

SANCTUARY POLICIES: VICTIMS' PERSPECTIVES

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION INTEGRITY,
SECURITY, AND ENFORCEMENT

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2026

Serial No. 119-76

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



Available via: <http://judiciary.house.gov>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

JIM JORDAN, Ohio, *Chair*

DARRELL ISSA, California	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Member</i>
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	JERROLD NADLER, New York
TOM McCLINTOCK, California	ZOE LOFGREN, California
THOMAS P. TIFFANY, Wisconsin	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
THOMAS MASSIE, Kentucky	HENRY C. “HANK” JOHNSON, JR., Georgia
CHIP ROY, Texas	TED LIEU, California
SCOTT FITZGERALD, Wisconsin	PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington
BEN CLINE, Virginia	J. LUIS CORREA, California
LANCE GOODEN, Texas	MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania
JEFFERSON VAN DREW, New Jersey	JOE NEGUSE, Colorado
TROY E. NEHLS, Texas	LUCY McBATH, Georgia
BARRY MOORE, Alabama	DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina
HARRIET M. HAGEMAN, Wyoming	BECCA BALINT, Vermont
LAUREL M. LEE, Florida	JESÚS G. “CHUY” GARCÍA, Illinois
WESLEY HUNT, Texas	SYDNEY KAMLAGER-DOVE, California
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
KEVIN KILEY, California	DANIEL S. GOLDMAN, New York
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
BRAD KNOTT, North Carolina	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
MARK HARRIS, North Carolina	
ROBERT F. ONDER, Jr., Missouri	
DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	
MICHAEL BAUMGARTNER, Washington	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION INTEGRITY, SECURITY, AND ENFORCEMENT

TOM McCLINTOCK, California, *Chair*

ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	PRAMILA JAYAPAL, Washington, <i>Ranking Member</i>
TOM TIFFANY, Wisconsin	JERROLD NADLER, New York
CHIP ROY, Texas	J. LUIS CORREA, California
TROY E. NEHLS, Texas	MARY GAY SCANLON, Pennsylvania
JEFFERSON VAN DREW, New Jersey	DEBORAH K. ROSS, North Carolina
TROY E. NEHLS, Texas	JESÚS G. “CHUY” GARCÍA, Illinois
BARRY MOORE, Alabama	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
WESLEY HUNT, Texas	ZOE LOFGREN, California
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	STEVE COHEN, Tennessee
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	Vacant
BRAD KNOTT, North Carolina	Vacant
ROBERT F. ONDER, Missouri	Vacant
DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

CHRISTOPHER HIXON, *Majority Staff Director*
ARTHUR EWENCZYK, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 2026

OPENING STATEMENTS

	Page
The Honorable Tom McClintock, Chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement from the State of California	1
The Honorable Pramila Jayapal, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement from the State of Washington	3
The Honorable Jim Jordan, Chair of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Ohio	5
The Honorable Jamie Raskin, Ranking Member of the Committee on the Judiciary from the State of Maryland	6

WITNESSES

Joe Abraham, Father of victim Katie Abraham	
Oral Testimony	13
Prepared Testimony	15
Sarah Pierce, Director of Social Policy, Third Way	
Oral Testimony	24
Prepared Testimony	26
Sheriff Gary W. Redman, Amador County Sheriff's Office	
Oral Testimony	44
Prepared Testimony	46
Jessica A. Gorman, Mother of victim Sheridan Grace Gorman	
Oral Testimony	49
Prepared Testimony	53

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC. SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

All materials submitted for the record by the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement are listed below	91
An article entitled, "Seven in 10 ICE arrests under Trump have criminal histories," Dec. 26, 2025, <i>Washington Examiner</i> , submitted by the Honorable Tom McClintock, Chair of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement from the State of California, for the record	
A joint statement from Americans for Immigrant Justice, Asian Pacific Institute on Gender-Based Violence, ASISTA Immigration Assistance, Esperanza United, Human Rights Watch, and Tahirih Justice Center, Jun, 30, 2026, submitted by the Honorable Pramila Jayapal, Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement from the State of Washington, for the record	

SANCTUARY POLICIES: VICTIMS' PERSPECTIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 2026

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION INTEGRITY, SECURITY,
AND ENFORCEMENT

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Washington, DC

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:41 p.m., in Room 2141, Rayburn House Office Building, the Hon. Tom McClintock [Chair of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives McClintock, Jordan, Biggs, Tiffany, Roy, Van Drew, Moore, Hunt, Fry, Grothman, Knott, Onder, Jayapal, Raskin, Nadler, Scanlon, and Ross.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. A quorum is present, and the Subcommittee will come to order. Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time. I want to welcome everyone to today's hearing on the consequences of sanctuary policies. I would especially like to note the presence of many sheriffs, as well as Angel Families who are here today to watch these proceedings.

Without objection, Ms. Miller and Mr. Lawler will be permitted to participate in today's hearing for the purpose of introducing witnesses. Hearing none, so ordered. Without objection, Mr. Baumgartner will be permitted to participate in today's hearing for the purpose of questioning the witnesses if a Member yields him time for that purpose. Without objection, so ordered.

I will now recognize myself for an opening statement. During this session, this Subcommittee is focused on so-called sanctuary laws that put criminal illegal aliens back on the streets, rather than turning them over to Federal authorities for deportation as the law requires. The sole effect is not to impede general immigration enforcement; it is specifically to prevent deporting criminals.

The toll of death and destruction caused by these policies is heartbreaking. As the death toll of innocent Americans continues to mount, Republicans will continue to avail victims' families the opportunity to describe the catastrophic impact that these policies have caused them, two of those families will address this shortly.

One is the mother of Sheridan Gorman. On March 19th this year, Sheridan Gorman, an 18-year-old freshman at Loyola University, went to a Chicago park with friends to watch the Northern

Lights. Instead, she was shot by an illegal alien from Venezuela allowed into this country by the Biden Administration. Within months of the illegal alien's release at the border, he was arrested for shoplifting.

Now, he should have been turned over to authorities for deportation then. Instead, Chicago's sanctuary law released him back into the community, where he had no legal right to be, and Sheridan Gorman is dead as a result. A few weeks ago, we heard from the mother of Stephanie Minter, murdered by an illegal alien with dozens of prior arrests, each time returned into the community by Fairfax County officials.

Their excuse was that despite an \$83 million annual budget for the county sheriff, they just didn't have the resources to pick up the phone and inform ICE that they had custody of an illegal alien so that alien could be deported. When I asked them how much it would cost to make a simple phone call to ICE, and whether Stephanie Minter's life was worth the cost of that phone call, I got no response.

The murderer's multiple releases were also enabled by a far-Left prosecutor who crafts sweetheart deals for illegal aliens so that they can avoid immigration consequences for their criminality. None of this makes any sense. Last year these sanctuary jurisdictions refused to honor at least 17,864 ICE detainer requests of illegal aliens accused of committing other crimes.

Instead, these aliens who had no right to be in this country were released onto our streets to re-offend at will. Illinois and California are just two examples of these renegade jurisdictions. Their refusal to cooperate with Federal immigration officials terrorized communities, incentivizes crime, and undermines the rule of law.

In Illinois alone, one State, in just 11 months, authorities blew off 1,768 ICE detainees, and instead released these criminals back onto the streets, despite crimes ranging from weapons offenses, to burglaries, and to homicides. According to documents obtained by this Committee, the Cook County Sheriff's Office alone released 408 criminal aliens from its custody in 2025 instead of honoring active ICE detainees.

The Democrats complain bitterly that we are focused on this tragedy. Well, I can assure them that the Republican Majority will continue to expose the human toll of their policies until they are rectified. I am sure we will re-hear their complaints that ICE arrests in communities have led to confrontations with violent demonstrators.

Those arrests that require squads of officers, and that put both officers and bystanders in danger would not be necessary if those aliens were turned over to ICE while in the custody of local-law enforcement. They also tell us that refusing to cooperate with ICE fosters trust with the illegal alien population. Well, this begs the obvious question, can legal residents trust sanctuary jurisdictions to protect them and their families?

By the way, a U visa is already available to illegal aliens who are witnesses or victims to crime. Earlier this year the Judiciary Committee passed a Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act. It prohibits sanctuary jurisdictions from restricting communications with ICE

about criminal aliens. It empowers local authorities in sanctuary jurisdictions to work with Federal immigration officials.

It forbids local jurisdictions from shielding criminals from ICE. It restricts certain Federal grant funding to sanctuary jurisdictions that thwart Federal law, and it provides a private right of action for the victims of these sanctuary policies. All that is simple commonsense. We shouldn't need a bill to force State and local officials to protect American citizens over dangerous foreign nationals.

Yet, not a single Democrat on this Committee voted for that legislation. In addition to the grieving families of Sheridan Gorman and Katie Abraham who are here today, we are also joined by Sheriff Gary Redman of Amador County, California, from my district. He is dealing with an epidemic of illegal alien crime centered on illegal marijuana grows.

Yet, forbidden by State law from cooperating or even communicating with ICE to protect his citizens from this scourge. The Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act would free him from these constraints. It is inconceivable that such a reckless and dangerous policy as the so-called sanctuary laws could be supported by a major political party.

As we will see again today, that is the current position of the Democratic Socialist Party. Not a fringe element, but the actual elected representatives of that party. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses, and I now yield to the Ranking Member for her opening statement.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. Let me start by offering my deepest condolences to you, Ms. Gorman, and to you, Mr. Abraham, for the loss of your children. As a parent myself, I can think of no greater loss, and I appreciate you being here to share their stories and their lives with us. Unfortunately, this hearing is the fourth time in this Committee that we have had a hearing on sanctuary cities, the fourth time.

There are many other things that we could be doing other than this. I would have loved to have had some hearings on the unconstitutionality of the President's Executive Order on eliminating birthright citizenship. This is something that the Supreme Court just ruled today in a 63 Majority was unconstitutional.

Yet this was an Executive Order that caused so much fear and trauma across the country, we could have been discussing that, but we haven't. Instead, we have had this series of hearings that are designed to attack the very trust policies that research has shown over and over again have actually saved lives and kept communities safer.

By maintaining the necessary and important division between the enforcement of Federal civil immigration laws, and the enforcement of local criminal laws. This division ensures that people don't fear law enforcement, who try to enforce immigration law, and that community members will actually come forward and be witnesses in these prosecutions to report crimes when they happen.

The Trump Administration however has ignored decades of research and has done the exact opposite. They have blurred the lines between immigration enforcement and law enforcement so much that they essentially no longer exist. They have destroyed trust in communities, created fear, and even deported witnesses to

important crimes so that then those crimes cannot be effectively prosecuted.

On top of that, the Trump Administration has diverted over 28,000 officers from their critical law enforcement activities to work on immigration enforcement instead. This has led to nonimmigration criminal prosecutions falling to their lowest point in decades. Gun prosecutions have fallen more than 10 percent. Investigators worked 33 percent fewer hours on child exploitation cases.

Nearly one in every five FBI agents have been reassigned to arrest immigrants instead of conducting complex criminal investigations of corruption, espionage, terrorism, cyberattacks, and transnational gangs, all things that are necessary to keep Americans safe. Similarly, around one in every two Drug Enforcement Agency agents, two in three Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives agents, and one in five U.S. Marshals have all been reassigned to immigration enforcement.

From within ICE, thousands of Homeland Security investigations, HSI agents, are focused on immigration enforcement instead of their stated mission of combating transnational crimes such as drug and weapons smuggling, child exploitation, and human trafficking. During the immigration enforcement surge in Minnesota, Federal prosecutions of gun and drug offenses dropped by nearly 90 percent—90 percent.

The DHS's former Chief of Staff says that as a result of all this, our government is quote,

Asleep at the wheel, and less prepared to stop terrorist attacks than at any point since 9/11.

For what, what are the results of that? Arrests of immigrants without a single criminal conviction surged by 770 percent.

These immigrants of all immigration statuses get locked up, or deported, or disappeared at tremendous cost to you, the taxpayers, and to the traumatized communities that are left behind. That is not a public safety agenda, that is a public safety disaster. Let us just remind people about what this immigration enforcement strategy of this Administration has led to.

Under Donald Trump, ICE doubled in size. Instead of funding Americans' healthcare, or housing, or childcare, Republicans poured over \$210 billion, \$210 billion into ICE and CBP. The DHS officers killed two U.S. citizens in cold blood in Minnesota; have we had a hearing on that? No, we haven't.

They beat and detained countless U.S. citizens for exercising First Amendment rights and broke down doors without a warrant in violation of the Fourth Amendment. ICE has imprisoned 400,000 people just in the interior of this country since Trump came in. Parents, children, military veterans, U.S. citizens, people on valid visas, and people who have never committed a single crime.

The private prison companies who incarcerate these people get massive profits. They turn around, and then contribute to Republicans and Trump's campaigns, while maintaining the most horrific conditions inside the prisons that have led to a record 51 deaths in ICE Detention just since President Trump took office. What does all this do for Americans? It hurts them.

Their communities get torn apart, their kids lose friends, their businesses suffer from lack of workers, and guess what? Americans

actually lose jobs due to harsh immigration enforcement. The Brookings Institution looked at increased ICE enforcement in 86 metro areas in Red and Blue States and found that up to 297,000 American born workers have lost their jobs as a result of ICE's increased enforcement.

That all needs to stop. Our hearings should be on how public safety has been hurt thanks to this Administration's policies, or on holding people who killed and detained American citizens accountable. On the numerous times that this Administration denies due process in violation of our Constitution. That is what the American people want, not more of what we are doing today.

More than 60 percent of Americans now disapprove of Donald Trump's immigration policies. Americans want Trump and Republicans to focus on lowering grocery prices, stop giving tax breaks to billionaires while stripping healthcare from tens of millions of Americans. Just like Trump has insulted Americans by refusing to sign the most consequential, bipartisan housing bill in a generation, calling it unimportant, and a quote "Yawn."

He is insulting Americans by continuing these harsh immigration policies that hurt safety and hurt opportunity for all Americans. Republicans instead want to coerce States and localities into doing the Federal Government's job, despite numerous court orders that have declared immigration detainers unlawful violations of the Fourth Amendment.

They want to force local police departments to prioritize their limited resources on immigration enforcement instead of encouraging all community members to come forward and report crimes without worrying about theirs or a loved one's immigration status. I hope that this Committee does hold hearings on the unconstitutionality of this Administration's policies.

Certainly, when Republicans are no longer in office after November, we will do just that in the Majority. I look forward to hearing from all our witnesses today. I yield back.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Appreciate the warning, the gentlelady yields back. The Chair is now pleased to recognize the Chair of the House Judiciary Committee for an opening statement.

Chair JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. We don't want to coerce anyone; we just want to stop this stupid policy of sanctuary jurisdiction that led to the tragedy that these families are going to testify and talk about today. The gentlelady from Washington, the Ranking Member, said, "this is the fourth hearing on sanctuary jurisdictions."

I will have five, six, seven, or eight, I will have whatever amount of hearings it takes to stop a policy that is so ridiculous. Because understand, never forget what sanctuary jurisdiction is in the simplest of terms, politicians tell local-law enforcement like Sheriff Redman, don't work with Federal law enforcement in enforcing Federal law, that is dumb.

It is not only dumb, it results in bad things happening to families. That is why we are having the fourth hearing, and like I said, we will do whatever, and my guess is the Chair is willing to do whatever amount of hearings it takes to get our legislation across the finish line. Our Sanctuary Jurisdiction Shutdown Act of 2026.

Understand this as well, it is a systematic—I have said this every single hearing, all four times, it is a systematic plan of the Lefts.

Step 1. They let in 10 million illegal migrants during the Biden Administration, no border, just let in 10 million people.

Step 2. Create sanctuary jurisdictions all over this country, 18 cities, 11 States, three large counties like Fairfax County.

Where the prosecutor there gives special deals to migrants who commit crimes, unequal treatment to Americans frankly. Let in 10 million, create sanctuary jurisdictions, 18 cities, 11 States, three counties, and the District of Columbia.

Step 3. Don't pay the guys who do the enforcement, don't pay ICE. They did that for 110 days; they wouldn't fund the guys who do the enforcement. That is their systematic plan.

Step 4. These crazy prosecutors, soft on crime prosecutors, who when an illegal migrant commits a crime, they won't work with Federal law enforcement, let the guy back out, and he does bad things. Just ask Ms. Gorman, she is going to talk about that. That is what, again, I just cannot fathom why a party would embrace that mind set, that approach.

God bless Chair McClintock, he is the sponsor of that bill, it is a good piece of legislation. We need it to pass the House, get to the Senate, and get to the President and sign it so we can stop this nonsense that has led to such tragic things.

With that, I will yield back, and again, I want to thank our witnesses for the work, Sheriff, the work you do, the families who have lost, God bless you, thank you for being here. It is not easy, I know, but thank you for coming. I know your Member appreciates it, particularly Ms. Gorman, for you being here as well.

With that I yield back to the Chair of the Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman yields back. I now recognize the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, Mr. Raskin, for his opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chair, and thanks to all our witnesses for being with us today. I especially want to thank Mr. Abraham and Ms. Gorman for coming to speak about their beloved daughters who were criminally and savagely stolen away from their families. As a father, I too know the pain and devastation of losing a child, and my heart goes out to you and your families.

Anyone who commits a crime must be held accountable swiftly and completely. Immigrants, whether lawful or undocumented who commit violent crimes must be deported at the end of their criminal sentences. Furthermore, we must end the polarization and dysfunction in Congress so we can pass comprehensive, commonsense immigration reform.

We need to make it a whole lot harder for people to enter the United States unlawfully, and a whole lot easier to enter the United States legally. Can we agree to an agenda around that? Yet, instead of working with us on basic, commonsense reforms to make dreamers lawful residents, to fortify the border, to expand the categories for admission of lawful immigrants.

To make sure DHS and ICE are properly focused on following the law, and pursuing their basic, self-proclaimed mission of keeping us safe from the worst of the worst, our colleagues are con-

ducting an endless series of hearings on sanctuary cities. This is our fourth such hearing. I am not sure Republicans have even come to any agreement on what they mean when they use that spooky term.

Last year, Trump's Department of Homeland Security published a list of nearly 400 counties that it classified as sanctuary jurisdictions. This caused an uproar with dozens of conservative sheriffs across the country. Their counties were named sanctuary jurisdictions simply because they had strong policies on upholding State's rights.

Rejecting unfunded Federal mandates, and strong policies against conscripting State and local officers to execute Federal duties. Stunned by this response, the DHS removed the list days after it was published.

Because a list of sanctuary jurisdictions defying the Feds could not possibly include so many conservative sheriffs from Red counties who drew a strict line around how much of their locally raised tax revenues and resources, they should have to spend carrying out the Federal Government's immigration enforcement agenda, and other constitutional responsibilities when the Federal Government has a budget far larger than they do.

Well, this was a telling collision between Republicans and Republicans. For decades conservatives argued that the Federal Government could not impose unfunded Federal mandates on localities, or boss around State and local officials to force them to do the work of Federal officers charged with enforcing Federal laws. They even succeeded in the *Prince* case.

In 1997 to convince a conservative Supreme Court majority to hold that the Tenth Amendment invalidated a provision in the Brady Handgun Control Act which purported to compel sheriffs and police chiefs to conduct background searches on prospective gun buyers. Just as Antonin Scalia found for the Majority, a five-four Majority that this provision violated the Tenth Amendment.

Which prevents the Federal Government he said from commandeering State and local officers to use their official time and their local resources to implement unfunded Federal mandates under the direction of Federal officers. Justice Scalia asserted that this constitutional prohibition in the Tenth Amendment was categorical.

He was unmoved by the heartfelt claims that the failure to integrate local sheriffs and local police into the Federal machinery of drug policy, of gun policy enforcement would result in more gun violence, more death, and more injury. "The Feds must enforce their own laws," Justice Scalia said. This is precisely the same mistake which I think our friends across the aisle are making here.

We have heard from some of the jurisdictions dragooned into Congress on their official time and their official salaries to participate in this endless sequence of repetitive hearings that they would notify, and they do notify Federal authorities of when any immigrant prisoner is set to be released from local jail.

They arrange for them to be picked up and handed over right away to immigration authorities. No jurisdiction is giving them a problem about that. What the ones who have appeared before us say they cannot do is hold such prisoners beyond the length of their judicial sentences for the convenience of Federal officials.

Both because this practice turns State and local officials into de facto Federal workers, as Justice Scalia said you can't do, "reporting to ICE or the Department of Homeland Security instead of reporting to their own courts." Also, because they say, and certainly the people from Virginia who showed up at the last hearing said, "they have no constitutional authority under due process or habeas corpus law to hold prisoners without arrest prosecution and conviction."

The position they have taken, which doesn't seem at least to be unreasonable or deranged, is simply they are very happy to work with the Feds to turn people over before their sentences are completed, but after their sentences are completed, they can't hold them. Why are our colleagues so desperate to keep pulling this boogeyman of the sanctuary jurisdictions out of the closet?

Well, perhaps it has to do with the fact that they voted to give the DHS more than a quarter of a trillion dollars to improve immigration enforcement. America has watched as the Department of Homeland Security has used this staggering pile of money to waste on luxurious private jets for the Secretary, complete with bedrooms and bars.

On overpriced and ultimately useless industrial warehouses to detain human beings that are now being sold off at a massive loss to the taxpayers. On a glitzy \$220 million public relations horseback photoshoot and ad campaign for a glamorous Department of Homeland Security Secretary who called the slain citizens Alex Pretti and Renee Good "terrorists."

MAGA Republicans have done nothing as ICE has abused hundreds of billions of dollars to arrest, beat up, shoot, and even kill American citizens for exercising their First and Second Amendment rights. They have allowed ICE to ignore its duty to keep us safe from the worst of the worst and instead go after kids and parents coming home from kindergarten.

Rape survivors who just finished testifying in court, and volunteers at Catholic church soup kitchens. ICE's indiscriminate and chaotic immigration enforcement has also undermined the ability of State and local prosecutors and law enforcement to keep their own communities safe, and to deliver justice to victims of crime. They are deporting crime victims, as well as key witnesses and informants without any notice to State or local police and prosecutors.

As a result, investigations are being thwarted, criminal trials are being thrown into disarray, and American communities are less safe. House Judiciary Democrats put out a report called, "Acquittal by Removal: How Trump's Mass Deportation Agenda Abandons Crime Victims and Allows Perpetrators to Avoid Justice," which I recommend that all of you check out.

Not only is the DHS not making our Communities safer, but it is making us worse off. A recent study found that the metro areas most targeted by ICE in both Red and Blue States had suffered losses of nearly 670,000 jobs, up to 44 percent of which were held by American citizens. The immigration roundup is profoundly costly to our communities.

The Administration's attacks on so called sanctuary jurisdictions are hurting Americans from all walks of life. One can only regard with amazement the fact that rather than own up to this disas-

trous record, my colleagues are trying to change the subject and blame the failures of the Department of Homeland Security not on Kristi Noem and her dysfunctional accomplices and successors.

On the State and local jurisdictions, which did not create the problem, have no real power to address it, and are constitutionally protected from being impressed into service as Justice Scalia said, “by an illegal commandeering policy passed by Congress.” The DHS has a quarter of a million employees, and a budget larger than that of 150 countries on earth.

It has over 80,000 sworn law enforcement officers, more than the number of officers in New York, Chicago, L.A., Houston, D.C., Las Vegas, and Dallas combined. Despite all that, our colleagues think that State and local jurisdictions should be using their money, and their funds to do the Department of Homeland Security’s job for them.

If our colleagues are serious about public safety, they should join us in imposing guardrails on ICE to refocus their energy on going after the worst of the worst, and to ensure that they respect the fundamental rights of every U.S. citizen. They should reinvest in public safety programs that the Administration has cut that supported local-law enforcement, assisted victims of crime, and gone after organized crime and drug traffickers.

They should push back on the President’s shocking abuse of the pardon power, which has allowed drug traffickers and international narco-dealers, and criminal fraudsters to walk free, depriving victims and taxpayers of nearly \$2 billion in unmet restitution. Last Congress we came together to craft a bipartisan border security bill.

President Biden agreed to sign it, but then candidate Trump blew up the deal because he wanted a crisis to run on more than he wanted an actual solution. Sadly, since then our colleagues have been doing more of the same, holding hearing after hearing on the same topic, failing to pass their signature border bill, or even their bill to coerce and commandeer sanctuary cities to do their bidding.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today, and hope that we can rejoin together in doing the work of the American people. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Without objection, all other opening statements will be included in the record, and we will now introduce today’s witnesses.

By the way, I will note that permitting Committee Members is not something our Committee normally allows, I would ask the Members to please focus their remarks on introducing the witness, and refrain from making a broader speech on the topic of today’s hearing.

I will begin by recognizing Ms. Miller to introduce Mr. Abraham.

Ms. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am honored to introduce my friend and fellow Illinois resident, Joe Abraham. One year ago, Mr. Abraham sat in the House Oversight Committee hearing as Illinois Governor JB Pritzker defended his Administration sanctuary policies. I had the opportunity to address that Committee and question the Governor.

