

ENHANCING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL
COORDINATION IN THE FIGHT AGAINST
CRIMINAL ILLEGAL ALIENS

HEARING

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
OF THE

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT
AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MARCH 11, 2025

Serial No. 119-13

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

59-605 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2025

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia, <i>Ranking</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	<i>Minority Member</i>
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	Columbia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	ROBERT GARCIA, California
PAT FALLON, Texas	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	GREG CASAR, Texas
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	EMILY RANDALL, Washington
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	SUHAS SUBRAMANYAM, Virginia
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	YASSAMIN ANSARI, Arizona
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	DAVE MIN, California
ELI CRANE, Arizona	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
JOHN MCGUIRE, Virginia	
BRANDON GILL, Texas	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JAMES RUST, Deputy Staff Director
MITCH BENZINE, General Counsel
ALAN BRUBAKER, Senior Advisor
JON COLLINS, Senior Professional Staff Member
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JAMIE SMITH, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT

CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana, Chairman

PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania <i>Ranking Minority</i>
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	<i>Member</i>
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	WESLEY BELL, Missouri
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	LATEEFAH SIMON, California
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
BRIAN JACK, Georgia	<i>Vacancy</i>

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on March 11, 2025	1

WITNESSES

Mr. Bob Gualtieri, Sheriff, Pinellas County, Florida Oral Statement	5
Mr. Joseph Humire, Executive Director, The Center for a Secure Free Society Oral Statement	7
Ms. Kerry E. Doyle (Minority Witness), Former Principal Legal Advisor, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement Oral Statement	9
<i>Written opening statements and bios are available on the U.S. House of Representatives Document Repository at: docs.house.gov.</i>	

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * 8 U.S. Code § 1324; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Article, NPR, “Immigrants less likely to commit crimes than U.S.-born”;
submitted by Rep. Lee.
- * Report, CAP, “The Effects of Sanctuary Policies on Crime and the Econ-
omy”; submitted by Rep. Lee.

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Gualtieri; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Questions for the Record: to Mr. Humire; submitted by Rep. Gosar.
- * Questions for the Record: to Ms. Doyle; submitted by Rep. Gosar.

*These documents were submitted after the hearing, and may be available
upon request.*

ENHANCING FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL COORDINATION IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CRIMINAL ILLEGAL ALIENS

Tuesday, March 11, 2025

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT
Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:18 p.m., in room 2247, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Clay Higgins [Chairman of the Subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Higgins, Gosar, Biggs, Mace, Perry, Boebert, Lee, Bell, and Simon.

Mr. HIGGINS. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to the first meeting of the Subcommittee on Federal law Enforcement under the Oversight Committee.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

I recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

As a military and civilian law enforcement officer since 1989, it is my great pleasure to chair this new Subcommittee that will examine the issues related to homeland security, criminal justice, Federal law, regulatory enforcement, border security, and immigration enforcement.

Before I continue, I would like to recognize my colleague from across the aisle, Ranking Member Summer Lee from the great state of Pennsylvania. I very much appreciate her willingness to participate in this new Committee, and I look forward to working with her for the betterment of all America.

I would also like to welcome our Subcommittee Members. I look forward to working with each and every one of you.

The work of this Subcommittee is essential. In recent years, we have seen the weaponization of our justice system, lawlessness in our cities, and an open border that has allowed illegal drugs and dangerous gangs into our country with deadly results.

Throughout this Congress, we will tackle these issues and ensure that President Trump has all the tools and resources he needs to address rampant crime.

This Subcommittee will also work to ensure our men and women in law enforcement are properly supported and the American people have a justice system that works for them, not against them.

Today, we will examine the dangers posed by criminal illegal aliens, especially those who belong to cartels, and how coordination between Federal immigration authorities and local law enforcement can bring criminal illegal aliens to justice and make our communities safer.

During the last 4 years, members of transnational criminal organizations were able to illegally enter and remain in our country and terrorize our cities and towns, largely without consequences. These gangs and cartels are responsible for bringing a significant amount of illegal fentanyl into our country, resulting in the death of hundreds of thousands of Americans. These criminal organizations plagued our communities with crime, violence, and fear.

Our state and local law enforcement officers were often left to deal with the previous Administration's failed border policies without much assistance from Federal counterparts. As we heard last week, some of those border policies are still being supported by sanctuary-city mayors.

