



Now is the Time to Stop “Sanctuary” Cities for Illegal Aliens

What is a sanctuary city?

“Sanctuary” policies are ordinances, resolutions, executive actions or any initiatives that prohibit local government officials and/or law enforcement from inquiring, acting on, or reporting a person’s immigration status – even when there is reasonable suspicion that person may be in the country illegally.

The bottom line is that despite the compassionate sounding term, it really means that a city is refusing to cooperate with federal immigration law enforcement efforts and extending various benefits to illegal aliens.

I’m not sure if my city is officially a sanctuary. Our politicians claim it isn’t.

It's not what they're called but it's the policies they engage in that define them. Some sanctuary policies are prescribed by bills, ordinances or resolutions but some are just unpublished, “don’t ask, don’t tell practices.”

The public is overwhelmingly opposed to sanctuary policies and the label has become toxic. City officials who put these policies in place are scrambling now to explain why they don’t fit into that category but we all know the expression, “if it walks like a duck....”

Why do cities enact these policies?

Cities think the law does not apply to them and the federal government looks the other way. Mostly though, while the law is quite clear that sanctuary cities violate federal law, there are no penalties.

It’s also driven by a top down example. The Obama administration has been neglecting to secure the borders, dismantling most interior enforcement and granting backdoor amnesty to thousands of illegal aliens. The message has been sent nationwide; violating immigration laws is inconsequential and the federal government won’t enforce the law. So instead of trying to pick up the slack, dozens of cities across the country are just following the example.

We’d remind elected and appointed officials that their job is to allocate limited community resources to existing legal residents, not aid and abet the behavior of people who have broken the law. That just encourages more illegal aliens to come into the community and drain finite resources.

Do these policies really put the public at risk?

Ask Kate Stienle's family. Kate was killed by an illegal alien who had been deported five times and each time he returned and was arrested, he was released back onto the street

Sanctuary cities are dangerous and counterproductive to reducing illegal immigration.

The politicians who push for these bills are adamantly defying federal law enforcement and, in so doing, are putting every law abiding, taxpaying resident of a state or city at risk. They are saying, "We don't care about immigration law violations, we won't cooperate with federal authorities, and if the public safety is put at risk, big deal, and if people die that's just too bad."

What about the argument we always hear that sanctuary policies encourage immigrants to report crimes?

Virtually all police have the discretion to give witnesses immunity-- regardless of their immigration status --and virtually all do. We're unaware of any case any place where an illegal alien reported crime or volunteered information that was useful to the police and then was deported.

Building trust in the community means uniformly enforcing all laws for all residents. Selectively excluding illegal aliens from the law for political gain reduces trust in law enforcement.

What we need instead

Law-abiding citizens are the ones who need protection from lawbreakers illegally residing in our communities. The solution is simple; replace these bad policies with ones that benefit the American public.

Now is the time for Congress to enact legislation that denies federal funds to these cities that harbor illegal aliens with sanctuary policies. There are currently five bills in Congress that deal with the problem and there is no excuse for Congress not to pass them all by the end of this session of Congress.

Urge your lawmakers to do so, now.