I will never forget seeing Mr. Abraham in the room, a grieving father seeking answers after losing his daughter to a tragedy that

was entirely preventable. As he will share with this Committee, the Illinois Governor's refusal to enforce our Nation's immigration laws contributed to the death of his youngest child.

Katie Abraham, who has been described by her father as having a beautiful soul and a large personality, was killed in the early hours of January 19, 2025, by an intoxicated illegal alien who crashed into the car carrying Katie and her friends. Despite unimaginable grief, Joe Abraham chose courage over silence.

He has become a powerful advocate, not just for Katie, but for families across America who believe their voices are being ignored, and for the victims whose stories deserve to be heard, and for Americans who expect their government to fulfill the most fundamental responsibility to protect its own citizens. You could not have picked a better witness, Mr. Chair.

Joe will provide this Committee with a firsthand account of the consequences of the Left's sanctuary policies, and why we must never forget its victims. Mr. Chair, thank you.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentlelady yields back. I now recognize Mr. Lawler to introduce Ms. Gorman.

Mr. LAWLER. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for having me at this important hearing. I am here today to introduce Jessica Gorman. Jessica should not be here today. She should not be testifying before Congress. She should be back in New York with her daughters Madelon and Sheridan, enjoying a quiet Tuesday afternoon in the summer.

Unfortunately, Jessica is here with us today, and she is here because just a few short months ago her beautiful daughter Sheridan was shot and killed in Chicago by an illegal immigrant. I cannot say it loud enough or clear enough, but this Nation, and this Congress owes you an apology. We are sorry to you, to Tom, and to Madelon.

I didn't know Sheridan personally, and that is a tragedy, but I know her family, and I know the Yorktown community. I know that she was a kind and compassionate young woman who cared about her community and had a bright future ahead of us. I know without a doubt in my mind the incredible things she would have done with her life, should she had been given the chance.

Her murder was senseless; it should not have happened. Our immigration policies exist for a reason, and they should have been enforced. Sheridan would still be with us today, and Jessica would not have to testify before this panel. Our immigration laws facilitate legal immigration processes to ensure that good, smart people can come into this country, assimilate, and contribute to our communities.

While also ensuring that criminals who break the law do not get to stay. Their jobs are made infinitely harder when places like New York and Chicago blatantly disregard existing law and provide safe harbor to criminals. Sanctuary policies are the reason why—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, point of order, this is a statement, not an introduction.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman will suspend; the gentlelady's point is well taken. The gentleman will please confine his remarks to the introduction.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you.

Mr. LAWLER. Back in May 2023, over three years ago, Sheridan's murderer illegally entered the United States. Border Patrol caught him, they apprehended him. Then because of the Biden Administration's ludicrous open border policies, he was released into our country. A month later he was arrested for shoplifting in Chicago.

Under existing law, and the law at the time, he should have been deported right then and there. If Chicago were abiding by our Federal laws—

Mr. NADLER. Point of order, this is not an introduction, it is a speech.

Mr. LAWLER. You all should be ashamed of yourselves, you should be ashamed of yourselves, this is disgraceful—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, we had—

Mr. NADLER. We ask for a ruling on the point of order—

Mr. LAWLER. Precisely because you have failed to do your jobs—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair—

Mr. NADLER. We ask for a ruling—

Mr. LAWLER. You wonder why we had four hearings—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Everybody settle down.

Mr. LAWLER. It is because you don't understand the consequence of sanctuary policies—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman will suspend; the gentleman will suspend—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, unfortunately we won't give our approval for people to introduce their constituents if people don't stick to the rules. I appreciate the Chair's insistence that we stick to the rules, and that you have the opportunity to introduce your constituent, which I think you have done—

Mr. LAWLER. Right, introducing my constituent is—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you very much, Mr. Lawler, and Mr. Chair, please have the Committee be in order—

Mr. LAWLER. Sharing the details of her death, you may not want to hear the details, it may be an inconvenience to you, but these details matter.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman will suspend. We have an agreement with the Minority that the introductions will be introductory only, so if I could just ask for the gentleman to make that introduction and conclude?

Mr. LAWLER. Sure. When you send your kid to college, you should be worried about making sure they go to class, or hopefully that they have a nice roommate, or how to help them get a summer internship, not worried that illegal immigrants are shooting them while they are out with their friends looking at the Northern Lights. It is shameful that we are here.

Not because this is the fourth hearing, but because we need to have four hearings to make people understand the real-life consequences of the disastrous sanctuary city policies. While some of my colleagues may not want to hear the truth, the same outrage you feel about Renee Good and Alex Pretti, you should feel about Sheridan Gorman—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, would you please end this?

Mr. LAWLER. Laken Riley, and every Angel Family in this country—

Ms. JAYAPAL. End this statement, unfortunately—

Mr. RASKIN. I do feel that outrage—

Mr. LAWLER. You do not, because if you did, you would not support sanctuary jurisdictions—

Mr. RASKIN. Do you feel the outrage about Alex Pretti and Renee Good—

Mr. LAWLER. You should be ashamed of yourself—

Mr. RASKIN. You should be ashamed—

Mr. LAWLER. You should be ashamed of yourself, Jamie—

Mr. RASKIN. You don't belong on this Committee; you should get the hell out of here—

Mr. LAWLER. You are a disgrace—

Mr. RASKIN. You don't understand the rules of the Committee, you don't understand the Constitution—

Mr. LAWLER. You are a disgrace; you are a disgrace—

Mr. RASKIN. You are full of it; you are absolutely full of it—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Raskin, Mr. Raskin—

Mr. LAWLER. You are an absolute disgrace supporting sanctuary policies—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Raskin, get ahold of yourself—

Mr. RASKIN. Say one word about Alex Pretti—

Mr. LAWLER. Get rid of sanctuary policies—

Mr. RASKIN. Renee Good—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Lawler, please suspend—

Mr. LAWLER. I did, I wrote a whole *The New York Times* op ed about it, you should be absolutely ashamed of yourself for not—

Mr. RASKIN. OK, then follow the rules of the Committee—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The Committee will be—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The Committee will be—

Mr. LAWLER. Opposing sanctuary policies that resulted in their daughter's death.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The Committee will be in order; we are going to—

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chair, I just want to say we will not allow, thanks to Mr. Lawler's outrageous outburst, we will not allow this to happen again. This was an agreement between—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We will proceed—

Ms. JAYAPAL. The Chair and the Ranking Member, and unfortunately you are not able to control your Members—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We will proceed—

Ms. JAYAPAL. It is time for us to proceed.

Mr. LAWLER. Your opening statement was outrageous; you should be ashamed of yourself—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We will proceed; we will proceed in order—

Ms. JAYAPAL. You are not on the Committee, Mr. Lawler—

Mr. LAWLER. I yield back.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Get off of it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Let us try to conduct ourselves in a civil manner.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Speak that to your Member, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We have two other introductions to make, which I think will go a little more smoothly. One is Ms. Sarah Pierce, who is the Director of Social Policy at Third Way. She pre-

viously worked at U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, and has served as Senior Counsel for the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Ms. Pierce has a bachelor's degree from Grinnell College, a master's degree from the Elliott School of International Affairs, and a law degree from the University of Iowa College of Law. Finally, we have Sheriff Gary Redman, who has been the Sheriff of Amador County, California, since 2021. He is a veteran of the U.S. Air Force.

Sheriff Redman's career includes service with the Los Angeles Police Department, and nearly three decades with the Amador County Sheriff's Office. He is a graduate of the Sherman Block Supervisory Leadership Institute, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's National Academy held in Quantico, Virginia.

On a personal note, I will add that Sheriff Redman has been a leading advocate in California to sound the alarm over California's sanctuary laws. As we will hear, Sheriff Redman and many of his fellow sheriffs want desperately to cooperate and coordinate with ICE, but are forbidden from doing so by State law.

With those introductions, we will now welcome our witnesses, thank them for appearing today, and we will begin by swearing you in.

Would you please rise and raise your right hand? Do you swear or affirm under penalty of perjury that the testimony you are about to give is true and correct to the best of your knowledge, information, and belief, so help you God? Let the record reflect the witnesses have answered in the affirmative, please be seated.

Please know that your written testimony will be entered into the record in its entirety. Accordingly, we ask that you summarize your testimony in five minutes.

We will begin with Mr. Abraham.

STATEMENT OF JOE ABRAHAM

Mr. ABRAHAM. Chair, Ranking Members, and the Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify. For most Americans January 19, 2025, was just an ordinary day. For my family it was the day that our lives were permanently altered. That night my 20-year-old daughter Katie was riding with friends in Urbana, Illinois, visiting University of Illinois, friends going to that college.

The vehicle was stopped at a red light, they were exactly where they were supposed to be, they were obeying laws and posed a danger to no one. In a matter of seconds, an intoxicated illegal immigrant driving nearly 80 miles an hour crashed into the back of their idle vehicle. Katie was killed, another young woman was killed, three other young people suffered serious injuries.

My daughter's future ended in that intersection. Katie was bright, compassionate, athletic, and deeply loved. Today, instead of watching her graduate from college this year, begin a career, build a family of her own, we visit and tend to her grave.

The individual responsible, Julio Cucul-Bol, a Guatemalan national who was previously deported, and re-entered illegally in the United States in 2022.

After the crash, he fled, leaving the death and destruction behind him, but was later apprehended in Texas. As devastating as Katie's death is, what brings me here before Congress is not what happened that night. It is everything that happened before it. Previously deported individual, illegally returned to the United States, remained here, obtained an Illinois driver's license, and ultimately killed two women.

Those are not my opinions, those are facts. During court proceedings, Bol testified through an interpreter that he could not read, write, or speak English or Spanish. He communicated primarily with K'iche', an indigenous Mayan Guatemalan language. Imagine the struggles of translators there. Yet, he was issued a valid Illinois driver's license, which raises serious questions.

How was competency evaluated? Whether public safety was even a concern, any protocols followed. Accountability cannot change what happened to Katie, but it can help prevent similar tragedies. My parents came to America legally more than 60 years ago from a developing country. Like millions of lawful immigrants, they believed America was a Nation governed by laws rather than political convenience.

They respected the process because they respected the country. They taught me citizenship carries obligations, that laws exist for a reason, and that government has fundamental responsibilities to the people it serves. When government fails in that responsibility, real people bear the consequences, my daughter was one of them.

The central question before this Committee to me is straight forward. Did failures in immigration enforcement, government coordination, public policy increase preventable risks to American citizens? These are not partisan questions, they are oversight questions, they are public safety questions. Too often immigration debates become about systems and policies, while victims fade into the background.

Katie was not a statistic; she was my daughter. She should still be alive today. Congress can't undo what happened to Katie, but it can examine what failed, demand transparency from government agencies and public officials, insist that policies be judged not by their intentions, by their outcomes. Katie lost her future January 19, 2025, my family lost ours with her.

I ask this Committee to demand full transparency, identify the failures that allowed a previously deported individual to illegally return, remain in this country, obtain a driver's license, and ultimately kill two young women. Hold government accountable, strengthen coordination between Federal, State, and local authorities, and judge every policy by one simple question. Would this better protect the next American stopped at a red light? Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Abraham follows:]

Testimony of Joe Abraham

Chairman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Subcommittee,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit this statement for the record.

For most Americans, January 19, 2025, was an ordinary day.

For my family, it was the day our lives were permanently altered.

That night, my twenty-year-old daughter Katie was riding with friends in Urbana, Illinois. Their vehicle was stopped at a red light.

They were exactly where they were supposed to be.

They were obeying the law.

They posed a danger to no one.

In a matter of seconds, an intoxicated illegal immigrant driving at nearly 80 miles per hour crashed into the back of their vehicle.

Katie was killed.

Another young woman was killed.

Three other young people suffered serious injuries.

The impact was so violent that first responders fought desperately to save lives at the scene. While they worked to free victims from the wreckage, the man responsible fled.

My daughter's future ended at that intersection.

Everything she should have experienced—graduating from college, beginning a career, finding love, getting married, raising a family, and growing old surrounded by people who loved her—was taken from her in an instant.

Katie was bright, compassionate, athletic, and deeply loved. She had an extraordinary ability to make people feel welcome and valued. She approached life with optimism, kindness, and a genuine interest in others. She had friends from many different backgrounds and possessed a rare gift for making people feel seen and appreciated.

As a father, one of the greatest privileges of my life was watching my children grow into adulthood and begin building lives of their own.

Katie deserved that opportunity.

She deserved decades of birthdays, holidays, accomplishments, disappointments, adventures, and ordinary moments that together make up a life.

Instead, she received a grave.

Today, we live with a loss that never leaves us. We visit and tend to Katie's grave when we should be watching her finish college, begin a career, and build the future that was taken from her.

Instead, we visit and tend to her premature grave, a permanent reminder of the future that was taken from her.

As devastating as Katie's death is, what brings me before Congress is not only what happened that night.

It is everything that happened before it.

Because Katie's death did not occur in a vacuum.

The individual responsible for this crash was Julio Cucul-Bol, a Guatemalan national who had previously been deported from the United States before illegally reentering the country.

After the crash, he fled.

He was later apprehended in Texas while attempting to avoid responsibility for what he had done.

His actions that night were reckless and inexcusable. He bears responsibility for the choices he made.

But congressional oversight requires us to examine more than the final act in a tragedy.

It requires us to examine the chain of events that made that tragedy possible.

A previously deported individual returned to the United States.

He remained here.

He lived under a false identity.

He obtained an Illinois driver's license.

He was authorized to drive on Illinois roads.

He drove intoxicated.

Two young women ended up dead.

Those are not opinions.

Those are facts.

The question before this Subcommittee is straightforward:

At what point should the system have worked?

At what point should safeguards have functioned as intended?

At what point should government agencies have coordinated effectively?

At what point should public officials have acted?

Was it at the border? During identity verification? During the licensing process? During enforcement of our drunk-driving laws? The answer should not be none of the above.

Because if government exists to protect the public, then every step in that chain deserves examination.

One of the most troubling questions in this case involves something many Americans take for granted: the process required to obtain a driver's license.

In court proceedings, Mr. Cucul-Bol testified through an interpreter that he could not read, write, or speak English. He also testified that he could not read, write, or speak Spanish. His primary language was identified as K'iche', an indigenous Mayan language spoken in Guatemala.

Yet despite those circumstances, he was issued a valid Illinois driver's license.

That raises serious questions.

Was a driver's examination available in K'iche'? If not, how was competency determined? How could someone who could not read English or Spanish safely understand road signs, traffic warnings, and the rules of the road?

Before Julio Cucul-Bol ever chose to drive drunk, government officials chose to put him behind the wheel.

I am not raising these questions to assign blame to any individual employee or agency worker. I raise them because the public deserves confidence that government systems designed to protect public safety are functioning as intended.

A driver's license is not simply a form of identification. It is government authorization to operate a vehicle capable of causing tremendous harm when used irresponsibly.

The public has a right to understand how that authorization was granted.

What verification procedures were followed?

What testing standards were applied?

What safeguards existed to ensure competency and understanding?

Were those safeguards adequate?

Were they followed?

If they were followed, should they be reexamined?

These are legitimate oversight questions.

When a preventable tragedy occurs, government should welcome those questions rather than avoid them.

Public confidence depends on transparency.

And transparency requires answers.

Katie's death also raises broader questions about the relationship between federal immigration enforcement and state-level policies.

Reasonable people can disagree about immigration policy.

Reasonable people can disagree about enforcement priorities.

What should not be controversial is the expectation that different levels of government communicate effectively when public safety is at stake.

The individual who killed my daughter had previously been deported from the United States.

That fact alone should cause every policymaker to ask a simple question:

What information existed, where did it exist, and who had access to it?

If information existed but was not shared, why not?

If information was shared but not acted upon, why not?

If legal barriers prevented effective coordination, should those barriers be reexamined?

Government systems are often described as separate jurisdictions with separate responsibilities.

Citizens do not experience government that way.

Citizens expect government to function as a system.

Families do not care which agency possessed which piece of information after a tragedy has occurred.

Families want to know why the information was not effectively used before the tragedy occurred.

That is not a political question.

It is a governance question.

And it deserves a serious answer.

No serious person disputes that Julio Cućul-Bol bears responsibility for the choices he made.

He chose to drive intoxicated.

He chose to drive at a reckless speed.

He chose to flee after the crash.

He bears responsibility for those actions.

But accountability cannot end there.

If accountability ends with the individual offender, then government is relieved of any obligation to examine whether preventable failures contributed to the outcome.

That is not how oversight works.

When an airplane crashes, investigators do not stop after identifying the pilot.

They examine every contributing factor.

They examine systems.

They examine procedures.

They examine failures.

They identify weaknesses.

And they recommend changes.

The goal is not merely to assign blame.

The goal is to prevent repetition.

The same principle should apply here.

A previously deported individual did not simply appear at the scene of the crash by accident.

He crossed the border, remained in the country, lived under a false identity, obtained a government-issued driver's license, and ultimately ended up behind the wheel on the night my daughter was killed.

A series of decisions, policies, procedures, and failures preceded that moment.

Congress has both the authority and the responsibility to examine those factors honestly.

If those failures are identified, they should be corrected.

If those policies increased preventable risk, they should be reconsidered.

If those safeguards proved inadequate, they should be strengthened.

That is not punishment.

That is accountability.

And accountability is how a society learns from tragedy rather than merely mourns it.

One lesson I have learned through this experience is that there is a significant difference between intentions and outcomes.

Public officials frequently ask to be judged by their intentions.

Families affected by policy failures live with outcomes.

Intentions do not change what happened to Katie.

Intentions do not restore stolen futures.

Intentions do not bring victims home.

Outcomes matter.

Results matter.

Accountability matters.

Every public policy creates incentives.

When immigration laws are inconsistently enforced, incentives change.

When previously deported individuals successfully return to the United States, incentives change.

When state and federal authorities fail to communicate effectively, incentives change.

When identity verification systems fail, incentives change.

Recognizing these realities is not ideological.

It is practical.

Good public policy begins with an honest assessment of how people actually behave, not how we wish they behaved.

My own family's story illustrates that point.

My parents immigrated legally to the United States more than sixty years ago from a developing country.

Like millions of lawful immigrants, they respected the process because they respected the country.

They came to America seeking opportunity, not entitlement.

They worked hard.

They followed the law.

They raised their family to believe that citizenship carries responsibilities as well as rights.

They believed deeply in the idea that America is a nation governed by laws.

That belief shaped my life.

It shaped Katie's life.

And it shaped our understanding of the relationship between citizens and government.

We honored our obligations.

Government failed to honor one of its most fundamental obligations to us.

Government asks citizens to obey the law, pay taxes, serve on juries, and trust public institutions.

That trust depends on a belief that government is fulfilling its most basic responsibilities.

When preventable failures take innocent lives and no one is willing to honestly examine those failures, that trust begins to erode.

The consequences of policy failures are rarely borne by those who create them.

Families bear them.

Victims bear them.

Communities bear them.

The policymakers responsible for those decisions continue with their lives.

The families left behind do not.

Every morning my family wakes up to the reality that Katie is gone.

Every holiday reminds us she is missing.

Every milestone reminds us she should be here.

Every visit to her grave reminds us of what was taken.

The years ahead that should have been filled with graduations, weddings, grandchildren, and family celebrations now exist only in our imagination.

That is the true cost of preventable failure.

One of the most frustrating aspects of this experience has been the refusal of many public officials to honestly examine whether policies contributed to preventable harm.

Silence has become a substitute for accountability.

Deflection has become a substitute for answers.

Too often, when tragedies like Katie's are discussed, the response is immediate and predictable.

Crime happens everywhere.

Citizens commit crimes too.

Those statements are true.

They are also irrelevant to the question before this Subcommittee.

The question is not whether crime exists.

The question is whether this death could have been prevented.

Could stronger enforcement have prevented it?

Could better coordination have prevented it?

Could more effective safeguards have prevented it?

Could greater accountability have prevented it?

Those are the questions that matter.
 Every preventable death deserves serious examination.
 Not because doing so changes the past.
 But because doing so may change the future.
 Katie's life cannot be reduced to a statistic used to defend a policy.
 She cannot become collateral damage in a political argument.
 She was a real person.
 She mattered.
 And the circumstances that led to her death deserve honest examination.
 Congress cannot undo what happened to Katie.
 No hearing will bring her back.
 No report will restore the future that was taken from her.
 But Congress can do something important.
 It can identify failures.
 It can demand transparency.
 It can strengthen oversight.
 It can insist that agencies answer difficult questions.
 It can ensure that policies are evaluated based on outcomes rather than intentions.
 And it can help reduce the likelihood that another family experiences what mine has experienced.
 The purpose of oversight is not to protect agencies.
 It is not to protect reputations.
 It is not to protect political narratives.
 It is to protect the American people.
 Katie should be alive today.
 She should be planning her future.
 She should be laughing with friends.
 She should be arguing with her siblings.
 She should be building a life.

Instead, we visit a cemetery.

Instead, we tend a grave.

Instead, we carry a loss that will remain with us for the rest of our lives.

Katie lost her future on January 19, 2025.

My family lost ours with her.

I respectfully ask this Subcommittee to pursue the facts wherever they lead, examine failures honestly, demand accountability from those entrusted with public authority, and remember that behind every policy debate are real families whose lives can be changed forever by decisions made far from the consequences.

Thank you for allowing me to share Katie's story.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you for your testimony. We will next hear from Ms. Pierce.

STATEMENT OF SARAH PIERCE

Ms. PIERCE. Chair McClintock, Ranking Member Jayapal, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I would like to start by saying Mr. Abraham and Ms. Gorman, I am incredibly sorry for your losses, no one should suffer like your families have suffered, and I honor and admire your bravery in being here today. My name is Sarah Pierce; I am the Director of Social Policy at Third Way.

Third Way has a long history of saying things that both Democrats and Republicans dislike, so let me start there. The Biden Administration's border policies were inexcusable. The Trump Administration's interior enforcement policies are also inexcusable. My testimony today focuses on why; I have three main points.

First, sanctuary policies do not prevent ICE from enforcing Federal law. Every jurisdiction, including self-proclaimed sanctuaries, participates in immigration enforcement. When someone is booked, fingerprints are checked against Federal databases, and ICE has access to that. ICE has Federal authority, agents, databases, and now extraordinary funding, \$113.5 billion in supplemental funding through 2029.

This is more than the combined operating budgets of every local-law enforcement jurisdiction in America. Meanwhile, State and local-law enforcement are starved for resources. Three quarters of local police departments have fewer than 25 officers. They handle crime, overdoses, sensitive community calls, asking them to absorb Federal duties, pulls them away from their local obligations.

The focus should be on how cooperation can advance public safety and support local policing.

Second, this Administration is making cooperation harder, not easier. Local jurisdictions need to trust Federal partners before they lend them local resources. Yet, this Administration has treated skeptical jurisdictions as adversaries to be punished, not partners to be persuaded.

This Administration has threatened funding, filed lawsuits, and accused entire jurisdictions of protecting criminals. ICE's tactics have deepened this trust deficit. The public cannot distinguish between police and ICE, especially when ICE is wearing police markings. When Federal operations are chaotic, abusive, or deadly, local police are left to repair the damage.

Third, this Administration's own decisions are making Americans more vulnerable to crime. Federal law enforcement are abandoning serious work in favor of immigration enforcement. In San Francisco, Federal drug dealing prosecutions fell by more than half after Federal agents were redirected to immigration enforcement.

In Minnesota, Hennepin County's top prosecutor said Federal agents were bringing criminal cases to her because they were too busy with immigration work. In addition, tens of thousands of Federal agents with specialized experience in child exploitation, human trafficking, arms trafficking, and violent crime have been diverted from their primary public safety missions to instead focus on immigration enforcement.

That is especially dangerous for child exploitation cases, which require specialized resources and personnel. When those agents get reassigned, children wait longer to be found, and predators get more time to harm them. The Department of Justice is also weakening public safety infrastructure by delaying and canceling grants.

Each year the Department of Justice grants billions for police hiring, prosecutors, and victim services across the United States. Congress provided more than \$4.5 billion for the Fiscal Year 2025 grants from the Department of Justice's Office of Justice Programs, but now nine months later less than half of that has gone out the door.

Notably for the Majority on this Committee, the States you represent are missing \$163 million in congressionally authorized public safety funding from last year. That money still has not gone out to Alabama, Arizona, California, Kansas, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin. The Administration has also terminated more than \$820 million in public safety grants.

Cutting initiatives on rural crime, officer safety and wellness, anti-terrorism training, and more than half of Federal gun violence prevention funding. For grants that are going out, new ideological conditions related to political priorities like vaccines, gender ideology, and protection of public monuments are discouraging applicants from even applying.

I urge this Subcommittee to broaden its oversight and stop treating sanctuary fights as a substitute for all public safety oversight. Demand a course correction, restore the grants to your own States. Stop diverting specialized agents from serious crime and rebuild trust that local-law enforcement need. Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Pierce follows:]



**Testimony of
Sarah Pierce
Director of Social Policy
Third Way**

Sanctuary Policies: Victims' Perspectives

**Before
the Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and
Enforcement
United States House of Representatives**

June 30, 2026

Chairman McClintock, Ranking Member Jayapal and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify. It is an honor to appear before you with my fellow witnesses. And Ms. Gorman and Mr. Abraham, no one should suffer what you have suffered. I am deeply sorry for your losses, and I respect and honor your courage in being here today.