The previous Administration effectively dismantled the 287(g) program, leaving state and local law enforcement agencies, who were once active participants, without any training or support from ICE.

But President Trump will not stand for that. President Trump is using the 287(g) program effectively, which Sheriff Gualtieri and the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office participate in, to increase coordination between local law enforcement and ICE.

President Trump has actually expanded the 287(g) program, and, since then, all 67 sheriff-run jails and 10 county-run jails in the state of Florida have entered into an agreement with ICE to participate in the program.

This is just one example of the swift action President Trump has taken since returning to office to secure our borders, to go after the cartels and gangs, and, most importantly, to protect Americans by ensuring our Nation's law enforcement agencies can work together to apprehend and remove criminal illegal aliens.

For the last 4 years, frontline law enforcement professionals at the local, state, and Federal level, who have sworn to protect our communities and maintain our sovereignty at the southern border, have been forced to endure unprecedented weakness from their own executive branch—policies so misguided that law enforcement witnessed with horror as longstanding traditions of constant battle against cartel trafficking of human beings and deadly drugs was replaced by complicit allowance of trafficking, even corroborated trafficking, of human beings.

Thanks be to God and the American people, those policies ended abruptly on January 20.

Today, we are going to continue to call out the foreign gangs and violent offenders operating in our country and discover ways to enable law enforcement to bring transnational criminal organizations, the gangs, the cartels, and all criminal illegal aliens to justice and remove them from the United States.

I look forward to hearing from all of our witnesses today and learning what more can be done to ensure our borders are secure, criminal illegal aliens are apprehended and removed, and transnational criminal organizations are stopped in their tracks.

I am honored to yield to Ranking Member Lee for her opening statement.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you so much for welcoming me and our side onto this Subcommittee.

Of course, I would like to first say “welcome” to our colleagues for our first hearing of this brand-new Subcommittee on Federal Law Enforcement. This is my first time as a Ranking Member, and I am proud to be joined by a group of bold Democrats: Congresswoman Ayanna Pressley, Congresswoman Lateefah Simon, and Congressman Wesley Bell. We are ready to stand up against Trump and his Administration and hold our Federal law enforcement accountable.

I think since we are talking about immigration enforcement at this hearing today, we need to start with the illegal detention of Mahmoud Khalil.

ICE kidnapped this university graduate with a permanent resident green card and jailed him in the middle of the night. They shipped him off to Louisiana without informing his pregnant wife or his attorney where they were taking him.

They intentionally isolated him from his community and his family, all because he dared to speak out against his university and against the actions of the United States, which is not a crime.

Punishing dissent by revoking legal status is a dangerous and illegal precedent to set. It is the first sign of a government moving toward authoritarianism.

Freedom of speech, expression, assembly, and religion are guaranteed by the First Amendment for a reason. The Founding Fathers put it first in the Bill of Rights because of how important those rights are. It is at the core of the formation of this country, it is at the core of what it is to be an American, and it is at the core of any democratic society. Isn't disagreeing with your government the foundation on which this country was founded?

Trump is attacking all of these basic rights as his primary agenda. He is doing everything he can to take away the ability to talk about his actions, the ability to form groups to counter his goals, and the ability of the press to report honestly.

Every single Member of Congress should be up in arms over this blatant erosion of our fundamental rights. Republicans and some of my colleagues are simply rolling over and giving up their status under the Constitution as a co-equal branch of government.

This is a basic tenet that we took an oath to defend. Have we forgotten that oath we take at the start of each Congress, literally 2 months ago? “I do solemnly swear or affirm that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.”

They are eroding our democratic principles to justify literally erasing Palestinians to appease a war criminal.

Trump revoked Mahmoud Khalil's legal status over his choice to speak out. It is not a crime to disagree with your school or your government. A judge quickly blocked his removal, because there was no legal basis.

It cannot be overstated how dangerous this action is. If they can disappear someone with legal status, what is going to stop them

from disappearing an American citizen who openly disagrees with Donald Trump or our government?

If this happened under a Democratic President, Republicans would be screaming about it.

And given the topic of today's hearing, is Donald Trump expecting local law enforcement to police the speech of immigrants?

