

Marriott Shareholder Meeting Question
Justin Danhof, Esq.
General Counsel and Free Enterprise Project Director
The National Center for Public Policy Research
May 9, 2014

I'm Justin Danhof of the National Center for Public Policy Research, a free-market think-tank, representing shareholder David Ridenour, who is president of our think-tank. Thank you for the opportunity to talk with you today.

It's been a year since we last talked about immigration reform, and even if my organization and many others disagree with the company's position on the issue, today I want to talk about tactics.

In 1986, President Reagan famously signed legislation granting amnesty for millions of illegal immigrants, but the law also contained significant border security provisions. But as Reagan's attorney general from the time Edwin Meese III has explained, "[t]he amnesty dealt with illegals who were already here. The rest of the '86 act was intended to get control of the problem so we didn't have any more coming in. [But] The government didn't do what was necessary to support the enforcement mechanisms in the '86 act."¹

I'm not here to rehash history, but it seems to me that we are still fighting the same fights.

The most recent Rasmussen poll from April 2013 shows that 57 percent of Americans support continuing to build the fence along the U.S – Mexico border.² And 69 percent of the population supports using the U.S. military to keep Mexican drug violence out of the U.S.³

If a comprehensive immigration bill is passed without a secure border fence, and without support of a majority of the American people, the perception will be that big business paid off politicians over the objections of the public. That would severely damage the reputation of Marriott and other large companies that have continued to press for immigration reform.

So my question is this: after so many years of public debate, why doesn't the company publicly support building a border fence and then engage in comprehensive immigration reform? You would win over a large block of the public and the idea would gain much more traction with the American people. In doing so you, would also protect Marriott's reputation that is at severe risk if the current immigration trajectory holds in D.C.

Contact:

*David Almasi at (202) 543-4110 x11 or (703) 568-4727 (text-enabled) or dalmasi@nationalcenter.org
Judy Kent at (703) 759-7476 or jkent@nationalcenter.org*

The National Center for Public Policy Research

501 Capitol Court NE

Washington DC 20002

(202) 543-4110

www.nationalcenter.org / www.conservativeblog.org / @NationalCenter

¹ <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052748703561604575282431263367708>

² http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/april_2013/57_think_u_s_should_continue_building_a_fence_along_mexican_border

³ http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/general_politics/april_2013/69_favor_use_of_u_s_military_on_border_to_keep_mexican_drug_violence_out