My name is Sarah Pierce, and I am the Director of Social Policy at Third Way, a national policy think tank where I lead our work on crime and immigration. At Third Way, we focus on practical solutions that make government work better for Americans, including a secure, orderly, and humane immigration system and a serious commitment to public safety.

Every jurisdiction in America—including those that describe themselves as sanctuaries—participates in immigration enforcement to some degree. No city, county, or state can prevent ICE from enforcing federal immigration law. The real dispute is narrower: whether local police and sheriffs should lend local time, jail space, personnel, and public credibility to federal civil immigration enforcement, by notifying ICE, holding people for ICE, or going further by joining programs like 287(g), which deputizes state and local officers to perform immigration enforcement functions.

That dispute is fundamentally about public safety. It is about what makes police more effective, what makes victims and witnesses more willing to report crime, and how limited law enforcement resources should be used. Unfortunately, this Administration is worsening the two problems at the center of the sanctuary debate: trust and resources. Local officials are being asked to trust federal immigration enforcement at the very moment ICE is using tactics many local officials cannot defend. And local agencies are being asked to spend scarce resources on ICE's efforts at the very moment the federal government is pulling resources away from work on gun smuggling, drug trafficking, child exploitation, and more, and leaving local agencies to try and fill the gap.

What Sanctuary Policies Are—and What They Are Not

Sanctuary policies are often presented as a blockade against ICE. That is misleading. These policies do not block ICE from entering a jurisdiction, conducting arrests, or enforcing federal law. They limit when local officials will lend local resources to help ICE do its job.¹

These choices are usually driven by four practical concerns: community trust; local control over police priorities; legal liability; and limited staffing, jail space, and resources.² These are the day-to-day realities of American policing.

¹ Sarah Pierce, "Sanctuary Isn't What You Think," Third Way, Sept. 9, 2025, updated Feb. 23, 2026, <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/sanctuary-isnt-what-you-think>.

² "Shared Principles of Agreement—Public Safety Leadership Convening," International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2026, https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2026-03/Law%20Enforcement_Convening_Shared%20Principles.pdf; Major Cities Chiefs, "Immigration Policy," 2024, <https://majorcitieschiefs.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/11/Revised-2017-Immigration-Policy.pdf>; "Balancing community trust and enforcement: The complex issue of immigration," Police Executive Research Forum, Apr. 12, 2025, <https://www.policeforum.org/trending12apr25>; International Association of Chiefs of Police, "Enforcing Immigration Law: The Role of State, Tribal, and Local Law Enforcement," Police Chief 19, no. 4, Apr. 2005, <https://www.ojp.gov/ncjrs/virtual-library/abstracts/enforcing-immigration-law-role-state-tribal-and-local-law>; "Legal Advisory: Legal Guidance for Massachusetts Chiefs of Police," Massachusetts Chiefs of Police Association, May 5, 2025,

State and local law enforcement are not flush with personnel. Three-quarters of local police departments in the United States employ fewer than 25 sworn officers.³ Even larger police forces are facing critical staffing shortages, putting significant strain on the officers who protect America's cities. These are agencies focused on core public safety responsibilities: responding to 911 calls, investigating shootings, handling domestic violence, clearing robberies, managing jail operations, and protecting their communities. Asking them to absorb additional federal duties risks pulling officers away from something else.

Meanwhile, ICE already has federal authority, federal agents, federal databases, and an unprecedented infusion of federal funding. ICE is not some underfunded agency begging local police for help. Congress has already provided ICE \$113.5 billion in supplemental funding through 2029—\$75 billion through OBBBA and another \$38.5 billion through the Secure America Act—on top of its regular annual budget.⁴ That supplemental pot alone is larger than the annual military budgets of all but four countries in the world.⁵ Congress has provided ICE with so much extra money that its reconciliation funding alone exceeds the combined annual operating budgets of every local police department in America.⁶

And despite that striking mismatch, even self-described sanctuaries provide information to ICE. When a person is booked by state or local law enforcement, fingerprints are run through federal systems, checked against DHS immigration databases, and flagged for ICE.⁷ Thus ICE has both the means and resources to find people. But the pressure remains on local agencies to do everything ICE asks, even when those requests raise legal, operational, and public safety concerns.

So the question should not be, “Why won’t every jurisdiction do everything ICE asks?” The question should be, “What kind of cooperation actually improves public safety and supports local policing?”

<https://westfordma.gov/DocumentCenter/View/17269/Massachusetts-Chiefs-of-Police-Association---Legal-Advisory---Cooperation-with-Immigration-Officials>.

³ Shelley S. Hyland and Elizabeth Davis. “Local Police Departments, 2016: Personnel.” Bureau of Justice Statistics, Oct. 2019, <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/lpd16p.pdf>.

⁴ U.S. Senate Committee on Budget, Ranking Member. “As Senate Republicans Give ICE, CBP \$70 Billion, Agencies are Sitting on \$100 Billion from Previous Reconciliation Bill.” May 20, 2026, <https://www.budget.senate.gov/ranking-member/newsroom/press/senate-republicans-ice-cbp-70-billion-agencies-sitting-100-billion-previous-reconciliation-bill>; American Immigration Council. “What’s in the Secure America Act?” June 10, 2026, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/fact-sheet/whats-in-the-secure-america-act/>.

⁵ Xiao Liang, Nan Tian, Diego Lopes da Silva, Lorenzo Scarazzato, Zubaida Karim, and Jade Guibertau Ricard. “Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2025.” Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, Apr. 2026, https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2026-04/2604_milex_2025.pdf.

⁶ Sean E. Goodison. “Local Police Departments Personnel, 2020.” Bureau of Justice Statistics, Nov. 2022, <https://bjs.ojp.gov/media/68016/download>.

⁷ FBI. “Privacy Impact Assessment Integrated Automated Fingerprint Identification System (IAFIS)/Next Generation Identification (NGI) Biometric Interoperability.” Jan. 18, 2012, <https://www.fbi.gov/how-we-can-help-you/more-fbi-services-and-information/freedom-of-information-privacy-act/departments-of-justice-fbi-privacy-impact-assessments/iafis-ngi-biometric-interoperability>.

This Administration is Making Cooperation Harder

Unfortunately, this Administration is making cooperation harder, not easier.

Local jurisdictions need to be able to trust their federal partners before they lend scarce time, personnel, jail space, and public credibility. That is especially true in immigration enforcement, where federal actions can and do directly affect how residents view local police.⁸ If DHS wants local jurisdictions to notify ICE before release, provide jail access, honor transfer requests, or participate in 287(g), local officials need confidence that federal immigration enforcement is targeted, professional, lawful, and coordinated with local public safety needs.

This Administration has done the opposite.

First, it has treated skeptical jurisdictions as enemies to be punished rather than partners to be persuaded. The Administration has threatened funding, filed lawsuits, issued subpoenas, published public lists, and accused entire jurisdictions of protecting criminals.⁹ The President's April 2025 executive order on sanctuary jurisdictions directed agencies to publish lists, identify federal funds for suspension or termination, and pursue legal remedies against jurisdictions deemed noncompliant.¹⁰ That may satisfy a political audience, but it is a poor strategy for building law enforcement cooperation.

Even law enforcement organizations that favor strong immigration enforcement have warned against this approach. The National Sheriffs' Association criticized DHS's sanctuary list process for failing to provide transparency, input, or a meaningful way for jurisdictions to respond, and warned that the approach could create a "vacuum of trust" that may take years to repair.¹¹ The International Association of Chiefs of Police organized a group of leaders from nearly 20 law enforcement organizations, including the National League of Cities, the National District Attorneys Association, and the Small and Rural Law Enforcement Executives' Association, and put out a joint document highlighting how the Administration's rhetoric and approach to immigration has diverted resources, undermined trust, and made it harder for law enforcement to do their jobs.¹²

⁸ Tom K. Wong et al., "How Interior Immigration Enforcement Affects Trust in Law Enforcement," *Perspectives on Politics* 19, no. 2 (2021): 357–370, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/abs/how-interior-immigration-enforcement-affects-trust-in-law-enforcement/1D3021F5802F2E0FCE741BDAEAB47A0>; Rebecca Succar, Mohamed S. Jalal, Christopher M. Olivola, and Daniel B. Neill, "Understanding the role of media in the formation of public sentiment towards the police," *Communications Psychology* 2, Article 20 (2024), <https://engineering.nyu.edu/news/high-profile-incidents-police-brutality-sway-public-opinion-more-performance-peoples-local-law>.

⁹ "Sanctuary Jurisdictions Defying Federal Immigration Law," Department of Homeland Security, archived May 30, 2025, <https://web.archive.org/web/20250530130245/https://www.dhs.gov/sanctuary-jurisdictions>; "U.S. Sanctuary Jurisdiction List Following Executive Order 14287: Protecting American Communities From Criminal Aliens," U.S. Department of Justice, <https://www.justice.gov/ag/us-sanctuary-jurisdiction-list-following-executive-order-14287-protecting-american-communities>.

¹⁰ "Protecting American Communities From Criminal Aliens," Executive Order 14287, The White House, Apr. 28, 2025, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/protecting-american-communities-from-criminal-aliens/>.

¹¹ National Sheriffs' Association, "NSA President Issues Statement Calling For DHS Accountability and Transparency," May 31, 2025, <https://www.sheriffs.org/nsa-president-issues-statement-calling-for-dhs-accountability-and-transparency/>.

¹² Jeff Winter, "Law enforcement leaders propose guidelines to restore trust amid immigration

Second, ICE's tactics are deepening the trust deficit.¹³ Local officials are being asked to attach their police departments' credibility to a federal enforcement effort that many view as reckless, indiscriminate, poorly coordinated, and legally risky. As explained by former Houston and Austin Police Chief Art Acevedo, the public often does not distinguish "one badge from the other," especially when ICE agents wear "police" markings and use tactics that local police would not defend.¹⁴ Residents often do not know who is ICE, who is local police, and who is simply wearing a badge—especially as ICE impersonation crimes are on the rise.¹⁵ Secretive, chaotic, or abusive ICE operations erode public trust, and leave local police to repair the damage.

Federal immigration agents have fatally shot three US citizens since March 2025, including Renee Good and Alex Pretti in Minnesota, whose deaths were captured on widely circulated videos.¹⁶ Agents have detained hundreds of US citizens, smashed car windows, pointed guns at crowds, used excessive force, and used tear gas at close range and in residential areas.¹⁷ Local law enforcement did not design those operations, but they must live with the consequences of public outcry, protest response, emergency calls, and damaged confidence in anyone wearing a law enforcement uniform.

operations." Apr. 2, 2026, <https://www.cnn.com/2026/04/02/us/immigration-enforcement-ice-operations>; Shared Principles of Agreement—Public Safety Leadership Convening." International Association of Chiefs of Police, 2026, https://www.theiacp.org/sites/default/files/2026-03/Law%20Enforcement_Convening_Shared%20Principles.pdf.

¹³ Sarah Pierce and Sudria Twyman. "How the Trump Administration is Making Policing More Difficult." May 11, 2026, <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/how-the-trump-administration-is-making-policing-more-difficult>.

¹⁴ Laura Rice. "Ex-police chief Art Acevedo: ICE agents are poorly trained or supervised, acting unconstitutionally." Texas Standard, Feb. 3, 2026, <https://texasstandard.org/stories/police-chief-art-acevedo-ice-criticisim-minneapolis-op-ed/>.

¹⁵ Sam Levin. "Police across the US worry officers are being misidentified as ICE, records show." The Guardian, Apr. 24, 2026, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2026/apr/24/ice-police-danger-us>.

¹⁶ "NEWS: House Oversight Democrats Demand Investigation into Death of Ruben Ray Martinez." Office of Rep. Greg Casar, Mar. 24, 2026, <https://casar.house.gov/media/press-releases/news-house-oversight-democrats-demand-investigation-death-ruben-ray-martinez>; "Alex Pretti, Renee Good ICE Shootings Federal Investigations." NPR, Apr. 10, 2026, <https://www.npr.org/2026/04/10/nx-s1-5775847/alex-pretti-renee-good-ice-shootings-federal-investigations>.

¹⁷ Nicole Foy. "We Found That More Than 170 U.S. Citizens Have Been Held by Immigration Agents. They've Been Kicked, Dragged and Detained for Days." ProPublica, Oct. 16, 2025, <https://www.propublica.org/article/immigration-dhs-american-citizens-arrested-detained-against-will>;

"Video shows Ice agents smashing car window to detain asylum seeker." The Guardian, Apr. 17, 2025, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/apr/17/ice-detention-massachusetts-man-video>; "We asked a former federal agent to review videos showing use of force against protesters. Here's what he found." CBS News, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/former-federal-agent-ice-use-of-force-against-protesters/>; "Tear gas, car crashes, chokeholds: Risky tactics have driven Trump's Chicago deportation 'blitz.'" WBEZ Chicago, Nov. 14, 2025, <https://www.wbez.org/immigration/2025/11/14/ice-bovino-border-patrol-homeland-security-chicago-police-department>; "They Kidnapped Me": L.A. Immigrant Rights Activist Recounts Violent Arrest by Masked Federal Agents." Democracy Now!, Aug. 19, 2025, https://www.democracynow.org/2025/8/19/union_del_barrio; "Pastor Shot in the Head by ICE Sues Trump Over First Amendment." The New Republic, <https://newrepublic.com/post/201531/pastor-shot-head-ice-sues-trump-first-amendment>; "Criminal investigation launched after feds fire pepper ball at CBS Chicago reporter's truck." CBS Chicago, https://www.cbsnews.com/chicago/news/feds-fire-pepper-ball-at-cbs-chicago-reporters-truck/?mc_cid=8dc507ce67&mc_eid=9c4a02011b.

Third, ICE is asking local officers for coordination when it is all too often failing to provide it in return. ICE does not need local permission to enforce federal law. But public safety is better served when federal operations are coordinated with local law enforcement whenever operationally safe and appropriate. Local police are the ones responsible for emergency response, traffic control, protest response, crowd management, and public order issues that arise from federal operations in their communities. When ICE or CBP conduct large, visible, or aggressive operations without meaningful coordination with local officials, local police are left responding to confused 911 calls, reports of suspicious armed individuals, protests, traffic disruptions, and potential confrontations without adequate situational awareness.¹⁸

Charlotte provides a recent example. During a Border Patrol operation there, the Mecklenburg County Sheriff's Office said federal officials had told them the operation was over, while DHS publicly contradicted that statement and said the operation was continuing.¹⁹ During that same operation, news outlets reported videos of masked agents smashing a pickup window and dragging a man out.²⁰ Public-facing federal operations like this one force local law enforcement to manage the aftermath.

This creates a vicious cycle. ICE conducts operations that local officials and residents view as excessive, poorly coordinated, or damaging to public trust and perceptions of law enforcement as a whole. Local officials respond by strengthening sanctuary policies or refusing deeper cooperation. The Administration then treats those policies as proof of hostility to immigration enforcement, and lashes out against localities on the public stage. That cycle does not make Americans safer. It makes cooperation less likely.

The point is not to stop all federal immigration enforcement. It is that federal immigration enforcement should be targeted, professional, lawful, and coordinated in ways that local law enforcement can defend. You cannot build law enforcement partnerships by treating local law enforcement as the enemy. And you cannot ask local police to lend ICE their hard-earned credibility while ICE uses questionable tactics that local police are then forced to explain, manage, and clean up.

The Federal Prioritization of Immigration Has Created More Burden for State and Local Partners

The Administration's immigration-first approach is not only damaging trust. It is pushing more public safety burden back onto state and local systems.

¹⁸ Andrew Stanton, "Police Chief Issues 'Kidnapping' Warning Ahead of Possible ICE Raids," *Newsweek*, Dec. 3, 2025, <https://www.newsweek.com/police-chief-issues-kidnapping-warning-ahead-of-possible-ice-raids-11151526>; Alex Stone, "Los Angeles police responded to a kidnapping call. But instead found an ICE operation," *ABC News*, June 25, 2025, <https://abcnews.com/US/los-angeles-police-responded-kidnapping-call-found-ice/story?id=123204661>; Jeremy Harris, "Seattle leaders respond to ICE arrests that prompted 911 calls at cemetery," *KOMO News*, Jan. 8, 2026, <https://komonews.com/news/local/seattle-police-chief-shon-barnes-mayor-katie-wilson-leaders-respond-to-ice-arrests-that-prompted-911-calls-at-cemetery-evergreen-washelli-cemetery-ice-shooting-ice-arrest>.

¹⁹ "Status of immigration crackdown operation in Charlotte in doubt," *Reuters*, Nov. 20, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/immigration-crackdown-operation-charlotte-ends-sheriff-says-2025-11-20/>.

²⁰ *Id.*

Cases that might once have been strengthened by federal prosecution are staying with local police and local prosecutors. In Maryland, federal gun prosecutions fell 32% in 2025, to the lowest level in at least 25 years, even as Baltimore police more than quadrupled local felon-in-possession arrests.²¹ In San Francisco, federal drug-dealing prosecutions fell by more than half in 2025 after federal agents who had worked with local police on drug busts were redirected toward immigration enforcement.²² Across Northern California, federal criminal charges dropped by 40% in 2025 through November 1, compared with the same period in 2024.²³ Drug charges fell by about half, gun charges fell by 40%, and drug conspiracy charges fell from 89 to 32.²⁴ Local and state officials then had to try to fill the gap, including through additional San Francisco police arrests and expanded deployments of California Highway Patrol to work on crime.

In Minnesota, after the Administration flooded the state with federal agents, only 8 people were charged federally with gun and drug charges between January and April 2026, compared to 77 people during the same period the year before.²⁵ Hennepin County Attorney Mary Moriarty said that federal agents had started bringing complex cases to her office, asking locals to take them on because the federal agents were too consumed by immigration work.²⁶

This pattern is national. Federal prosecutions for drug conspiracy, money-laundering, and drug prosecutions have all decreased under this Administration—with federal drug prosecutions at their lowest level in decades.²⁷ Relatedly, referrals from ATF, DEA, and the US Marshals have all fallen under this Administration—meaning the federal government is doing less on guns, drugs, and fugitive apprehensions.²⁸ With the federal government failing to detect and disrupt these crimes, that burden goes to state and local law enforcement.

Meanwhile, the federal government has prioritized immigration enforcement above all else. In just May 2025, CBP and ICE referred seven times more cases to federal prosecutors than ATF, 7.3 times more than DEA, and 3.3 times more than FBI.²⁹

²¹ Brad Heath. “How immigration swallowed up federal gun crime efforts.” Reuters, Dec. 22, 2025, updated Dec. 23, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/how-immigration-swallowed-up-federal-gun-crime-efforts-2025-12-22/>.

²² Megan Cassidy. “S.F. federal drug cases plummeted under Trump administration, data shows.” San Francisco Chronicle, Nov. 12, 2025, <https://www.sfchronicle.com/crime/article/federal-drug-dealer-prosecution-21129613.php>.

²³ Brad Heath. “Trump promised a San Francisco crime crackdown. His administration did the opposite.” Reuters, Dec. 2, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-promised-san-francisco-crime-crackdown-his-administration-did-opposite-2025-12-02/>.

²⁴ Brad Heath. “Trump promised a San Francisco crime crackdown. His administration did the opposite.” Reuters, Dec. 2, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/trump-promised-san-francisco-crime-crackdown-his-administration-did-opposite-2025-12-02/>.

²⁵ Brad Heath, Andrew Goudswaard, and Kristina Cooke. “Trump vowed to fight crime in Minneapolis. Prosecutions plunged.” Reuters, May 7, 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/how-trumps-minneapolis-immigration-blitz-hobbled-federal-crime-fighting-2026-05-07/>.

²⁶ Brad Heath, Andrew Goudswaard, and Kristina Cooke. “Trump vowed to fight crime in Minneapolis. Prosecutions plunged.” Reuters, May 7, 2026, <https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/how-trumps-minneapolis-immigration-blitz-hobbled-federal-crime-fighting-2026-05-07/>.

²⁷ Brad Heath. “Federal drug prosecutions fall to lowest level in decades as Trump shifts focus to deportations.” Reuters, Sept. 29, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/federal-drug-prosecutions-fall-lowest-level-decades-trump-shifts-focus-2025-09-29>.

²⁸ “June 2025 Sees Declines in Federal Criminal Referrals by ATF Agents and DEA Agents.” Transactional Records Access Clearinghouse, <https://tracreports.org/reports/764/>.

²⁹ “Referrals for Criminal Prosecution of Immigration Violations.” Transactional Records Access

This is the public safety problem Congress should be examining. The Administration is demanding that local police help ICE do its job while making it harder for federal law enforcement to help local police do theirs. Local departments need federal partners on gun trafficking, fentanyl networks, child exploitation, money laundering, violent crime, and transnational criminal organizations. Instead, federal capacity is being consumed by immigration enforcement, and state and local agencies are being asked to pick up the slack.

This Administration is Making Americans Less Safe and Life Harder for Victims

I share the majority's concern for public safety. But after eight sanctuary hearings, Congress should also examine the Administration's own decisions that are weakening local law enforcement, destabilizing victim services, and letting serious criminal work fall through the cracks.

Trump's Covert Cuts to Law Enforcement

Under President Trump, the Department of Justice has withheld, delayed, canceled, and redirected public safety dollars that Congress approved.³⁰ The Justice Department's Office of Justice Programs (OJP) is one of the federal government's central pipelines for state and local public safety funding, awarding an average of \$3.9 billion a year over the past decade. Agencies rely on these grants to hire officers, buy body cameras, support prosecutors, serve crime victims, and fund anti-violence programs. But roughly half of last year's funds from OJP still have not reached the police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, victim service providers, and violence prevention programs waiting for them.

These dollars are vital for public safety in American communities. Decades of research show these investments significantly reduce violent crime.³¹

But since Trump took office, that support has slowed dramatically and, in some cases, been reversed.

In fiscal year 2025, Congress provided OJP with more than \$4.5 billion for policing, justice systems, violence prevention, and victim services.³² Under a normal timeline, most of that money would have been awarded by September 30, 2025, the end of the fiscal year. Instead, nearly nine months later, only half—just \$2.26 billion—has gone out the door.³³ Instead of delivering money that Congress appropriated, OJP is leaving communities waiting.

Clearinghouse, <https://tracreports.org/reports/763/>.

³⁰ Sarah Pierce. "Trump's Covert Cuts to Law Enforcement." Third Way, May 11, 2026, <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/trumps-covert-cuts-to-law-enforcement>.

³¹ Evans, William N., and Emily G. Owens. "COPS and Crime." *Criminology & Public Policy* 6, no. 3 (2007): 481–517, <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2008.00512.x>.

³² "FY 2027 DOJ Grants Table (Including FY 2025 Enacted and FY 2026 Enacted)." U.S. Department of Justice, accessed June 29, 2026, <https://www.justice.gov/jmd/media/1434906/dl?inline>.

³³ "OJP Awards Since FY2021 By NOFO As Of 6/28/2026." U.S. Department of Justice, accessed June 29, 2026, <https://charts.ojp.usdoj.gov/t/public/views/OJPAwardsDashboardallFiscalYears/AwardsByNOFO?%3Aembed=y&%3Aiid=2&%3AisGuestRedirectFromVizportal=y>.

