

# Why Are Mayors And Governors Supporting Sanctuary Cities?

Dan Stein, director of the Federation for American Immigration Reform, [www.fairus.org](http://www.fairus.org), gave a report on the phenomenon of sanctuary cities within the United States.

First of all, such cities house, employ and transport illegal aliens in violation of Federal Laws. Anyone employing, housing or transporting an illegal alien faces up to a \$2,000.00 fine per illegal and up to five years in prison.

Since the U.S. Government hasn't enforced the law for over 40 years, American citizens, governors and mayors created sanctuary cities to protect illegals. They love their 21<sup>st</sup> century slave labor, but don't mind the rest of us paying for it.



Ironically, illegal aliens, numbering from 20 million to 31 million, create drug gangs, shoplifting teams, welfare scams, anchor babies, rapes, robberies and killings—even as they steal jobs from American citizens. Ironically, cities like Los Angeles,

Chicago and New York fill their schools and prisons with illegals at a cost of billions. No wonder California Governor Jerry "Moonbeam" Brown cannot balance the budget.

I interviewed Dan Stein. What do you see as the most confounding aspects of sanctuary cities?

“Cooperation between federal, state, and local governments is the cornerstone of effective immigration enforcement,” said Stein. “State and local law enforcement officers are often the last line of defense against criminal aliens, and are far more likely to encounter illegal aliens during routine job activities than are federal agents.

“As such, the ability of state and local law enforcement and other government officials to freely cooperate and communicate with federal immigration authorities is not just important – but essential – to the enforcement of our immigration laws.

“Nonetheless, law enforcement agencies, local governments, and even states across the country are proactively enacting policies and practices to restrict or all together prohibit cooperation with federal immigration authorities.

“Commonly referred to as “sanctuary policies,” such ordinances, directives, and practices undermine enforcement of U.S. immigration law by impeding state and local officials, including law enforcement officers, from asking individuals about their immigration status, reporting them to the federal government, or otherwise cooperating with or assisting federal immigration officials. While many of these policies and practices are written, they may be unwritten as well, sometimes making them difficult to discover or verify.

“Most of the sanctuary policies and practices instituted since FAIR first issued its list of sanctuary jurisdictions in 2013 fall into the “anti-detainer” category. These generally refer to directives that inhibit or restrict the ability of state and local law enforcement to hold criminal aliens for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE).

“Some anti-detainer policies even go so far as to prohibit state and local law enforcement from simply notifying ICE that they are about to release a criminal alien back onto the streets or from otherwise assisting federal authorities.

Sadly, most anti-detainer policies are put in place by the law enforcement agencies themselves, bullied by the illegal alien lobby into believing they must follow the open borders agenda or risk being sued.

“While some of the sanctuary policies noted in this report were enacted decades ago – such as the ones in New York City, Los Angeles, and San Francisco – the vast majority have been instituted since President Obama took office in 2009. Of the 300 jurisdictions cited in this report:

- 239 jurisdictions have sanctuary policies or practices instituted by law enforcement agencies;
- 23 jurisdictions have sanctuary resolutions;
- 15 jurisdictions have sanctuary laws or ordinances, including statewide laws in California, Connecticut, and Oregon;
- 5 jurisdictions have sanctuary executive orders; and
- 18 jurisdictions either have multiple forms of sanctuary policies or practices in place, or have a policy or practice that simply fit no other classification.

“Some of these policies or practices were very easy to discover and label,” said Stein. “Others required a bit more digging to locate. As such, FAIR used a wide-variety of sources when compiling this list of jurisdictions and evidence.

“This included primary sources such as the actual resolutions, ordinances, and policy directives, as well as secondary sources such as the U.S. Department of Homeland Security’s Declined Detainer Outcome Report obtained by the Center for Immigration Studies, various academic or congressional reports, and even media coverage.

“FAIR has found that jurisdictions often justify their sanctuary policies by claiming that illegal aliens will be more likely to report crimes to law enforcement without fear

of deportation. However, FAIR knows of no evidence demonstrating that sanctuary policies lead to increased crime reporting among illegal immigrant communities, and law enforcement officers already have the discretion to grant immunity to witnesses and victims of crime.

“Sanctuary jurisdictions also often lament that immigration is a “federal issue” and therefore they do not have a responsibility to cooperate with federal officials. This argument is belied by the fact that illegal immigration costs state and local governments roughly \$84 billion annually – a significant majority of the estimated \$113 billion annual price tag of illegal immigration on U.S. taxpayers. As such, the cost of illegal immigration in terms of government services, education, healthcare, crime, and impact on the labor market are far greater than any benefit that may accrue from a perceived increase in cooperation between illegal alien communities and law enforcement.

“Our comprehensive (but by no means exhaustive) list of sanctuary jurisdictions appears below. It includes jurisdictions with laws, resolutions, policies, or practices that obstruct cooperation with federal immigration authorities or assistance with federal immigration detainers. FAIR ceased conducting research activities for this report in November 2016; changes have already been made to the policies and practices in some jurisdictions, while additional sanctuary policies and practices have been instituted in others and will be added in the next edition. Indeed, dozens of city and county officials have doubled-down on their jurisdiction’s sanctuary policy in the days and weeks following the 2016 election.”

In effect, our own leaders legalize illegality at a cost of \$113,000,000,000.00 (billion) to American taxpayers across 15 Federal Agencies. (Source: [www.fairus.org](http://www.fairus.org), [www.cis.org](http://www.cis.org))

Is your city a sanctuary city? Have you stood up at your city

council to protest? No wonder over 500,000 illegal aliens cross America's borders annually!

© 2017 Frosty Wooldridge – All Rights Reserved