 2006. During her short term in office, she co-sponsored the STRIVE Act, described above. However, she broke ranks with the majority of her party in supporting the Brown-Waite Amendment to fund 700 miles of border fence. She also supported a reduction of Homeland Security Department funds to states and localities with “sanctuary policies” that protect illegals from revealing their status.

Giffords, like Kolbe before her, supports comprehensive immigration reform.

### **Statement by Rep. Giffords on the failure of the Senate to advance S. 1639:**

It is extremely unfortunate that the Senate voted today to end debate on immigration reform. Doing nothing to address our nation’s immigration crisis is irresponsible. The federal government cannot continue to shirk its responsibility to protect our borders.

An impressive bipartisan coalition of Senators – including Senator Jon Kyl – worked tirelessly to craft compromise legislation on this difficult issue. Their work deserves our praise. But the failure we witnessed today in the Senate leaves the burden of dealing with illegal immigration on state and local governments.

My district in Southern Arizona confronts the many negative impacts of illegal immigration every day. The toll is profound. I will not relent in my efforts to find ways to remove the unfunded mandates placed on local law enforcement, health and social service agencies and our public schools.

In the House I will pursue every opportunity to introduce legislation and increase funding to address the problems we face with illegal immigration. This includes adding more Border Patrol agents and technology to secure our border and fighting to fully fund the federal program that reimburses local law enforcement agencies for the apprehension and detention of illegal immigrants.

The fight for comprehensive immigration reform goes on and it will remain my top priority in Congress.

-- from <http://giffords.house.gov>, Press Center, statement of 6/28/07

## Rep. Steve Pearce (R) – NM 2

### Immigration Policy

Rep. Pearce received the highest ratings that anti-CIR groups gave to any border incumbent: a gentleman's "C" on the Citizens' for Immigration Reform report card; and plaudits on 8 of 12 key immigration votes by the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR).

What recommended Pearce (comparatively speaking) to these anti-amnesty groups was his record on border security. In its rating of the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, FAIR applauded Pearce's stands on the following issues:

- National standards for drivers licenses to prevent the proliferation of false I.D.'s among aliens;
- Reduced funding for state and local governments that restrict information flows to Immigration and Customs Enforcement;
- Requiring the Department of Homeland Security to construct 700 miles of border fence on the nation's border with Mexico;
- Expediting removal of criminal aliens and alien gang members;
- Authorizing (but not requiring) state and local officials to investigate, identify, arrest and detain aliens in the normal course of duties for the purpose of assisting enforcement of U.S. immigration laws;
- Voting to eliminate the visa lottery program, which distributes 50,000 permanent resident visas (green cards) per year, without regard to skill levels, economic need, or family ties.

But what Pearce did not support – the reason he got a Gentleman's "C", rather than some higher grade – is equally revealing. Pearce opposed:

- the Sullivan amendment to H.R. 4437, which would have required the mass deportation of illegals who could not document the duration of their residence as one year or longer.
- H.R. 4437 which would have replaced civil penalties with criminal penalties for many common frauds associated with work by the undocumented.

In the next chapter we will examine how Pearce's mixed record of strict border control and sympathy for migrant workers fared in one of the nation's most heavily Hispanic congressional districts.

### Rep. Steve Pearce on immigration Reform:

The United States has a need for immigrants who bring vitality, new ideas, innovation and workers as additional fuel for the American spirit and economy. Congress must find solutions that respect the law and the people involved.

Over the last few years, I have stressed throughout my district and here in Congress that reforming the immigration problem in America is a three-step process: 1) Successful reform to secure our borders; 2) Deal with the 12-15 million illegal immigrants already here; 3) Reform an immigration system that can take 20 years to gain citizenship legally....

Last year, Congress addressed the problem of securing our borders and while we can still debate the merits of a virtual or real fence, or any of the dozens of other proposals included in that package, the reality is those steps have made a real difference. What was a super-highway of humans and narcotics flowing across our border is now a two-lane road that is slowing down.

Congress must now turn its attention to dealing with the 12–15 million illegal immigrants currently residing in the United States. We must find a solution that will bring them out of the shadows, protect them from exploitation, make them pay taxes and legally integrate them into the workforce they are already in.

Illegal immigrants will be given two choices, if they want to become a citizen then they have to return to their home country and get into the legal immigration line. However, if they want to stay in America and work, they can but that privilege will never convert to citizenship. These temporary workers would have to meet a certain standard. Drug dealers, sex offenders, gang members or felons would not be eligible. Most immigrants are committed to being a part of our economy and must meet these minimum standards. In addition, these visas should have a simple fee, around \$100 a month. This is reasonable for a worker to be a part of the greatest economy on Earth and offset our budgetary costs for processing and monitoring these visas while they work in America. If they want to become a United States citizen, they have to return to their home country and get into the lawful immigration line.

Finally, having secured our border and addressed the problem of illegal immigration in the United States, Congress then must turn its full attention to the matter of fixing a broken legal immigration system. We must deal with the real questions of how to make this system fairer, more responsive and more respectful without the emotional burden of fighting over illegal immigration and border security. We must find solutions to bring families together, while letting new skilled immigrants come to the United States. We must ensure we have a stable workforce and growing economy.

-- Pearce, Steve: "Respect for Law, Respect for People," *The Hill*, May 2, 2007

## **Rep. Silvestre Reyes (D) – TX 16**

### **Immigration policy:**

Centered around El Paso, the Texas 16<sup>th</sup> is the sole border district where Hispanics constitute a majority of both the population and the electorate.

Rep. Silvestre Reyes' immigration voting record is normative for a Democratic liberal: he supports higher immigration levels, while attempting to restrict or mitigate American job displacement. But Reyes, a 26-year veteran of the Border Patrol, is in fact the architect of a substantial part of the Democratic Party policy he supports. Reyes prefers electronic fencing to physical fencing, with the savings diverted to human assets on the border – i.e., more trained Border Patrol agents to react to the border violations detected by enhanced surveillance techniques, and to process those apprehended.

### **Silvestre Reyes' statement on President Bush's "comprehensive immigration" initiative**

Comprehensive immigration reform is long overdue, and something I have advocated throughout my ten years in Congress," said Reyes. "I've lived my life and built a successful career on the U.S.-Mexico border, and have experienced firsthand the realities of the border region. I have pushed for progress through what I have always referred to as a 'three-legged stool' of increased border security; tough, strictly-enforced sanctions against employers who hire undocumented immigrants; and a guest worker program that offers a path to earned legalization.

All three components are critical to success.

It is important for President Bush to raise these issues, and it is even more important for him to work with Congress. I am an original cosponsor of the Security Through Regularized Immigration and a Vibrant Economy (STRIVE) Act in the U.S. House of Representatives, which is a practical, comprehensive bill that provides our nation with the tools to keep us safe and honor our history as a nation of immigrants."

Today, President Bush reiterated his support for comprehensive immigration reform. I look forward to working with him to create a system that is in the best interests of our nation as a whole."

-- From: [http://wwwc.house.gov/reyes/news\\_detail.asp?id=1157](http://wwwc.house.gov/reyes/news_detail.asp?id=1157)

## **Rep. Ciro Rodriguez (D) – TX 23**

### **Immigration Policy**

In 2006, Texas' 23<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District was redrawn by court order. In the runoff to a special election, Democrat Ciro Rodriguez, a former incumbent himself, defeated seven-term Republican

incumbent, Henry Bonilla, 54.3% to 45.7%. Both Rodriguez and Bonilla supported guest worker programs. But Bonilla had a record of hostility to illegals. In 2005, Bonilla voted for H.R. 4437, which changed unlawful presence from a civil to a criminal offense in many instances. The Rodriguez camp gleefully accused Bonilla of employing an illegal alien nanny for seven years, then criminalizing both her status as a worker, and his own as an employer.

As a freshman in the Texas 23<sup>rd</sup>, Rep. Rodriguez co-sponsored the STRIVE Act in 2007.

### **Rep. Rodriguez on the failure of Senate to pass comprehensive immigration reform:**

This Congress has to act to secure our borders and address the illegal immigration crisis. Unfortunately, instead of moving forward legislation as a starting point for much needed immigration reform, Senate Republicans for all intents and purposes killed immigration reform today.

They had the chance to help lay the foundation for Congress to reform our nation's immigration system, a system we all agree is broken, and instead they settled for an irresponsible do-nothing approach.

There are an estimated 12 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. today, our border is not secure, and our nation's agricultural industry and small business community needs help dealing with a labor shortage, but those issues are just not that important to those Republican Senators more interested in using the issue as a political wedge than doing something to fix the problem.

I believe the time for immigration reform is now but the Republicans have once again failed to be part of the solution to this national problem.

-- from: <http://www.rodriguez.house.gov> Newsroom, 6/28/07, "Rodriguez Statement on End of Immigration Bill"

### **Rep. Henry Cuellar (D) – TX 28**

#### **Immigration Policy**

In a marginally Democratic district that gave George W. Bush 53% of its vote in 2004, Rep. Henry Cuellar broke ranks with his party on a number of issues:

- He voted to penalize "sanctuary cities" by withholding federal funds -- a pet cause of Rep. Tom Tancredo;
- He voted for the "REAL ID Act", which would make illegals ineligible for drivers' licenses;
- He voted to end the "Visa Lottery" system.

But in other respects, Cuellar's record was in line with party policy. He co-sponsored the "STRIVE" act. And, like every border incumbent except the defeated Bonilla, he opposed the criminalization of "unlawful presence."

### **Rep. Cuellar statement on comprehensive immigration reform:**

I favor a bill that emphasizes both strong border security and immigration reform. We have to address the undocumented immigrants already living in the United States ... and expand avenues for permanent immigration if workers meet other requirements, including paying additional fines and back taxes and registering for selective military service.

It's no secret that our nation's immigration system is badly broken. A comprehensive immigration reform package is necessary and should include all aspects of this complex challenge: humanitarian concerns, employment needs, and the ever intensifying realm and scope of our nation's security challenge.

There are an estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants living and working in the United States. Many of these immigrants have been in the country for decades; they have put down roots and have given birth to children who are U.S. citizens.

Immigration reform is necessary, but it will only succeed if it encourages earned citizenship, enhances national security, promotes economic growth, and protects freedom and liberty.

-- from [http://www.house.gov/list/press/tx28\\_cuellar/060328.html](http://www.house.gov/list/press/tx28_cuellar/060328.html), March 28, 2006

## **Rep. Lloyd Doggett (D) – TX 25**

### **Immigration Policy**

Lloyd Doggett's former district, centered around the University town of Austin, was redistricted to incorporate substantial Hispanic populations. It remains among the most heavily Democratic seats in the nation. Rep. Doggett has been a persistent critic of the border fence, and of the use of military personnel to perform border control functions. He has defended sanctuary cities, but has voted to restrict illegals' access to drivers licenses, and to require terror-watch and criminal background checks before aliens are granted legal status.

### **Rep. Doggett floor speech against H.R. 4437: "Border protection, Anti-Terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005"**

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, all Americans have an interest in securing our borders, but this bill is neither genuine security nor fairness. It threatens American businesses, agriculture, and it certainly threatens to destroy border commerce and punish hardworking border citizens.

This is just the latest in a series of bad bills that appeal to the worst fears and prejudices of xenophobes rather than advancing meaningful immigration reform. It is a cynical bill because it is not comprehensive. There is no one-dimensional solution looking solely at law enforcement that can succeed. There is no wall that can be built high enough to solve this problem.

Over a century ago, my own great grandfather came from Sweden to Louisiana to chop sugar cane. He came for the same reason that many people come to this country today: to take on the most difficult jobs in order to have a better life. Until we address that economic concern with a meaningful guest worker program, we will not address immigration today....

The kind of measure we are offered is not new. It is part of a sad and recurring theme in American history. In the 19th century, it was the work of the Know-Nothing Party. Today, there are some in this Republican leadership who want to make the Republican Party the Know-Nothing Party of the 21st century.

-- Congressional Record, Dec 15, 2005 Page: H11677

## **Rep. Solomon Ortiz (D) – TX 27**

As the Democratic chair of the Border Caucus, Solomon Ortiz is, along with Rep. Reyes, a primary architect of the Democratic Party alternatives to the Bush Administration's border security proposals. The Democratic Party border agenda includes an emphasis on electronic surveillance; additional training and manpower for the Border Patrol; emphasis on the federal role in enforcement; and a more rigorous system of personal identification in order to penalize employers responsible for illegal hires. Ortiz' co-sponsored the STRIVE Act.

### **Rep. Ortiz floor statement against a border fence, and for comprehensive immigration reform, 9/14/2006**

You want security? Then you want comprehensive immigration reform...

As the founder and co-chair of the Congressional Border Caucus, I have been advocating for adequate border security funding before it was a political issue this year. In particular I have been concerned with the lack of detention space, the need for adequate technology for our United States Border Patrol, the need for more immigration judges, prosecutors and customs agents, and the importance of sanctions on employers illegally employing immigrants.

None of those issues are addressed in the bill before us today. Rather, this bill simply authorizes 700 miles of fencing - again - along the 2,000 mile U.S.-Mexico Border.

The Southern part of my district rests along the U.S. - Mexico border and my constituents want real solutions. We have 8 - 10 million people living in this country that we have absolutely no information on.

It is in the national security interest of this nation to know who is living inside our borders, and we cannot do that without offering them a path to citizenship so they can come out of the shadows and be part of this economy. THAT'S how you secure this country - not with a fence....

In a post September 11th world, we must comprehensively address immigration and border security.

-- From: [http://ortiz.house.gov/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=239&Itemid=78](http://ortiz.house.gov/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=239&Itemid=78)

## Interest Group Ratings

The unanimity of the border congressmen on comprehensive immigration reform has made them unpopular among groups that seek to radically lower American population growth by some combination of the following policies:

- hard deportation (direct removal of illegals by government action),
- soft deportation (making employment of illegals untenable through fines and penalties), and
- forward limitations on immigration, through either a general moratorium, or reduced visa and naturalization levels.