Ungranted FY 2025 Office of Justice Programs Formula Funds

State	JAG Formula	Title II Formula	Byrne SCIP	Total
Alabama	\$ 5,322,039	\$ 766,035	\$ 2,265,488	\$ 8,353,562
Alaska	1,555,984	486,525	733,643	2,776,152
American Samoa	484,329	99,842	219,844	804,015
Arizona	6,998,394	947,813	3,101,076	11,047,283
Arkansas	3,608,308	653,328	1,657,242	5,918,878
California	32,506,609	4,204,755	14,672,295	51,383,659
Colorado	5,446,091	657,314	2,349,312	8,452,717
Connecticut	2,665,209	731,260	1,241,726	4,638,195
Delaware	1,609,643	485,413	686,751	2,781,807
District of Columbia	1,584,318	611,677	761,489	2,957,484
Florida	18,535,250	2,308,518	7,792,412	28,636,180
Georgia	8,494,582	1,416,039	3,862,826	13,773,447
Guam	724,005	103,256	328,126	1,155,387
Hawaii	1,631,713	627,595	732,077	2,991,385
Idaho	1,853,891	630,261	848,671	3,332,823
Illinois	10,580,845	1,299,251	4,792,068	16,672,164
Indiana	5,655,571	967,651	2,583,449	9,206,671
Iowa	2,803,757	667,142	1,268,394	4,739,293
Kansas	3,220,879	664,280	1,372,680	5,257,839
Kentucky	3,400,078	711,582	1,552,896	5,664,556
Louisiana	5,314,848	467,205	2,300,349	8,082,402
Maine	1,374,778	622,975	630,374	2,628,127
Maryland	6,013,635	726,537	2,555,689	9,295,861
Massachusetts	5,506,142	450,522	2,506,105	8,462,769
Michigan	9,349,531	1,186,498	4,043,567	14,579,596
Minnesota	4,142,227	837,045	1,909,759	6,889,031
Mississippi	2,716,009	662,918	1,184,176	4,563,103
Missouri	6,405,908	884,403	2,776,276	10,066,587
Montana	1,590,473	621,419	720,351	2,932,243
Nebraska	2,059,977	385,667	927,332	3,372,976
Nevada	3,641,830	653,877	1,555,255	5,850,962
New Hampshire	1,416,424	613,338	661,493	2,691,255
New Jersey	5,997,898	1,156,410	2,697,661	9,851,969
New Mexico	3,203,935	643,204	1,445,022	5,292,161

New York	15,115,940	1,772,916	6,724,205	23,613,061
North Carolina	8,606,004	1,336,601	3,949,757	13,892,362
North Dakota	726,801	616,839	328,125	1,671,765
Northern Mariana Islands	238,550	99,190	108,282	446,022
Ohio	9,093,654	1,458,573	3,871,959	14,424,186
Oklahoma	4,261,940	689,098	1,814,798	6,765,836
Oregon	3,443,494	667,119	1,588,284	5,698,897
Pennsylvania	9,747,434	1,389,911	4,409,454	15,546,799
Puerto Rico	2,146,361	639,938	1,111,318	3,897,617
Rhode Island	1,368,907	618,883	618,325	2,606,115
South Carolina	5,605,302	587,426	2,410,960	8,603,688
South Dakota	1,498,632	620,198	653,159	2,771,989
Tennessee	8,133,902	974,370	3,454,070	12,562,342
Texas	24,773,964	1,045,806	10,973,066	36,792,836
Utah	2,753,002	674,378	1,253,810	4,681,190
Vermont	709,849	488,929	328,125	1,526,903
Virgin Islands	722,881	80,021	328,126	1,131,028
Virginia	6,074,128	677,555	2,584,861	9,336,544
Washington	5,907,313	998,528	2,672,994	9,578,835
West Virginia	1,887,991	624,207	885,494	3,397,692
Wisconsin	4,621,010	811,488	2,117,254	7,549,752
Wyoming	754,694	600,000	328,125	1,682,819
Total	\$ 295,606,863	\$ 46,423,529	\$ 31,250,425	\$ 473,280,817

Source: Byrne JAG, <https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/jag-state-local-allocations.pdf>. Accessed June 26, 2026.
 Title II Source, <https://ojdp.ojp.gov/funding/fy2025/titleii/fy25-award-amounts.pdf>. Accessed June 26, 2026.
 Title II Non-Participating, <https://www.ojp.gov/funding/docs/OJDP-2025-172545.pdf>. Accessed June 26, 2026.
 Byrne SCIP Source: <https://bja.ojp.gov/funding/fy-2025-byrne-scip-allocations.pdf>. Accessed June 26, 2026.

That means police chiefs, sheriffs, prosecutors, and victim service providers across the country are still waiting on funding that should already be at work in their communities. The direct consequences include stalled investigations, delayed hiring, disrupted planning, and fewer tools for agencies already stretched thin.

And the Administration's failures do not stop at delays. In April 2025, DOJ terminated more than \$820 million in public safety grants, including funding tied to police training and officer wellness.³⁴ The majority of that terminated grant money—\$500 million—had been awarded but not yet distributed. The National Association of Counties warned that many of the canceled

³⁴ Amy Solomon and Betsy Pearl. "DOJ Funding Update: A Deeper Look at the Cuts." Council on Criminal Justice, May 2025, <https://counciloncj.org/doj-funding-update-a-deeper-look-at-the-cuts/>; "Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative." Rural VCRI, <https://ruralvcri.org/>; "VALOR Officer Safety and Wellness Initiative." Bureau of Justice Assistance, <https://bja.ojp.gov/program/valor/overview>.

grants were already midstream, forcing recipients to stop work after programs had been built, staff hired, and communities had come to rely on the services.³⁵

The cuts hit the Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative, the VALOR Initiative to improve officer safety and wellness, and the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training (SLATT) program, which, since 1996, has trained more than 427,000 law enforcement officers to respond to domestic and international terrorism, targeted violence, and hate crimes.³⁶

DOJ also cut programs that many police leaders say help them do their jobs more effectively, including community violence intervention efforts that prevent shootings and retaliation before officers have to respond to another crime scene.³⁷ It cut more than half of all federal gun violence prevention funding.³⁸ In response, 18 law enforcement groups and police chiefs urged then-Attorney General Pam Bondi to restore the grants, calling them “lifesaving, law-enforcement-enhancing strategies that work.”³⁹

Hundreds of DOJ grantees have appealed these cancellations, but those appeals are languishing.⁴⁰ As of December 2025, more than 170 appeals from the grants canceled in April were still pending. In the meantime, programs have laid off staff or shut down altogether.

For the grants that are going out the door, DOJ has imposed sweeping new conditions that are not tailored to crime reduction or justice system performance.⁴¹ Instead, the conditions drag public safety funding into the White House’s ideological battles over gender, vaccines, diversity initiatives, immigration, and other unrelated political priorities.

Conditions Placed on DOJ Grants

DOJ Funding Streams	Specific Conditions
Immigration	

³⁵ “DOJ terminates justice and public safety-focused grants.” National Association of Counties, <https://www.naco.org/news/doj-terminates-justice-and-public-safety-focused-grants>.

³⁶ Amy Solomon and Betsy Pearl. “DOJ Funding Update: A Deeper Look at the Cuts.” Council on Criminal Justice, May 2025, <https://counciloncj.org/doj-funding-update-a-deeper-look-at-the-cuts/>; “Rural Violent Crime Reduction Initiative.” Rural VCRI, <https://ruralvcri.org/>; “VALOR Officer Safety and Wellness Initiative.” Bureau of Justice Assistance, <https://bjaojp.gov/program/valor/overview>; “State and Local Anti-Terrorism Training Program.” Bureau of Justice Assistance, archived Jan. 17, 2025, <https://web.archive.org/web/2025011721908/https://bjaojp.gov/program/state-and-local-anti-terrorism-training-program/overview>; “DOJ cancels \$500M in public safety grants, cuts officer safety and crime prevention programs.” Police1, <https://www.police1.com/police-grant-center/doj-cancels-500m-in-public-safety-grants-cuts-officer-safety-and-crime-prevention-programs>.

³⁷ Amy Solomon and Betsy Pearl. “DOJ Funding Update: A Deeper Look at the Cuts.” Council on Criminal Justice, May 2025, <https://counciloncj.org/doj-funding-update-a-deeper-look-at-the-cuts/>.

³⁸ “Trump administration slashed federal funding for gun violence prevention.” Reuters, July 29, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/trump-administration-slashed-federal-funding-gun-violence-prevention-2025-07-29/>.

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ “US Justice Department slow to respond to appeals after April wave of grant cuts.” Reuters, Dec. 19, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/us-justice-department-slow-respond-appeals-after-april-wave-grant-cuts-2025-12-19/>.

⁴¹ Marla Guerra and Sarah Pierce. “DOJ’s Ideological Hijacking of Public Safety Grants.” Third Way, <https://www.thirdway.org/memo/dojs-ideological-hijacking-of-public-safety-grants>.

COPS	→ State and local law enforcement must comply with <u>8 USC 1373</u> and prohibit policies that limit communication with DHS
OJP	→ Some grantees must certify compliance with <u>8 USC 1373</u> → Funding may not be used to <u>impede federal immigration enforcement</u> , including by failing to provide information on citizenship or immigration status with DHS, honor DHS requests, or provide requested notice to DHS → Funding must not be used for <u>legal services</u> to any noncitizens, with few exceptions for protection orders for crime victims
OVW	→ Some grantees may be required to certify compliance with <u>federal immigration laws</u> → Programs cannot promote <u>any violations</u> of federal immigration law → Programs cannot <u>discourage collaboration</u> between law enforcement and immigration enforcement in addressing violence against women → Programs <u>cannot prioritize undocumented immigrants over citizens or legal residents</u> in receiving victim services and support
Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion	
COPS	→ Programs must not have components relating to <u>diversity, equity, and inclusion</u> that “violate federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws” → Funding may not be used to <u>advance diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility, or environmental justice</u>
OJP	→ Programs must not have components relating to <u>diversity, equity, and inclusion</u> that “violate federal civil rights or nondiscrimination laws”
OVW	→ Grants must not promote “ <u>discriminatory programs or ideology, including illegal DEI</u> ” or diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility programs that do not align with the policy of equal dignity and respect as outlined in <u>EO 14173, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity</u>
Gender	
COPS	→ Funding may not be used to promote “ <u>gender ideology</u> ”
OVW	→ Funding may not be used for “ <u>inculcating or promoting gender ideology</u> ” defined by <u>EO 14168, Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government</u> → Funding must not be used for “ <u>activities that frame domestic violence or sexual assault as systemic social justice issues rather than criminal offenses (e.g., prioritizing criminal justice reform or social justice theories over victim safety and offender accountability).</u> ”
Vaccines	
COPS	→ Funding cannot <u>directly or indirectly support any educational institution</u> that requires a COVID-19 vaccine for in-person instruction
Public Monuments	
COPS	→ Funding cannot support state or local governments and law enforcement agencies that have <u>failed to protect public monuments</u> , memorials, and statutes from destruction or vandalism

Other Presidential Executive Orders

COPS	→ Programs must certify compliance with <u>“all applicable federal laws and Presidential Memoranda and all Executive Orders by the President”</u>
OVW	→ Applicants must certify that funding will not be used for <u>“any activity or program that unlawfully violates an Executive Order”</u>

Note: The affected DOJ grantmaking streams include the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), the Office of Justice Programs (OJP), and the Office on Violence Against Women (OVW).

Source: [Department of Justice, Sanctuary Jurisdiction Directives](#); [White House, Defending Women from Gender Ideology Extremism and Restoring Biological Truth to the Federal Government](#); [White House, Ending Illegal Discrimination and Restoring Merit-Based Opportunity](#); [White House, Improving Oversight of Federal Grantmaking](#).

The immediate danger is that these conditions will deter qualified applicants from seeking federal support at all. Some states, cities, agencies, and nonprofit partners have decided that the legal uncertainty, confusion around the conditions, ideological strings, and compliance burden are simply too great. Even jurisdictions that cooperate with federal immigration authorities may be hesitant to certify compliance with some of the more subjective and ill-defined grant conditions, such as the ban on “promoting gender ideology” or the requirement to comply with executive orders that have not yet been issued. Others have concluded that accepting the money is not worth the risk of later losing it or being dragged into litigation.

Jurisdictions that do apply may feel pressure to tailor their work toward the Administration’s preferred ideological priorities rather than their communities’ actual safety needs. That means grant dollars are less likely to flow to the best violence-prevention strategy, the most effective victim-service provider, or the strongest community-policing proposal. Instead, they are more likely to reward political conformity.

Taken together, these conditions represent a major shift in how the federal government supports public safety in American communities. Instead of directing DOJ grants toward proven public safety solutions, the Administration is using public safety dollars to reward political alignment and punish independence.

The Immigration Focus Is Weakening Core Crime-Fighting Missions

The Administration’s immigration crackdown is pulling federal law enforcement away from the core missions that keep Americans safe. Agents and specialized personnel from across the federal government—including the FBI, ATF, DEA, US Marshals Service, HSI, CISA, and other agencies—have been redirected to support civil immigration operations, even when their ordinary work involves violent crime, child exploitation, human trafficking, firearms trafficking, cyber threats, terrorism, narcotics, and transnational criminal networks.⁴²

Complex cases depend on agents with specialized training, long-running intelligence, digital evidence, confidential sources, and coordination with state, local, tribal, and international partners. When those agents are reassigned, cases slow down, leads go cold, evidence becomes harder to use, and dangerous actors get more time to operate.

⁴² David J. Bier. “ICE Has Diverted Over 25,000 Officers from Their Jobs.” Cato Institute, Sept. 3, 2025, <https://www.cato.org/blog/ice-has-diverted-over-25000-officers-their-jobs>; “DHS Agents Reassigned.” The New York Times, Nov. 16, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/11/16/us/politics/dhs-agents-reassigned.html>.

The effects are especially devastating at Homeland Security Investigations (HSI)—an agency the United States relies on to protect national security and combat human trafficking, child exploitation, money laundering, narcotics smuggling, firearms trafficking, and violent transnational gangs. HSI's work protecting and rescuing children from exploitation, abuse, and trafficking is highly specialized and relies on experienced agents, forensic interviewers, digital-evidence teams, and long-term partnerships that cannot be recreated overnight. Pulling those teams into immigration operations means the country is taking scarce expertise away from some of the most sensitive and urgent public safety work in government.

This is happening at a particularly dangerous moment. Artificial intelligence is accelerating the production and spread of child sexual abuse material, while technology companies report that federal follow-up on child exploitation referrals has dropped sharply over the course of this Administration.⁴³ Reports that some HSI personnel have tried to keep these cases alive by working them during their nights and weekends only underscore the point: career law enforcement officials understand that the mission they were trained to perform is being sidelined.⁴⁴

The problem is broader than HSI. Nearly a quarter of FBI agents have been assigned to immigration enforcement, while ATF has reportedly shifted roughly 80% of its special agents to immigration-related work—undermining gun trafficking investigations and the agency's ability to investigate corrupt firearms dealers.⁴⁵ Cybersecurity personnel have also been pulled into deportation operations at a time when hospitals, water systems, energy grids, pipelines, and election infrastructure face growing threats from foreign adversaries.⁴⁶

⁴³ "AI Mental Health Crisis Law Enforcement." Bloomberg, 2026, <https://www.bloomberg.com/features/2026-ai-mental-health-crisis-law-enforcement/>; "DHS Agents Reassigned." The New York Times, Nov. 16, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/11/16/us/politics/dhs-agents-reassigned.html>.

⁴⁴ Josh Meyer. "Thousands of DHS agents shift to deportation instead of drugs, weapons, and human trafficking." USA Today, Feb. 14, 2025, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2025/02/14/dhs-agents-deportation-nottrafficking/78641666007/>; Brad Heath, Joshua Schneyer, et al. "Exclusive: Thousands of agents diverted to Trump immigration crackdown." Reuters, Mar. 22, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/thousands-agents-diverted-trumpimmigration-crackdown-2025-03-22/>; Nick Miroff. "Trump Loves ICE. Its Workforce Has Never Been So Miserable." The Atlantic, July 10, 2025, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2025/07/trump-ice-moraleimmigration/683477>.

⁴⁵ "FBI has reassigned nearly one-quarter of agents to immigration." The Washington Post, Oct. 8, 2025, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/2025/10/08/fbi-agents-reassigned-immigration/>; "Trump immigration push diverted ATF from gun cases." CNN, Oct. 15, 2025, <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/10/15/us/trump-immigration-atf-gun-cases-invs/>; "How Trump Reversed Biden's Crackdown on Guns." ProPublica, <https://www.propublica.org/article/how-trump-reversed-biden-gun-crackdown-atf>.

⁴⁶ "DHS Cybersecurity Staff Reassigned to Trump's Deportation Push." Bloomberg, Oct. 8, 2025, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2025-10-08/homeland-security-cyber-personnel-reassigned-to-jobs-in-trump-s-deportation-push>; "CISA Directs Federal Agencies to Mitigate Vulnerabilities in F5 Devices." Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, Oct. 15, 2025, <https://www.cisa.gov/news-events/alerts/2025/10/15/cisa-directs-federal-agencies-mitigate-vulnerabilities-f5-devices>.

A federal team in El Paso that had pursued child traffickers was disbanded as federal agents were redirected toward immigration enforcement.⁴⁷ Highway checkpoints near the southwest border that have long been identified as major drug-trafficking routes have gone unstaffed.⁴⁸

The Administration calls this a public safety strategy, but its resource choices tell a different story. It is not prioritizing safety by pulling child exploitation investigators, firearms agents, cyber specialists, and national security personnel away from their missions. It is weakening the very institutions Americans rely on to stop predators, traffickers, violent criminals, cartels, and hostile foreign actors. Immigration enforcement should not come at the expense of the core crime-fighting work that protects families and communities.

This Administration is Undermining Victims and Letting Criminals Walk Free

The Administration's approach to public safety is also weakening the systems that help victims recover and hold criminals accountable.

The President's corrupt use of pardons has directly reduced resources owed to crime victims. The Crime Victims Fund is not funded by taxpayers. It is supported by fines, penalties, and forfeitures paid by people and corporations convicted of federal crimes.⁴⁹ Those dollars help pay for victim compensation, domestic violence shelters, rape crisis centers, legal assistance, counseling, and other services that victims rely on after the worst moments of their lives. By pardoning convicted federal criminals and wiping away at least \$113 million in fines and penalties owed to the Fund, the President did not only erase accountability for offenders.⁵⁰ He denied victims money that was meant to support their recovery.

At the same time, the Administration has allowed thousands of federal criminal cases to collapse. In the first six months of the Trump Administration, the Department of Justice closed more than 23,000 pending criminal cases without prosecution, including cases involving elder abuse, fentanyl and other deadly drugs, money laundering, domestic terrorism, federal procurement fraud, health care fraud, labor racketeering, and human trafficking.⁵¹

Those choices deny victims their day in court, reduce future deposits into the Crime Victims Fund, and send a dangerous message that serious criminal conduct may go unanswered. During that same period, DOJ prosecuted roughly 32,000 immigration cases, making clear that the Administration is prioritizing immigration over core criminal enforcement.⁵²

⁴⁷ "Trump's Immigration Push Diverts U.S. Agents From Drug, Money and Sex Crime Cases." The Wall Street Journal, https://www.wsj.com/politics/policy/trumps-immigration-push-diverts-u-s-agents-from-drug-money-and-sex-crime-cases-90b37cc9?st=QV2ntL&reflink=desktopwebshare_permalink.

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ "Crime Victims Fund." Office for Victims of Crime, Office of Justice Programs, <https://ovc.ojp.gov/about/crime-victims-fund>.

⁵⁰ "Trump Pardons Are Draining Money From a Fund for Crime Victims." The Trace, Apr. 2026, <https://www.thetrace.org/2026/04/trump-pardons-crime-victims-fund-voca/>.

⁵¹ "Trump's DOJ Is Letting Criminal Investigations Wither While Prioritizing Immigration Cases." ProPublica, <https://www.propublica.org/article/trump-doj-immigration-bondi-declinations-criminal-investigations>.

⁵² *Id.*

The same pattern shows up in DOJ's grantmaking. The Administration's sweeping and irresponsible grant cuts included nearly \$50 million in support for victims of crime.⁵³ The cuts threatened or eliminated support for programs that provided sign language interpreters for deaf crime victims, helped law enforcement protect people with disabilities from human trafficking, and offered transitional housing and food assistance to survivors of sexual assault and domestic violence.⁵⁴

The Administration has also been breaking down the immigration protections Congress established for foreign national victims of crime.⁵⁵ By disregarding these protections, even when the victim is actively serving as a witness, the Administration is not only hurting victims, but also increasing the chances that their perpetrators go free and victimize again.⁵⁶

There is a significant gap between this Administration's public safety rhetoric and its actual record. Pardoning offenders, abandoning criminal cases, destabilizing victim services, deporting victims, cutting violence prevention programs, and undermining local justice systems do not make communities safer. They make it harder for victims to recover, harder for law enforcement to do its job, and easier for serious criminals to avoid accountability.

On Sanctuary Jurisdictions, There is a Smarter Path the Administration Refuses to Take

There is a clear alternative to threats, grant conditions, and coercion: focus on serious public safety cases and create a cooperation framework that local jurisdictions can actually say yes to. That means respecting local law and local policing needs while giving ICE a practical path to pursue individuals who pose real security or safety risks.

The Obama Administration's Priority Enforcement Program (PEP) was not perfect, but it reflected the right basic insight.⁵⁷ Many cities, counties, police departments, and sheriffs are not willing to let ICE dictate local policing or use local officers as a force multiplier for civil immigration enforcement. But some of those same jurisdictions may be willing to cooperate in serious cases if the federal government respects local law, local policy, resource limits, and community policing concerns.

PEP tried to work within that reality. It did not ask local police to become immigration agents or require jurisdictions to join 287(g)-style deputization programs. Instead, it created a more

⁵³ Amy Solomon and Betsy Pearl. "DOJ Funding Update: A Deeper Look at the Cuts." Council on Criminal Justice, May 2025, <https://counciloncj.org/doj-funding-update-a-deeper-look-at-the-cuts/>.

⁵⁴ "Justice Department Slashes Essential Services for Crime Victims." Brennan Center for Justice, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/justice-department-slashes-essential-services-crime-victims>; "Georgia nonprofit balancing federal funding cuts while supporting South Asian American abuse, assault survivors." WABE, <https://www.wabe.org/georgia-nonprofit-balancing-federal-funding-cuts-while-supporting-south-asian-american-abuse-assault-survivors/>.

⁵⁵ Mel Leonor Barclay. "Immigrant victims of domestic violence and human trafficking sue over ICE policies." The 19th, Oct. 16, 2025, <https://19thnews.org/2025/10/u-t-visas-lawsuit-trump-immigration/>.

⁵⁶ Anna-Catherine Brigida, "After increased detentions, Harris County DA provides cards to identify immigrant witnesses." Houston Landing, Apr. 7, 2025, <https://www.houstonlanding.org/after-increased-detentions-harris-county-da-provides-cards-to-identify-immigrant-witnesses/>.

⁵⁷ "Priority Enforcement Program." U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, 2015, https://www.ice.gov/sites/default/files/documents/Fact%20sheet/2015/pep_brochure.pdf.

targeted framework around priority cases, release notifications, limited detention requests, and transfers to federal custody.⁵⁸ The purpose was to give ICE a way to pursue individuals who posed real public safety risks without forcing local jurisdictions to abandon their own rules or undermine the trust they need to investigate crime.

PEP sought to work with jurisdictions instead of against them. A city may reject blanket detainers, refuse to hold people without judicial authorization, or bar local officers from civil immigration enforcement—and still be willing to notify ICE before releasing someone convicted of a serious offense. That is smart law enforcement. The federal government gets more cooperation by making reasonable, legally sound requests tied to public safety than by threatening every jurisdiction that will not sign up for maximal immigration enforcement.

PEP showed that this middle path can work. Many jurisdictions that had previously resisted immigration detainers agreed to provide some form of cooperation under the program, including limited notification or transfer arrangements in priority cases.⁵⁹ For example, Philadelphia is now routinely treated as a sanctuary jurisdiction by this Administration, yet under PEP it provided ICE with limited release notifications in serious public safety cases.⁶⁰ That was a real public safety gain—and it happened because the federal government worked with the city instead of trying to bully it into submission.

The Administration has chosen the opposite approach. By threatening grants, attacking local officials, prioritizing immigration enforcement above real safety risks, and demanding all-or-nothing cooperation, it is making the politics harder and the public safety results worse. A serious administration would rebuild a targeted cooperation framework that jurisdictions can legally and practically join. This Administration would rather pick a fight.

Conclusion

Improving public safety requires focusing on what works. Local police need public trust to solve crimes. They need resources to respond to calls, investigate shootings, protect victims, and clear cases. They need federal partners they can trust, who are focused on gun smuggling, drug trafficking, child exploitation, cyber threats, terrorism, and violent criminal networks. And when ICE asks for help, local officials need confidence that federal immigration enforcement is targeted, lawful, professional, and coordinated with local public safety needs.

This Administration is failing that test. It is demanding more from local law enforcement while giving them less. It is asking police and sheriffs to help ICE do its job while pulling federal agents away from the work those same local agencies need help with. It is threatening grants,

⁵⁸ “Immigration Detainers Under the Priority Enforcement Program.” American Immigration Council, <https://www.americanimmigrationcouncil.org/fact-sheet/immigration-detainers-under-priority-enforcement-program/>.

⁵⁹ Muzaffar Chishti and Sarah Pierce. “Trump’s Unfinished Business: A Shift in the U.S. Immigration Enforcement System.” Migration Policy Institute, Oct. 29, 2020, <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/trump-deportations-unfinished-mission>.

⁶⁰ “U.S. Sanctuary Jurisdiction List Following Executive Order 14287: Protecting American Communities From Criminal Aliens.” U.S. Department of Justice, <https://www.justice.gov/ag/us-sanctuary-jurisdiction-list-following-executive-order-14287-protecting-american-communities>; “Executive Order No. 2015-07.” City of Philadelphia, 2015, <https://www.phila.gov/media/20210602144726/executive-order-2015-07.pdf>.

destabilizing victim services, diverting federal law enforcement capacity, and then blaming local jurisdictions for the breakdown in cooperation.

There is a smarter path. Focus immigration enforcement on serious public safety threats. Use lawful, transparent, and targeted requests. Respect local resource constraints and legal limits. Rebuild the kind of cooperation framework that skeptical jurisdictions can say yes to. That is how the federal government earns cooperation—not by demanding it, but by proving it is a reliable public safety partner. That is also how Congress can move this debate away from political theater and back toward the public safety mission we all claim to share.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you for your testimony. We will next hear from Sheriff Redman.

STATEMENT OF SHERIFF GARY W. REDMAN

Sheriff REDMAN. Distinguished Members of the Committee, today I would like to share my perspective on the impacts illegal immigration has had on a small, rural county such as Amador. Located in California's Gold Country East of Sacramento, Amador covers 594 square miles, and is served by just 54 sworn deputies, and approximately 40 correctional deputies.

