



January 11, 2008

From the Desk of Judicial Watch President Tom Fitton:

Judicial Watch Releases Border Patrol Report Documenting Mexican Government Border Incursions



Border security ought to be a critical issue in the presidential campaign, and this week we got a shocking look at the dangers faced by our nation's Border Patrol agents on the Mexican border.

On Wednesday, Judicial Watch released a Border Patrol [report](#) titled, "Mexican Government Incidents – 2006 Fiscal Year Report," which we obtained under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). The report, which was labeled "For Official Use Only" by the Department of Homeland Security, describes 29 confirmed incidents in 2006 along the U.S. - Mexican border involving Mexican military and/or law enforcement personnel, 17 of which involved armed Mexican government agents. (The release of the information garnered national media attention – in print, radio, and on television.)

These incidents are broken into three separate categories: incursions, encounters, and sightings. The following are just a few examples. (Click [here](#) to read the rest.)

- MEXICAN MILITARY ENCOUNTER (ARMED/INTENTIONAL) EL PASO – FORT HANCOCK STATION – At 2 P.M. on January 3, 2006, [Troopers] attempted to apprehend three vehicles believed to be smuggling contraband on I-10...As the vehicles approached the border, [Troopers] stated that a Mexican Military Humvee armed with a .50 caliber weapon and several soldiers were seen assisting smugglers return to Mexico...Officers then noticed several armed subjects dressed in fatigue type clothing unload the contraband into the Humvee. These subjects set fire to the stalled vehicle before leaving the area...
- MEXICAN POLICE INCURSION (ARMED/INTENTIONAL) TUCSON NOGALES STATION – On June 2, 2006, a Border Patrol Agent assigned to the Nogales, Arizona station encountered two Mexican Police Officers that had illegally entered into the U.S. one mile west of the Mariposa Port of Entry...the Mexican Police Officers ran back into Mexico when ordered [by Border Patrol] to remain for questioning.
- MEXICAN MILITARY INCURSION (ARMED/INTENTIONAL) EL CENTRO SECTOR – CALEXICO STATION – On September 16, 2006, a Border Patrol Agent assigned to the Calexico, California Station observed an individual in an olive drab uniform with a possible Mexican flag on the shoulder approximately 100 yards north of the International Border near the Calexico POE. The individual appeared to be carrying a sidearm and was running southbound to Mexico through the vehicle lanes of the Calexico POE.

Overall, between 1996 and September 30, 2006 there have been [253 confirmed incursions](#) into the United States by Mexican Government personnel according to the Border Patrol Field Intelligence Center – a truly disturbing figure.

There is no question that these documents would never have seen the light of day but for our FOIA request. They not only provide clear evidence of the dangerous and chaotic situation at our nation's southern border, but they also reveal the complicity of some Mexican government agents in violating U.S. law. The U.S. government must begin to take these incidents seriously, publicize them, and then take measures to bring the crisis at our border under control.

Clinton Stages a Comeback

It was springtime for Hillary in New Hampshire. Didn't I tell you Hillary was in this for the long haul? News reports last weekend following her third place showing in Iowa had her planning a campaign exit strategy behind closed doors. Not so fast. Hillary pulled out a tough comeback win in the New Hampshire primary and is now, once again, the favorite to win it all.

So how did Hillary go from dead in the water on Monday to delivering a victory speech on Tuesday? Many pundits believe it was Hillary's [teary response](#) to a question during a campaign stop about how she stays motivated while campaigning for president under such difficult circumstances. "I just don't want to see us fall backward as a nation," Hillary said, her eyes welling. "I mean, this is very personal for me, not just political. I see what's happening. We have to reverse it." Finally, sympathizers in the media gushed, we caught a glimpse of the "real Hillary."

Well, let me tell you a little bit about the "real Hillary" I know, based on her long political career office, not on a carefully produced campaign sound bite intended to manipulate the emotions of the voters. (Call me a cynic, but I believe this was Hillary's "I feel your pain" moment. She just forgot to bite her lower lip.)