Two groups that advocate such policies, and that issue congressional voter guides, are Americans for Better Immigration and the Federation for American Immigration Reform.

Americans for Better Immigration (ABI) assigns a letter grade to every member of Congress based on analyses developed by Numbers USA. FAIR issues a biennial Congressional Voting Report that indicates organization positions on immigration-related issues, and the votes of each member of Congress thereon. The most recent FAIR report covered the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress (2005 and 2006). No letter grade is assigned, so we will report the FAIR analysis of each border Congressman as a fraction: A congressman's FAIR-approved votes divided by his total number of votes on FAIR issues.

Finally, we chart the vote of each Congressman on H.R. 4437, the Border Protection, Anti-terrorism, and Illegal Immigration Control Act of 2005. The law criminalized the document fraud common among working illegals, assigning criminal rather than civil penalties to complicit employers and employees. It also included incentives for local governments to assist in deporting illegals, and forbade the release of a known illegal once in custody. On December 16, 2006, the House of Representatives passed this bill 239 to 182, with the support of 92% of Republicans and the opposition of 82% of Democrats. The proposed law died in the Senate.

In the two border districts that changed hands – AZ 08 and TX 23 – we have included the record of the incumbent's predecessor in italics. Jim Kolbe retired from the former; Henry Bonilla was defeated in a re-election bid from the latter.

## Anti-Amnesty Group Ratings, and vote on criminalization of illegal status

Dist	Representative	Party	ABI	FAIR	H.R. 4437
CA 51	Bob Filner	D	F	0-of-12	Opposed
AZ 07	Raul Grijalva	D	F-	0-of-12	Opposed
AZ 08	Gabrielle Giffords	D	C-	N/S*	N/S*
<i>AZ 08</i>	<i>Jim Kolbe</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>C-</i>	<i>4-of-8</i>	<i>N/V**</i>
NM 02	Steve Pierce	R	C	8-of-12	Opposed
TX 16	Sylvestre Reyes	D	F	1-of-12	Opposed
TX 23	Ciro Rodriguez	D	F	N/S	N/S
<i>TX 23</i>	<i>Henry Bonilla</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>C+</i>	<i>10-of-12</i>	<i>Supported</i>
TX 28	Henry Cuellar	D	D	3-of-10	Opposed
TX 25	Lloyd Doggett	D	D-	1-of-12	Opposed
TX 27	Solomon Ortiz	D	F	1-of-12	Opposed

\* N/S – Not serving at the time of the vote

\*\* N/V – Didn't not vote on the bill.

# Chapter 2: Hispanic Precinct Study

Support of comprehensive immigration reform – some combination of border enforcement and amnesty -- is the norm among politicians who win Congressional District seats along the U.S.-Mexican border. But in 2006, one Republican incumbent, Henry Bonilla (TX-23), and one G.O.P. candidate for a vacated seat, Randy Graf (AZ-08), defied this consensus. An additional Arizona Republican, J.D. Hayworth (AZ-05), renounced his previous support for comprehensive reform. Graff and Hayworth embraced an “enforcement only” approach to immigration reform that envisioned the removal, by means coercive, voluntary, or some combination thereof, of the roughly 12 million illegal aliens currently in the United States. Bonilla supported H.R. 4437, which, absent an amnesty,<sup>5</sup> threatened the same result.

In this chapter, we will study how partisan vote patterns changed, 2004-to-2006, in precincts where Hispanics constituted either a numerical majority, or (in the case of AZ 05 instance) a substantial minority (30 percent-plus).

The 2006 midterm witnessed a considerable shift of the electorate in favor of Democratic Party congressional candidates. To filter the overt impact of this trend from our consideration of the impact of “enforcement only” policy on the Latino vote, we have selected three border-state Congressional districts to act as controls: New Mexico 01, New Mexico 02, and Arizona 06. In these districts, comprehensive reform was embraced by the incumbent.

Differences in the average vote shifts in these two groups – the “enforcement-only” group and the “control” group -- are then analyzed.

For illustrative purposes, we have included, district-by-district, the Hispanic precinct results for other federal races in 2004 and 2006. Our intent is to show how “enforcement only” and “CIR” candidates fared vis-à-vis Presidential and Senatorial candidates of their own party.

---

<sup>5</sup> Supporters of comprehensive immigration reform exercised great ingenuity in re-naming amnesty, which we define as any reform policy that, at its conclusion, leaves most illegal aliens in the United States on an extended basis. Some of the more common terms to avoid “amnesty” were “earned legalization,” “touchbacks,” and various visa classifications for “guest work”. If CIR advocates were ingenious, deportation advocates were disingenuous: There is no “easy” way to enforce laws that have been freely violated for decades. The remnants of that lawlessness include millions of employment agreements, millions of resident illegal workers, and millions of American citizens born to them during their implicitly tolerated presence.

## Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

- **Cook P.V.I.:** R (+) 1
- **2004 result:** Republican Jim Kolbe defeats Democrat Eva Bacal, 60.4% to 36.2% .
- **2006 result:** Democrat Gabrielle Giffords defeats Republican Randy Graf, 54.3% to 42.1%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 9 in Cochise county, with Latino population ranging from 70.3% (Douglas) to 97.1% (Calvary).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 3,597 and 2,873 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Eva Bacal defeated Republican Jim Kolbe, 54.77% to 42.56%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Gabrielle Giffords defeated Republican Randy Graff, 79.32% to 18.13%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 48.98 per 100 cast.

## ARIZONA Dist. 08 - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Kolbe (R)	% Kolbe	Bacal (D)	% Bacal	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Cochise	Calvary	97.1%	202	42.53%	261	54.95%	12	2.5%	475	749
Cochise	Carlson	88.9%	278	50.92%	256	46.89%	12	2.2%	546	820
Cochise	Castro Park	73.9%	217	34.61%	398	63.48%	12	1.9%	627	1053
Cochise	Douglas	70.3%	199	42.98%	255	55.08%	9	1.9%	463	657
Cochise	Gadsden	84.9%	215	43.35%	265	53.43%	16	3.2%	496	818
Cochise	Pan American	88.8%	124	31.00%	272	68.00%	4	1.0%	400	708
Cochise	Sunnyside	84.9%	296	50.17%	263	44.58%	31	5.3%	590	1033
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>1531</b>	<b>42.56%</b>	<b>1970</b>	<b>54.8%</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>3597</b>	<b>5838</b>

## ARIZONA Dist. 08 - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Graf (R)	% Graf	Giffords (D)	% Giffords	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Cochise	Calvary	97.1%	53	14.48%	303	82.79%	10	2.7%	366	749
Cochise	Carlson	88.9%	94	20.80%	346	76.55%	12	2.7%	452	820
Cochise	Castro Park	73.9%	58	12.11%	411	85.80%	10	2.1%	479	1053
Cochise	Douglas	70.3%	63	16.45%	312	81.46%	8	2.1%	383	657
Cochise	Gadsden	84.9%	77	19.20%	311	77.56%	13	3.2%	401	818
Cochise	Pan American	88.8%	21	7.39%	259	91.20%	4	1.4%	284	708
Cochise	Sunnyside	84.9%	155	30.51%	337	66.34%	16	3.1%	508	1033
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>521</b>	<b>18.13%</b>	<b>2279</b>	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2873</b>	<b>5838</b>

## Analysis

The Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> includes Tucson, but excludes its main Latino sections. The district is 73.9% White and 18.1% Hispanic. The 8<sup>th</sup> supported George W. Bush over John Kerry by 7 percentage points in 2004. In Cochise County, non-Hispanic Whites outnumber Latinos 2-to-1 in population, and by roughly 4-to-1 among registered voters.

Some 40% of all illegal border crossings occur in Cochise County, which straddles the Mexican border of Arizona's 8<sup>th</sup> District. It is the home turf to an active chapter of the Minutemen Civil Defense Corps, which operates a neighborhood watch along the border to alert the Border Patrol when they site illegal crossings. The mission statement of the group states its purpose: "To secure United States borders and coastal boundaries against unlawful and unauthorized entry of all individuals, contraband, and foreign military."

But the group's agenda extends beyond a neighborhood watch. "Illegal Aliens Must Go Home," writes Minuteman Founder Jim Gilchrist in *Minutemen: The Battle to Secure America's Borders*. "Enforcing our rule of law means that we are going to deport several million people."

Elsewhere Gilchrist writes, "Illegal immigration is called 'illegal' because the very nature of the activity involves breaking the law. Illegal immigrants are, by definition, criminals from the moment they cross the United States border.... If the United States refuses to enforce laws demanding that illegal immigrants face deportation or prosecution, why should illegal immigrants fear committing other crimes?"

One chapter of *Minutemen* is titled "The 'Guest Worker' Program is a De Facto Amnesty." Gilchrist writes, "These 'guest workers' already say to Americans, 'we're taking over. Your country is now our country, and we're going to do it by sheer population numbers.' One look at the spring 2006 marches will provide enough evidence that this attitude already prevails among them. 'Guest worker' is simply another euphemism."

In 2004, Randy Graff, former Majority Whip of the Arizona House, challenged incumbent Jim Kolbe, the architect of "comprehensive immigration reform." Minuteman co-founder Chris Simcox wrote, "My friends, I can't even begin to put in words what a huge victory it would be if Randy Graf were to win the race and the 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional District was finally, finally represented by a Minuteman who understands the importance of border security."

Graff lost. Kolbe carried the primary, 57.5%-to-42.5%, and went on to win the district, 54.8%-to-42.6% in the general election. But Graf carried Cochise County, and when Kolbe retired in 2006, he ran again. This time, he won the Republican primary with 42.2% of the vote in a five-man race.

Graff's opponent, State Senator Gabrielle Giffords, described her position on immigration as "enforcement plus," which she described as a position in harmony with that of Senator John McCain and President George W. Bush.

In the general election, Giffords carried not only the population centers of Pima County, but Graf's ostensible stronghold of Cochise, 17,889 to 16,807. Voters the Anglo-dominated county most afflicted by the ills of illegal border trafficking preferred the candidate of comprehensive immigration reform to the candidate of enforcement and deportation.

## Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

### ARIZONA Presidential - 2004

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Cochise	Calvary	97.1%	140	29.1%	341	70.9%	0	0.0%	481	749
Cochise	Carlson	88.9%	212	38.1%	344	61.8%	1	0.2%	557	820
Cochise	Castro Park	73.9%	140	21.8%	500	77.8%	3	0.5%	643	1053
Cochise	Douglas	70.3%	149	31.6%	321	68.2%	1	0.2%	471	657
Cochise	Gadsden	84.9%	169	33.9%	326	65.5%	3	0.6%	498	818
Cochise	Pan American	88.8%	84	20.8%	319	79.0%	1	0.2%	404	708
Cochise	Sunnyside	84.9%	273	45.0%	329	54.2%	5	0.8%	607	1033
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>1167</b>	<b>31.9%</b>	<b>2480</b>	<b>67.7%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>3661</b>	<b>5838</b>

### ARIZONA Senate - 2004

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	McCain (R)	% McCain	Starsky (D)	% Starsky	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Cochise	Calvary	97.1%	241	51.1%	222	47.0%	9	1.9%	472	749
Cochise	Carlson	88.9%	363	65.9%	181	32.8%	7	1.3%	551	820
Cochise	Castro Park	73.9%	278	44.0%	343	54.3%	11	1.7%	632	1053
Cochise	Douglas	70.3%	268	57.9%	194	41.9%	1	0.2%	463	657
Cochise	Gadsden	84.9%	312	62.5%	179	35.9%	8	1.6%	499	818
Cochise	Pan American	88.8%	167	41.9%	230	57.6%	2	0.5%	399	708
Cochise	Sunnyside	84.9%	391	66.0%	191	32.3%	10	1.7%	592	1033
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>2020</b>	<b>56.0%</b>	<b>1540</b>	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>3608</b>	<b>5838</b>

### ARIZONA Senate - 2006

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	Kyl (R)	% Kyl	Pederson (D)	% Pederson	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Cochise	Calvary	97.1%	87	23.8%	265	72.4%	14	3.8%	366	749
Cochise	Carlson	88.9%	158	34.7%	287	63.1%	10	2.2%	455	820
Cochise	Castro Park	73.9%	93	19.3%	382	79.3%	7	1.5%	482	1053
Cochise	Douglas	70.3%	122	31.8%	251	65.4%	11	2.9%	384	657
Cochise	Gadsden	84.9%	118	29.4%	271	67.6%	12	3.0%	401	818
Cochise	Pan American	88.8%	50	17.8%	231	82.2%	0	0.0%	281	708
Cochise	Sunnyside	84.9%	185	36.4%	304	59.8%	19	3.7%	508	1033
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>813</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>1991</b>	<b>69.2%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>2877</b>	<b>5838</b>

The same heavily Hispanic precincts that gave George Bush 31.9% in 2004, and Senator John McCain a hefty 56.0%, voted 18.1% for Randy Graff in 2006. The collapse of Hispanic support for the Republican congressional candidate was unique, not general. The other federal G.O.P. candidate, Senator Jon Kyl, carried 28.3% in these precincts – a vote-share 10.2% higher than Graff.

### Texas 23<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District

- **2004 result:** Republican Henry Bonilla defeats Democrat Joe Sullivan, 69.3% to 29.4% .
- **2006 result (runoff election):** Democrat Ciro Rodriguez defeats Republican Henry Bonilla, 54.3% to 45.7%
- **Hispanic Counties in study:** 4 counties, with Latino population ranging from 75.5% (Val Verde) to 95.0% (Maverick).

- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these four counties accounted for 28,005 and 10,297 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Henry Bonilla defeated Democrat Joe Sullivan, 58.81% to 39.88%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Ciro Rodriguez defeated Republican Henry Bonilla, 69.69% to 30.31%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 58.31 per 100 cast.