Providing public safety services across such a large geographic area presents unique challenges. From 1999–2015 I served eight years as a SWAT operator, and another eight years as a SWAT team leader responsible for high-risk search warrants and tactical operations. During that time, many large scale, illegal marijuana cultivation operations in Amador and neighboring counties were controlled by the Mexican drug cartels.

These organizations frequently utilized individuals who had been smuggled into the United States to work at cultivation sites. Many of these individuals were armed, and on occasion have engaged law enforcement officers. These operations pose significant risks not only to law enforcement personnel, but also the public.

Amador attracts more than 20,000 visitors annually to its streams, rivers, lakes, hiking trails, and campgrounds. Hikers and outdoor enthusiasts have encountered illegal cultivation sites and armed individuals. Cartels also smuggled banned pesticides into the region, causing substantial environmental damage, and harming local wildlife.

Between 2015–2025, Amador County investigated 73 illegal marijuana cultivation operations involving individuals believed to be unlawfully present in the United States. Arrests or charges resulting from those investigations include 173 individuals' Asian origin, persons from China, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam, 53 Mexican nationals, one Venezuelan national, two Ukrainian nationals, two South African nationals, and one Guatemalan national.

Since President Trump returned to office, and Federal immigration enforcement priorities have changed, we have cooperated with ICE to the fullest extent permitted under California's SB 54 sanctuary law. As sheriff, my highest priority is protecting public safety. In early 2025, I made the decision that I would not knowingly release an undocumented criminal offender who posed a significant public safety risk back into the community.

Even if doing so placed me at odds with SB 54. On September 2, 2024, my office received a report involving a 14-year-old girl who disclosed to her cousin that her uncle, Diaz Mendoza, age 48, had been touching her over her clothing in the vaginal area. A deputy responded to the lake where she was present, interviewed the visibly distraught victim.

She reported the abuse had been occurring for approximately five months outside of Amador County. My deputy interviewed the suspect and established probable cause to arrest him for felony lewd acts involving a minor. Two days later the suspect appeared in court and was released by the judge.

In 2025, I was informed by our probation department that Diaz Mendoza had entered into a plea agreement negotiated by an Amador County Deputy District Attorney. The agreement reduced the case to a misdemeanor offense with credit time served, and suspended probation sentence. I was advised that the plea agreement was structured at least in part because of my publicly stated position regarding cooperation with ICE, and the likelihood that ICE would be notified on his release.

On learning of the plea agreement, I immediately contacted ICE and requested the agents take him into custody on his release from court. Due to the limited notice, ICE was unable to respond that day. However, agents did locate and arrest him approximately two weeks later. We subsequently informed the victim and her mother, both of whom expressed appreciation for our efforts, and relief that he would no longer have access to this 14-year-old victim.

Since 2025, I have contacted ICE eight times regarding removals authorized under SB 54 within my jail. Additionally, under SB 54, I have been required to release 16 individuals arrested for low-level offenses that did not meet the requirements of SB 54. My greatest concern as sheriff is that one of these individuals may re-offend, and cause another preventable tragedy such as Laken Riley, and the people that are here with me to my right and my left.

Preventable. In my view, public policies should prioritize accountability for criminal offenders, protection for victims, and the safety of law-abiding citizens. I believe it is long-overdue that we place greater emphasis on victims' rights, hold offenders accountable, and ensure that public safety remains our highest priority. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Sheriff Redman follows:]

OFFICE OF
SHERIFF - CORONER



GARY W. REDMAN
SHERIFF - CORONER

United States House Committee on the Judiciary

"Sanctuary Policies: Victims' Perspectives"

Tuesday June 30th, 2026

2:00 PM

Opening Statement

Distinguished Members of the Committee,

My name is Gary Redman, and I have served as the Sheriff of Amador County, California, since 2021. I began my law enforcement career in the United States Air Force as a Security Police Officer, serving both in the United States and Germany from 1988 to 1992. In 1996, I started my civilian law enforcement career with the Los Angeles Police Department. In 1998, I joined the Amador County Sheriff's Office, where I have served in every rank from Deputy Sheriff to Sergeant, Lieutenant, Captain, Undersheriff, and now Sheriff.

Today, I would like to share my perspective on the impact illegal immigration has had on a small rural county such as Amador County. Located in California's Gold Country east of Sacramento, Amador County covers 594 square miles and is served by just 54 sworn deputies and approximately 40 correctional deputies. Providing public safety services across such a large geographic area presents unique challenges.

From 1999 through 2015, I served eight years as a SWAT operator and another eight years as a SWAT team leader responsible for high-risk search warrants and tactical operations. During that time, many large-scale illegal marijuana cultivation operations in Amador County and neighboring counties were controlled by Mexican drug cartels. These organizations frequently utilized individuals who had been smuggled into the United States to work at cultivation sites. Many of these individuals were armed and, on occasion, engaged law enforcement officers.

These operations posed significant risks not only to law enforcement personnel but also to the public. Amador County attracts more than 20,000 visitors annually to its streams, rivers, lakes, hiking trails, and campgrounds. Hikers and outdoor enthusiasts have encountered illegal cultivation sites and armed individuals. Cartels also smuggled banned pesticides into the region, causing substantial environmental damage and harming local wildlife.

PROUD TO SERVE • READY TO PROTECT

700 COURT STREET • JACKSON, CA 95642 • (209) 223-6500 • FAX (209) 223-1609

ADMINISTRATION (209) 223-6515 • EMERGENCY SERVICES (209) 223-6384 • CIVIL (209) 223-6544

CORONER (209) 223-6754 • JAIL (209) 223-6522

Between 2015 and 2025, Amador County investigated 73 illegal marijuana cultivation operations involving individuals believed to be unlawfully present in the United States. Arrests or charges resulting from those investigations included:

- 173 individuals of Asian origin, including persons from China, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam
- 53 Mexican nationals
- 1 Venezuelan national
- 2 Ukrainian nationals
- 2 South African nationals
- 1 Guatemalan national

I oversee a county jail with a rated capacity of 76 beds and an average daily population in the 90s. Although we recently completed a 40-bed expansion project, like many law enforcement agencies across the nation, we face significant recruitment and retention challenges. As a result, we are currently unable to utilize the new housing unit.

During President Biden's administration and following the implementation of California Senate Bill 54 (SB 54), our agency generally ceased inquiring about immigration status or contacting Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) regarding individuals in our custody who were suspected of being unlawfully present in the country. In my view, this policy contributed to criminal offenders being released back into the community, where some continued patterns of reoffending and victimizing others.

Since President Trump returned to office and federal immigration enforcement priorities changed, we have cooperated with ICE to the fullest extent permitted under SB 54. Unfortunately, some individuals are still released because they do not meet the statutory thresholds required for ICE notification or transfer.

As Sheriff, my highest priority is protecting public safety. In early 2025, I made the decision that I would not knowingly release an undocumented criminal offender who posed a significant threat to public safety back into the community, even if doing so placed me at odds with SB 54.

On September 2, 2024, my office received a report involving a 14-year-old girl who disclosed to her cousin that her uncle, Adan Diazmendoza, age 46, had been touching her over her clothing in the vaginal area. A deputy responded to the lake where the family was present and interviewed the visibly distraught victim. She reported that the abuse had been occurring for approximately five months outside Amador County.

Using a Spanish-language interpretation service via mobile phone, my deputy interviewed the suspect and established probable cause to arrest him for felony lewd acts involving a minor. Two days later, the suspect appeared in court and was released by the judge. Had current federal immigration enforcement policies been in place at that time, I would have contacted ICE and requested that agents take him into custody before his release. Under SB 54, such notification would have been permissible because the court had found probable cause for the offense.

In 2025, I was informed by our Probation Department that Diazmendoza had entered into a plea agreement negotiated by an Amador County Deputy District Attorney. The agreement reduced the case to a misdemeanor offense with credit for time served and a suspended probation sentence. I was advised that the plea agreement was structured, at least in part, because of my publicly stated position regarding cooperation with ICE and the likelihood that ICE would be notified upon his release.

Upon learning of the plea agreement, I immediately contacted ICE and requested that agents take him into custody upon his release from court. Due to the limited notice, ICE was unable to respond that day. However, agents located and arrested him approximately two weeks later. We subsequently informed the victim and her mother, both of whom expressed appreciation for our efforts and relief that he would no longer have access to the victim.

Since 2025, we have contacted ICE eight times regarding removals authorized under SB 54. In two of those cases, ICE was unable to respond before the individuals were released, resulting in two felony offenders returning to the community. Additionally, under SB 54, I have been required to release 16 individuals arrested for lower-level offenses.

My greatest concern is that one of these individuals may reoffend and cause another preventable tragedy such as Laken Riley. In my view, public policy should prioritize accountability for criminal offenders, protection for victims, and the safety of law-abiding citizens. I believe it is long overdue that we place greater emphasis on victims' rights, hold offenders accountable, and ensure that public safety remains our highest priority.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you for your testimony, sheriff. Finally, we will hear from Ms. Gorman.

STATEMENT OF JESSICA A. GORMAN

Ms. GORMAN. Hi, my name is Jessica Gorman, I am—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Can you turn on your microphone?

Ms. GORMAN. Hi, my name is Sheridan Gorman—I am sorry. My name is Jessica Gorman; I am the mother of Sheridan Grace Gorman. Sheridan was 18 years old, she was a freshman at Loyola University Chicago, she was beautiful, she was funny, faithful, loving, and full of plans to build something with her life. On March 19th Sheridan went with friends to the lake front in Chicago, because they hoped they might see the Northern Lights.

She never saw those lights. The man accused of murdering my daughter is Jose Medina, an illegal immigrant from Venezuela, who should not have even been in this country. Even after committing a crime and having an outstanding warrant, he was left on the streets of Chicago to murder my innocent, American child.

This story is not about him, this story is about my Sheridan. It is about how failed border policies, sanctuary city laws, and twisted leaders refuse to cooperate with ICE, they sent her to her grave. It is about a government and politicians that forgot their first priority, and the question before this Committee is painfully simple. When did protecting our American citizens, stop being your first priority?

Even more important, why did protecting our American citizens stop being your first priority? I want an explanation, I need one, and I deserve one, but first I want you to know who my Sheridan was. I want you to understand what we all lost because of your mismatched priorities. My husband and I have always joked that our older daughter Madelon is our pride, while Sheridan was our joy.

From the moment she was born, Sheridan had pure energy, enthusiasm, laughter, and fun. She was the kind of person who made every room brighter, and usually a little louder. Which is why when Sheridan was in kindergarten, I remember going to her first parent teacher conference, I was a little nervous. Because while she was the sweetest little girl you could possibly imagine, she was also the chattiest.

I remember sitting down across from her teacher bracing myself, and asking with bated breath, how is my Sheridan? I will never forget when the teacher looked at me very seriously and said I only have one thing to say to you, my stomach dropped. Then she said, “Your Sheridan stalks the buddy bench.” I remember blinking at her, “I am sorry, what?” She said, “Your Sheridan stalks the buddy bench.”

I was totally confused, and I asked is that a good thing, or is that a bad thing? What exactly is a buddy bench? The teacher smiled and said it is a beautiful thing. She explained that they had a bench in the play yard, she said that not all kids are as outgoing and confident as your Sheridan, so the children were told that if they wanted to play, or if they felt lonely, left out, shy, they could sit on that bench.

Then the other children were told that if they saw someone sitting there, they should go over, talk to them, and ask them to play. Apparently Sheridan, my tiny kindergartner, had appointed herself the guardian of that bench. Every day at recess, instead of heading straight to the swings or joining in a game of kick ball, my daughter hung back, and hovered by the nearby tree, just watching that bench, just waiting, just in case someone might need her.

Kids didn't even have a chance to fully sit down on the bench before Sheridan was rushing over to take their hand, pull them away, girls, boys, first graders, and kindergartners, it really didn't matter to her. If a child looked lonely, Sheridan went over. If someone had no one to play with, Sheridan was there. If someone felt invisible, Sheridan saw them.

That was my daughter, and that is who she was until the day she was stolen from us. I honestly can't make sense of it. I cannot make peace with it. What world does the child who makes sure no one was lonely die terrified and alone on a pier in Chicago? In what world does the girl who saw everyone become invisible to the people in power responsible for protecting her?

This cannot be explained away, and it cannot be buried beneath the list of unrelated issues that you all paraded before us, thanks for telling me without telling me that you are here, but you don't want to be. This is the fourth time you had Angel Families, thanks for telling me you don't care. This cannot be buried under your slogans, your statistics, or excuses, and this just can't stand.

Today, I bring this back to the buddy bench. I think Congress needs one. Every Governor, every mayor, every sanctuary city official and politician, shifting blame and interest, hiding behind their slogans and talking points should have to all sit on one. I challenge you all to sit down with me, take my hand, look me in the eye, and then explain to me, because I just don't understand.

Explain why people here illegally matter more than your American citizens. Explain why sanctuary policies matter more than my Sheridan's life. Explain why cooperation with ICE was too much to ask for. Asking our American parents to bury our children is somehow acceptable. Ask me, I need you to tell me.

I want you to imagine that this little girl on the buddy bench, that innocent college freshman with a heart full of compassion and a head full of dreams that was gunned down by an illegal immigrant, I want you to imagine that was your daughter, not mine. What if she was yours, would you even hesitate for 1 second to act, or to make changes? My Sheridan spent her whole life choosing others.

Today, I am just asking this Committee, our Congress, and our country to choose her. She was worth protecting, she was worth saving, she was worth your brave vote. To all those who have supported us, who have prayed for us, who have cried with us, and to those that have had the courage to speak out, and say Sheridan's name, thank you. Because every time you say her name you give a piece of her back to us.

You remind the world that Sheridan was not a talking point, she wasn't a statistic or a headline, she was our daughter. She will always be my sweet sunshine. If the people who failed her would rather look away, then I am asking the rest of you to look right

at her, here she is, there is she and I, here she is, this is taken then day before she died.

Say her name, tell her story, and demand better, because my Sheridan Grace Gorman should still be alive. No mother should have to stand where I am standing, begging, begging, elected leaders to value my child's life after it is already too late. I cried when I came into the room, I saw this poster that you made, it said "at every stop the system had a chance to stop him, at every step it failed."

My daughter paid for those failures, your failures with her life. No family should ever have to bury a child because public officials failed to put American lives first. I am just asking you to choose us, we choose you, we choose you, choose us. Why does my child matter less than an illegal immigrant, why? Listen, I have a heart, I love immigrants, two of my best friends in this whole world are immigrants, they came here the right way.

I absolutely think they make America beautiful, but my daughter is beautiful too. I need you to think about what these policies are, and I need you to imagine this is your daughter, because I am very sure you won't be cutting off anyone when they are speaking, I would be very sure you won't call this a political stunt, the grief is real. Every day I wake up with unimaginable pain.

Do you know what, I wake up in the middle of the night, and I think did my daughter cry for me? She made it forty feet, she made it forty feet running for her life, did she cry out for me? She died on that pavement all by herself, lonely, bleeding on that pavement, and I will never, ever rest, I actually have to say that I am devastated, my husband and I, we are only a couple years away from retirement, I have worked my whole life so hard.

All I wanted to do was just enjoy our children, I just wanted to enjoy my Sheridan, my Madelon, and now I am bitter. I am bitter because I am a lover, not a fighter, I am a lover, I love children, I love pumping people up and making them feel good about themselves. I am not racist, I am not xenophobic, we have done everything right, my husband and I, we taught our daughter to be a wonderful, beautiful person, her love was extravagant.

Now, I am going to have to spend my last waking moment, I am going to have to spend fighting, fighting against these policies, and fighting for people to say her name. If you have the courage, please come talk to me, come sit on that bench, I will buy Congress a bench. Talk to each other, we shouldn't be screaming across the room. I mean we also shouldn't say "but," because I have to just say, and I understand that you are here for a reason.

I don't understand why it is only the Republican side that cares about our American children. I know that you are a mother, I know that you are a father, I deeply value that, but basically what you just did, what you said was I am so sorry for your loss, I have a daughter too, I have a son, I feel your pain, you don't, you don't feel my pain. Because the next words out of your mouth were "but."

There is no but when your child is in the coffin, there is no but. I need you to understand that, and if you ever want to talk about it, I am here, I am going to buy you a bench. I am going to buy, you can put that on the record, I am going to buy Congress the bench, and they can come, and sit, and hold my hand, and look me

in the eye, and explain to me why illegal immigrants are more important than my daughter.

I really want to know, because I don't understand. Please, I welcome you, I will listen, I will listen, I care, I care, I just need you to explain it to me, because I don't, and I fear I will never understand. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Gorman follows:]

**Written Testimony of Jessica Anne Gorman
Mother of Sheridan Grace Gorman
Before the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement
Committee on the Judiciary
United States House of Representatives**

**Hearing: “Sanctuary Policies: Victims’ Perspectives”
June 30, 2026**

My name is Jessica Gorman. I am the mother of Sheridan Grace Gorman.

Sheridan was eighteen years old. She was a freshman at Loyola University Chicago. She was beautiful, funny, faithful, loving, and full of plans to build something with her life, to help people and make the world brighter.

On March 19th, 2026, Sheridan went with friends to the lakefront in Chicago because they hoped they might see the Northern lights.

She never saw those lights.

The man accused of murdering my daughter is Jose Medina, an illegal immigrant from Venezuela who should not have even been in this country. And even after committing a crime and having an outstanding warrant, he was left on the streets of Chicago to murder my innocent American child.

But this story is not about him.

This story is about my Sheridan.

It’s about how failed border policies, sanctuary-city laws and twisted leaders refusing to cooperate with ICE sent her to her grave.

It’s about a government and politicians that forgot their first priority.

And the question before this Committee is painfully simple:

When did protecting our American citizens stop being your first priority? And even more important – WHY did protecting our citizens stop being your first priority?

I want an explanation, I need one. I deserve one. But first I want you to know who Sheridan was.

I want you to understand what we ALL lost because of your mismatched priorities.

My husband and I have always joked that our older daughter, Madelon, is our pride, while Sheridan is our joy.

From the day she was born, Shera was pure energy, enthusiasm, laughter, and fun.

She was the kind of person who made every room brighter — and, usually, a little louder.

Which is why when Sheridan was in kindergarten, I remember going to her first parent-teacher conference a little nervous.

She was the sweetest little girl you could possibly imagine, but she was also the chattiest.

I remember sitting down across from her teacher, bracing myself, and asking with bated breath, “So... how’s my Sheridan?”

I'll never forget when the teacher looked at me very seriously and said, "I only have one thing to say to you."

Ugh! My stomach dropped.

Then she said, "Your Sheridan stalks the buddy bench."

I remember blinking at her. "I'm sorry, what?"

She repeated it: "Your Sheridan stalks the buddy bench."

Totally confused, I asked, "Um, is that a good thing or a bad thing? And what exactly is a buddy bench?"

Her teacher smiled and said, "It is a BEAUTIFUL thing."

She explained that they had a bench in the play yard. She said not all kids are as outgoing and confident as your Sheridan so the children were told that if they wanted to play, or if they felt lonely, left out, shy, or unsure of where to go, they could sit on the bench. Then the other children were told that if they saw someone sitting there, they should go over, talk to them, or ask them to play.

And apparently Sheridan, my tiny kindergartener, had appointed herself the guardian of that bench.

Every day at recess, instead of heading straight to the swings or joining in a game of kickball, my daughter hung back and hovered by a nearby tree just watching that bench and waiting just in case someone needed her.

The teacher said kids didn't even have a chance to fully sit down on that bench before Shera was rushing over to take their hand and pull them away to play. Girls, Boys, first graders or third graders, it did not matter to her.

If a child looked lonely, Sheridan went over.

If someone had no one to play with, Sheridan was there.

If someone felt invisible, Sheridan saw them.

That was my daughter.

That is who she was until the day she was cruelly stolen from us.

And I honestly cannot make sense of it.

I cannot make peace with it.

I cannot accept a world where the little girl who once stalked the buddy bench — the child who noticed the lonely, reached for the forgotten, and made room for the people everyone else missed — was forced to run for her life and was shot down in cold blood by someone who should never have even been here in the first place.

In what world does the child who spent her life making sure no one was lonely die terrified and alone on a pier in Chicago?

In what world does the girl who saw everyone become invisible to the people in power responsible for protecting her?

This cannot be explained away, and it cannot be buried beneath a list of unrelated issues. No other crisis changes the fact that my daughter is dead because a preventable failure was allowed to become a permanent loss.

This cannot be buried under your slogans, statistics, or excuses.

This cannot stand.

Because my daughter is not an exception to be managed.

She is not collateral damage.

She is not the cost of your compassion.

Please know that I am not here to attack immigrants.

So many people we love are immigrants. We support legal immigration. We honor people who come here the right way, follow the rules, respect our laws and culture, and contribute to this country.

Legal immigration is a beautiful part of the American story.

But legal immigration and illegal immigration are not the same thing.

And compassion is not chaos.

Compassion is not lawlessness.

And compassion for people entering this country illegally CANNOT come before the compassion for and the safety of our American citizens already here.

There is an old saying: when everything is a priority, nothing is a priority.

And too many of our leaders have forgotten their first priority.

The American people voted you into power. American citizens trusted you with authority. Your first duty is to us.

Our children.

Our families.

Our veterans.

Our elderly.

Our disabled.

Our American citizens – No, YOUR American citizens!

Only after we protect and care for our own people should we focus on bringing others in and even then, it must be done the right way.

Create lawful pathways. Vet people carefully. Welcome people who respect our laws and culture and want to build a life here the legal way.

But above all - DO NOT ask American families to pay for your contrived compassion with the lives of our children.

Do not hide behind statistics when I am sitting here without my child.

Because Sheridan is not a statistic.

She is not a rare exception to be explained away. I can't believe how many Angel families are out here – we don't hear about them, most of the press skips over their pain and loss because it doesn't align with their politically skewed agendas - it's downright despicable!

My Sheridan would be alive if the man accused of killing her had not been allowed to come into this country by the previous administration and if Chicago's sanctuary city policies hadn't allowed him to remain on our streets to kill.

Congress needs to act.

I understand that many of the reforms I am asking for are already reflected in the House Judiciary Committee's Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act of 2026. I strongly support that effort. But I also urge Congress to ensure that any final legislation is broad enough, strong enough, and enforceable enough to prevent another family from sitting where mine sits now.

First, Congress should fully enforce and fully fund the Laken Riley Act. A public safety law without resources is only paper. ICE needs the officers, detention space, data access, court capacity, and operational support necessary to detain criminally charged illegal aliens before warning signs become funerals.

Second, sanctuary jurisdictions must be required to notify ICE before releasing an illegally present alien or otherwise removable noncitizen who has been arrested for or charged with serious criminal conduct. That should include violent crimes, weapons offenses, theft-related offenses, domestic violence, sexual offenses, crimes involving minors, human trafficking, drug trafficking, gang-related offenses, and any crime resulting in death or serious bodily injury.

Third, states and localities should be required to honor lawful immigration detainers, warrants, and custody-transfer requests in public safety cases. When a removable person is already in custody for criminal conduct, law enforcement should not be forced to release that person back into the community when federal authorities are prepared to take custody.

Fourth, federal law enforcement and public safety funding should be conditioned, to the fullest extent allowed by the Constitution, on cooperation with federal immigration authorities in cases involving criminal offenders and public safety threats. Taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize policies that block enforcement of federal law and place Americans at risk.

Fifth, Congress should require transparent public reporting. Every jurisdiction should publicly report how many ICE detainers, warrants, or notification requests it receives; how many it honors; how many it declines; what charges were involved; and whether the person was later rearrested or accused of additional crimes. The public should not learn the cost of sanctuary policies only after a citizen is dead.

Sixth, victims and families must have a civil remedy when sanctuary policies contribute to violent crime. I support legislation such as the Justice for Victims of Sanctuary Cities Act. If a jurisdiction refuses to honor a lawful DHS detainer or notification request and that refusal helps lead to a violent crime, victims and surviving families should be able to seek accountability.

Seventh, the federal government should have clear authority to prosecute certain murders committed in the United States by inadmissible or deportable noncitizens. Murder is usually prosecuted locally, but families should not be left entirely dependent on jurisdictions where politics, resources, or sentencing options may limit justice. I support legislation such as the Justice for Victims of Illegal Alien Murders Act.

Eighth, where the law, facts, Constitution, and evidence support it, prosecutors should pursue the most serious available penalties for the most heinous crimes, including capital crimes committed by aliens illegally present in the United States. This is not about vengeance. It is about justice, deterrence, and recognizing the gravity of a preventable loss.

Ninth, Congress should support legislation such as the Justice for American Victims of Illegal Aliens Act, which would allow unlawful immigration status to be considered as an aggravating factor in appropriate federal capital sentencing cases involving the murder of a United States citizen.

Tenth, final orders of removal must mean something. If a person has received due process and has no lawful right to remain in this country, removal should occur promptly. A system that issues orders but does not enforce them teaches the public that the law is optional.

Eleventh, immigration-related crimes and related criminal conduct must be prosecuted seriously, including illegal reentry after removal, document fraud, identity fraud, alien smuggling, human trafficking, illegal firearm possession, and violent crimes committed by persons unlawfully present.