If Republicans want local law enforcement to act as Federal immigration agents, will they, too, be tasked with suspending the First Amendment for those who disagree, monitoring their social media posts, cataloging which protests they attend?

We are beyond just a slippery slope. President Trump himself said that this unconstitutional arrest is only the start.

This callous enforcement and chaotic approach to immigration enforcement is not making us any safer. It is only eroding our democratic principles.

I look forward to getting into what can make us safer, the policies that we can and should promote in this body and in this Committee. And I look forward to our work not just today but throughout the rest of this Congress to get to the root causes of crime, of just and humane immigration reform, and true accountability for our Federal law enforcement.

So, I would like to thank our panel of witnesses for coming in today, and I yield back.

Mr. HIGGINS. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I am pleased to welcome our expert panel of witnesses for today.

I would first like to welcome Pinellas County Sheriff Bob Gualtieri of Florida. Sheriff Gualtieri was first elected in 2012, and his agency has partnered with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement as part of the 287(g) program since 2019. Earlier this year, he was appointed to Florida's new State Immigration Enforcement Council.

I would next like to welcome Joseph Humire, the Executive Director for the Center for a Secure Free Society. Mr. Humire is a national-security expert who has studied transregional threats in the Western Hemisphere and very effectively has communicated his knowledge of that space. That theater of understanding is very complex. We appreciate him being here.

Additionally, he speaks frequently about the emerging threats of China, Russia, and Iran as an authoritarian influence in Latin America—a very important topic. We appreciate his knowledge on that subject.

Our final witness today is Kerry Doyle. Ms. Doyle is a former Principal Legal Advisor for U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. Ms. Doyle has served in several immigration-related legal roles during her career.

Thank you for being here, ma'am.

I thank each of the witnesses for being here today, and we all look forward to your testimony.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Thank you.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. I do.

Mr. HUMIRE. I do.

Ms. DOYLE. I do.

Mr. HIGGINS. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

We appreciate you being here today, all of you, and we look forward to your testimony.

Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statement and it will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statement to 5 minutes, as close as possible.

As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you when you speak so that it is on and Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes has expired and we ask you try and wrap up.

I now recognize Sheriff Gualtieri of Florida for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF BOB GUALTIERI
SHERIFF
PINELLAS COUNTY, FL**

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lee, and Committee Members. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today to discuss how our Nation's illegal-immigration problem impacts local law enforcement and how local law enforcement has to maximize coordination with our Federal partners to address this national-security issue.

We all know immigration enforcement is primarily a Federal responsibility, but the problem of illegal immigration impacts everyone. It is a problem for every village, every town, every city, every county, and every state in America.

It is a problem for a number of reasons, but at the forefront is the problem of criminal illegals—those in our country illegally who wreak havoc in our communities, those who victimize our citizens by peddling their dope, stealing, molesting kids, and killing people.

Another big issue is the people who come here illegally. A judge orders them deported, they are deported, and then they come back, again illegally, like the criminal illegal from Honduras who killed one of our deputies in September 2022. That guy was twice previously deported back to Honduras, and he came back a third time, illegally, through Eagle Pass, Texas, and killed Pinellas County Sheriff's Deputy Michael Hartwick.

None of that is OK.

Now, ICE's stated priorities are criminal illegals, public-safety threats, national-security threats, and those who have been previously deported and come back again, like Deputy Hartwick's killer.

We all have heard some local officials who say it is a Federal responsibility and that they are not helping ICE apprehend these criminal illegals. This is shortsighted because local law enforcement has to help ICE if we are going to be successful in combating this national issue. ICE is strapped and does not have the resources to do it alone.

It is our constituents, the people who elected us to keep them safe, who are being victimized by these criminal illegals.

Most jails in America, they are run by sheriffs. Sheriffs work, hopefully, with ICE now to deliver to them people who are booked into our jails who are clearly illegals and who have clearly committed crimes so that these people are deported and not released back into the community to yet commit more crime.

We do that through ICE's immigration detainer requests, which are accompanied by an arrest warrant or a removal warrant. During the first Trump Administration, we received about 400 detainees a year in the Pinellas County Jail alone, and in the first year of the Biden Administration, we got 14.

We currently have about 150 people in the Pinellas County Jail who are charged with crimes, who are in the country illegally, and for whom we have received ICE detainees.