## TEXAS Dist. 23 - 2004

County	Hispanic pop %	Bonilla (R)	% Bonilla	Sullivan (D)	% Sullivan	Other	% Other	Total	Reg
Dimmit	85.0%	1614	49.2%	1586	48.4%	80	2.4%	3,280	7,848
Maverick	95.0%	5151	59.5%	3363	38.8%	148	1.7%	8,662	25,041
Presidio	84.4%	837	50.3%	806	48.4%	21	1.3%	1,664	5,306
Val Verde	75.5%	7838	68.3%	3552	30.9%	89	0.8%	11,479	26,561
Zavala	91.2%	1031	35.3%	1861	63.7%	28	1.0%	2,920	8,176
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>16471</b>	<b>58.8%</b>	<b>11168</b>	<b>39.9%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>1.3%</b>	<b>28,005</b>	<b>72,932</b>

## TEXAS Dist. 23 - 2006 (run-off)

County	Hispanic pop %	Bonilla (R)	% Bonilla	Rodriguez (D) & Rodriguez	% Rodriguez	Other	% Other	Total	Reg
Dimmit	85.0%	292	25.2%	867	74.8%	N/A	N/A	1159	7619
Maverick	95.0%	471	14.2%	2857	85.8%	N/A	N/A	3328	25528
Presidio	84.4%	161	35.0%	299	65.0%	N/A	N/A	460	5425
Val Verde	75.5%	1942	50.9%	1873	49.1%	N/A	N/A	3815	26521
Zavala	91.2%	255	16.6%	1280	83.4%	N/A	N/A	1535	7967
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>3121</b>	<b>30.3%</b>	<b>7176</b>	<b>69.7%</b>			<b>10,297</b>	<b>73,060</b>

### Analysis

The Texas 23<sup>rd</sup> covers a huge stretch of the U.S.-Mexican border, from south-of-El Paso to Laredo. First elected in 1992, Republican Henry Bonilla achieved a string of Hispanic “firsts” in the G.O.P. He was appointed to the Appropriations Committee in 1993; in 1997, he co-chaired (with Solomon Ortiz) the Border Caucus, which protected U.S. interests in the maquiladoras. In 2001, he won chairmanship of the powerful Agriculture Appropriations subcommittee. He became the voice of the Latino middle-class, entrepreneurial and market oriented.

He survived a vigorous challenge from Henry Cuellar in 2002. His seat was redistricted twice: once by the Texas Republican leadership, to make it safer; then, by a court, to make it more Hispanic.

His surprise defeat in 2006 was marked by an astonishing collapse of his Hispanic support in a district 55.1% Latino. That collapse was intimately connected to his support of H.R. 4437, and, specifically, the “Sensenbrenner Amendment,” which raised various penalties for infractions associated with “unlawful presence” from civil to criminal status.

His campaign opponent, Ciro Rodriguez – himself a former Congressman – hammered Bonilla for imposing criminal sentences on a law that he himself had disobeyed.

On February 18, 1994, Bonilla wrote a letter, published in the San Antonio Express-News in which he stated, “Illegal immigrants are a tremendous drain on our society. They use our hospitals, our schools and our social services without paying the taxes to support them.”

But on October 29, 1994 the Washington Post published an article entitled “Bonilla Employed Illegal Immigrant; British Nanny Worked 7 Years for Republican Congressman.” Post reporter Kenneth Cooper wrote:

“Rep. Henry Bonilla (R-Tex), who has voted against benefits for immigrants, employed an illegal immigrant as a nanny for seven years, Justice Department records show.

“The records indicate that a British woman who entered the United States as a tourist in 1986 worked as a live-in babysitter for Bonilla and his wife, Deborah Knapp Bonilla, in Philadelphia and San Antonio until early 1993.

“The undocumented worker told immigration officials that the Bonillas usually paid her in cash. She said the family let her go shortly after the freshman congressman was sworn in because of the problems encountered by Zoe E. Baird, whose nomination as attorney general was dropped after it was disclosed she had hired illegal immigrants.

“The Bonillas’ former nanny, Paula V. Vousden, said in a June, 1993 Affidavit that the couple did not pay Social Security or taxes on her wages. Bonilla, she said, informed her in February 1993 that he would pay all back taxes owed....”

The Justice Department closed the case due to the statute of limitations. And the scandal would have remained dormant, but for Bonilla’s support of H.R. 4437, which criminalized behavior in which he had participated at the precise moment when the consequences of such behavior generated real fear. Bonilla’s vote for H.R. 4437 triggered a storm of rage in his district, carefully fed by his opponents.

The collapse of his support in Hispanic-majority counties, including Dimmit, Maverick, Presidio, Val Verde, and Zavala, was abrupt and drastic. In a single cycle, his vote share was halved.

### Texas 23<sup>rd</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

Once again, the Hispanic vote-share of other federal G.O.P. candidates served to highlight the exceptional nature of Bonilla’s political collapse:

#### TEXAS Presidential - 2004

County	Hispanic pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	% Other	Total	Reg
Dimmit	85.0%	1188	33.3%	2365	66.3%	13	0.4%	3,566	7,848
Maverick	95.0%	4025	40.1%	5948	59.3%	61	0.6%	10,034	25,041
Presidio	84.4%	715	37.8%	1159	61.3%	16	0.8%	1,890	5,306
Val Verde	75.5%	6968	59.1%	4757	40.3%	70	0.6%	11,795	26,561
Zavala	91.2%	777	24.9%	2332	74.8%	9	0.3%	3,118	8,176
		<b>13673</b>	<b>45.0%</b>	<b>16561</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>30,403</b>	<b>72,932</b>

#### TEXAS Senate - 2006

County	Hispanic pop %	Hutchison (R)% Hutchison	Radnofsky	% Radnofski	Other	% Other	Total	Reg	
Dimmit	85.0%	641	37.4%	1051	61.2%	24	1.4%	1,716	7,619
Maverick	95.0%	1424	38.2%	2243	60.2%	62	1.7%	3,729	25,528
Presidio	84.4%	332	37.1%	544	60.7%	20	2.2%	896	5,425
Val Verde	75.5%	3718	53.0%	3161	45.1%	137	2.0%	7,016	26,521
Zavala	91.2%	445	27.1%	1173	71.5%	22	1.3%	1,640	7,967
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6560</b>	<b>43.7%</b>	<b>8172</b>	<b>54.5%</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>1.8%</b>	<b>14,997</b>	<b>73,060</b>

In 2004, Rep. Bonilla ran 13.8% ahead of President George W. Bush in the Hispanic-dominant counties. In 2006, he ran 14.7% behind Bush's 2004 total, and 13.4% behind Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchinson's 2006 vote-share.

Among Latinos, Randy Graff suffered by his association with *deportation*. A policy of *criminalization* sealed Bonilla's fate.

### Arizona 5<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

- **Cook P.V.I.:** R (+) 4
- **2004 result:** Republican J.D. Hayworth defeats Democrat Elizabeth Rogers, 59.5% to 38.2% .
- **2006 result:** Democrat Harry Mitchell defeats Republican J.D. Hayworth, 50.4% to 46.4%
- **Hispanic Influenced Precincts in study:** 8 in Maricopa County, with Latino population ranging from 32.8% (Mesa 051) to 60.9% (Diamond).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 6,119 and 4,119 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Elizabeth Rogers defeated Republican J.D. Hayworth, 48.41% to 48.15%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Harry Mitchell defeated Republican J.D. Hayworth, 58.73% to 36.25%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 22.22 per 100 cast.

AZ 05 was included in this study for illustrative purposes. It is a non-border white-majority district with *no* areas in which Hispanics comprise a voter majority, but within parts of which Hispanics constitute a considerable minority. The incumbent Congressman, J.D. Hayworth, became a national spokesman against CIR. As such, AZ 05 was a place where a “white backlash” against CIR might be measured – if there were any.

### ARIZONA Dist. 05 - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Hayworth (R)	% Hayworth	Rogers (D)	% Rogers	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	Mesa 051	32.8%	494	55.1%	370	41.3%	32	3.6%	896	1352
Maricopa	Tempe 23	33.0%	417	44.9%	487	52.5%	24	2.6%	928	1246
Maricopa	Mesa 063	34.4%	528	51.2%	472	45.8%	31	3.0%	1031	1547
Maricopa	Tempe 12	38.8%	266	42.5%	328	52.4%	32	5.1%	626	987
Maricopa	Mesa 090	39.9%	569	54.1%	450	42.8%	33	3.1%	1052	1415
Maricopa	Tempe 18	41.9%	147	30.9%	306	64.3%	23	4.8%	476	762
Maricopa	Powell	43.6%	144	44.7%	168	52.2%	10	3.1%	322	483
Maricopa	Diamond	60.9%	381	48.4%	381	48.4%	26	3.3%	788	1234
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>2946</b>	<b>48.1%</b>	<b>2962</b>	<b>48.4%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>3.4%</b>	<b>6119</b>	<b>9026</b>

### ARIZONA Dist. 05 - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Hayworth (R)	% Hayworth	Mitchell (D)	% Mitchell	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	Mesa 051	32.8%	274	47.6%	274	47.6%	28	4.9%	576	1058
Maricopa	Tempe 23	33.0%	216	28.5%	530	69.9%	12	1.6%	758	1056
Maricopa	Mesa 063	34.4%	305	41.1%	381	51.3%	56	7.5%	742	1361
Maricopa	Tempe 12	38.8%	82	25.2%	228	70.2%	15	4.6%	325	710
Maricopa	Mesa 090	39.9%	298	40.5%	398	54.1%	40	5.4%	736	1227
Maricopa	Tempe 18	41.9%	57	20.1%	211	74.6%	15	5.3%	283	586
Maricopa	Powell	43.6%	59	28.9%	138	67.6%	7	3.4%	204	394
Maricopa	Diamond	60.9%	231	40.2%	306	53.2%	38	6.6%	575	1000
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>1522</b>	<b>36.2%</b>	<b>2466</b>	<b>58.7%</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>5.0%</b>	<b>4199</b>	<b>7392</b>

## Analysis

The Arizona 5<sup>th</sup> is neither a border district, nor heavily Latino. Centered around the Phoenix suburbs of Scottsdale and Tempe, its 13.3% Latino population is slightly *below* the national average; the 5<sup>th</sup> contains one predominantly Hispanic precinct, and a handful that are substantially Hispanic.

But Arizona is a state whose schools, hospitals, and courts are fiscally burdened by the influx of illegals from the South; moreover, the incumbent highlighted his opposition to CIR in his campaign.

J.D. Hayworth's 2006 tome *Whatever It Takes* describes his conversion from a border moderate to a Minuteman aficionado. His attitude toward guest worker programs is neatly described in a chapter title: "Guest Worker = Amnesty = Surrender."

Regarding deportation, he writes:

"The *Wall Street Journal* once scolded that lawmakers need 'to distinguish between immigrants who bus tables and those who hijack airplanes,' without giving any practical advice on how to make such a distinction. Here's the distinction I make: if the busboy is illegal, he should be deported. The hijacker should be executed."

But as a practical matter, Hayworth opts for a "soft" deportation. Instead of government rounding up illegals, Hayworth expects that their employers (i.e., the folks who clearly want them here) will fire them, or suffer criminal penalties themselves. First, a system of universal, tamper-proof identification should be established. Then, sanctions should be administered against recalcitrant bosses:

"The demand for cheap labor is the magnet drawing illegal aliens into our country. If we get serious about punishing the businesses that hire illegal aliens, they will stop hiring them... The current penalties for hiring illegal aliens are not severe enough to act as a deterrent. For companies with an established pattern of hiring illegal workers, we should increase the fine from \$10,000 to \$50,000 per illegal alien. This would have a greater impact on illegal immigration than hiring a thousand Border Patrol agents."

Perhaps so. We'll never know – at least by Rep. Hayworth's agency – because he lost the election to a Democratic Party advocate of comprehensive immigration reform.

Here is Rep. Harry Mitchell's campaign statement on immigration:

"Every sovereign nation has a responsibility to secure its border. In Congress, I'll make it a top priority to secure the U.S.-Mexico border and stop illegal immigration.... Specifically, I'll work to:

- Station more Border Patrol agents along the border;
- Put more high-tech tools along the border so we can better monitor border activity;
- Extend existing fencing in urban areas;
- Establish a temporary worker program that allows us to keep track of who crosses our borders; and
- Hold employers accountable for whom they hire.

"I oppose amnesty and will not support it. Still, we must deal with the millions of illegal immigrants who are already here. Catching and deporting 11 million illegal immigrants, as some have suggested, is neither realistic nor wise. I believe we should give families an opportunity to gain legal status if they pay a penalty for breaking the law, pay their taxes, learn English, and hold a job for a period of years."

-- Source: Harry Mitchell for Congress website

Mitchell advocated border control, a guest worker program, and earned legal status – the "comprehensive immigration" position of the Bush administration – even down to the detail of calling the amnesty something else.

In the White dominant, Latino-influenced precincts we have listed, Hayworth's vote declined 11.9%.

As an answer to illegal immigration, employer sanctions proved no more politically attractive in Scottsdale than criminalization had in Laredo, or deportation in Tucson.