Twelfth, catch-and-release practices must end. No person who enters unlawfully should be released into the United States without reliable identity verification, biometric and criminal background checks, gang and terrorism database checks, a reliable address and sponsor where applicable, and enforceable monitoring and appearance requirements.

Thirteenth, public safety vetting must be continuous. When a noncitizen is arrested, charged, fails to appear, violates release conditions, or is linked to weapons, gangs, violence, or repeated criminal behavior, that information must be shared between local law enforcement, courts, corrections, DHS, ICE, FBI, and other relevant agencies. The government has the technology to share information. What it too often lacks is the will.

Fourteenth, legal immigration must be improved. America should welcome people who follow the rules, submit to vetting, respect our laws, and want to contribute to this country. Lawful pathways should be orderly, timely, and honest. Immigration courts and asylum adjudication should be adequately staffed so legitimate claims are heard quickly and fraudulent or meritless claims are denied quickly.

Fifteenth, states and cities should not be allowed to create practical immunity from immigration enforcement. They are not required to become federal immigration agencies, but they should not be allowed to obstruct federal enforcement or prevent cooperation when criminal conduct and public safety are involved. There is a meaningful difference between not doing ICE's job and actively preventing ICE from doing its job.

Sixteenth, victims and surviving families should be notified and heard. When a violent crime involves a person unlawfully present in the United States, families should have access to basic information about immigration status, detainers, release decisions, custody transfers, and removal proceedings, subject to lawful privacy and prosecutorial limits. Families should not be kept in the dark while agencies trade responsibility behind closed doors.

Seventeenth, Congress should examine the specific failures in Sheridan's case. The public deserves to know what happened when Jose Medina entered this country. The public deserves to know what happened after his reported shoplifting arrest in Chicago. The public deserves to know whether any detainer, notice, warrant, communication, or request was made, honored,

ignored, or prevented by policy. The public deserves to know whether federal, state, county, or city officials had a chance to prevent this and failed to act.

This should not be controversial.

A nation has borders.

A government has laws.

And elected officials have a duty.

Their first duty is to protect the people they serve.

The Shut Down Sanctuary Policies Act of 2026 is an important step toward restoring that duty. But whatever Congress passes must have teeth. It must require cooperation in public safety cases. It must impose consequences for obstruction. It must protect victims and families. It must ensure that sanctuary policies cannot be used as a shield when American citizens are placed in danger.

Accountability must be complete.

I am asking for reform because I do not want another mother to sit where I sit.

I cannot stomach the thought of another family becoming an Angel family.

I do not want another child's name to become a hearing title, a memorial scholarship, a press release, or a political talking point after it is too late.

We hear constantly about compassion. But compassion has to be ordered. It has to be honest. It has to begin with the people our government is sworn to protect.

It is not compassionate to legal immigrants to erase the difference between those who waited, complied, and entered lawfully and those who ignored the rules.

It is not compassionate to police officers to prevent them from cooperating with federal partners.

It is not compassionate to communities to release dangerous offenders.

It is not compassionate to citizens to make them bear the risk of government's refusal to enforce the law.

And it is not compassionate to Sheridan.

Sheridan's life was worth more than a policy slogan.

Her future was worth more than a sanctuary ordinance.

Her safety was worth more than the political comfort of officials who prefer not to cooperate with ICE.

My daughter should be alive.

She should be finishing her freshman year. She should be laughing with her friends. She should be calling me with stories about college life. She should be making plans for her future.

Instead, we are planning memorials.

We are giving out scholarships and awards in her name.

We are learning how to speak about our child in the past tense.

And we are asking our government to do the one thing it should have done before we ever had to come here: Protect us and our children above all else.

So today, I bring this back to the buddy bench.

I think Congress needs one.

I think every governor, mayor, sanctuary-city official, and politician shifting blame and interest and hiding behind their slogans and talking points should have to sit on one.

Not behind a podium.

Not behind a press secretary.

Come sit on a simple bench.

The kind a lonely child would sit on when she needs someone to see her.

I challenge you all to sit there with me.

Take my hand.

Look me in the eye.

And explain it because I just don't understand.

Explain why people here illegally matter more than your American citizens.

Explain why sanctuary policies matter more than my Sheridan's life.

Explain why cooperation with ICE was too much to ask, but asking our American parents to bury their children is somehow acceptable.

Explain why the little girl who stalked the buddy bench was not protected by the politicians placed into power to protect her.

I want you to imagine that that little girl on the buddy bench, that innocent college freshman with a heart full of compassion and a head full of dreams that was gunned down by an illegal immigrant was your daughter not mine.

What if she was yours? Would you be deflecting, would you even hesitate for one second to act, to make changes?

My Sheridan spent her life choosing others.

Today, I am asking this Committee, our Congress, and our country to choose us.

Please choose the people you were elected to protect.

Please choose the child on the buddy bench.

Please choose Sheridan.

She was worth protecting.

She was worth saving.

And she was worth your brave vote.

I want to thank, among many others, President Trump, Dan Scavino, Karoline Leavitt, Congressman Mike Lawler, Speaker Mike Johnson, Majority Leader Steve Scalise, Chairman Jim Jordan, Senators John Barrasso, John Thune, Dave McCormick, and John Fetterman, Congressmen Ralph Norman and Brandon Gill, our own Assemblyman Matt Slater, Yorktown

Supervisor Ed Lachterman, the Illinois lawmakers, the podcasters, the journalists, the advocates, the mothers and fathers, and every single person who has had the courage to speak Sheridan's name.

Because every time you say her name, you give a piece of her back to us.

You remind the world that Sheridan was not a talking point.

She was not a statistic.

She was not a headline.

And she was never, ever a "random dead person."

She was our daughter.

She was Madelon's little sister.

She was Tom's baby girl.

She was and will always be my sweet sunshine, my Shera Grace.

And if the people who failed her would rather look away, then I am asking the rest of you to look right at her.

Say her name.

Tell her story.

Demand better.

Because Sheridan Grace Gorman should still be alive.

And no mother should have to stand where I am standing, begging elected leaders to value her child's life after it is already too late.

I thank you from the bottom of my broken heart.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you for your testimony, I can't imagine how difficult this appearance is for you, and we thank you for being here today. We will now proceed under the five-minute rule of questions.

We will begin with Mr. Tiffany.

Mr. TIFFANY. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Mr. Abraham and Ms. Gorman, for being here. We are proud to cite the names of Sheridan and Katie here before this Judiciary Committee hearing. Ms. Gorman, would you say you, your neighbors, and your community are safer when a government protects violent criminals and illegal aliens over Americans?

Ms. GORMAN. No.

Mr. TIFFANY. Same question, Mr. Abraham.

Mr. ABRAHAM. No, they are not.

Mr. TIFFANY. Ms. Gorman, do you believe that your State or this country is safer when criminal illegal aliens are released into our streets?

Ms. GORMAN. No.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Abraham?

Mr. ABRAHAM. No, not at all.

Mr. TIFFANY. In my home State of Wisconsin we had a terrible situation, not unlike what you are experiencing, where there is a sanctuary community, Dane County, that allowed an illegal immigrant from Venezuela, let him free, and he was arrested over 100 miles away in a little community, Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin. The charges were domestic violence, sexual assault, child abuse, and strangulation.

Fortunately, the woman did not die, but it had to be horrific. When thinking about that, we should be concerned with neighboring communities, should places like Missouri, Indiana, Iowa, and Wisconsin be concerned when there is sanctuary policies that are on our borders that may affect us when we see it happen in our own State 100 miles away from a sanctuary jurisdiction?

Should we be concerned, Mr. Abraham, with those policies being carried out in the State of Illinois?

Mr. ABRAHAM. If you care about your citizens, you should be concerned?

Mr. TIFFANY. Ms. Gorman?

Ms. GORMAN. I sent my daughter to Chicago because I thought it was safe. You hear all the rhetoric in the politics, I sent her there because I thought she was safe, no, she wasn't safe. It never would have occurred to me that this could have happened. Yes, Mr. Abraham talked about as a parent you worry, I worry about car accidents, you worry that they will drink too much.

You never even conceive that she would be murdered, shot in the back of the head by an illegal immigrant on a pier going to see the Northern Lights with her friends. It is not even something you could even conceive. I just have to say one thing, because it has been plaguing me, and this is how messed up this situation is, this is why I am sorry I got so upset with your "buts," and you don't want to talk about this.

This is the fourth hearing. Do you know what I am thankful for? This is so messed up, I am going to say it, I am thankful after hearing, I didn't even know what an Angel Family was, I had no

idea, had never even heard about it, there are so many out here. You know what I am thankful for?

I'm thankful that my daughter was just shot in the back of the head, not raped, murdered, dismembered, put in a garbage can like Megan Bos with bleach poured on her, and they didn't find her for fifty days. You can actually dismiss the Angel Families, you can say "but"? You don't want to hear four sessions on Angel Families? I am sorry, you need to, you need to.

I am actually thankful that my daughter wasn't raped, how messed up is that? That I am thankful every day that she was just murdered, not raped and dismembered. Think about that, how messed up is that? Do you know what I thought of this morning when I got up? The joy of—does anyone have a baby here? The joy of picking out their first outfit that they are going to wear on their ride home from the hospital.

I had to pick out my daughter's last outfit, and she was a fabulous dresser. We had a hundred people come to our home, a hundred friends and family came to our home, we had her cremated actually after, and they all decorated her urn with rhinestones. All of them put it on there, she is fabulous even in death. For the first time, all the excitement of having a child, and then having people make excuses and "buts."

I am sorry, this is unacceptable. There are so many Angel Families out here, and the day that I have to wake up and be thankful that my daughter was only shot and not raped should tell you something. It is crazy.

Mr. TIFFANY. Thank you, Ms. Gorman. By the way, you used the term sorry early on, when you answered that question. You never have to apologize. Never apologize for the story that you are delivering to the American people.

Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman yields back.

Ms. GORMAN. Can I just say one thing? I am sorry, I am sorry I have to be here. I am sorry, I am actually—like I said, I am a lover, I am a lover, not a fighter, I am not a public speaker, I am not someone who ever speaks out about things, I actually am very bitter that I have to be here, No. 1. Now, I am going to have to fight for my daughter. I am sorry that I have to be here, and that I have to even oppose anyone, it is crazy.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you.

Ms. GORMAN. Sorry.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to go to a statement that you ended with, Sheriff Redman, that I agree with, and I believe this is how you said it, as well as in your written testimony. Public policy should prioritize accountability for criminal offenders, protection for victims, and the safety of law-abiding citizens. I agree with that, and I think everybody on this side agrees with that.

The question really is what creates that environment most effectively. I spent some time in my opening statement, and I know you did as well, Ms. Pierce, talking about how resources are getting taken from different parts of Department of Homeland Security, other Federal law enforcement agencies, to do immigration enforce-

ment that has really focused largely on people who don't have any convictions.

More importantly, in this context of sanctuary jurisdictions, has actually hurt law enforcement's ability to do its job at the local level. I wanted to go to this question about the central question here is not about whether there should be justice for Ms. Gorman, and Mr. Abraham's daughter's murders, there absolutely should be, I don't think there is any disagreement about that anywhere on this bench, Democrat or Republican.

The central question is what gets us that accountability across the board, for everybody? The Trump Administration's approach has been to force every State, city, and locality to use their resources, precious resources, quite small in many jurisdictions, to enforce Federal immigration law. In Mr. Abraham's case, it sounds like actually that was a Chicago, that sounds like a State of Illinois issue.

The whole question of where local-law enforcement prioritizes resources, and what keeps us safer, my question for you is does the Trump Administration's approach to immigration enforcement, which is forcing local jurisdictions to enforce immigration law, is that what keeps us most safe, and prevents the kinds of things we are hearing about today?

Ms. PIERCE. No, it does not. I agree, the central question here is not only just about accountability, right? It is about public safety, what can keep us all the safest? There are a few different problems with what the Trump Administration is doing, and how they are approaching that, and I will touch on two of them.

First, the redirection of Federal resources to immigration enforcement above violent crimes. This Administration has moved tens of thousands of Federal law enforcement officers away from their primary duties of going after human trafficking, going after child sexual exploitation, going after cybercrimes, terrorism, and violent crime, and instead focused them on immigration enforcement.

That immigration enforcement work unfortunately is not focused on the worst of the worst, rather it is focused on rounding up as many individuals as possible. We are neglecting terrorists, and we are instead focusing on individuals who have violated civil immigration law.

Second, that this Administration is bullying jurisdictions to fully cooperate with immigration enforcement, despite those jurisdictions' considerations about their own resources. Police departments have limited resources, and they use those to decide how much and what level of cooperation they are going to give to the Trump Administration.

Not only that, but they need to look at their relationships with their communities. Is a certain level of cooperation with ICE going to harm the trust that they have established with their local communities? Is it going to redirect the priorities that they have decided are best to keep safety in their communities?

Those are the things that these local jurisdictions need to decide before they decide what level of cooperation that they will give ICE. Unfortunately, this Administration doesn't seem to want to acknowledge that they would rather bully these jurisdictions into that full cooperation.

Ms. JAYAPAL. As well as concerns about how much they would have to pay in lawsuits if what they do is actually unconstitutional. Why is it dangerous to have policies in place, this gets at the community trust piece, why is it dangerous to have policies in place that prevent huge swathes of the community, both undocumented folks, as well as family members, or friends of undocumented people who may live in the same household from feeling secure in calling 911? What happens in that situation to the safety of all community members?

Ms. PIERCE. Police can't be everywhere, right? They rely on community members to be their eyes and ears, to report crimes, to be witnesses, and to provide testimony. When those individuals are no longer willing to cooperate with the police, when they think that a call to 911 is going to make their lives worse, that means that those police, their reach into that network, into the community is then limited.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Thank you, my time is expired, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thank the witnesses for being here today. Ms. Gorman, thank you particularly, Mr. Abraham, thank you. I appreciate, Ms. Gorman, the way you called folks across the aisle out. I want to tell you that this isn't just the fourth hearing, we actually had a field hearing in Phoenix, Arizona on this, where we had Angel Families come in and testify.

Do you know how many from the Democrats came? Not one, zero, no one came. They didn't care enough to come to that field hearing, what a shame, really too bad, they needed to hear what had gone on, we had seven families at that one. Federal law, I have got it up here, a little bit low behind me here, says clearly, "no city, county, or State can block its officers from sharing immigration information with the Federal Government."

It is not complicated. Ms. Pierce, Illinois' TRUST Act, tells local officers they cannot share information with ICE, is that a direct violation of Federal law?

Ms. PIERCE. It is not, 8 U.S.C. 1373 directs that local officials cannot restrict officials within their jurisdiction from sharing information about immigration status.

Mr. BIGGS. You don't think this—so if Illinois' law, their TRUST Act, which says they cannot provide information in response to any immigration agent's inquiry or request for information regarding any individual in the agency's custody, they can't provide that, you don't think that is a violation of 1373? I guess that is why things are so screwed up.

Let me just tell you that we are going to go along here and talk about Sheridan Gorman and Katie Abraham, because I am telling you, and I am asserting that this has not been settled by any court, your statement has not been settled by any court, and it is under review still. I don't believe that the families of Sheridan, Katie, or any other Angel Family would say yes, "you should be allowed to withhold information."

That is what you saw in this particular case. Sheriff Redman, you ever see that, your State, they trying to prevent you from providing this information to ICE or other Federal authorities?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. Give us an example please.

Sheriff REDMAN. We are able to share some limited information. The gentleman that I—call him gentleman, the suspect that was arrested in my jurisdiction for the lewd acts with a child, that information under SB 54 that I provided to them, was not legally able to provide that information.

Mr. BIGGS. We have got a set of facts here. Jose Medina entered this country illegally, he had no address, no ID, and no legal status. Went to Chicago, he was arrested for shoplifting. Chicago had him in custody, ICE was never notified. He walked out the door, got an OR if I understand right, never showed back up for his court date, nobody went looking for him, because that is the way it is, it is a shoplifting case.

Nobody is going to go look for a shoplifter. Less than three years later he shot Sheridan Gorman in the head in a Chicago park. Now, you have got 8 U.S.C. 1324 makes it a Federal crime to knowingly conceal, harbor, or shield an illegal alien from detection. Were those facts met, do you think, Ms. Pierce, when Chicago took Medina into custody, they knew he was in the country illegally.

They knew he had a criminal charge pending, they released him back onto the street, did they shield, do you think that was shielding?

Ms. PIERCE. No, sir. When Medina was booked into custody, those fingerprints were shared with the Department of Homeland Security, and with ICE, ICE had access to that information.

Mr. BIGGS. Did they transfer him to ICE? The answer is no. The question would be at what point does systematically refusing to notify ICE, knowing an individual is unlawfully present, has a criminal record, cross into shielding someone from detection? That is really the question here. You can take that position to say well, you know what, we just don't think that is right.

That is what a sanctuary jurisdiction does, they say we are not going to provide that information, if ICE has a detainer, we are not going to transfer them to them, because they want only a criminal arrest warrant. They don't want an ICE hold, they don't want an ICE detainer, and they want an actual criminal arrest warrant, those are two distinctive things.

What you do is allow a very dangerous, illegal alien back onto the street, wreaking havoc in our communities. That is the pissant shame of it all.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time is expired. Mr. Raskin?

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Pierce, I remember when we started this term of Congress, and Elon Musk, and DOGE wiped out about \$500 million of grants that were going to victim assistance groups, crime fighting groups, and local police departments. Nobody could quite explain why the particular DOGE employee did that.

They wiped out about a half a billion dollars of grants going to help the families of victims, and to try to stop crime. Can you discuss what happened there, what were those grants, why did that happen, and what kind of effect does that have when money that we have appropriated from Congress for this purpose, and the grants or programs that are wiped out, what effect does that have?

Ms. PIERCE. Sure. It was actually \$820 million in Department of Justice grants that they canceled, \$500 million of which had already been granted. That means the organizations that were receiving those grants had already started hiring staff, renting spaces, the communities that were going to receive those public safety grants had already started relying on that money coming in, and all that was wiped away.

I have recently been working with the victim rights law center, which is an amazing nonprofit organization in Massachusetts. They have lost three attorneys so far because of the way that the Department of Justice is messing with these public safety grants. That means victims, hundreds of victims of sexual assault and rape no longer have attorneys because that public safety funding has disappeared.

Mr. RASKIN. It is not just victim assistance groups, it is also crime fighting groups, and police departments had millions of dollars of grants that were canceled, correct? To my recollection.

Ms. PIERCE. Absolutely, yes.

Mr. RASKIN. Have the Office of Justice Programs grants from Fiscal Year 2025 been reinstated and distributed?

Ms. PIERCE. We were talking earlier about canceled grants, right? There is another problem with the Department of Justice grants, in that they have significantly slowed down the amount of grants that are going across the United States, not only for organizations, but also for police departments.

In the Fiscal Year 2025, the Department of Justice grants that go through the Office of Justice Programs have not been fully granted.

Mr. RASKIN. Why is that happening?

Ms. PIERCE. I don't know, the Department of Justice has not spoken to why this has happened. This is an unprecedented thing that has caused disruption across our country, and the Department of Justice is not telling anyone why they have been delaying this. It is more than \$2 billion in grants that have not gone—

Mr. RASKIN. Two billion dollars did you say?

Ms. PIERCE. Two billion dollars.

Mr. RASKIN. What would that \$2 billion have been able to do for local police forces around the country?

Ms. PIERCE. It would be used to hire officers, it would be used to train officers, it would be used to support officer wellness programs, it would be used to support resources for law enforcement, such as body cameras, different things that they desperately need.

Mr. RASKIN. Our system is complex because it is a Federal system, so we have national government, Department of Justice, Federal policies, and we have State and local policies, and you described this tension, this hostility that is creating problems. Can you discuss how jurisdictions normally cooperate with the Federal Government in different ways, and how does it best work?

Ms. PIERCE. Sure, I mean talking specifically about immigration enforcement—

Mr. RASKIN. Sure.

Ms. PIERCE. Like I said during my testimony, every single law enforcement jurisdiction across the United States cooperates with immigration enforcement, every time someone is booked, that infor-

mation is sent to the Department of Homeland Security, and to ICE, and then jurisdictions from there need to decide how much more of their local resources they will lend to ICE and immigration enforcement to help ICE do its job.

Mr. RASKIN. OK, will you just help us understand the different resources that are available to the Federal Government, and then to local government police forces?

Ms. PIERCE. Sure. As I said during my testimony, this Congress has provided ICE with \$113.5 billion to do their job, to enforce immigration law in the United States, and that is more than the combined annual operating budget of every single local-law enforcement jurisdiction in America. We are talking about local police departments that have limited amount of resources, and their primary duty is public safety.

Their primary duty is not immigration enforcement. Meanwhile, we have a Federal agency who has a budget larger than all but four militaries in the world, and their primary duty is in civil immigration enforcement.

Mr. RASKIN. What would you suggest we work on a bipartisan basis in Congress in to reduce criminal violence by undocumented immigrants, but in general, because there are people suffering these tragedies generally across the country, what can we do to bring down the crime rate generally, and all the violence?

Ms. PIERCE. Those resources that ICE receives should be targeted at the biggest public safety threats, right? We shouldn't have a Federal agency that is running amok across the United States trying to fulfill a quota to get as many people into detention and deportation as possible, that is not making us safer. In addition, we need a Federal Government that is willing to work with local-law enforcement jurisdictions.

We have had ICE in the past have compromise and communication be their primary driver when they are working with local jurisdictions. That goes a lot further than the bullying that we see from this Administration. That only increases the distrust that we are seeing at the Federal level, between the Federal level, the State, and local level.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Roy?

Mr. ROY. I thank the Chair, thank you for holding this hearing. Mr. Redman, thank you for your service in law enforcement. Ms. Gorman and Mr. Abraham, sorry for your loss, I have gotten to know all too often too many Angel Families, too many people in my home State of Texas who have lost loved ones due to the absolute, abject failure of leaders in both parties, to be very clear.

I will be a little partisan here, and very specifically the previous Administration, in particular, and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and their absolute refusal to secure the border. Ms. Gorman, it struck me that you noted that we had this poster, and it alluded to the extent to which the Federal Government, in particular, and law enforcement in this country failed you, and failed your daughter more importantly at multiple levels across the board.

That is really important, especially in light of the questioning we just heard from the Ranking Member of the Full Committee with

Ms. Pierce, who is appearing before us here today. Ms. Pierce, now you have worked previously for USCIS in the previous Administration, is that correct?

Ms. PIERCE. During both the previous Administration and this Administration, yes.

Mr. ROY. You have been testifying here at the questioning about the resources, and the lack of resources for local-law enforcement, and grants not being given out, but then dollars that have been set aside for ICE. The question here is how much taxpayer funds should have to be spent right now, how many taxpayer dollars of current American taxpayers should have to be spent to go round up illegal aliens?

Ms. PIERCE. Unfortunately, the better question is how that money should be spent, not how much.

Mr. ROY. Wait a minute, no, I actually think it matters how much. Because with all due respect, Ms. Pierce, you were working under the previous Administration, if I remember correctly, with Safe Mobility Offices. Safe Mobility Offices, now these were offices that were directed and designated toward helping people move through our security system to get to the United States.

To end run the processes along the way, to exploit asylum laws, to exploit parole laws to funnel people into the United States. That was precisely what was happening in the previous Administration, we know this to be true. Then, to sit here and listen to this exchange about what we are doing with our resources really strikes me as pretty hypocritical.

Given the extent to which we have dangerous people in the United States that have been killing innocent Americans because the previous Administration and the people who worked for it were working directly, specifically to end run the laws of the United States, putting the dangerous people on the streets that resulted in the death of Ms. Gorman's daughter and Mr. Abraham's family.

I have gotten to know Jocelyn Nungaray as a dear friend, or her mother, Alexis Nungaray as a dear friend for the loss of her daughter Jocelyn. We are well advised by Laken Riley, we are well advised of those who have lost loved ones, Kayla Hamilton, and many others, and we are hearing more here. You are right, Ms. Gorman, we can't have enough.

We can keep having hearings and allowing these people to put pictures up of the people who have been murdered because we allow our borders to be used as some sort of plaything. Now, today the U.S. Supreme Court manufacturing out of thin air a complete abomination of a ruling by the chief justice, suggesting that you can simply become a citizen from being born on dirt.

Thereby validating the abhorrent practice of baby factories and moving people here to be born to be able to become a citizen, leaving us under no choice but to do what we must do to say pause immigration, just stop it, stop all immigration. Because if it is going to be exploited for people to come here when they are pregnant, to allow somebody who is working for the Chinese Communist Party, and to come here and have children who become American citizens.

Then, have our laws exploited like they were under the previous Administration; it is why this Congress should act to pause all im-

migration. This Congress should act immediately to codify what the President has been doing to close the loopholes under asylum and parole, the catch and release policies.

To codify those that a future Biden and Mayorkas Administration cannot do to the American people what these radical leftists did to the American people, and then dare sit here and testify under questioning by my colleagues that we need to have more taxpayer money going to the local jurisdictions to make up for what they caused.