To give you an example of the type of people we are holding in the Pinellas County Jail today on these ICE detainees so they are not released back in the community, one criminal illegal in our jail is from Mexico, and he is charged with possessing 20 different counts of child pornography.

Another person is one we arrested for lewd and lascivious battery of a child under 12 years old, and he is here illegally from El Salvador.

Another illegal is from Mexico, who we arrested for sexual battery or raping a child under 12 years old.

Yet another illegal is from Cuba, and he is charged with DUI manslaughter for killing someone while drunk-driving and then resisting arrest.

Another person is from Honduras, who raped a physically helpless person and committed numerous acts of lewd and lascivious molestation on a child.

And some say illegal immigration is only for the Feds to address? It is definitely a problem for local law enforcement to help address.

For 4 years under the previous Administration, no county-jail personnel in Florida or elsewhere were trained by ICE under the detainer immigration program, and huge numbers of criminal illegals, like these killers and child rapists, were released back into our communities.

When President Trump took office in January, ICE ramped up the detainer process, but 26 of Florida's 67 jails were unable to honor the immigration detainees because there were no ICE-trained and—designated correctional officers in our jails who could make these immigration arrests. We have been working hard on this, and we are close to having personnel in all 67 county jails who can honor the detainees.

One of the problems across the country is that ICE detainees, in and of themselves, do not have any force of law and they have to be accompanied by a warrant, and local law enforcement officers are not authorized to serve these types of warrants.

A solution is Federal legislation authorizing jails to hold criminal illegals for ICE solely on the immigration detainees—in other words, give the detainees force of law as opposed to simply making them an ask with no teeth.

This is a big deal to fix, and it should be done as soon as possible, because it would mean criminal illegals, like the ones I mentioned, will be deported directly from jail and not released back into the community to commit more crime.

Another important role for state and local law enforcement is a designated immigration officer program under section 287(g) of the INA. This is also known as the 287(g) task force program.

The ICE-aided task forces have not existed since the Obama Administration ended them in 2012. Thirteen years of local law enforcement not being able to help ICE arrest these criminal illegals on the street has had a negative impact.

People ask why so many Americans have died over that time from fentanyl overdoses. In Florida, during 2022, we had 6,230 fentanyl overdose deaths. It is because—that is what happens when there is a porous border, illegal-alien drug traffickers run amok, and a strapped immigration agency cannot get help from local law enforcement to deport people peddling this poison.

Law enforcement conducting drug-trafficking investigations with our Federal partners is vital to combating illegal drug trafficking. And this is where the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, or HIDTA, initiatives are crucial to reducing fentanyl and other drug overdose deaths. HIDTA provides much-needed funding for personal expenses, equipment, and undercover operations. Moreover, the HIDTA concept fosters powerful collaborative relationships that lead to better successes and ultimately saves lives.

Bed space is another major issue. In Florida, there are about 2,000 ICE detention beds, and they are full. As more local law enforcement officers come on line with the 287(g) task force, bed capacity will get worse because more arrests will be made.

The sheriffs look forward to working with our Federal partners to do what citizens elected us to do, and that is keep them safe. And we will do that.

I look forward to your questions.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

I am going to recognize Mr. Humire for his opening statement.

Ms. Doyle, I am going to be generous with your time when we get to you out of respect for my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, because, like most police officers, the sheriff takes 6 minutes to give a 5-minute speech. That is OK; I am with him.

Mr. Humire, you are recognized for 5 minutes for your statement, sir.

**STATEMENT OF JOSEPH HUMIRE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
THE CENTER FOR A SECURE FREE SOCIETY**

Mr. HUMIRE. Thank you, Chairman.

Good afternoon, Chairman Higgins, Ranking Member Lee, distinguished Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for your leadership on this issue, for holding this hearing, and for inviting me to testify before you today.

My name is Joseph Humire, and I am a national-security scholar who has spent the past 7 years studying a phenomenon known as “weaponized migration.”

For some, this may be considered a conspiracy theory or perhaps a bit too alarmist. But after the past 4 years and seeing an unprecedented number of illegal aliens entering the United States, then seeing the skyrocketing rates of fentanyl-related deaths—more than 100,000 Americans poisoned each year—and then you had the emergence of new and hyper-powered gangs, like Venezuela's Tren de Aragua, taking over entire apartment complexes and tragically carrying out the rape and murder of innocent Americans like Laken Riley and Jocelyn Nungaray, we all realize that something more nefarious is happening inside our Nation.