### Arizona 5<sup>th</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

In the Hispanic-influenced precincts, Hayworth ran ahead of President Bush as recently as 2004. But in 2006, he ran substantially behind Sen. Kyl. Sen. McCain, a vocal champion of CIR, ran far ahead of all other G.O.P. candidates among Hispanic voters.<sup>6</sup>

### ARIZONA Presidential - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	Mesa 051	32.8%	477	50.6%	460	48.8%	6	0.6%	943	1352
Maricopa	Tempe 23	33.0%	387	39.5%	581	59.3%	11	1.1%	979	1246
Maricopa	Mesa 063	34.4%	528	49.0%	546	50.6%	4	0.4%	1078	1547
Maricopa	Tempe 12	38.8%	246	36.0%	429	62.8%	8	1.2%	683	987
Maricopa	Mesa 090	39.9%	558	49.4%	563	49.9%	8	0.7%	1129	1415
Maricopa	Tempe 18	41.9%	137	27.2%	361	71.6%	6	1.2%	504	762
Maricopa	Powell	43.6%	129	37.7%	205	59.9%	8	2.3%	342	483
Maricopa	Diamond	60.9%	418	46.6%	477	53.2%	2	0.2%	897	1234
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>2880</b>	<b>43.9%</b>	<b>3622</b>	<b>55.3%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>6555</b>	<b>9026</b>

### ARIZONA Senate - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	McCain (R)	% McCain	Starsky (D)	% Starsky	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	Mesa 051	32.8%	663	72.7%	225	24.7%	24	2.6%	912	1352
Maricopa	Tempe 23	33.0%	677	70.5%	258	26.9%	25	2.6%	960	1246
Maricopa	Mesa 063	34.4%	713	67.6%	299	28.4%	42	4.0%	1054	1547
Maricopa	Tempe 12	38.8%	476	72.7%	159	24.3%	20	3.1%	655	987
Maricopa	Mesa 090	39.9%	827	75.7%	229	21.0%	36	3.3%	1092	1415
Maricopa	Tempe 18	41.9%	290	58.7%	182	36.8%	22	4.5%	494	762
Maricopa	Powell	43.6%	214	62.9%	119	35.0%	7	2.1%	340	483
Maricopa	Diamond	60.9%	623	72.1%	216	25.0%	25	2.9%	864	1234
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>4483</b>	<b>70.4%</b>	<b>1687</b>	<b>26.5%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>6371</b>	<b>9026</b>

### ARIZONA Senate - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Kyl (R)	% Kyl	Pederson (D)	% Pederson	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	Mesa 051	32.8%	282	49.1%	267	46.5%	25	4.4%	574	1058
Maricopa	Tempe 23	33.0%	283	37.6%	454	60.4%	15	2.0%	752	1056
Maricopa	Mesa 063	34.4%	336	45.0%	366	49.0%	45	6.0%	747	1361
Maricopa	Tempe 12	38.8%	99	30.5%	215	66.2%	11	3.4%	325	710
Maricopa	Mesa 090	39.9%	353	47.6%	355	47.9%	33	4.5%	741	1227
Maricopa	Tempe 18	41.9%	71	24.8%	202	70.6%	13	4.5%	286	586
Maricopa	Powell	43.6%	67	32.8%	123	60.3%	14	6.9%	204	394
Maricopa	Diamond	60.9%	266	46.0%	283	49.0%	29	5.0%	578	1000
<b>TOTALS:</b>			<b>1757</b>	<b>41.8%</b>	<b>2265</b>	<b>53.8%</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>4.4%</b>	<b>4207</b>	<b>7392</b>

<sup>6</sup> For McCain's 2004 statewide Hispanic vote-share, see: CNN 2004 Arizona Senate exit poll -- <http://www.cnn.com/ELECTION/2004/pages/results/states/AZ/S/01/epolls.0.html>

## **New Mexico 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District**

- **Cook P.V.I.:** D (+) 2
- **2004 result:** Republican Heather Wilson defeats Democrat Richard Romero, 54.7% to 45.3% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Heather Wilson defeats Democrat Patricia Madrid, 50.2% to 49.8%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 38 in Bernalillo County, 4 in Sandoval County, and 5 in Valencia County, with Latino population ranging from 75.9% (Bernalillo 41) to 90.4% (Bernalillo 135).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these 47 precincts accounted for 30,916 and 22,610 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Richard Romero defeated Republican Heather Wilson, 56.34% to 43.60%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Patricia Madrid defeated Republican Heather Wilson, 65.03% to 34.97%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Democrats gained 17.32 per 100 cast.

New Mexico's 1<sup>st</sup> District includes most of Albuquerque. 42.6% of its residents are Latino, and it leans Democratic politically. In 2000, Al Gore carried the District by one percentage point; in 2004, John Kerry won by three.

Following the death of Rep. Steven Schiff in 1988 Republican Heather Wilson was elected to replace him with 45% of the vote in a three-way race. The District has been heavily contested ever since. In 2006, two-term state attorney general Patricia Madrid, a seasoned Latina politician, faced off against Wilson in a race that whose outcome was determined by less than 500 votes.

Immigration was not a major topic in this campaign. The war in Iraq, prescription drug policy, and G.O.P. scandals dominated the political debate.

Wilson, like Madrid, is an immigration moderate. The congresswoman endorsed a number of high-profile border security measures, including border fencing and expedited deportation proceedings for criminals and gang members. But she has voted consistently for guest worker programs in both low-tech and high-tech categories. Citizens for Better Immigration grades her at "D". FAIR's most recent ratings show her opposing the organization's viewpoint on 9 of 12 votes. Wilson voted "no" on H.R. 4437.

In the extensive Latino-dominated precincts of Bernalillo County, Wilson lost 8.6% from her 2004 totals to Madrid, one of the state's most successful Hispanic politicians. But at 35.0%, Wilson maintained enough Hispanic support to save her incumbency. Had her losses in the Latino precincts been of the magnitude suffered by Graff, Bonilla, or even Hayworth, Patricia Madrid would have readily won.

In New Mexico's 1<sup>st</sup> District, immigration was not decisive in 2006. But had Wilson voted differently, it might have been.

## **New Mexico 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts**

In both 2004 and 2006, Wilson ran ahead of the other G.O.P. federal candidates in the Hispanic precincts of NM 01. She ran 4.7% ahead of George W. Bush in '04, and 16.1% ahead of G.O.P. Senatorial candidate Allen McCulloch in 2006.

The next four pages chart the federal votes, 2004 and 2006, in the heavily Hispanic precincts of NM 01:

# New Mexico 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District

## NEW MEXICO Dist. 01 - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Wilson (R)	% Wilson	Romero (D)	% Romero	Other	% Other	Total
Bernalillo	32	80.2%	238	40.8%	346	59.2%		0.0%	584
Bernalillo	33	81.2%	232	30.9%	519	69.1%		0.0%	751
Bernalillo	34	81.2%	151	39.5%	230	60.2%	1	0.3%	382
Bernalillo	36	85.8%	191	37.8%	312	61.8%	2	0.4%	505
Bernalillo	37	76.5%	335	39.7%	508	60.2%	1	0.1%	844
Bernalillo	38	81.5%	306	38.1%	498	61.9%		0.0%	804
Bernalillo	40	86.0%	256	42.7%	343	57.3%		0.0%	599
Bernalillo	41	75.9%	344	46.5%	396	53.5%		0.0%	740
Bernalillo	42	78.4%	231	45.8%	273	54.2%		0.0%	504
Bernalillo	43	85.5%	323	40.3%	478	59.7%		0.0%	801
Bernalillo	44	82.9%	259	37.4%	432	62.3%	2	0.3%	693
Bernalillo	45	88.9%	167	36.9%	286	63.1%		0.0%	453
Bernalillo	46	86.9%	230	35.2%	423	64.7%	1	0.2%	654
Bernalillo	48	85.7%	177	31.2%	389	68.5%	2	0.4%	568
Bernalillo	49	80.6%	756	49.4%	774	50.6%		0.0%	1,530
Bernalillo	51	85.1%	163	34.9%	304	65.1%		0.0%	467
Bernalillo	52	77.5%	339	49.0%	353	51.0%		0.0%	692
Bernalillo	53	80.2%	165	44.4%	207	55.6%		0.0%	372
Bernalillo	54	81.8%	359	45.6%	426	54.1%	2	0.3%	787
Bernalillo	55	79.6%	614	49.3%	630	50.6%	1	0.1%	1,245
Bernalillo	61	79.8%	160	39.7%	242	60.0%	1	0.2%	403
Bernalillo	65	80.3%	171	37.7%	283	62.3%		0.0%	454
Bernalillo	66	77.9%	196	40.7%	286	59.3%		0.0%	482
Bernalillo	67	86.0%	220	34.0%	428	66.0%		0.0%	648
Bernalillo	71	82.5%	267	41.7%	373	58.3%		0.0%	640
Bernalillo	72	86.0%	102	31.4%	223	68.6%		0.0%	325
Bernalillo	73	76.4%	411	50.5%	403	49.5%		0.0%	814
Bernalillo	77	82.0%	206	43.8%	263	56.0%	1	0.2%	470
Bernalillo	90	82.3%	284	44.7%	352	55.3%		0.0%	636
Bernalillo	98	81.1%	196	38.3%	316	61.7%		0.0%	512
Bernalillo	99	80.6%	306	45.5%	366	54.5%		0.0%	672
Bernalillo	103	76.1%	150	36.1%	264	63.6%	1	0.2%	415
Bernalillo	135	90.4%	84	22.9%	283	77.1%		0.0%	367
Bernalillo	151	76.4%	197	33.6%	389	66.4%		0.0%	586
Bernalillo	154	79.8%	304	32.2%	639	67.7%	1	0.1%	944
Bernalillo	161	80.8%	118	32.2%	248	67.8%		0.0%	366
Bernalillo	186	77.8%	245	33.4%	487	66.4%	1	0.1%	733
Bernalillo	212	85.5%	98	27.0%	264	72.7%	1	0.3%	363
Sandoval	1	82.0%	422	47.8%	461	52.2%		0.0%	883
Sandoval	2	84.3%	322	44.7%	398	55.3%		0.0%	720
Sandoval	3	81.7%	218	42.0%	301	58.0%		0.0%	519
Sandoval	4	86.2%	133	41.2%	190	58.8%		0.0%	323
Valencia	6	83.4%	615	63.6%	350	36.2%	2	0.2%	967
Valencia	8	80.0%	635	58.4%	453	41.6%		0.0%	1,088
Valencia	16	83.3%	593	61.0%	379	39.0%		0.0%	972
Valencia	28	76.5%	521	62.0%	319	38.0%		0.0%	840
Valencia	32	80.1%	469	58.7%	330	41.3%		0.0%	799
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>13,479</b>	<b>43.6%</b>	<b>17,417</b>	<b>56.3%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>30,916</b>

# NEW MEXICO Dist. 01 - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Wilson (R)	% Wilson	Madrid (D)	% Madrid	Total
Bernalillo	32	80.2%	121	32.4%	253	67.6%	374
Bernalillo	33	81.2%	127	23.2%	421	76.8%	548
Bernalillo	34	81.2%	96	33.7%	189	66.3%	285
Bernalillo	36	85.8%	105	27.2%	281	72.8%	386
Bernalillo	37	76.5%	227	32.9%	462	67.1%	689
Bernalillo	38	81.5%	165	28.4%	415	71.6%	580
Bernalillo	40	86.0%	137	31.1%	303	68.9%	440
Bernalillo	41	75.9%	223	44.7%	276	55.3%	499
Bernalillo	42	78.4%	130	33.9%	253	66.1%	383
Bernalillo	43	85.5%	150	28.7%	373	71.3%	523
Bernalillo	44	82.9%	157	31.0%	350	69.0%	507
Bernalillo	45	88.9%	90	26.0%	256	74.0%	346
Bernalillo	46	86.9%	128	25.1%	381	74.9%	509
Bernalillo	48	85.7%	121	29.0%	296	71.0%	417
Bernalillo	49	80.6%	119	32.8%	244	67.2%	363
Bernalillo	51	85.1%	95	28.2%	242	71.8%	337
Bernalillo	52	77.5%	226	40.9%	326	59.1%	552
Bernalillo	53	80.2%	98	38.9%	154	61.1%	252
Bernalillo	54	81.8%	296	40.1%	443	59.9%	739
Bernalillo	55	79.6%	335	40.7%	489	59.3%	824
Bernalillo	61	79.8%	112	33.9%	218	66.1%	330
Bernalillo	65	80.3%	123	33.2%	247	66.8%	370
Bernalillo	66	77.9%	132	33.8%	258	66.2%	390
Bernalillo	67	86.0%	114	22.9%	384	77.1%	498
Bernalillo	71	82.5%	165	34.1%	319	65.9%	484
Bernalillo	72	86.0%	61	24.5%	188	75.5%	249
Bernalillo	73	76.4%	278	44.6%	345	55.4%	623
Bernalillo	77	82.0%	129	37.4%	216	62.6%	345
Bernalillo	90	82.3%	171	37.1%	290	62.9%	461
Bernalillo	98	81.1%	111	31.0%	247	69.0%	358
Bernalillo	99	80.6%	238	42.2%	326	57.8%	564
Bernalillo	103	76.1%	68	25.5%	199	74.5%	267
Bernalillo	135	90.4%	59	19.9%	238	80.1%	297
Bernalillo	151	76.4%	115	24.5%	354	75.5%	469
Bernalillo	154	79.8%	192	24.9%	578	75.1%	770
Bernalillo	161	80.8%	65	28.5%	163	71.5%	228
Bernalillo	186	77.8%	183	28.8%	452	71.2%	635
Bernalillo	212	85.5%	57	21.3%	211	78.7%	268
Sandoval	1	82.0%	285	38.0%	465	62.0%	750
Sandoval	2	84.3%	216	36.0%	384	64.0%	600
Sandoval	3	81.7%	145	33.3%	291	66.7%	436
Sandoval	4	86.2%	106	37.6%	176	62.4%	282
Valencia	6	83.4%	434	55.9%	342	44.1%	776
Valencia	8	80.0%	450	52.6%	405	47.4%	855
Valencia	16	83.3%	369	50.1%	368	49.9%	737
Valencia	28	76.5%	287	52.1%	264	47.9%	551
Valencia	32	80.1%	344	48.3%	368	51.7%	712
<b>TOTAL</b>			7907	35.0%	14703	65.0%	<b>22,610</b>