Then, criticize the Administration and this Congress for putting money aside for ICE and Border Patrol to do the job that Administration wouldn't do. By the way, get that funding by having to figure out how to use reconciliation to do it, because Democrats refuse to appropriate money to secure our communities, and to make sure that our people would not be murdered.

It is the absolute chutzpah to be here testifying, having had a hand in South America working to end run our laws, and put people into the United States that resulted in the deaths of the American people. I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Nadler?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chair, let me begin by offering my deepest condolences to Ms. Gorman and Mr. Abraham. The loss of a child is unimaginable and is something no parent should ever face. Mr. Chair, Republicans want to coerce States and localities into furthering the Trump Administration's extreme anti-immigrant agenda.

With masked agents murdering American citizens in the streets, tearing children away from their parents, and detention facilities that have their highest death rate in decades and fail to meet the basic medical and sanitary needs of detainees. It is no wonder that many States and localities have chosen not to use their limited resources to aid and abet the Trump Administration's reckless, chaotic, and inhumane mass deportation campaign.

Some communities have concluded that certain forms of cooperation with Federal immigration authorities such as detaining immigrants past their sentences without a judicial order raise constitutional concerns and can even put them at risk of legal liability.

In many cases States and localities have determined that taking on the Federal responsibility to enforce immigration laws would destroy trust between immigrants and local-law enforcement, which would make everyone less safe. They believe that their communities are at greater risk when a victim of domestic violence is afraid to ask the police for protection from her abuser for fear of deportation.

When witnesses to a murder refuse to assist law enforcement in tracking down their perpetrator because they are afraid their immigration status will be discovered. Republicans actually want to punish these communities by denying them billions of dollars in funding that they need to protect public safety. Federal immigration authorities are perfectly capable of enforcing Federal law on their own.

In fact, they are swimming in money, Congress has given them \$240 billion in little more than a year with no guardrails attached. With this money, these agencies have assembled a massive force

consisting of tens of thousands of agents who have flooded our streets to carry out Donald Trump's brutal and reckless campaign to strike fear in immigrant communities across the country.

That is what the Committee should be examining today. Ms. Pierce, immigration enforcement is the responsibility of the Federal Government, and the DHS has unprecedented resources and historic levels of funding. Does the Federal Government have the resources and personnel necessary to enforce immigration law, or does it need to usurp State resources?

Ms. PIERCE. As you said, sir, ICE has unprecedented resources. At the moment we should assess what they can do with those resources before we have them usurp local resources.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you. Ms. Pierce, the Trump Administration claims that it is only going after the worst of the worst, and targeting criminals, but according to ICE's own data, the majority of immigrants they have detained have no criminal record. In fact, this Administration's mass deportation agenda is wreaking havoc on communities across the country.

Now, Republicans want to force States, cities, and localities to participate in this lawless, and dangerous scheme—

Mr. KNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NADLER. No. Is the Trump Administration really going after the worst of the worst?

Ms. PIERCE. No, sir. According to ICE's own data, more than 70 percent of individuals in detention have no criminal records, and another recent analysis said only three percent of those individuals in detention have violent criminal convictions.

Mr. NADLER. Ms. Pierce, can you explain why Administrative ICE detainers often raise constitutional concerns, and can create liability for States, cities, and localities?

Ms. PIERCE. Because they don't create new legal authority for a new detention. If an individual is done with their criminal custody, then the local-law enforcement agency needs a new authority to continue detaining that individual. A detainer is just a suggestion from ICE, or a request from ICE that local jurisdiction continue to hold that individual.

It doesn't create a new legal authority, and as a result, some jurisdictions have had to pay hundreds of millions of dollars in civil liabilities and settlements for holding individuals beyond the time that they were supposed to be released from custody.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you, Mr. Pierce. The Trump Administration has diverted over 28,000 officers from their law enforcement roles in the Federal Government to do immigration enforcement. How does this shifting focus from criminal enforcement to immigration enforcement hurt public safety?

Ms. PIERCE. I feel like very few people would argue that taking officers who were focused on violent crime, child exploitation, human trafficking, firearms trafficking, fentanyl smuggling, and putting them instead to focus on civil immigration enforcement, that doesn't increase public safety, it pulls individuals away from their primary public safety missions.

Also, unfortunately, this Administration has failed to answer questions from Congress about how many, exactly, agents were pulled away from their primary public safety duties. What analysis

if any was done prior to pulling them about what that would do to their primary public safety missions. What would it do to the open cases that they abandon to focus instead on increasing immigration enforcement?

We haven't heard a word from this Administration about whether or not they are weighing those important public safety considerations.

Mr. NADLER. Thank you, Ms. Pierce. My time is expired; I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Van Drew?

Mr. VAN DREW. Thank you, Chair. I am going to say it is telling the truth time, and first I want to thank you, especially Mr. Abraham and Ms. Gorman, you must be so tired, so worn out, it is like probably a surreal world, it is like hell on earth. Condolences don't do it. The only thing we can ever do is by actions.

Because the truth matters, and you are in a place right now in Washington, DC, I am not going to go into it because I only have five minutes, you could talk about it for hours, where a lot of times the truth doesn't matter. You hear so much BS, and so much debating, political philosophy, and the reality is you guys are here because you don't want other kids to die, that is all it is about.

Both of you I don't necessarily believe are usually people who want to be having orations, debates, speaking out, and all the, forgive me, BS goes on around you, and it swirls around you, man, it gets old. It is tell the truth time. The truth is it doesn't matter if we do this four times, 40 times, 400 times, or 4,000 damn times.

It needs to be done because innocent children and people have lost their lives, or have been dismembered, or have been raped, or have been injured, and it didn't have to be that way. I don't know how damn clear, you made it so clear, you both articulated so well, there are no words. We know what the truth is about, the truth is in sanctuary cities, people die because it is a sanctuary city.

Ms. Pierce, forgive me, but we have people that were on the street because it was a sanctuary city, or a sanctuary county, or a sanctuary State, or a jurisdiction, whatever it was, and people are not walking, and living on this earth because of that policy.

I don't mean to be mean to you, I understand you are just doing your job here, but all the politically Left gobbledygook, and the statistics, and all the stuff you are moving around, that doesn't mean anything to them. Look to the right, and look to the left, and tell them about all your political stuff, and all that you have done, all that Left-wing political nonsense doesn't mean anything to them.

Their kids aren't alive, that is all that matters to them. That is all that will matter for the rest of their lives. The truth is somebody said that we don't know the definition of a sanctuary city, yes, we do, it is a place where we don't cooperate with Federal officials. When we have somebody who is a bad person, who broke a crime besides being illegal, we don't cooperate.

You know why there are so many problems in the Blue cities? Because they don't cooperate, because ICE does not want to go out and have crowd control, they don't want to be involved in that, they don't want to have to do any of that. They want people when they are incarcerated, and they are illegal, to be notified, so they can send them out of the country.

Because I don't even want them imprisoned here. We can't afford it; they shouldn't be here. We pay for their clothing, we pay for their housing in some cases, we pay for their transportation. In New Jersey where I am from, it makes me sick to my stomach, we are paying for a legal defense fund for illegal criminals. We pay for their education, we can't afford it and we are tired of it.

Your issues are even more important because it is life and death. Ms. Pierce, and I don't think you are going to do—I have a request, but I don't think you will do it. I would really love you to look to your right, because they will look to you, and look to your left, tell them about all your numbers, all your grants, all your BS, and why we shouldn't arrest and deport people who are here illegally and commit crimes.

Do you want to do that? Explain to them, and also explain to the sheriff why you are correct, and he is wrong, even though he has been on the ground, and in the street, have you served in law enforcement, have you been a law enforcement official?

Ms. PIERCE. No, sir.

Mr. VAN DREW. OK, he has seen it, he has been on the street, he has seen the blood and the guts. This isn't some philosophical thing out in space we are talking about; these are real people who are really getting hurt because of bad politics. I have time for one question. In your testimony you listed, Ms. Pierce, four practical concerns that you say drive the needs for sanctuary policies.

We should have sanctuary policies because of your complicated formula here, community trust, local control, legal liability, and staffing. Can you look at them, and say that those four pillars of your thesis, or your idea, of your think tank are worth the lives of their children? I am just asking you a question, please answer it.

Ms. PIERCE. Yes, I would love to answer it. The children of Mr. Abraham and Ms. Gorman should be alive. The fact that they are not is a travesty, and I am extremely apologetic about that—

Mr. VAN DREW. It is because of your policies, you are the one doing it. No offense, but you are.

Ms. PIERCE. I am here today to testify to the American people and to Congress about how Federal policies should operate. I am an expert on Federal policy—

Mr. VAN DREW. I am out of time, thank you, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Ms. Ross?

Ms. ROSS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I too very sincerely want to express my condolences to Ms. Gorman and to Mr. Abraham. What happened to your children should never have happened, and Ms. Gorman, I look forward to sitting on the bench. I do want to share, because I know every single one of my police chiefs, and I know my sheriff.

I do want to share how important it is that our local-law enforcement get funding, and get grants so they can prevent crimes, respond to crimes, and make sure our communities are safe. That is from everybody who commits crimes, illegal immigrants, legal immigrants, and American citizens, we need to make sure we give our law enforcement at the local level closest to the community the tools that they need.

Every single time I can get a community project for my local-law enforcement, I do it. I am however very concerned that the Trump

Administration has stopped some of the grants to local-law enforcement to help hire new officers, to get the equipment that they need. I understand that we now have unprecedented investment in ICE and CBP, and that there are a whole lot of hiring and bonuses.

My local-law enforcement sometimes loses some of their best people to ICE and CBP, but it is a free country and take the job that you think you should be doing, I think that is fine. I want to know a little bit more about these grants. I was concerned, Ms. Pierce, I didn't know you were going to mention that North Carolina, which is my home State, was one of the States that hasn't gotten grants.

We are not a sanctuary city State, so could you talk a little bit more about the grants that my State has lost? Because we are not doing the things that my friends on the other side of the aisle claim are so bad.

Ms. PIERCE. Absolutely. The grants I mentioned that have been delayed, the Fiscal Year 2025 grants, the \$4.5 billion that should have been given out more than nine months ago, they actually should be going to every single State in the country. Majority on this Committee, because I think that this is a real issue—

Ms. ROSS. The States, you mean.

Ms. PIERCE. I am sorry, the States, thank you. Represented by the Majority on this Committee, because I think this is a real and important issue that this Committee should be examining. Every single State in the United States is missing public safety grant funding that should have been given to them more than nine months ago.

Ms. ROSS. Could you tell me what that grant funding would go toward?

Ms. PIERCE. Funding from the Office of Justice Programs goes to a wide variety of resources that help protect local safety. They go to law enforcement officers to help with hiring, to help with officer training, and to help with officer wellness. They also go to organizations out in the community that help represent individuals.

It also goes to organizations that help prevent gun violence. A variety of issues all designed to increase public safety in the United States.

Ms. ROSS. OK, I wanted to ask, I only have about a minute and a half, but you briefly mentioned how there has been diversion from child exploitation cases, could you explain how agents have been pulled off child exploitation cases?

Ms. PIERCE. Absolutely. Homeland Security Investigations is a wing of ICE. Unfortunately, this Administration has pulled many of the individuals who specialize in the specific crimes that HSI focuses on to instead focus on immigration enforcement, and that includes individuals focused on child exploitation cases.

These are very specialized agents that work on these cases. When they leave them, the cases can't just be picked back up at a later time, instead the evidence gets outdated, more children are vulnerable to exploitation, and predators get longer to work on them. It is extremely concerning that this Administration would pull investigators from those cases.

Ms. ROSS. Have they been pulled from human trafficking cases?

Ms. PIERCE. Yes, absolutely. Homeland Security Investigations, which has lost so many agents to instead focus on civil immigration enforcement, also focuses on human trafficking, drug smuggling, cartels, a variety of issues that are very important to the public safety of the United States.

Ms. ROSS. OK, thank you, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentlelady yields back. Mr. Moore?

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Ms. Gorman, thank you for being here today. Mr. Abraham, certainly sorry for your loss. Sheriff, we hear a lot of talk about grants and funding, but it seems like to me you have a bigger problem with some of the laws actually, you may have the resources to do some things sometimes.

It seems like State laws, sanctuary States, and cities, and communities actually create a bigger hurdle for you sometimes. What specific authority or cooperation do you need to prevent a removable offender from being released back into the community before ICE can take lawful custody?

Sheriff REDMAN. Thank you. We don't spend a whole lot of resources on any type of immigration enforcement, we have no authority to do that. When I keep hearing that our resources are tapped, what they are actually tapped into is when they come into our custody, that is where we are getting hit by these sanctuary laws, where it is impacting my budget, precious jail bed spaces.

That has a huge impact, it is not that we are out there doing any type of enforcement, we never have, and we never will, that is a Federal component of the government. What we need to have happen is those low-level offenses that don't fall within California SB 54, the 16 I mentioned, and Ms. Pierce did put out some numbers.

Out of seven that I gave over to ICE, I had 16 that I could not turn over because they did not meet the high-level offenses where I could cooperate with ICE, and those were released back into the community, I need that to change.

Mr. MOORE. I was talking to a judge who is a friend of mine, and under the prior Administration, he would actually have people in his courtroom that were driving under the influence that were here illegally, and very often if he turned them over, they would take them down the road and turn them loose. Angel and Jeremy Seay actually died in my community.

A drunk driver, Mr. Abraham, much like what you described, they had him, they turned him loose, he was a repeat offender, and then he was back out on the street again, and ultimately killed two newlyweds, young newlyweds. Ms. Gorman, I understand that the individual that murdered Sheridan had been in prior custody, and they had been released.

Do you want to tell me a little bit about the details? And then if you don't mind, tell us what real accountability looks like to your families, and to the communities when we have these sanctuary jurisdictions?

Ms. GORMAN. Sure. I just have to say that I am not a lawmaker, and I am not a politician, but one of the things that I searched on ChatGPT of all things, when we found out that Sheridan was murdered by an illegal immigrant, and when we found out what Angel Families were, I was curious. One night I went online, and I said

how many people have been killed by illegal immigrants in Chicago, or in Illinois, I did both.

Do you know what the answer was? Without being point blank, it basically said that Chicago police are not allowed to track that information, they are not allowed to ask, so we don't know. The answer is we don't know how many people have been killed by illegal immigrants in Chicago or in Illinois. In my opinion that is the biggest part.

We keep talking about programs being taken away, and funding, it is about cooperation, it is about sitting on that bench together and just saying I am going to tell you my side, you tell me yours and let us find a way to cooperate. I don't think that the sanctuary cities are cooperating. Yes, this man apparently came across the border and was actually asked the questions.

Which apparently you would know about, because you were helping facilitating people coming over illegally. Asked the questions whether they claim asylum, are they in danger, and need to be rescued by the United States, and this man actually answered no, and yet we took him anyway. There are so many steps.

Yes, this man was arrested, he was arrested when he came to Chicago for stealing at a Macy's apparently, and then because of cashless bail policies, they just released him back on the street. The original intent I believe of cashless bail was that these people are from our community, so the chances of them coming back to court are high because they are part of the community.

That doesn't apply to illegal immigrants, this man didn't have an address. The fact that he was even released on his own recognition, how do we know this man is not even using a different name? We trust that the name he gave himself is Jose Medina. There is so much wrong with these policies, cashless bail, sanctuary cities, it is a roundabout.

The sad thing is that I've had to educate myself, my husband, we have had to educate ourselves on immigration law. Really it is disgusting, there is so many little loopholes, and the fact that Chicago is not even allowed to ask if someone who commits a murder is an illegal immigrant, they are not allowed to store that information, that should tell you everything you need to know.

It is an evasive game of shifting cards, and shifting blame, and frankly, yes, sitting here, when yes, I am thankful my daughter wasn't dismembered. I need people to think about that. You don't have to be a parent to feel the pain that we are feeling, and the betrayal. One of the things that happened, I am sorry I have done this, but one of the things that happened is we are in Chicago getting ready to claim my daughter's body.

The mayor there is naming a truck Abolish ICE, standing, laughing, and joking while my daughter was just murdered there. Like what?

Mr. MOORE. Thank you, Ms. Gorman. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time is expired. Mr. Knott?

Ms. GORMAN. Sorry about that.

Mr. KNOTT. No, no, Ms. Gorman, Mr. Abraham, thank you for your testimony today. Sheriff, thank you for your service, Ms. Pierce, thank you for being here. I again, I stated this often as the father of two precious girls, I can't imagine being in your chair, and

I am sorry. Because again, we have not only a refusal to apologize for the policies, but we are trying to bake in the lie that these crimes were unavoidable.

That is the lie that no one will talk about. Both of these crimes were avoidable; they should never have happened. Unfortunately, for my colleagues on the other side, had President Trump been in office from 2000–2024, both of your daughters would be alive. That is the elephant in the room here. That is the absolute elephant in the room.

The idea that these crimes are unavoidable is one of the biggest lies that I can't really tolerate anymore, I really can't. Look at Jose Medina, apprehended by the Border Patrol on May 9, 2023. He told immigration officials he did not have any fear of harm or death. He was marked by Border Patrol as someone who was likely to abscond.

He asked to be deported to Columbia. He could not provide any point of contact inside the United States. The Democrats behind Biden–Harris programmatically ushered him into the country, paying for his healthcare, his food, and his clothing. My colleagues here today on the other side will not say it was avoidable.

He was arrested for theft, he did not show up to court, two crimes. Not a conviction, this is very important, it was not a conviction, two crimes. They say we don't deport anybody unless they have a conviction, well it is very hard to convict someone when you don't prosecute them. He then murdered a precious American child, a young lady for doing nothing more than looking at the Northern Lights.

Again, it is the biggest lie that is being told in Congress, that these crimes are unavoidable. The second case, Mr. Abraham's daughter, you said that Mr. Bol was deported once before, do you know what he was deported for?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I don't know why, I can't get that information from Illinois, but he was—

Mr. KNOTT. You can't get it from Illinois?

Mr. ABRAHAM. No.

Mr. KNOTT. I wonder why.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I can't get anything from Illinois. He was also using aliases, he was presenting himself as a Mexican national, not a Guatemalan national. Federal agencies knew that, but the State didn't bother checking.

Mr. KNOTT. Yes, well I can tell both of you I did work in the Department of Justice under President Obama, under President Trump, and under President Biden. It was a programmatic effort to bring as many people into the country as they could, and to keep them here regardless of what they did. I do have to ask you, Ms. Pierce, one question.

You said that sanctuary jurisdictions do not prevent ICE or immigration enforcement. Do you stand by that comment?

Ms. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNOTT. We have heard testimony in this Committee of sanctuary jurisdictions that consider immigration consequences before they finalize cases, before they charge cases, before they plead cases, are you aware of that?

Ms. PIERCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KNOTT. Will you condemn that?

Ms. PIERCE. That both U.S. citizens and immigrants should be charged, and treated—

Mr. KNOTT. I didn't ask that. Will you condemn considering immigration policies before charging or resolving cases?

Ms. PIERCE. I don't think immigration should be a consideration when we are talking about criminal law—

Mr. KNOTT. Because when they do that, it does affect immigration enforcement, correct?

Ms. PIERCE. We are not talking about criminal law; we are not talking about civil immigration enforcement.

Mr. KNOTT. I am talking about criminal illegal immigrants, ma'am. Someone sat in that very chair and said I will release somebody if they are an illegal immigrant and they are charged with a serious felony; I questioned them two weeks ago. That would affect immigration enforcement, would it not?

Ms. PIERCE. ICE can pick them up whether or not they are charged, sir.

Mr. KNOTT. Asking a Biden official to talk about border policy is pretty laughable, I have got to say so. It is past time that we as Americans do stand up and say that American children are treasures, they are unique. Protecting them should be our foremost priority. That is impossible when you embrace open borders. That is impossible when you welcome people from all over the world, regardless of who they are here.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you.

Mr. KNOTT. Thank you, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time is expired. Ms. Scanlon?

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you, Mr. Chair. At this point I feel like I shouldn't be surprised by some of the wild stories and fantasies that Republicans on this Committee have embraced when they talk about sanctuary cities to really ramp up political drama, even if it is at the expense of individuals' pain and personal tragedy, but it is always jarring to hear the lies being embraced.

According to our Republican colleagues, most immigrants to our country are criminals, despite the overwhelming evidence, and as even Ms. Gorman said, "we have good immigrants among us."

Ms. GORMAN. They came here legally, so they aren't criminals.

Ms. SCANLON. Exactly, but that distinction seems to get lost on this Committee. Evidence is immigrants are actually more law abiding than Native born Americans overall, and we have the fact that over 70 percent of the immigrants detained by this Administration actually have no criminal record either here or in their home countries. According to our Republican colleagues, sanctuary policies block ICE from doing its job.

According to our Republican colleagues, elected officials in cities with so called sanctuary jurisdictions are scheming to protect immigrant criminals at the expense of their own constituents, or they are not prosecuting immigrants who commit crimes. How could any of that actually be possible? No one would agree to elect officials who deliberately make their own communities less safe.

No one would agree to live in such places. Law enforcement professionals are not in the practice of endangering their communities by allowing criminals, no matter where they came from, to run

rampant. These arguments become a complete distortion of the truth about policies that cities and States put in place to improve trust, cooperation, and ultimately safety in those communities.

Here is the reality, over and over again, congressional Republicans have used this Committee to support the Trump Administration as it tries to force State and local-law enforcement to use their own limited resources to do the Federal Government's job. Even though they have sent almost a quarter trillion dollars to DHS and ICE.

To support this Administration's chaotic, out of control, mass deportation agenda that both doesn't go after the worst of the worst, and has actively harmed, endangered, and even killed innocent people, including American citizens. In doing so, our colleagues have supported the defunding of law enforcement by blocking resources for local police.

Diverting resources at the Federal level for fighting child trafficking, terrorism, drug trafficking, corporate overreach, fraud, and more. Ms. PIERCE, we have heard a lot of rhetoric about so-called sanctuary jurisdictions, but I think it is pretty well established now that there isn't even a single definition for that term.

Can you describe for us what sanctuary policies actually do, what their purpose is, where they have been adopted, and what effect do they have?

Ms. PIERCE. Thank you. Jurisdictions adopt sanctuary policies, or policies in which they limit the amount that they cooperate with civil immigration enforcement to protect their own resources, to protect their criminal and civil liability to protect their communities, and the trust that they have established with their local communities. Those policies limit how much they lend their resources to ICE to do civil immigration enforcement.

Ms. SCANLON. I am just trying to make plain, or understandable how sanctuary policies protect local resources. How does that work, how does going the extra yard—well first, are there any jurisdictions in the country that you are aware of that actually violate Federal law with respect to cooperating with ICE where it is required by law?

Ms. PIERCE. Not that I am aware of, no.

Ms. SCANLON. OK, not that I am aware of either. There is this middle ground where ICE would like local jurisdictions to take extra steps to detain people longer on the local dime, or to take other actions that actually cost our cities and States money, can you talk about that a little bit?

Ms. PIERCE. Yes, absolutely. An ICE detainer for example, requesting that a local jurisdiction hold someone beyond the time that they would be in criminal custody, that takes up jail space, as well as personnel time. Then it also subjects that local jurisdiction to legal liability for which they can be charged hundreds of millions of dollars in liabilities, or in civil settlements.

Ms. SCANLON. That legal liability is if, for example, ICE wants someone detained who shouldn't be detained?

Ms. PIERCE. If ICE fails to establish probable cause, or another legal authority to hold someone beyond the time that they would be in criminal custody, yes, that local jurisdiction holds the legal liability for holding that individual beyond their time in custody.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. The gentlelady's time is expired. Mr. Fry?

Ms. SCANLON. Thank you, I yield back.

Mr. FRY. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I really appreciate the witnesses, Ms. Gorman and Mr. Abraham, you are being here today sharing that. It is incredibly brave. It is not an easy thing to do.

I appreciate you being here and talking about your children. Talking about the failures of the system and what would have resulted if we had actually done our job, if the Government had done its job.

Ms. Pierce, the Ranking Member of this Subcommittee, has sponsored legislation in the past to abolish ICE. Do you believe that we should abolish ICE?

Ms. PIERCE. No, sir.

Mr. FRY. When people call ICE slave camps or the Gestapo, do you believe that this is an accurate reflection of ICE?

Ms. PIERCE. There are a lot of problems with the current approach to immigration enforcement. No, I would not use those words.

Mr. FRY. Why do you think, as the Democrat witness here today, which is that you would disagree with the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee and other Members of this Committee and this Congress that want to abolish ICE, why do you think that we should not abolish ICE?

Ms. PIERCE. Immigration enforcement has a role in keeping us all safe and a role in the proper function of our government.

Mr. FRY. Do you believe that is where most of Americans are at, is they also want to abolish ICE?

Ms. PIERCE. No, sir.

Mr. FRY. Why do you think that is?

Ms. PIERCE. In the United States, we care a lot about our laws being enforced.

Mr. FRY. Enforcement, what a novel concept. When the last Administration, you have had a lot of criticisms in this hearing today about this Administration. What do you think the last Administration failed at, just briefly?

Ms. PIERCE. The last Administration could have done more, and more quickly, to control the Southern border.

Mr. FRY. In what way?

Ms. PIERCE. Limiting the benefits given to individuals crossing the Southern border, when it comes especially to asylum.