The Hillary I know help operate the [most corrupt presidential administration](#) in modern American history. She presided over the theft of FBI files from former Reagan staffers and then used the information to blackmail them into submission. She crafted a scheme to sell access to the Communist Chinese in exchange for campaign contributions to the Clinton-Gore re-election campaign. She filed false campaign finance reports in order to cheat the system and raise more money.

She also smeared the reputations of women who had the courage to come forward to tell the truth about her husband's assaults, intimidation, philandering, including Kathleen Willey and Gennifer Flowers. And I can assure you, not a single tear was shed for the lives she tried to destroy.

Sure the media went crazy with Obamamania. (One NBC reporter admitted, "It's hard to stay objective covering this guy.") Incredibly, Bill Clinton complained that Obama has not received the scrutiny that Hillary has. From my perspective, neither have received sufficient scrutiny.

As the campaign continues, all the presidential candidates need to be held to account for any ethical and legal misdeeds. The candidates, because many of them are compromised (see our "[Ten Most Wanted Corrupt Politicians](#)" for 2007), won't do that job – so it will be up to the American people. And you can bet Judicial Watch will do its part.

Court Ruling in Jefferson Case Threatens Public Corruption Investigations

This is a story that you probably won't see on the nightly news or even covered much in the alternative media. But it now seems that the Justice Department can't fully investigate members of Congress for criminal activity because of a flawed court ruling. Last August, an

appellate court ruled that an FBI search of Congressman William "Dollar Bill" Jefferson's congressional office violated the constitution's "Speech and Debate" clause. You will likely recall that Jefferson was caught red handed during an FBI sting operation accepting a cash bribe to broker business deals in Nigeria. The money was later found stashed in his freezer at home. Unfortunately, documents obtained during an FBI raid of Jefferson's congressional office are now likely inadmissible for his prosecution. (Unsurprisingly, leaders of Congress from both parties are thrilled by the new court protection of illegal conduct by their members.) We knew here at Judicial Watch that this appellate court ruling would likely have a chilling effect on other public corruption investigations and cases. Unfortunately, we were right.

According to the [Missoulian](#)...

"The Justice Department ended its investigation of former Sen. Conrad Burns, R-Mont., at a time when it fears that all its public corruption cases, including those involving jailed lobbyist Jack Abramoff, have been jeopardized by an August court ruling. The department has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to reverse the ruling, saying that 'until it does so, investigations of corruption in the nation's capital and elsewhere will be seriously and perhaps even fatally stymied.'"

So what did Burns allegedly do wrong? It is alleged the Montana Republican pressured the Department of the Interior to grease the wheels for a \$3 million school construction grant for the Saginaw Chippewa tribe, a client of convicted felon and former lobbyist Jack Abramoff. When the Department of the Interior failed to cooperate, Burns earmarked the money. Burns took in \$150,000 in campaign contributions from Abramoff and his associates, "the highest total of anyone in Congress," the Missoulian notes.

How did the Jefferson case impact the Burns' investigation? The Justice Department could not comment on the specifics, but according to the Missoulian article, "Because of the ruling, federal investigators changed their investigative techniques." For example, investigators no longer search the home office of a member of Congress, which is a logical hiding place for incriminating documents.

The appellate court decision in the Jefferson case was flawed. Judicial Watch filed an [amicus brief](#) in the case, which explains why. (In short, Judicial Watch argued that the "Speech and Debate" clause is intended to protect members of Congress conducting legislative business, not for bribery and extortion.) Hopefully, the Supreme Court will do as the Justice Department requests and overturn the decision. Until then, it looks like some crooked members of Congress may have a "get out of jail free" card.

Until next week...



Tom Fitton
President

Judicial Watch is a non-partisan, educational foundation organized under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue code. Judicial Watch is dedicated to fighting government and judicial corruption and promoting a return to ethics and morality in our nation's public life. To make a tax-deductible contribution in support of our efforts, [click here](#).