The United States is facing the worst border and immigration crisis in its history. Since 2021, our border authorities have encountered 11 million illegal aliens and an additional 2.2 million got-aways. Add another 1.5 million migrants who arrived in America through flawed immigration and humanitarian parole programs and you have 14 million illegal aliens in America in just 4 years.

That is larger than the population of 45 U.S. states or the equivalent of adding another state the size of Pennsylvania to the Union or, Chairman, three Louisianas.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as much as we would all love to have more constituents like those from the great Bayou State in this country, unfortunately the sad reality is most of these illegal aliens are not assimilating to America, and, in some cases, even worse, some of them are tied to the most notorious gangs, cartels, criminal organizations, and terrorist groups in the world.

If only half a percent, 0.5 percent, of this emerging illegal-alien population in America is tied to or affiliated with criminal and terrorist organizations, then we are facing a crime/terror contingent inside the United States that is the size of the U.S. Army and Marine Corps combined. If that is not a national-security, I do not know what is.

Now, let me get back to weaponized migration. I began this research in October 2018, when thousands of mostly Central Americans crashed the U.S. southwest border in the span of a few weeks.

I was actually in Guatemala at the time for a different reason. I was there training some of our partner militaries on counterterrorism and counter-transnational-organized-crime when I got a call from a friend who is a senior Guatemalan national-security official, who asked for my help.

So, to give you the bottom line up front, what I discovered back then in Guatemala is that the Central American caravans were planned, financed, organized, and steered by state and non-state actors to cause chaos in Guatemala, Mexico, and eventually the United States.

How do I know this? I know this because I embedded with the Central American caravans and interviewed hundreds of migrants, but, more importantly, saw firsthand who was behind this. It was a series of politicized NGOs from Honduras who were receiving money from U.S. and European charities but, more importantly, were getting guidance and direction from an anti-American adversarial nation-state. That state is the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, who worked with the Honduran NGO known as Pueblo Sin Fronteras, which is Spanish for "People Without Borders," who then worked with a series of NGOs and charities inside America,

notably in California and Chicago, to create the Central American caravans.

Now, this begs the question, why would the Venezuelan Government care about illegal immigration? The answer is, because Venezuela is a proxy of China, Russia, and Iran, they all understand that mass migration can be employed as a weapon of asymmetric warfare to erode national borders, steal sovereignty, and eventually have the United States collapse from within. Remember, China's whole warfare strategy is based on submission, to have America give up without fighting.

Far from a problem of root causes derived from socioeconomic hardship, natural disasters, or high levels of insecurity, which is abundant in all parts of the world, the center of gravity of the U.S. border and immigration crisis that enabled no fewer than 14 million illegal aliens to enter the United States in just 4 years is weaponized migration, an academic concept that has empirical evidence and an abundance of political-science literature behind it.

Weaponized migration is when state and non-state actors catalyze, manipulate, and/or induce mass migration to achieve political and geopolitical objectives. Weaponized migration suggests that criminal illegal aliens inside the United States do not merely arrive here by accident; they were sent here by America's enemies and adversaries.

In my written testimony, I include this map of our country. It is what I call a "migrant invasion map," because it shows the major hubs of where criminal organizations are spreading throughout America, moving toward sanctuary cities, and, combined with land purchases by the Chinese Communist Party, are all here to steal the sovereignty of our country. This is a national-security crisis, perhaps the greatest in our lifetime.

So, again, I thank you for your leadership, I thank you for holding this important hearing, and I look forward to your questions.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, sir.

Ms. Doyle, you are recognized for your opening statement for 5 generous minutes, ma'am.

**STATEMENT OF KERRY E. DOYLE
FORMER PRINCIPAL LEGAL ADVISOR
U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT**

Ms. DOYLE. Thank you, Chairman Higgins, Ranking Member Lee, and Members of the Subcommittee. I am grateful for this opportunity to share with you my knowledge and experience regarding immigration law and to discuss the work that cities like Boston, where I live, have done and continue to do to make their cities welcoming, safe, and thriving.