Mr. FRY. Don't give them free stuff, right? Don't open, is that what you are saying? Limiting the benefits? Don't give them free stuff that incentivizes them. Do you think that this incentivizes them to come to the country?

Ms. PIERCE. No asylum seeker gets free stuff. To be clear, I am talking about the benefit of asylum, an immigration benefit.

Mr. FRY. In your written testimony, you wrote that there is a smarter path the Trump Administration can do with sanctuary jurisdictions, and highlighting how some jurisdictions may be willing to cooperate in serious cases.

You also wrote that focus immigration enforcement on serious public safety threats. What do you consider a serious case or a serious public safety threat?

Ms. PIERCE. We could look at criminal law, we can look at violations, then we can decide which of those are more concerning.

Mr. FRY. Well, you are the expert, so I am asking you, what do you consider, this is in your public testimony, what do you consider a serious case or a serious public safety threat?

Ms. PIERCE. There is a lot to that answer that I would like more time than five minutes to consider.

Mr. FRY. Well, like what? Like a felony, would a felony be considered a serious case?

Ms. PIERCE. Absolutely.

Mr. FRY. Like a DUI, would that be considered a serious case?

Ms. PIERCE. It depends on the circumstances. A DUI is an extremely serious violation.

Mr. FRY. What about in the case of Mr. Abraham's daughter? A DUI, a prior charge or conviction, would that be considered a serious case?

Ms. PIERCE. A DUI is a significant violation of our laws.

Mr. FRY. What about shoplifting?

Ms. PIERCE. Again, it is a significant violation of our laws.

Mr. FRY. Now, shoplifting is, I guess, a misdemeanor. Would you still consider shoplifting a serious case?

Ms. PIERCE. In my testimony, I talked about how this Administration should work with local jurisdictions to decide with them what are serious cases. Where are those jurisdictions willing to lend local resources to help ICE do its job?

That those conversations would be more fruitful than this Administration's approach, which is instead to name and shame jurisdictions that it sees as not cooperating.

Mr. FRY. The question is like, what do you consider a serious case. In the case of a DUI or shoplifting as in Ms. Gorman, those would be considered serious cases. I am glad you actually did that. I am glad you disagree with the Ranking Member.

Ms. Gorman, did you watch any of President Trump's State of the Union speech? Did you watch any of President Trump's State of the Union speech?

Ms. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. FRY. When the President asked, I am going to paraphrase loosely, that "it is the duty of public servants in Congress to protect the safety and security of American citizens." Do you remember that moment?

Ms. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. FRY. What happened at that moment?

Ms. GORMAN. I am sorry, say it again.

Mr. FRY. What happened at that moment?

Ms. GORMAN. They booed and acted up.

Mr. FRY. Did anyone stand?

Ms. GORMAN. No one, the Democrats didn't respond.

Mr. FRY. I don't know if your microphone is on or not.

Ms. GORMAN. Oh. They didn't respond.

Mr. FRY. They didn't respond. What did you think? What did you feel at that moment?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FRY. Could she answer?

Ms. GORMAN. How did I feel? I felt outraged. Outrage that our politicians who we choose, don't choose us in return. That is how I felt.

Mr. FRY. Thank you.

Ms. GORMAN. I feel outraged that this guy who, yes, he might have only committed a misdemeanor, but he murdered my daughter. He was on the streets to murder my daughter, 100 percent preventable. He could have been scooped up twice and he wasn't. He was allowed to murder my daughter.

Mr. FRY. He should have never been here. Thank you for that. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Thank you. Mr. Hunt?

Mr. HUNT. Sheridan Gorman, Katie Abraham, Chloe Polzin, Jocelyn Nungaray, Rachel Morin, Megan Bos, Lizbeth Medina, DaCara Thompson, and many more. Say their names.

Say their names. Sheridan, Katie, Chloe, Lincoln, Jocelyn, Rachel, Megan, Lizbeth, and DaCara. May you rest in peace.

These are Americans. These are people's children. It is their family members, their friends. Every single one of the names that I just mentioned deserve the chance to pursue the American dream.

Every last one of them deserves to grow up and build a future and live in a country that is safe, secure, and governed simply by the rule of law. The rule of law that I fought in combat to fight for every single American.

Instead, these stories end in tragedy. These tragedies were preventable. When Democrat leaders refuse to cooperate with Federal immigration enforcement, Americans bear the deadly consequences.

I am disgusted by my colleagues that fight so hard for the rights of people that have no business being here in the first place.

This should not be a political debate. We are talking about real people and real families whose lives cannot be replaced ever again.

Entering the United States illegally does not create a right to remain here indefinitely. For whatever reason, this is a political football. It is very cut and dry.

This is very simple for someone like me. Let's consider this, this has already been stated. In just 10 months, New York released nearly 7,000 aliens subject to ICE detainers.

We are talking about crimes that include 29 murders, 2,500 assaults, 200 burglaries, 300 robberies, and hundreds of sexual assaults. We are allowing these criminals and these animals back into our midst.

Government's first responsibility is to protect our citizens. Anything less than that is a derelict of duty and a failure of leadership. In this case, the intentional failure of leadership is done for political purposes.

Our Chair was speaking earlier during his opening remarks talking about 10 million people that have entered this country illegally that we know of. I have heard 15, I have heard 20. I don't give a damn how many it is. It is one too many.

Especially people that come here and rape and maim our babies. This is why I get up and do this job every single day, because I have babies too.

I see these pictures that are in front of me and I weep for you, because I see my babies in these photos. That could have been one of mine as well.

If we don't do our jobs up here on Capitol Hill, we are going to have more pictures. We are going to have more murders, and we are going to have more rapes. This is the bottom line.

This is not a partisan issue. Ms. Gorman, Mr. Abraham, I want to thank you so much for being here. I want to offer you my deepest condolences. Thank you so much for being here.

Ma'am, I know this has to be very difficult. You are doing it in the name of your baby. She is looking down on you and she is very, very proud of you for doing this. I can assure you.

Sheriff, thank you very much for being here as well. Last year, sir, you did a *Fox News* interview in which you mentioned that under the direction of Gavin Newsome, you received a threatening letter from the Attorney General of California, because of your pledge to work with law enforcement. Is this true, sir?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes, sir. It is.

Mr. HUNT. With my remaining time, sir, what would be your message to Governor Gavin Newsome and Democrat leaders across this country, who persist with these homicidal sanctuary policies?

Sheriff, do you think that it is normal for the Governor and Attorney General of a State to tell a member of law enforcement to not cooperate with law enforcement?

Sheriff REDMAN. No, I do not. It puts me in a very hard position. Once again, I will continue to do what I believe is right. My message is really clear, in California, stop championing the criminals and let's start championing the victims, sir.

Mr. HUNT. Amen. We are killing each other from within. That is how this country comes to an end, not from anybody from the outside.

Because we allow 10 million people to enter our country illegally, and then we make excuses for them after they murder our babies. That is insanity.

No other country operates like that. Neither should we. I yield back the remainder of my time. Thank you all so much, and I offer you my deepest condolences. Thank you all.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you. First, I want to clean up some of the things that have been said here in the past.

When people talk about the number of crimes committed who are people, by people in this country illegally and people claim that they are more law abiding than the Native born here. The reason they can make that statement is nobody keeps track of the number of crimes who are committed by people here illegally.

Right, if I walk into a Wisconsin jail and ask the sheriff how many of these people are illegal immigrants? He has no clue.

We have got a Federal prison in Wisconsin, and I have toured the Federal prison, and I ask the warden of the Federal prison, how many of these people here in this prison are people who are illegal? He has no idea.

Whenever you hear a politician say that people who are here illegally are committing less crimes than the native born, they don't have a clue.

The second thing I want to point out is, because they are lost in the debate, the huge number of people who come here legally every year. They try to set those of us up who want the current law enforced as being some mean people who won't let anybody in here.

Right now, on a rolling average every year, we have about 800,000 new people sworn in as new citizens. Eight hundred thousand.

If you look at that historically, it is high. When I was a child, that number was around 200,000. We are right now letting in, legally, a very high number.

Right now, in this country, one-sixth of the people are foreign-born. We have never had so many people in our country foreign born as we do now.

That is more than even in the late 1800s when we had all the immigration from Eastern Europe, and Germany, and what have you. For whatever reason, they don't talk about that.

Now, if we do believe in immigration laws, we should remove the people who tried to sneak in here illegally. That to me is also obvious.

In so far, as nobody knows exactly how many and so far as President Biden let eight million people in this country illegally, if we are going to have our laws mean anything, it means ICE, and Border Patrol, and whoever should remove those eight million people.

I don't know any serious person who believes we should only remove people who have committed a serious crime. Right? If eight million people came here illegally, eight million people should be removed.

Now, we have had a long hearing here, and we are having this hearing because of the horrific acts committed by people who are in this country illegally. Sometimes it is easy to forget the wonderful people whose lives were cut short by the zeal of what I think is the Democrat Party trying to change America as quickly as they can and letting everybody under the sun come here.

In any event, we will start with Mr. Abraham. Do you want to share with us a little bit of your daughter's history, and what her dreams were, so that whoever is listening today can see what life was cut short because of letting all these people in our country illegally?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes. Katie was a special person for sure. She had this unique personality, drew everyone in and always made people feel seen and heard.

I actually want to ask questions. Actually, Ms. Pierce, and then the Congresswoman who kind of stepped away scowling, the inconsistencies I am struggling with here.

They are complaining about children being exploited. I didn't hear these voices from 2021–2025. Were you talking about that too? Because maybe I wasn't paying attention.

As wonderful as Katie was and how she got sacrificed by awful policies, she was sacrificed, there is no question about it. People knew a preventable outcome.

This is part of the equation and calculation. OK? This is 100 percent, I believe. It just seems to me strike the inconsistencies that, oh, we are so worried about now, I don't know.

Over the last four years, nothing, not a word from anybody. I am just confused, I guess. I don't want to talk about it, because I don't think anyone here cares.

I don't want to waste my breath on that. I just want to know why the inconsistency? Why does it only one side and the other?

That is what I would like to know. We will talk after this. I would love to hear how you are saying now is important, but back then it wasn't important, anyway.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Thank you. It comes from there, just people want to dramatically change this country. They will go through, ignore any ounce of commonsense to change America.

Ms. Gorman, would you like to tell us at all about your daughter's future?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I am afraid I am going to have to interrupt. We are going to have to save that for the next question, because the gentleman's time has expired. We will go to Chair Jordan.

Mr. JORDAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let me start with, well, let me go back to Mr. Abraham. Your daughter went to school in Ohio, is that right?

Did I? When we talked in our office a couple months ago.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, it was Ohio. Ohio University Bobcat.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. Yes. What was she majoring in?

Mr. ABRAHAM. She was going to be in marketing. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. We got a big journalism school there. I wondered if she was going to be a journalist. Well, I know she was a lovely young lady. Sheriff, your State is a sanctuary State, is that right?

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. Even if you wanted to enter into these 287G agreements that Ms. Pierce was kind of alluding to, where you can work with the Federal Government in enforcing Federal law relative to immigration, you are not allowed to do that in your State, is that right?

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. You decided you are going to do the right thing.

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. You are going to work with them, right?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Guess what? If we had passed the Bill that Mr. McClintock is the sponsor of, that we have already passed out of this Committee, you would be protected.

It says you couldn't face any kind of repercussions or consequences from the State if you would, if that law would be passed. Right now, you are just doing it because it is the right darn thing to do. Is it really that hard?

Ms. Pierce said it is tough to do. It is a cost on counties. It is basically honoring the detainer notice.

My understanding of what, well, I have seen these notices. It is like, hey, if you are going to release so-and-so, who we know is an illegal migrant, who was in your detention center or your jail, because it has been alleged he has committed some other crime, if you are going to release him, just call us. Give us a heads up 48

hours before you release him. How is that an additional cost for the county or the city?

Sheriff REDMAN. There is no cost. In fact, that is probably the most efficient way. What I have been hearing is, the Federal resources have now been reallocated, and it is all because of sanctuary laws.

Instead of going to the jails where it is extremely efficient, now they have to go out into the community, which is not safer.

Mr. JORDAN. Jeopardizing the safety of law enforcement, jeopardizing the safety of the public. Maybe just as importantly, jeopardizing the safety of the migrant, right?

Sheriff REDMAN. One hundred percent, sir.

Mr. JORDAN. Yes. That is why I used the word dumb three times in my opening statement, because I have yet to figure out anything smart about this policy that is now, as I said, in almost a third of the Nation lives in a jurisdiction where that is the policy. That is just crazy.

Ms. Gorman, I know it is not easy to talk about, but the individual who took your daughter's life, Jose Medina, do you know when he was apprehended by border patrol?

Ms. GORMAN. May 9, 2023.

Mr. JORDAN. May 9, 2023, during the Biden Administration. When they were letting in 10 million people.

Mr. Abraham, when was your, the guy who took the life of your precious daughter, when was he apprehended?

Mr. ABRAHAM. He reentered easily 2022, using false documents and aliases.

Mr. JORDAN. In 2022, during the Biden Administration. They let in 10 million people, right? Just let them in.

OK. Do you know what, do you know, Ms. Gorman, what Mr. Medina happened to say at his interview when he was, he was apprehended by Border Patrol. You know what he happened to say at his interview?

Ms. GORMAN. Yes, sir. As I understand it, he said he was not claiming—

Mr. JORDAN. Put your microphone, if you would, please. Thank you.

Ms. GORMAN. As I understand it, he was asked the standard questions, of whether he was claiming asylum and whether he felt threatened or scared to return to his country. He was in Columbia at the time.

He answered negatively. No, he was not afraid. No, he was not claiming asylum. We took him anyway. That is my understanding.

Mr. JORDAN. He gets asked the question, is there a credible fear of persecution or harm in your country? His answer was no.

Ms. GORMAN. No.

Mr. JORDAN. I just want to come to the U.S., because it is great, best country ever. He just wanted to come here.

The agents and people who were doing the interview said, "he is likely to not show up." He is likely to abscond, right?

Ms. GORMAN. Yep.

Mr. JORDAN. OK.

Ms. GORMAN. Yet, they gave him cashless bail after he committed a crime in Chicago.

Mr. JORDAN. After that crime too. I am getting to that. He gets charged a few months later, or sometime later he gets charged with a crime, right? Did it. They released him. They don't call.

Ms. GORMAN. Nope.

Mr. JORDAN. They don't have an 287G, because Chicago and Illinois are sanctuary cities and sanctuary State. He gets charged with the crime, and he gets released. Does he show up for his court date?

Ms. GORMAN. Of course not.

Mr. JORDAN. Of course not. Did local authorities ever once think of calling ICE?

Ms. GORMAN. No.

Mr. JORDAN. No. They didn't have a sheriff like the guy sitting beside you, like Sheriff Redman. They didn't have that. Then, this terrible thing happens. That is what we are trying to change.

Ms. GORMAN. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. I don't think, to me, I don't get it either, because it sure doesn't seem that hard to me. It seems like—

Ms. GORMAN. Commonsense.

Mr. JORDAN. There you said it. Commonsense. I actually think, I am going to get really political here, but I actually think this mid-term election is really, I said this in an interview the other day.

You could summarize it in two sentences. They are crazy. We are not. Right? Because this policy is crazy. It is crazy versus commonsense as the President said.

This is the most commonsense thing. Just work, let the sheriff work with you. He wants to work with you in California, let him do it. Not being maybe violating the law for doing the commonsense thing for goodness sake. I want to again, thank you all for coming.

Mr. NADLER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I will yield the four-seconds to the right and—

Mr. NADLER. I want to say I agree with you.

Mr. JORDAN. Well, God bless you.

Mr. NADLER. One is crazy and one isn't. The only question—

Mr. JORDAN. You figured it out on your way out the door, Mr. Nadler. That is great to know.

Mr. NADLER. The only question is which way?

Mr. JORDAN. All right. I yield back. I want to do this again if I could, Mr. Chair. I want to thank the Chair of this Subcommittee. He is the sponsor of the Bill that fixes it.

He has been working on this issue, and so many others that are commonsense things we need to do to make it work.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I hate to interrupt the Chair. His time, especially on that subject, but his time has expired. Mr. Onder.

Mr. ONDER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you to all the witnesses for being here today. It is utterly devastating to think of the damage that has been done in America's largest cities today, because of the embrace of sanctuary city policies.

Ms. Gorman, Mr. Abraham, I am so deeply sorry for the loss of your daughters. I commend you for your courage in being here today, and bearing witness to the insanity, the almost sadistic cruelty represented by the politically and ideologically driven sanc-

tuary policies of these jurisdictions that one-third of Americans are forced to live in today. Thank you. Thank you for being here.

Sanctuary policies create a safe haven for criminal illegal aliens. They embolden repeat offenders and they make our communities less safe.

Americans all over the country are subject to senseless violence. When State governments like Illinois refuse to honor ICE detainers, and criminal illegal aliens are released into the public without repercussions, there are consequences.

For example, even after the horrific sexual assault of a three-year-old girl by an illegal alien whose ICE detainer was ignored by the Chicago Police Department, the Chicago PD's only response was, "They remain committed to protecting all Chicago residents, regardless of their immigration status."

Tell me that the governing class in Chicago cares about Americans. They are putting illegal aliens first and American citizens last.

In Missouri in 2008, we had the foresight to ban sanctuary cities. Actually, we passed a piece of legislation called House Bill 1549. It was my Bill; it was at the time probably the strongest State law in the country to fight illegal immigration.

We banned sanctuary cities. We have a lot of crazy Left Democrat politicians in St. Louis, Columbia, Kansas City, Springfield in Missouri, but we don't have any sanctuary cities because of our foresight to get ahead of this.

Back when folks said you are just being an alarmist, you are racist, or you are xenophobic. Actually, I am happy to say, quite a few of my Democrat colleagues back then joined me in supporting that Bill, because it just represented commonsense.

We cannot treat our immigration laws with the contempt that we are seeing out of sanctuary jurisdictions in this country today. I just wanted to ask you, Ms. Gorman, if you had ever an opinion on this, what policy changes do you hope to see so that other families aren't subjected to the pain and just the misery that you have been?

Ms. GORMAN. I really am not educated on the specific policies. I have been reading a lot about them. Obviously, the sanctuary policies that they have, combined with cashless bail, combined with failure to follow actual Federal law that is already in place. I don't know that there really needs to be much that is changed. As long as you follow the Federal law, then—

Mr. ONDER. Yes. You are not a lawyer. You are not a criminologist. You are not a subject matter expert. This is just—

Ms. GORMAN. If they had followed the Federal law, my daughter would be sitting next to me right now.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Ms. GORMAN. I would be on a beach somewhere, not sitting here.

Mr. ONDER. If any of my Democrat colleagues have troubles with that law, there is a place you can go, it is called a legislature, specifically Congress, where you can change laws that have been on the books since at least 1965. You can change those laws.

Instead, we are going to take it on ourselves and our sanctuary jurisdictions to be like John C. Calhoun. We are just going to nul-

lify Federal law. We are just not going to cooperate with law enforcement.

Mr. ABRAHAM, what are your thoughts?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes, I agree. First, you can't nullify Federal law and then have no process to fill the vacuum.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. You want 10 million illegals apparently or whatever it is, or just 10 million immigrants, do it the proper way. Do it the way my parents did.

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I learned on their knee, right?

Mr. ONDER. Yes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. What happened in the prior Administration, that crazy unprecedented recklessness, and now you are objecting to correcting some of the past?

Mr. ONDER. Absolutely not.

Mr. ABRAHAM. It is just so dishonest.

Mr. ONDER. Absolutely.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I am not even sure what to say with that.

Mr. ONDER. I do want to echo the sentiments of my colleague, Representative Grothman. The United States of America has nothing to apologize for regarding our immigration policies.

We let millions of legal foreigners into our country. We give some of them green cards, we naturalize some of them who do it legally.

It is not fair for all those around the world who are waiting to do it the right way, that some get to jump the line. Some of those are criminals who victimize our families.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Our job, your jobs are not to incentivize, entice, and bring people like you saw at that Southern, was that compassionate? Was that compassion?

Mr. ONDER. Of course.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I saw those. That wasn't compassion.

Mr. ONDER. Of course it wasn't.

Mr. ABRAHAM. It is not our job to do that.

Mr. ONDER. Thank you.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The Ranking Member wants to remind you that—

Mr. ABRAHAM. We did not see a good environment.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ONDER. Thank you for that.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. For my time, Mr. Abraham, go ahead. Finish answering your question on my time.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I would just say that the job and the role of this country is not to entice and go out and pull in, right?

Create the best country you can. People will come; you have a process. They say about, well, citizens create more crime than illegal immigrants. Even if this is true—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. It is not.

Mr. ABRAHAM. As human nature, then you ought to assume the similar type of percentage will create havoc here. Filter them out.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Abraham, by the way, that is not true.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I agree. It is not true.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We have had a lot of testimony to that extent.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I agree. It is distorted.

Ms. GORMAN. We are not allowed to know that information and track it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. The illegal alien population commits crimes at a higher rate than the general population. We see that in the SCAAP numbers, for example.

One way they hide these numbers is by simply refusing to report illegal alien crimes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Exactly. Illinois doesn't, and they will never figure it out.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I do need to set the record straight on claims we heard from Ms. Pierce and Ms. Scanlon.

The fact is, of the aliens arrested by ICE during President Trump's first year of the second term, 70 percent had a conviction or pending criminal charges.

That doesn't include the number of aliens who have criminal histories in their home countries but not in the U.S., or aliens without criminal histories but who are gang members or terrorists. That is one of the games they play.

I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter into the record an article entitled "Seven in 10 ICE arrests under Trump have criminal histories," from the *Washington Examiner*, December 26, 2025.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Without objection. Sheriff Redmond, we hear several arguments from the Democrats in defense of so-called sanctuary laws. The first one you have already addressed, the question of resources.

Let me ask you another question in that respect. What is more taxing to local-law enforcement, turning an illegal alien over to ICE while they are in your custody?

Having ICE to send squads into the community to arrest that same alien because you are forbidden under sanctuary laws from reporting that alien to ICE?

Sheriff REDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Obviously, sending in ICE into my community poses some significant issues and problems when we are not allowed to cooperate and be there.

There are interoperability issues. The fact that we know our community, we know the players, and we know the neighborhood. If something goes down, then we are not involved, that is not safe for my community. The locals should be involved.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Without those sanctuary laws, you could turn that individual who is already safely in custody over to ICE without any of those problems, correct?

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct. Correct, absolutely. With those low-level offenses.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Yet, the Democrats keep telling us about the terrible consequences of having, to send ICE squads to arrest illegal aliens who could have been turned over while in custody, but under their laws, law enforcement was forbidden from doing so.

Another argument we hear is that honoring ICE detainees would discourage illegal aliens from reporting crimes. What is your response?

Sheriff REDMAN. My response is, I met with our local migrants in my community. We are a rural county with a huge winery.

They had a litany of questions for me. I sat down and talked to their representative, and after our conversation, they want to feel safe. They want to be safe. They do trust law enforcement. They do not want criminals because of these migrants—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. In fact, they are the first victims of these criminal illegal aliens—

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct, right.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. That the Democrats are requiring be allowed back into our communities. Is that not the case?

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct. The illegals will prey on their own people, because they know that they don't want to say anything.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Another one is that, well, a Federal judicial warrant should be required. How do you obtain a Federal judicial warrant for a State crime or for a civil deportation?

Sheriff REDMAN. You can't.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. We have had testimony on that from other witnesses as well. You can't. That is another one of the games they play. They know that. They use that as an excuse not to enforce the law.

Sheridan's murderer was in custody for shoplifting. Under SB 54, California Sanctuary Law, is that considered a low-level crime that forbids you from honoring an ICE detainer, shoplifting?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. What other crimes are required by law to keep secret from the public and from ICE? Burglary?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. DUI?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Welfare fraud?

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Yet, Ms. Pierce tells us these are not serious crimes. Another one of the games that they play.

Could you just walk us through, very quickly, how you would honor an ICE detainer if you had the legal authority from the State of California to do so?

You would get a request from ICE to notify them when an illegal alien is about to be released from custody. Is that correct?

Sheriff REDMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. You got a written legal detainer request?

Sheriff REDMAN. Correct.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. What would you do in response to that request?

Sheriff REDMAN. If we were able to contact ICE, we would immediately notify them and let them know this person is—

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. You would pick up the phone and call them and say, "We are about to release this individual unless you want to come pick them up?"

Sheriff REDMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Does that represent a serious drain on county resources?

Sheriff REDMAN. Not at all. We do it all the time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Is that worth the life—

Ms. GORMAN. Of my daughter?

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Of Sheridan Gorman? Many of the other angel families that we have here? Or Katie Abraham?

Sheriff REDMAN. One hundred percent.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. That is what they are saying, is it is not worth a phone call.

Well, my time has expired. That concludes today's hearing, I believe. I want to thank our witnesses for appearing before the Subcommittee today.

Without objection, all members will have five legislative days to submit additional written questions for the witnesses or additional materials for the record.

With that and without objection, the hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:20 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

All materials submitted for the record by the Members of the Subcommittee on Immigration Integrity, Security, and Enforcement can be found at the following links: <https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=119421>.