## New Mexico 1<sup>st</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

### NEW MEXICO Presidential - 2004

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	% Other	Total
Bernalillo	32	80.2%	217	36.8%	370	62.8%	2	0.3%	589
Bernalillo	33	81.2%	206	27.1%	541	71.3%	12	1.6%	759
Bernalillo	34	81.2%	120	31.3%	262	68.2%	2	0.5%	384
Bernalillo	36	85.8%	151	29.5%	357	69.7%	4	0.8%	512
Bernalillo	37	76.5%	335	39.0%	517	60.1%	8	0.9%	860
Bernalillo	38	81.5%	267	32.9%	537	66.2%	7	0.9%	811
Bernalillo	40	86.0%	233	38.4%	366	60.3%	8	1.3%	607
Bernalillo	41	75.9%	320	43.0%	418	56.1%	7	0.9%	745
Bernalillo	42	78.4%	208	41.2%	292	57.8%	5	1.0%	505
Bernalillo	43	85.5%	286	35.4%	513	63.6%	8	1.0%	807
Bernalillo	44	82.9%	237	34.2%	450	65.0%	5	0.7%	692
Bernalillo	45	88.9%	156	33.3%	305	65.2%	7	1.5%	468
Bernalillo	46	86.9%	188	28.4%	467	70.4%	8	1.2%	663
Bernalillo	48	85.7%	164	28.7%	401	70.2%	6	1.1%	571
Bernalillo	49	80.6%	675	43.7%	856	55.4%	14	0.9%	1,545
Bernalillo	51	85.1%	143	30.4%	322	68.5%	5	1.1%	470
Bernalillo	52	77.5%	288	41.1%	403	57.5%	10	1.4%	701
Bernalillo	53	80.2%	142	38.3%	227	61.2%	2	0.5%	371
Bernalillo	54	81.8%	343	43.0%	449	56.3%	5	0.6%	797
Bernalillo	55	79.6%	557	44.1%	696	55.1%	10	0.8%	1,263
Bernalillo	61	79.8%	137	33.7%	264	65.0%	5	1.2%	406
Bernalillo	65	80.3%	161	34.9%	294	63.8%	6	1.3%	461
Bernalillo	66	77.9%	197	40.0%	286	58.1%	9	1.8%	492
Bernalillo	67	86.0%	181	27.8%	463	71.0%	8	1.2%	652
Bernalillo	71	82.5%	234	35.2%	420	63.3%	10	1.5%	664
Bernalillo	72	86.0%	101	30.7%	225	68.4%	3	0.9%	329
Bernalillo	73	76.4%	350	42.4%	460	55.8%	15	1.8%	825
Bernalillo	77	82.0%	189	40.4%	276	59.0%	3	0.6%	468
Bernalillo	90	82.3%	242	37.9%	393	61.6%	3	0.5%	638
Bernalillo	98	81.1%	183	35.3%	330	63.7%	5	1.0%	518
Bernalillo	99	80.6%	276	40.9%	386	57.2%	13	1.9%	675
Bernalillo	103	76.1%	130	30.8%	279	66.1%	13	3.1%	422
Bernalillo	135	90.4%	82	22.0%	288	77.4%	2	0.5%	372
Bernalillo	151	76.4%	167	28.1%	420	70.6%	8	1.3%	595
Bernalillo	154	79.8%	264	27.7%	675	70.8%	15	1.6%	954
Bernalillo	161	80.8%	110	29.5%	260	69.7%	3	0.8%	373
Bernalillo	186	77.8%	223	30.1%	511	68.9%	8	1.1%	742
Bernalillo	212	85.5%	71	19.3%	290	78.8%	7	1.9%	368
Sandoval	1	82.0%	375	41.8%	513	57.1%	10	1.1%	898
Sandoval	2	84.3%	284	39.2%	435	60.1%	5	0.7%	724
Sandoval	3	81.7%	203	38.3%	324	61.1%	3	0.6%	530
Sandoval	4	86.2%	137	40.9%	195	58.2%	3	0.9%	335
Valencia	6	83.4%	567	57.9%	397	40.5%	16	1.6%	980
Valencia	8	80.0%	628	56.8%	472	42.7%	6	0.5%	1,106
Valencia	16	83.3%	546	54.5%	440	44.0%	15	1.5%	1,001
Valencia	28	76.5%	480	56.0%	362	42.2%	15	1.8%	857
Valencia	32	80.1%	430	53.2%	371	45.9%	7	0.9%	808
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>12184</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>18778</b>	<b>60.0%</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>31,313</b>

# NEW MEXICO Senate - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	McCulloch(R)	% McCulloch	Bingaman(D)	% Bingaman	Other	% Other	Total
Bernalillo	32	80.2%	64	17.4%	304	82.6%	0	0.0%	368
Bernalillo	33	81.2%	55	9.9%	500	90.1%	0	0.0%	555
Bernalillo	34	81.2%	48	17.0%	235	83.0%	0	0.0%	283
Bernalillo	36	85.8%	51	13.2%	336	86.8%	0	0.0%	387
Bernalillo	37	76.5%	130	19.0%	556	81.0%	0	0.0%	686
Bernalillo	38	81.5%	80	13.8%	499	86.2%	0	0.0%	579
Bernalillo	40	86.0%	76	17.1%	368	82.7%	1	0.2%	445
Bernalillo	41	75.9%	111	22.2%	388	77.8%	0	0.0%	499
Bernalillo	42	78.4%	73	19.1%	309	80.9%	0	0.0%	382
Bernalillo	43	85.5%	86	16.4%	437	83.4%	1	0.2%	524
Bernalillo	44	82.9%	81	16.0%	421	83.2%	4	0.8%	506
Bernalillo	45	88.9%	37	10.7%	309	89.3%	0	0.0%	346
Bernalillo	46	86.9%	72	14.1%	440	85.9%	0	0.0%	512
Bernalillo	48	85.7%	44	10.5%	374	89.3%	1	0.2%	419
Bernalillo	49	80.6%	60	16.4%	305	83.6%	0	0.0%	365
Bernalillo	51	85.1%	48	14.2%	291	85.8%	0	0.0%	339
Bernalillo	52	77.5%	129	23.2%	427	76.8%	0	0.0%	556
Bernalillo	53	80.2%	38	15.1%	213	84.9%	0	0.0%	251
Bernalillo	54	81.8%	168	22.7%	571	77.3%	0	0.0%	739
Bernalillo	55	79.6%	166	20.0%	663	79.9%	1	0.1%	830
Bernalillo	61	79.8%	51	15.5%	279	84.5%	0	0.0%	330
Bernalillo	65	80.3%	77	20.8%	293	79.2%	0	0.0%	370
Bernalillo	66	77.9%	59	15.1%	332	84.9%	0	0.0%	391
Bernalillo	67	86.0%	51	10.3%	443	89.5%	1	0.2%	495
Bernalillo	71	82.5%	95	19.7%	387	80.3%	0	0.0%	482
Bernalillo	72	86.0%	31	12.5%	217	87.5%	0	0.0%	248
Bernalillo	73	76.4%	162	26.0%	461	74.0%	0	0.0%	623
Bernalillo	77	82.0%	70	20.1%	276	79.3%	2	0.6%	348
Bernalillo	90	82.3%	87	18.8%	375	81.2%	0	0.0%	462
Bernalillo	98	81.1%	44	12.4%	309	87.3%	1	0.3%	354
Bernalillo	99	80.6%	144	25.6%	417	74.2%	1	0.2%	562
Bernalillo	103	76.1%	32	11.9%	236	87.7%	1	0.4%	269
Bernalillo	135	90.4%	21	7.0%	277	93.0%	0	0.0%	298
Bernalillo	151	76.4%	53	11.3%	414	88.7%	0	0.0%	467
Bernalillo	154	79.8%	89	11.7%	674	88.3%	0	0.0%	763
Bernalillo	161	80.8%	24	10.6%	202	89.4%	0	0.0%	226
Bernalillo	186	77.8%	86	13.7%	543	86.2%	1	0.2%	630
Bernalillo	212	85.5%	27	10.1%	239	89.5%	1	0.4%	267
Sandoval	1	82.0%	132	17.7%	614	82.2%	1	0.1%	747
Sandoval	2	84.3%	90	15.1%	508	84.9%	0	0.0%	598
Sandoval	3	81.7%	49	11.1%	390	88.6%	1	0.2%	440
Sandoval	4	86.2%	51	17.9%	234	82.1%	0	0.0%	285
Valencia	6	83.4%	263	34.2%	507	65.8%	0	0.0%	770
Valencia	8	80.0%	246	28.4%	617	71.2%	3	0.3%	866
Valencia	16	83.3%	223	30.1%	516	69.7%	1	0.1%	740
Valencia	28	76.5%	154	27.9%	398	72.1%	0	0.0%	552
Valencia	32	80.1%	184	25.8%	530	74.2%	0	0.0%	714
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>4212</b>	<b>18.4%</b>	<b>18,634</b>	<b>81.5%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>22,868</b>

## New Mexico 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional District

- **Cook P.V.I.:** R (+) 6
- **2004 result:** Republican Steve Pearce defeats Democrat Gary King, 60.5% to 39.5% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Steve Pearce defeats Democrat Albert Kissling, 59.9% to 40.1%.
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** 6 in Chavez county, 34 in Dona Ana County, 4 in Eddy County, 8 in Grant County, 3 in Guadalupe County, 4 in Luna County, 3 in Socorro County, and 8 in Valencia County, with Latino population ranging from 75.2% (Dona Ana 47) to 98.5% (Dona Ana 80).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these 70 precincts accounted for 35,767 and 24,409 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Gary King defeated Republican Steve Pearce, 56.97% to 43.03%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Democrat Albert Kissling defeated Republican Steve Pearce, 55.44% to 44.48%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Republicans gained 2.98 per 100 cast.

New Mexico's 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional district straddles a huge stretch of the border, and contains the highest percentage of Hispanic residents (47.3%) in the most heavily Hispanic-populated state (42.1%) in the U.S. The border of the 2<sup>nd</sup> sees more than its share of problems. As Congressman Pearce wrote Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff (May 29, 2007):

"I am writing you regarding an emergency need for additional Border Patrol Agents along the U.S. – Mexican border, particularly near the Palomas/Columbus Point of Entry. As you are aware, there is an ever growing problem with drug and gang related violence along our border with Mexico. It is imperative to the safety and well being of all Americans, and specifically those in the Second District of New Mexico, living near or on the border that we heighten border security with increased man power and technological resources.

"The small town of Columbus, New Mexico has recently been the growing battleground for Mexican gang members and drug dealers coming across from Palomas. These criminals have been running into New Mexico after engaging in street warfare in Mexico. In addition, the lack of border control has left the burden of medical treatment on my smallest communities. It is only a matter of time before the fighting will result in American casualties on our own soil.

"Your efforts to immediately increase border security will ensure safer living conditions for those in our communities. In the last Congress, I introduced legislation that would help secure our border and after varying immigration legislation was signed into law last year, I am disappointed in the response of your agency so far to the problems we are facing."

In the previous chapter, we examined Pearce's record on immigration: his strong support for measures to stop illegal migrant flows, but adamant resistance to measures which deport or criminalize undocumented workers en masse. In this chapter, we witness how this policy combination fared in a region that has been plagued by unrestricted borders.

As demonstrated by the huge sample of Hispanic precincts on the next eight pages, Rep. Pearce's strong advocacy of border control did not damage his electoral performance in Hispanic-dominant precincts. In fact, his vote-share in these precincts increased 1.5% from 2004 to 2006. In both years, he ran ahead of the G.O.P. federal ticket, pulling a 1% higher Latino-precinct vote than George W. Bush in 2004, and a 23% higher vote-share than senatorial candidate Allen McCulloch in 2006.

# NEW MEXICO Dist. 02 - 2004

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	Pearce (R)	% Pearce	King (D)	% King	Total
Chaves	00000051	89.8%	134	54.5%	112	45.5%	246
Chaves	00000052	86.8%	197	65.0%	106	35.0%	303
Chaves	00000061	89.0%	76	33.3%	152	66.7%	228
Chaves	00000062	86.7%	110	41.7%	154	58.3%	264
Chaves	00000063	80.1%	254	43.4%	331	56.6%	585
Chaves	00000092	80.9%	260	69.1%	116	30.9%	376
Dona Ana	00000004	80.5%	202	35.3%	370	64.7%	572
Dona Ana	00000005	81.2%	468	54.1%	397	45.9%	865
Dona Ana	00000008	93.9%	150	31.9%	320	68.1%	470
Dona Ana	00000010	89.4%	138	40.6%	202	59.4%	340
Dona Ana	00000011	97.7%	106	24.6%	325	75.4%	431
Dona Ana	00000012	92.6%	236	32.3%	494	67.7%	730
Dona Ana	00000013	97.1%	171	17.2%	822	82.8%	993
Dona Ana	00000015	82.1%	318	46.5%	366	53.5%	684
Dona Ana	00000017	84.0%	234	41.3%	332	58.7%	566
Dona Ana	00000023	76.3%	195	42.0%	269	58.0%	464
Dona Ana	00000024	83.4%	248	50.2%	246	49.8%	494
Dona Ana	00000027	79.8%	225	41.7%	314	58.3%	539
Dona Ana	00000028	83.7%	185	33.9%	360	66.1%	545
Dona Ana	00000029	88.5%	82	34.5%	156	65.5%	238
Dona Ana	00000032	89.9%	45	34.4%	86	65.6%	131
Dona Ana	00000035	85.6%	69	24.4%	214	75.6%	283
Dona Ana	00000036	91.3%	79	38.5%	126	61.5%	205
Dona Ana	00000038	75.4%	246	41.1%	352	58.9%	598
Dona Ana	00000040	82.5%	681	53.9%	583	46.1%	1264
Dona Ana	00000041	86.3%	79	32.4%	165	67.6%	244
Dona Ana	00000042	85.5%	97	36.6%	168	63.4%	265
Dona Ana	00000043	76.3%	153	45.8%	181	54.2%	334
Dona Ana	00000047	75.2%	219	41.6%	307	58.4%	526
Dona Ana	00000048	76.0%	214	35.9%	382	64.1%	596
Dona Ana	00000063	84.0%	575	60.8%	370	39.2%	945
Dona Ana	00000065	81.7%	410	47.4%	455	52.6%	865
Dona Ana	00000066	83.4%	445	50.1%	443	49.9%	888
Dona Ana	00000075	76.3%	325	59.4%	222	40.6%	547
Dona Ana	00000080	98.5%	77	18.2%	347	81.8%	424
Dona Ana	00000092	92.8%	61	33.0%	124	67.0%	185
Dona Ana	00000093	90.0%	51	36.2%	90	63.8%	141
Dona Ana	00000097	97.1%	154	19.9%	620	80.1%	774
Dona Ana	00000101	75.4%	279	45.3%	337	54.7%	616
Dona Ana	00000105	75.9%	443	56.2%	345	43.8%	788
Eddy	00000002	89.6%	264	38.8%	417	61.2%	681
Eddy	00000009	77.6%	257	55.5%	206	44.5%	463
Eddy	00000010	84.3%	159	34.9%	297	65.1%	456
Eddy	00000011	92.9%	77	29.5%	184	70.5%	261