I bring a unique perspective today, having worked for ICE and DHS and as an immigration attorney and an immigration judge. I have seen immigration enforcement and advocacy through multiple administrations and angles since I became an immigration attorney in 1993.

I am here to tell you today that welcoming city policies work. They work to keep residents safe and communities thriving.

I also know that if Congress was truly focused on improving the safety of our communities, it would address our broken immigration system through immigration reform.

I graduated from law school in 1993 and went to work as an immigration lawyer in the nonprofit and private sector. I have taught immigration law at Suffolk Law School and at University of Miami Law School.

I served, as the Chairman mentioned, as the Principal Legal Advisor for ICE from 2021 to 2024, and in this role I oversaw the 1,500-plus attorneys and staff of OPLA. OPLA is the largest legal department in DHS, and its attorneys represent DHS, prosecuting cases in the Nation's immigration courts every day. As PLA, I also worked closely with ICE leadership, providing advice and counsel to both Homeland Security Investigations, Enforcement and Removal Operations, and ICE leadership.

The opinions expressed herein are my own and are not intended to reflect the views or positions of DHS, OPLA, ICE, or the Department of Justice.

To understand why the Boston Trust Act works, you must first understand Boston. As Mayor Wu aptly explained, more than 700,000 people currently call Boston home. It is a city of immigrants. Approximately 28 percent of Boston's residents were born in a country other than the United States, and Boston public-school students hail from 139 different countries and speak 88 languages.

As the full Oversight Committee heard last week, Boston is the safest large city in the country due to its welcoming city policies and dedication to community policing, which those of you who come from a law enforcement background know works.

For many years, Boston has focused on community policing. It is inclusive and effective policing built on trust between city residents and the police. It allows women who are afraid for their safety due to domestic violence to dial 911 without fear of being arrested due to their own status. It allows witnesses in murder cases to report what they saw, appear in court to testify against the assailant, and promote justice regardless of their immigration status.

Simply put, it means the justice system works for everyone, and the community knows and understands that.

Welcoming ordinances and Trust Act laws do not mean that cities violate Federal or state law. It also does not mean that cities refuse to cooperate with ICE in all circumstances. Rather, cities regularly engage in joint task forces and cooperate in detaining immigrants with the most serious criminal charges.

Nor do they encourage violation of the law. A review of Denver, Chicago, and Boston's policies all say unequivocally the cities will follow Federal law or educate city employees about Federal law. Philadelphia and California's policies have been upheld by the Federal courts as consistent with both Federal law and the 10th Amendment.

The courts understand that the 10th Amendment means unequivocally that the Federal Government cannot force states and cities to act in their stead. State and local governments set their own policies, their own priorities, regarding what crimes cause the most damage to their communities and what resources should be

deployed where. The 10th Amendment makes clear that these are states' rights and these are priorities the states are able to set.

The current Administration's immigration policies directly conflict with the successful approach taken by cities like Boston to make their communities as safe as they can be. To quote my mayor again, "A scared city is not a safe city. A land ruled by fear is not the land of the free." Yet this Administration's policies have promoted unbridled and debilitating fear.

This Administration continues to lack law enforcement priorities, resulting in indiscriminate arrests and detention.

Despite the Administration's promise to focus on criminal non-citizens, current ICE published statistics show an almost double-digit increase, doubling the number of immigrants without criminal convictions or criminal records arrested by ICE. The number of individuals in ICE custody without a criminal conviction is 49 percent, virtually half of those detained.

The current pattern of ICE arrests mirror the detention numbers. Recently, the Administration boasted of arresting almost 1,200 people in 1 day in Chicago. Analysis of the records of this operation were consistent in showing that only half of those arrested were immigrants with criminal records.

ICE has been directed to deport 75 people a day per field office, amounting to 21 total arrests a day. In attempting to meet this quota, they have arrested United States citizens, veterans, and, most recently, a 23-year resident of the United States with an extremely ill, wheelchair-bound daughter undergoing cancer treatment.

In the harrowing video, the mother is seen crying, sobbing, and stating, "They are going to take me," while the young daughter, who is undergoing chemotherapy, wonders what will happen to her without her primary caretaker.

Apparently, knowing it cannot fulfill these unreasonable numbers solely by pursuing criminal non-citizens, the Administration recently announced that they would start a new operation to target adults and minor children who enter the country together and have orders of deportation. After the families are arrested, agents will place them into detention before they are removed.