## NEW MEXICO Dist. 02 - 2004 (cont)

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Pearce (R)	% Pearce	King (D)	% King	Total
Grant	00000015	78.2%	292	46.4%	337	53.6%	629
Grant	00000019	82.9%	79	22.6%	270	77.4%	349
Grant	00000022	86.2%	196	33.7%	386	66.3%	582
Grant	00000025	86.9%	76	22.2%	266	77.8%	342
Grant	00000026	83.9%	71	24.7%	216	75.3%	287
Grant	00000027	87.0%	64	20.1%	254	79.9%	318
Grant	00000028	88.2%	89	23.2%	294	76.8%	383
Grant	00000032	84.2%	39	23.4%	128	76.6%	167
Guadalupe	00000001	85.2%	243	41.9%	337	58.1%	580
Guadalupe	00000002	93.2%	210	40.6%	307	59.4%	517
Guadalupe	00000003	92.3%	208	47.3%	232	52.7%	440
Luna	00000005	77.1%	455	52.0%	420	48.0%	875
Luna	00000008	88.9%	201	34.3%	385	65.7%	586
Luna	00000011	85.8%	145	52.5%	131	47.5%	276
Luna	00000012	78.4%	203	47.2%	227	52.8%	430
Socorro	00000001	83.7%	213	40.4%	314	59.6%	527
Socorro	00000005	87.6%	196	52.5%	177	47.5%	373
Socorro	00000006	77.7%	166	45.7%	197	54.3%	363
Valencia	00000003	80.8%	297	55.7%	236	44.3%	533
Valencia	00000007	75.6%	699	56.8%	531	43.2%	1230
Valencia	00000022	81.0%	235	48.9%	246	51.1%	481
Valencia	00000023	79.7%	491	50.7%	478	49.3%	969
Valencia	00000025	77.5%	152	47.4%	169	52.6%	321
Valencia	00000026	79.6%	220	46.1%	257	53.9%	477
Valencia	00000031	78.2%	454	53.1%	401	46.9%	855
Valencia	00000035	78.3%	248	53.4%	216	46.6%	464
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>15,390</b>	<b>43.0%</b>	<b>20,377</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>35,767</b>

# NEW MEXICO Dist. 02 - 2006

County	Precinct	Hispanic pop %	Pearce (R)	% Pearce	Kissling (D)	% Kissling	Other	%Other	Total
Chaves	00000051	89.8%	92	53.8%	78	45.6%	1	0.6%	171
Chaves	00000052	86.8%	138	61.9%	85	38.1%	0	0.0%	223
Chaves	00000061	89.0%	58	35.8%	104	64.2%	0	0.0%	162
Chaves	00000062	86.7%	68	37.0%	116	63.0%	0	0.0%	184
Chaves	00000063	80.1%	200	43.7%	258	56.3%	0	0.0%	458
Chaves	00000092	80.9%	158	68.7%	71	30.9%	1	0.4%	230
Dona Ana	00000004	80.5%	121	33.4%	241	66.6%	0	0.0%	362
Dona Ana	00000005	81.2%	256	51.3%	243	48.7%	0	0.0%	499
Dona Ana	00000008	93.9%	94	38.4%	151	61.6%	0	0.0%	245
Dona Ana	00000010	89.4%	70	34.7%	132	65.3%	0	0.0%	202
Dona Ana	00000011	97.7%	47	23.0%	156	76.5%	1	0.5%	204
Dona Ana	00000012	92.6%	125	33.2%	251	66.6%	1	0.3%	377
Dona Ana	00000013	97.1%	60	12.8%	409	87.2%	0	0.0%	469
Dona Ana	00000015	82.1%	222	46.5%	255	53.5%	0	0.0%	477
Dona Ana	00000017	84.0%	172	45.9%	203	54.1%	0	0.0%	375
Dona Ana	00000023	76.3%	102	38.8%	161	61.2%	0	0.0%	263
Dona Ana	00000024	83.4%	149	46.1%	174	53.9%	0	0.0%	323
Dona Ana	00000027	79.8%	96	36.8%	165	63.2%	0	0.0%	261
Dona Ana	00000028	83.7%	98	29.4%	235	70.6%	0	0.0%	333
Dona Ana	00000029	88.5%	43	28.9%	106	71.1%	0	0.0%	149
Dona Ana	00000032	89.9%	22	29.7%	52	70.3%	0	0.0%	74
Dona Ana	00000035	85.6%	46	25.7%	133	74.3%	0	0.0%	179
Dona Ana	00000036	91.3%	30	25.9%	85	73.3%	1	0.9%	116
Dona Ana	00000038	75.4%	118	40.5%	173	59.5%	0	0.0%	291
Dona Ana	00000040	82.5%	456	49.4%	467	50.6%	0	0.0%	923
Dona Ana	00000041	86.3%	45	30.0%	105	70.0%	0	0.0%	150
Dona Ana	00000042	85.5%	52	33.5%	103	66.5%	0	0.0%	155
Dona Ana	00000043	76.3%	82	41.6%	115	58.4%	0	0.0%	197
Dona Ana	00000047	75.2%	97	37.5%	162	62.5%	0	0.0%	259
Dona Ana	00000048	76.0%	86	32.1%	182	67.9%	0	0.0%	268
Dona Ana	00000063	84.0%	419	58.0%	300	41.6%	3	0.4%	722
Dona Ana	00000065	81.7%	217	43.7%	280	56.3%	0	0.0%	497
Dona Ana	00000066	83.4%	262	45.6%	311	54.1%	2	0.3%	575
Dona Ana	00000075	76.3%	191	53.7%	164	46.1%	1	0.3%	356
Dona Ana	00000080	98.5%	40	17.2%	192	82.8%	0	0.0%	232
Dona Ana	00000092	92.8%	28	33.7%	55	66.3%	0	0.0%	83
Dona Ana	00000093	90.0%	29	30.9%	65	69.1%	0	0.0%	94
Dona Ana	00000097	97.1%	45	12.4%	318	87.6%	0	0.0%	363
Dona Ana	00000101	75.4%	197	48.4%	210	51.6%	0	0.0%	407
Dona Ana	00000105	75.9%	258	50.3%	255	49.7%	0	0.0%	513
Eddy	00000002	89.6%	199	43.7%	256	56.3%	0	0.0%	455
Eddy	00000009	77.6%	181	54.4%	152	45.6%	0	0.0%	333
Eddy	00000010	84.3%	90	30.2%	208	69.8%	0	0.0%	298
Eddy	00000011	92.9%	37	19.7%	151	80.3%	0	0.0%	188

NEW MEXICO Dist. 02 - 2006 (cont.)

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Pearce (R)	% Pearce	Kissling (D)	% Kissling	Other	%Other	Total
Grant	00000015	78.2%	284	48.4%	303	51.6%	0	0.0%	587
Grant	00000019	82.9%	70	27.1%	188	72.9%	0	0.0%	258
Grant	00000022	86.2%	148	35.2%	270	64.3%	2	0.5%	420
Grant	00000025	86.9%	62	21.7%	224	78.3%	0	0.0%	286
Grant	00000026	83.9%	64	28.8%	158	71.2%	0	0.0%	222
Grant	00000027	87.0%	58	22.3%	201	77.3%	1	0.4%	260
Grant	00000028	88.2%	100	29.9%	235	70.1%	0	0.0%	335
Grant	00000032	84.2%	7	6.3%	104	93.7%	0	0.0%	111
Guadalupe	00000001	85.2%	282	60.3%	186	39.7%	0	0.0%	468
Guadalupe	00000002	93.2%	266	59.0%	185	41.0%	0	0.0%	451
Guadalupe	00000003	92.3%	235	59.8%	158	40.2%	0	0.0%	393
Luna	00000005	77.1%	375	51.9%	347	48.1%	0	0.0%	722
Luna	00000008	88.9%	160	37.0%	273	63.0%	0	0.0%	433
Luna	00000011	85.8%	175	41.3%	248	58.5%	1	0.2%	424
Luna	00000012	78.4%	181	52.2%	166	47.8%	0	0.0%	347
Socorro	00000001	83.7%	173	41.1%	248	58.9%	0	0.0%	421
Socorro	00000005	87.6%	137	50.9%	132	49.1%	0	0.0%	269
Socorro	00000006	77.7%	164	54.3%	138	45.7%	0	0.0%	302
Valencia	00000003	80.8%	254	58.5%	180	41.5%	0	0.0%	434
Valencia	00000007	75.6%	575	60.2%	379	39.7%	1	0.1%	955
Valencia	00000022	81.0%	198	52.5%	178	47.2%	1	0.3%	377
Valencia	00000023	79.7%	418	59.4%	285	40.5%	1	0.1%	704
Valencia	00000025	77.5%	128	49.6%	130	50.4%	0	0.0%	258
Valencia	00000026	79.6%	175	52.2%	160	47.8%	0	0.0%	335
Valencia	00000031	78.2%	365	59.5%	248	40.5%	0	0.0%	613
Valencia	00000035	78.3%	208	63.2%	121	36.8%	0	0.0%	329
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>10,858</b>	<b>44.5%</b>	<b>13,533</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>0.1%</b>	<b>24,409</b>

## New Mexico 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

### NEW MEXICO Presidential - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	%Other	Total
Chaves	00000051	89.8%	120	48.6%	125	50.6%	2	0.8%	247
Chaves	00000052	86.8%	192	61.3%	116	37.1%	5	1.6%	313
Chaves	00000061	89.0%	77	33.6%	150	65.5%	2	0.9%	229
Chaves	00000062	86.7%	114	40.7%	162	57.9%	4	1.4%	280
Chaves	00000063	80.1%	248	41.3%	346	57.6%	7	1.2%	601
Chaves	00000092	80.9%	245	64.3%	129	33.9%	7	1.8%	381
Dona Ana	00000004	80.5%	192	32.7%	392	66.8%	3	0.5%	587
Dona Ana	00000005	81.2%	479	54.6%	387	44.1%	12	1.4%	878
Dona Ana	00000008	93.9%	143	29.1%	343	69.9%	5	1.0%	491
Dona Ana	00000010	89.4%	121	35.4%	220	64.3%	1	0.3%	342
Dona Ana	00000011	97.7%	94	21.6%	337	77.5%	4	0.9%	435
Dona Ana	00000012	92.6%	217	29.1%	521	69.8%	8	1.1%	746
Dona Ana	00000013	97.1%	192	18.6%	835	80.9%	5	0.5%	1032
Dona Ana	00000015	82.1%	301	43.5%	387	55.9%	4	0.6%	692
Dona Ana	00000017	84.0%	231	40.5%	336	58.9%	3	0.5%	570
Dona Ana	00000023	76.3%	191	40.4%	276	58.4%	6	1.3%	473
Dona Ana	00000024	83.4%	224	44.7%	272	54.3%	5	1.0%	501
Dona Ana	00000027	79.8%	223	40.7%	316	57.7%	9	1.6%	548
Dona Ana	00000028	83.7%	185	33.6%	363	66.0%	2	0.4%	550
Dona Ana	00000029	88.5%	69	28.9%	167	69.9%	3	1.3%	239
Dona Ana	00000032	89.9%	36	26.7%	98	72.6%	1	0.7%	135
Dona Ana	00000035	85.6%	75	25.8%	214	73.5%	2	0.7%	291
Dona Ana	00000036	91.3%	80	36.0%	134	60.4%	8	3.6%	222
Dona Ana	00000038	75.4%	225	36.8%	378	61.9%	8	1.3%	611
Dona Ana	00000040	82.5%	682	53.2%	588	45.9%	11	0.9%	1281
Dona Ana	00000041	86.3%	70	27.6%	177	69.7%	7	2.8%	254
Dona Ana	00000042	85.5%	85	31.5%	181	67.0%	4	1.5%	270
Dona Ana	00000043	76.3%	153	45.3%	181	53.6%	4	1.2%	338
Dona Ana	00000047	75.2%	208	39.5%	309	58.7%	9	1.7%	526
Dona Ana	00000048	76.0%	193	32.1%	404	67.2%	4	0.7%	601
Dona Ana	00000063	84.0%	582	60.9%	366	38.3%	7	0.7%	955
Dona Ana	00000065	81.7%	419	47.6%	454	51.6%	7	0.8%	880
Dona Ana	00000066	83.4%	440	48.9%	448	49.8%	11	1.2%	899
Dona Ana	00000075	76.3%	333	58.6%	232	40.8%	3	0.5%	568
Dona Ana	00000080	98.5%	84	19.2%	352	80.5%	1	0.2%	437
Dona Ana	00000092	92.8%	52	28.1%	130	70.3%	3	1.6%	185
Dona Ana	00000093	90.0%	55	37.7%	88	60.3%	3	2.1%	146
Dona Ana	00000097	97.1%	165	20.4%	639	78.9%	6	0.7%	810
Dona Ana	00000101	75.4%	273	43.8%	347	55.7%	3	0.5%	623
Dona Ana	00000105	75.9%	428	53.8%	363	45.6%	5	0.6%	796

## NEW MEXICO Presidential - 2004 (cont.)

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	%Other	Total
Eddy	00000002	89.6%	278	40.3%	405	58.7%	7	1.0%	690
Eddy	00000009	77.6%	257	54.9%	204	43.6%	7	1.5%	468
Eddy	00000010	84.3%	151	32.6%	310	67.0%	2	0.4%	463
Eddy	00000011	92.9%	75	28.4%	187	70.8%	2	0.8%	264
Grant	00000015	78.2%	315	47.9%	335	51.0%	7	1.1%	657
Grant	00000019	82.9%	188	41.2%	262	57.5%	6	1.3%	456
Grant	00000022	86.2%	193	32.6%	396	66.9%	3	0.5%	592
Grant	00000025	86.9%	66	19.0%	281	80.7%	1	0.3%	348
Grant	00000026	83.9%	74	24.7%	226	75.3%	0	0.0%	300
Grant	00000027	87.0%	67	20.8%	254	78.9%	1	0.3%	322
Grant	00000028	88.2%	90	22.7%	300	75.8%	6	1.5%	396
Grant	00000032	84.2%	33	19.6%	133	79.2%	2	1.2%	168
Guadalupe	00000001	85.2%	241	40.8%	346	58.6%	3	0.5%	590
Guadalupe	00000002	93.2%	205	39.1%	316	60.3%	3	0.6%	524
Guadalupe	00000003	92.3%	222	50.1%	220	49.7%	1	0.2%	443
Luna	00000005	77.1%	473	53.8%	400	45.5%	7	0.8%	880
Luna	00000008	88.9%	247	41.2%	348	58.1%	4	0.7%	599
Luna	00000011	85.8%	143	51.4%	129	46.4%	6	2.2%	278
Luna	00000012	78.4%	216	49.0%	220	49.9%	5	1.1%	441
Socorro	00000001	83.7%	190	35.4%	339	63.2%	7	1.3%	536
Socorro	00000005	87.6%	180	47.0%	196	51.2%	7	1.8%	383
Socorro	00000006	77.7%	154	41.3%	219	58.7%	0	0.0%	373
Valencia	00000003	80.8%	300	55.5%	234	43.3%	7	1.3%	541
Valencia	00000007	75.6%	712	57.2%	521	41.9%	11	0.9%	1244
Valencia	00000022	81.0%	224	45.6%	256	52.1%	11	2.2%	491
Valencia	00000023	79.7%	522	52.4%	466	46.7%	9	0.9%	997
Valencia	00000025	77.5%	152	46.9%	167	51.5%	5	1.5%	324
Valencia	00000026	79.6%	186	38.5%	292	60.5%	5	1.0%	483
Valencia	00000031	78.2%	455	52.8%	402	46.6%	5	0.6%	862
Valencia	00000035	78.3%	254	54.4%	213	45.6%	0	0.0%	467
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>15,359</b>	<b>42.0%</b>	<b>20,840</b>	<b>57.0%</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>36,543</b>

# NEW MEXICO Senate - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	McCulloch(R)	% McCulloch	Bingaman(D)	% Bingaman	Other	%Other	Total
Chaves	00000051	89.8%	36	20.8%	137	79.2%	0	0.0%	173
Chaves	00000052	86.8%	66	29.5%	158	70.5%	0	0.0%	224
Chaves	00000061	89.0%	20	12.3%	143	87.7%	0	0.0%	163
Chaves	00000062	86.7%	24	13.0%	160	86.5%	1	0.5%	185
Chaves	00000063	80.1%	73	15.8%	389	84.2%	0	0.0%	462
Chaves	00000092	80.9%	79	34.5%	150	65.5%	0	0.0%	229
Dona Ana	00000004	80.5%	45	12.4%	319	87.6%	0	0.0%	364
Dona Ana	00000005	81.2%	161	32.3%	337	67.7%	0	0.0%	498
Dona Ana	00000008	93.9%	40	16.4%	204	83.6%	0	0.0%	244
Dona Ana	00000010	89.4%	48	23.5%	156	76.5%	0	0.0%	204
Dona Ana	00000011	97.7%	20	9.8%	184	90.2%	0	0.0%	204
Dona Ana	00000012	92.6%	77	20.4%	299	79.3%	1	0.3%	377
Dona Ana	00000013	97.1%	32	6.8%	435	92.9%	1	0.2%	468
Dona Ana	00000015	82.1%	155	32.6%	320	67.4%	0	0.0%	475
Dona Ana	00000017	84.0%	95	25.2%	282	74.8%	0	0.0%	377
Dona Ana	00000023	76.3%	52	20.0%	208	80.0%	0	0.0%	260
Dona Ana	00000024	83.4%	96	30.0%	224	70.0%	0	0.0%	320
Dona Ana	00000027	79.8%	56	21.5%	204	78.5%	0	0.0%	260
Dona Ana	00000028	83.7%	48	14.6%	281	85.4%	0	0.0%	329
Dona Ana	00000029	88.5%	19	12.8%	130	87.2%	0	0.0%	149
Dona Ana	00000032	89.9%	8	11.0%	65	89.0%	0	0.0%	73
Dona Ana	00000035	85.6%	25	13.6%	158	85.9%	1	0.5%	184
Dona Ana	00000036	91.3%	20	17.5%	94	82.5%	0	0.0%	114
Dona Ana	00000038	75.4%	63	21.7%	227	78.3%	0	0.0%	290
Dona Ana	00000040	82.5%	323	35.2%	595	64.8%	0	0.0%	918
Dona Ana	00000041	86.3%	24	16.1%	125	83.9%	0	0.0%	149
Dona Ana	00000042	85.5%	23	15.0%	130	85.0%	0	0.0%	153
Dona Ana	00000043	76.3%	42	21.3%	155	78.7%	0	0.0%	197
Dona Ana	00000047	75.2%	60	23.2%	198	76.4%	1	0.4%	259
Dona Ana	00000048	76.0%	46	17.3%	220	82.7%	0	0.0%	266
Dona Ana	00000063	84.0%	293	40.9%	422	58.9%	1	0.1%	716
Dona Ana	00000065	81.7%	129	25.9%	370	74.1%	0	0.0%	499
Dona Ana	00000066	83.4%	176	31.0%	389	68.6%	2	0.4%	567
Dona Ana	00000075	76.3%	135	38.4%	217	61.6%	0	0.0%	352
Dona Ana	00000080	98.5%	20	8.6%	212	91.4%	0	0.0%	232
Dona Ana	00000092	92.8%	13	15.5%	71	84.5%	0	0.0%	84
Dona Ana	00000093	90.0%	16	17.2%	77	82.8%	0	0.0%	93
Dona Ana	00000097	97.1%	27	7.5%	335	92.5%	0	0.0%	362
Dona Ana	00000101	75.4%	106	25.9%	303	74.1%	0	0.0%	409
Dona Ana	00000105	75.9%	178	34.9%	331	64.9%	1	0.2%	510
Eddy	00000002	89.6%	61	13.4%	394	86.6%	0	0.0%	455
Eddy	00000009	77.6%	80	24.2%	251	75.8%	0	0.0%	331
Eddy	00000010	84.3%	32	10.6%	269	89.4%	0	0.0%	301
Eddy	00000011	92.9%	12	6.3%	178	93.7%	0	0.0%	190

## NEW MEXICO Senate - 2006, cont.

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	McCulloch(R)	% McCulloch	Bingaman(D)	% Bingaman	Other	%Other	Total
Grant	00000015	78.2%	111	18.9%	477	81.1%	0	0.0%	588
Grant	00000019	82.9%	20	7.6%	243	92.4%	0	0.0%	263
Grant	00000022	86.2%	64	15.1%	359	84.9%	0	0.0%	423
Grant	00000025	86.9%	18	6.3%	270	93.8%	0	0.0%	288
Grant	00000026	83.9%	24	10.5%	205	89.5%	0	0.0%	229
Grant	00000027	87.0%	17	6.5%	242	93.1%	1	0.4%	260
Grant	00000028	88.2%	29	8.6%	308	91.4%	0	0.0%	337
Grant	00000032	84.2%	26	23.6%	84	76.4%	0	0.0%	110
Guadalupe	00000001	85.2%	67	14.3%	401	85.7%	0	0.0%	468
Guadalupe	00000002	93.2%	55	12.3%	393	87.7%	0	0.0%	448
Guadalupe	00000003	92.3%	38	9.8%	351	90.2%	0	0.0%	389
Luna	00000005	77.1%	197	27.6%	517	72.4%	0	0.0%	714
Luna	00000008	88.9%	61	14.0%	375	86.0%	0	0.0%	436
Luna	00000011	85.8%	83	19.3%	346	80.7%	0	0.0%	429
Luna	00000012	78.4%	75	22.0%	266	78.0%	0	0.0%	341
Socorro	00000001	83.7%	75	17.9%	345	82.1%	0	0.0%	420
Socorro	00000005	87.6%	55	20.7%	211	79.3%	0	0.0%	266
Socorro	00000006	77.7%	60	20.1%	239	79.9%	0	0.0%	299
Valencia	00000003	80.8%	116	26.7%	318	73.1%	1	0.2%	435
Valencia	00000007	75.6%	270	28.0%	692	71.9%	1	0.1%	963
Valencia	00000022	81.0%	67	17.9%	308	82.1%	0	0.0%	375
Valencia	00000023	79.7%	162	22.9%	546	77.1%	0	0.0%	708
Valencia	00000025	77.5%	49	18.8%	211	81.2%	0	0.0%	260
Valencia	00000026	79.6%	51	15.0%	290	85.0%	0	0.0%	341
Valencia	00000031	78.2%	148	22.6%	508	77.4%	0	0.0%	656
Valencia	00000035	78.3%	86	25.7%	248	74.3%	0	0.0%	334
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>5178</b>	<b>21.2%</b>	<b>19259</b>	<b>78.8%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>24,449</b>

### Arizona 6<sup>th</sup> Congressional District

- **Cook P.V.I.:** R (+) 12
- **2004 result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeats Libertarian Craig Stritar, 79.4% to 20.6% .
- **2006 result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Jason Blair, 74.8% to 25.2%
- **Hispanic Precincts in study:** Due to realignment, the precincts are not identical in 2004 and 2006. In 2004, 4 heavily Hispanic precincts were identified in Maricopa County, and 1 in Pinal County. In 2006, 5 heavily Hispanic precincts were identified in Maricopa County, and 2 in Pinal County. In both years, the Latino population ranged from 62.7% (Western Skies) to 97.2% (Higley).
- **Canvas size:** In the congressional contests of 2004 and 2006, these nine precincts accounted for 9,576 and 6,839 votes cast respectively.
- **2004 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Craig Stritar, 79.26% to 20.74%
- **2006 Hispanic precinct result:** Republican Jeff Flake defeated Libertarian Jason Blair, 75.45% to 24.55%
- **Net Hispanic vote shift, 04-06:** Libertarians gained 7.62 per 100 cast.

## Analysis

Centered around the southeastern suburbs and exurbs of Phoenix, the Arizona 6th is one of the most conservative districts in the nation. Its current representative, Jeff Flake, was the former Director of the Goldwater Institute, a free-market think tank.

At 17.2% of population, Hispanics are a substantial, but not dominant, portion of Flake's constituency. Like Pearce, Rep. Flake earns a gentleman's "C" on immigration issues from the enforcement-first interest groups, and for the same reasons: He consistently supported both rigorous border controls and freer labor markets. In a press release subtitled "Congress Needs to Pass Comprehensive Immigration Reform" (Sept 6, 2007), Flake stated: "Enforcement alone cannot solve this problem. Until Congress creates a comprehensive temporary worker program, the success of state and Administration measures [*for enforcement – ed.*] will have a ceiling."

In 2007, Flake joined forces with Chicago Democratic Rep. Luis Gutierrez to author the STRIVE Act -- a combination rigorous border and interior enforcement of immigration law with extremely flexible worker entry programs. The measure would also allow resident illegals to stay for extended periods of time provided they "pay fines, undergo background checks, meet English-language and civics requirements, pay back taxes, and, most importantly, go to the back of the line if they wish to adjust their status."

His outspoken support of international markets in trade and labor have made Flake the conservative whom anti-immigrant groups most love to hate, despite his comparatively high marks. On Feb. 2, 2005, FAIR president Dan Stein sent Flake a public rebuke for his support of President Bush's plans for comprehensive reform. Stein wrote:

"The President's plan is an amnesty because it eliminates prosecution for a criminal offense, i.e. the violation of immigration laws against illegally entering the country or overstaying a visa. By definition, forbearing prosecution (and actually rewarding it by giving the illegal presence effective permanent status) is an amnesty whether you care to admit it or not....

"The President's plan is not only an ill advised amnesty, it is also bad economic policy that threatens to place virtually every American's job on the auction block for the cheapest bidder."

Flake remained unrepentant. He readily survived a restrictionist primary challenge in 2004, 59.3-to-40.7. No Republican challenged him in 2006. In neither 2004 nor 2006 did the Democrats run a candidate against him in the general election. Votes against him are, to a large degree, protest votes.

In 2004, Flake's Hispanic numbers ran slightly below his overall numbers in the district: 79.3% vs. 79.4%. In 2006, after the immigration debate, his Hispanic vote share exceeded his over-all vote share, 76.5% vs 74.8%.

## ARIZONA Dist. 06 - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Flake (R)	% Flake	Stritar (L)	% Stritar	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	San Marcos	67.0%	1047	70.2%	444	29.8%	1491	2663
Maricopa	Higley	97.2%	2394	81.8%	532	18.2%	2926	3934
Maricopa	Mesa 067	73.4%	209	69.2%	93	30.8%	302	583
Maricopa	Western Skies	62.7%	1292	81.0%	303	19.0%	1595	2292
Pinal	Johnson Ranch	75.0%	2648	81.2%	614	18.8%	3262	5464
<b>Total</b>			<b>7590</b>	<b>79.3%</b>	<b>1986</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>9576</b>	<b>14,936</b>

## ARIZONA Dist. 06 - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Flake (R)	% Flake	Blair (L)	% Blair	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	San Marcos	67.0%	497	65.2%	265	34.8%	762	1840
Maricopa	Higley	97.2%	929	77.9%	263	22.1%	1192	2150
Maricopa	Mesa 067	73.4%	125	70.2%	53	29.8%	178	424
Maricopa	Western Skies	62.7%	829	73.3%	302	26.7%	1131	2173
Maricopa	Tierra Madre	88.2%	1182	82.4%	253	17.6%	1435	2388
Pinal	Johnson Ranch	75.0%	995	74.9%	334	25.1%	1329	2985
Pinal	Copper Basin	72.2%	603	74.3%	209	25.7%	812	2004
<b>Total</b>			<b>5160</b>	<b>75.4%</b>	<b>1679</b>	<b>24.6%</b>	<b>6839</b>	<b>13,964</b>

### Arizona 8<sup>th</sup> Congressional District: Supplementary Charts

Against nominal competition in the general elections, Flake's totals in the heavily Hispanic precincts of his district were phenomenal – but so were the Hispanic totals of Republicans who *did* have competition. In 2004, George W. Bush carried 64.2%

## ARIZONA Presidential - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Bush (R)	% Bush	Kerry (D)	% Kerry	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	San Marcos	67.0%	940	51.9%	863	47.7%	8	0.4%	1811	2663
Maricopa	Higley	97.2%	2293	69.0%	1016	30.6%	12	0.4%	3321	3934
Maricopa	Mesa 067	73.4%	180	52.0%	160	46.2%	6	1.7%	346	583
Maricopa	Western Skies	62.7%	1169	63.5%	663	36.0%	9	0.5%	1841	2292
Pinal	Johnson Ranch	75.0%	2509	67.2%	1216	32.6%	8	0.2%	3733	5464
<b>Total</b>			<b>7091</b>	<b>64.2%</b>	<b>3918</b>	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>11,052</b>	<b>14,936</b>

John McCain, whose overall Arizona Hispanic vote share was estimated by the CNN's exit poll at 74%, carried 83.7% in the Arizona 6<sup>th</sup>. And in 2006, Jon Kyl carried 62.0%.

## ARIZONA Senate - 2004

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	McCain (R)	% McCain	Starsky (D)	% Starsky	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	San Marcos	67.0%	1351	77.0%	357	0.203535	46	2.6%	1754	2663
Maricopa	Higley	97.2%	2831	87.6%	337	0.104302	63	1.9%	3231	3934
Maricopa	Mesa 067	73.4%	242	71.0%	88	0.258065	11	3.2%	341	583
Maricopa	Western Skies	62.7%	1543	86.3%	218	0.121992	26	1.5%	1787	2292
Pinal	Johnson Ranch	75.0%	3030	83.4%	506	0.139317	96	2.6%	3632	5464
<b>Total</b>			<b>8997</b>	<b>83.7%</b>	<b>1506</b>	<b>0.140158</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>2.3%</b>	<b>10,745</b>	<b>14,936</b>

## ARIZONA Senate - 2006

County	Precinct	Hisp pop %	Kyl (R)	% Kyl	Pederson (D)	% Pederson	Other	% Other	Total	Reg.
Maricopa	San Marcos	67.0%	422	49.2%	409	47.7%	27	3.1%	858	1840
Maricopa	Higley	97.2%	841	66.0%	410	32.2%	23	1.8%	1274	2150
Maricopa	Mesa 067	73.4%	121	60.2%	71	35.3%	9	4.5%	201	424
Maricopa	Western Skies	62.7%	748	60.2%	465	37.4%	29	2.3%	1242	2173
Maricopa	Tierra Madre	88.2%	1089	71.2%	409	26.7%	31	2.0%	1529	2388
Pinal	Johnson Ranch	75.0%	878	59.2%	562	37.9%	42	2.8%	1482	2985
Pinal	Copper Basin	72.2%	550	60.5%	334	36.7%	25	2.8%	909	2004
<b>Total</b>			<b>4,649</b>	<b>62.0%</b>	<b>2,660</b>	<b>35.5%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>2.5%</b>	<b>7,495</b>	<b>13,964</b>

## Summary:

### **“Enforcement-Only” Candidacies: 2004 vs 2006**

AZ 08, TX 23, and AZ 05

In three of the Congressional districts analyzed, G.O.P. candidates advocated an “enforcement only” approach to immigration reform that promoted the removal, by means coercive, voluntary, or some combination thereof, of illegal aliens currently residing in the United States. In each case, “enforcement only” constituted a departure from the prior policy of the district’s elected representative.

- The average Democratic Party Hispanic-area congressional vote gain, 2004-2006, across these three districts was 21.56 votes/100 cast.
- The average Republican Party Hispanic-area vote loss, 2004-2006, across these three districts was 21.61 votes/100 cast.

In two of these districts, Latinos constituted population majorities in the selected precincts.

- The average Democratic Party Hispanic-precinct congressional vote gain, 2004-2006, across these two districts was 26.47 votes/100 cast.
- The average Republican Party Hispanic-precinct vote loss, 2004-2006, across these two districts was 27.18 votes/100 cast.

### **“Comprehensive Immigration Reform” Candidacies: 2004 vs 2006**

NM 01, NM 02, and AZ 06

In three of the Congressional districts analyzed, G.O.P. candidates advocated a “comprehensive” approach to immigration reform that envisioned some combination of border enforcement and amnesty.

- The average Republican Party Hispanic-precinct vote loss, 2004-2006, across these three districts was 3.66 votes/100 cast.
- The average Anti-Republican Hispanic-precinct congressional vote gain, 2004-2006, across these three districts was 3.66 votes/100 cast.

# Chapter 3:

## How “Enforcement-Only” Will Effect the Latino Presidential Vote in 2008

Using calculations of the observed Democratic Party vote share advantage derived from the Hispanic precinct study in the preceding chapter, the chart on page 48 predicts the electoral impact of the adoption of an “enforcement only” immigration policy by the Republican Party presidential nominee on Hispanic voting in 2008.

The percent share of Hispanic population per state is based on numbers published by the Pew Hispanic Center.

The U.S. Census Bureau calculation of Hispanic votes actually cast in 2004 is 7,587,000. This number, not explicit on the chart, underlies the calculations in the scenarios below.

### Scenario 1

This scenario calculates what the electoral map would have looked like had George Bush adopted an “enforcement only” approach to immigration in 2004.<sup>7</sup>

Scenario 1 applies a vote-shift factor to the portion of the 7,587,000 votes allocated to each state. The factor applied is derived from the average of the “Hispanic vote-shift factor” in the “enforcement only” districts (AZ 08 and TX 23) *minus* the “Hispanic vote-shift factor” in the “CIR” control districts (NM 01, NM 02, and AZ 06). This is done to remove the “background noise” of the election of 2006 – i.e., the general trends favoring Democratic candidates in heavily Hispanic areas.

In this scenario, we estimate that a pro-Democratic shift of 3,514,678<sup>8</sup> would have occurred among Latinos – more than enough to wipe out the 3,158,211 vote margin that provided George W. Bush’s

---

<sup>7</sup> Both scenarios measure the shift in the Hispanic vote as an isolated factor.

<sup>8</sup> Remember: The number electors changing their vote is roughly half this amount. Most voters (but not all) who abandon the Republican candidate vote for the Democrat in his stead, generating a two-vote swing.

popular vote victory over John Kerry. Under an “enforcement only” regime, with turnout held constant, the Democratic Party advantage varies from 1,051,877 in California to 375 votes in Vermont.

As the chart illustrates, the Hispanic vote changes in New Mexico and Nevada would have reversed the allocation of electoral votes from those states. This would not have affected the outcome of the 2004 election. Rather, George W. Bush would have won his second term as President while losing the popular vote, as in 2000.

## Scenario 2

This scenario projects how the electoral map would change under a Republican “enforcement only” regime if Hispanic citizens voted proportionately to their weight in the nation’s citizen population. The Census Bureau calculates that in 2004, Hispanics accounted for 7,587,000 votes of 125,736,000 cast, or 6.0341%. Latinos now constitute roughly 14.1% of the population. But excluding illegals and children, there are (according to the Census Bureau) 16,088,000 million Hispanic citizens of voting age, or 8.1663% of America’s 197,005,000 eligible voters.

Scenario 2 hypothesizes what would occur, holding total population stable, if Hispanic citizens voted their weight – i.e., if they accounted for 8.1663% of votes cast, rather than 6.0341%. This would require a turnout increase of slightly over 35%, resulting in a total Hispanic vote of 10,267,966<sup>9</sup> rather than 7,587,000.

Applying the Pew-derived proportions of this vote across the states, and using the vote-change factors derived from our precinct study, we can see how the Hispanic vote would change were Latino turnout fully weighted to Hispanic citizenship-share.

Under this scenario, Republican’s 3,158,211 popular-vote majority of 2004 would be transformed into a 1,598,425 vote deficit.

Hispanic vote shifts would range from 1,423,572 in California to 508 in Vermont. Latino votes alone would shift the electors of New Mexico, Nevada, Colorado, Iowa, and Florida from the Republican presidential candidate to the Democrat.

Scenario 2 calculates turnout growth, not population growth. Population growth will be far more significant in the long-term: but in the short-term – 2008 – Hispanic turnout will affect outcomes more dramatically, should the Republican Party presidential ticket adopt an “enforcement only” immigration policy.

In “Republican Issue Advertising In Black and Hispanic Population Areas: a Metastudy of the 2002 Midterm Elections,” John Uhlmann and this author documented “spikes” in minority turnout between 23% and 65% over a single election cycle. These “spikes” are not acts of nature. They are based on conscious, cost-informed decisions of operatives in the political process. Such decisions generally occur in the presence of three preconditions:

- a minority population underrepresented in the active electorate;
- simple, cost-effective ways to target that population, by geography or by media;
- a partisan tilt per 100-votes that makes mass registration cost effective as a strategy.

A partisan vote-shift of the magnitude documented in this study radically improves the cost-effectiveness of Hispanic turnout drives by opponents of “enforcement-only” immigration policy.

---

<sup>9</sup> The preceding percentages are rounded, creating a small apparent discrepancy in the estimate impact of a full-weight voter-eligible Hispanic electorate.

A Latino turnout increase on the order of 35% in a single presidential cycle will not occur nationwide. But Hispanic GOTV efforts of this magnitude are likely to occur in precisely those states where they may alter the electoral outcome: New Mexico, Nevada, Colorado, Florida, Iowa, and perhaps Arizona.

## Projected Impact of "Enforcement Only" on Hispanic Presidential Vote, 2008

Area	Hisp pop.	% of US Hisp pop.	1st scenario: Democrat gains, GOP "enforce-only"	2nd scenario: Democrat gains, Hisp full-weight turnout	Bush minus Kerry totals, from 2004
<b>USA</b>	41,882,446	100.00%	<b>3,514,678</b>	<b>4,756,636</b>	<b>3,158,211</b>
CA	12,534,628	29.93%	1,051,877	1,423,572	(1,235,659)
TX	7,882,254	18.82%	661,460	895,196	1,694,213
<b>FL</b>	3,433,355	8.20%	288,119	<b>389,930</b>	<b>380,978</b>
NY	3,026,286	7.23%	253,959	343,699	(1,351,713)
IL	1,807,908	4.32%	151,715	205,326	(545,604)
AZ	1,679,116	4.01%	140,908	190,699	210,770
NJ	1,312,326	3.13%	110,127	149,042	(241,427)
<b>CO</b>	895,176	2.14%	75,121	<b>101,666</b>	<b>99,523</b>
<b>NM</b>	827,940	1.98%	<b>69,479</b>	<b>94,030</b>	<b>5,988</b>
GA	625,382	1.49%	52,481	71,025	548,105
<b>NV</b>	557,370	1.33%	<b>46,773</b>	<b>63,301</b>	<b>21,500</b>
WA	546,209	1.30%	45,837	62,034	(205,307)
NC	544,470	1.30%	45,691	61,836	435,317
MA	489,662	1.17%	41,091	55,611	(732,691)
PA	488,144	1.17%	40,964	55,439	(144,248)
VA	440,988	1.05%	37,007	50,083	262,217
MI	378,232	0.90%	31,740	42,956	(165,437)
CT	372,718	0.89%	31,278	42,330	(163,662)
OR	360,000	0.86%	30,210	40,886	(76,332)
MD	311,191	0.74%	26,114	35,342	(309,790)
IN	273,004	0.65%	22,910	31,005	510,427
UT	264,010	0.63%	22,155	29,984	422,543
OH	253,014	0.60%	21,232	28,735	118,599
WI	230,715	0.55%	19,361	26,203	(11,384)
OK	218,987	0.52%	18,377	24,871	455,826
KS	218,244	0.52%	18,315	24,786	301,463
MN	185,464	0.44%	15,564	21,063	(98,319)
TN	171,890	0.41%	14,425	19,522	347,898
MO	154,744	0.37%	12,986	17,574	196,542
SC	136,616	0.33%	11,464	15,516	276,275
ID	135,733	0.32%	11,390	15,415	228,137
AR	130,328	0.31%	10,937	14,801	102,945
LA	126,856	0.30%	10,645	14,407	281,870
NE	124,504	0.30%	10,448	14,140	258,486
RI	114,077	0.27%	9,573	12,956	(90,714)
HI	103,764	0.25%	8,708	11,785	(37,517)
<b>IA</b>	102,047	0.24%	8,564	<b>11,590</b>	<b>10,059</b>
AL	98,624	0.24%	8,276	11,201	482,461
KT	65,177	0.16%	5,470	7,402	356,706
DE	50,007	0.12%	4,196	5,679	(28,492)
MS	48,795	0.12%	4,095	5,542	191,215
WY	36,722	0.09%	3,082	4,171	96,853
AK	29,219	0.07%	2,452	3,318	79,864
NH	24,248	0.06%	2,035	2,754	(9,274)
MT	21,970	0.05%	1,844	2,495	92,353
ME	12,407	0.03%	1,041	1,409	(66,641)
SD	12,311	0.03%	1,033	1,398	83,340
ND	11,380	0.03%	955	1,292	85,599
WV	9,760	0.02%	819	1,108	97,237
VT	4,474	0.01%	375	508	(62,887)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>41,882,446</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,514,678</b>	<b>4,756,636</b>	<b>3,158,211</b>

Border Wars:  
The Impact of Immigration on the Latino Vote

by Richard Nadler  
Americas Majority Foundation  
*Cover art by Bob Parks*

Americas Majority Foundation  
© October 2007