The separation of families appears to be driving up fear in immigrant communities for documented, undocumented, and United States citizens alike. Millions of families will be impacted and communities will be impacted by continued indiscriminate, quota-driven enforcement, including separating mixed-status families.

We can be smarter about our policies. As a Nation, we should be emulating Boston and not indiscriminately targeting immigration communities and sweeping up citizens, documented immigrants, and non-criminal citizens as well.

Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, ma'am.

Members will be recognized by seniority and appearance in the Subcommittee.

I now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questioning.

Sheriff, can you clarify for the Committee Members and the Americans that are observing this hearing regarding detainees?

That can be confusing to Americans that do not know how it works, so would you just lay it out?

You have local, state, and Federal law enforcement operating across the country. And when you have someone incarcerated in your jail, in your county jail, if there is a local jurisdictional authority—say, the county over has a warrant for an arrest on an inmate in your jail, what happens when that inmate is finished with his time, it is time to be released from your jail, if that county next to you has contacted your jail and said, “Hey, we have a warrant, let us know when you are ready to let this guy go”? That is called a detainer.

What happens when a local law enforcement contacts you about that?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. We turn him over to them.

Mr. HIGGINS. At what point? In the parking lot an hour after you released him, or in the jail?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. No, in the jail.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

So that is a detainer, America. This is the way it works.

What about your state police in Florida? If the state police have a detainer, a warrant on an inmate, do they come and pick them up from in the jail?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Well, no, because the state police do not operate jails. So, the detainees would only be generally——

Mr. HIGGINS. Would be a detective’s hold?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Sure.

Mr. HIGGINS. But state police, if they want that inmate, before he is released to the parking lot, they would come to the jail. Is that correct?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Yes.

Mr. HIGGINS. OK.

So, Federal law enforcement works the same way. If the FBI has a detainer on someone, do you hold them in your jail, turn them over directly to the FBI, not to the parking lot?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. All the time.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you.

And if ICE does that now in Florida, if ICE has a detainer, what happens to that inmate?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. We are turning them over to ICE.

Mr. HIGGINS. Directly to ICE.

In the jail, America, not after they have been released to the parking lot, good lady, which was happening in sanctuary cities.

So, the sanctuary city mayors will say, “Yes, we are turning them—we are releasing them to ICE. We are following the law.” But listen to what they are saying, America. They are releasing these guys into the parking lot, and when ICE contacts them, they say, “Yes, we let him go 2 hours ago. He was last seen wearing this, walking in that direction.”

That is not the way detainees have worked historically across the country.

So, that ties in, Mr. Humire, to what you brought up regarding weaponized migration. It occurs to me—I would like you to address this.

We have millions of illegals coming into our country that came into our country over the last 4 years in wave after wave. Policy—it was always known amongst law enforcement that policy caused that and policy could quickly fix it. We have proven that that is true since January the 20.

But these guys are already here. What have they done to plug into the criminal networks and the cartel networks across the country that our sovereign states and our communities across the country are now having to deal with? Please go into that.

Mr. HUMIRE. Yes. So, Mr. Chairman, there is a concept that was used in the executive order that President Trump signed designating cartels as terrorist organizations. It as a concept called “convergence.” And what convergence is, is when you get terrorist organizations, criminal organizations, an array of illicit actors converging together under logistics.

And what we are seeing today is logistical networks be erected all throughout the United States as service providers. I will give you an example. If you are an accountant for a major Mexican cartel, you are a good candidate to be an accountant for ISIS, Al Qaeda, Hezbollah that is also operating United States the United States. What this does is it empowers illicit economies and allows those illicit economies to grow and overtake counties, overtake states, and eventually overtake the country.

So, we are seeing a convergence of criminals, terrorists, and all kinds of illicit actors coming together, who may not agree, who may fight on turf battles, but fundamentally want the country to become illicit and—

Mr. HIGGINS. So, the criminal networks that already existed in our cities and our sovereign states across the country, how are they battling for their territory?

Are we seeing an expansion of violent crimes and serious property crimes push into parts of our communities that had not historically seen that crime, because of the expansion of turf, just the numbers of criminal operators battling for turf? How is that happening across the country?

Mr. HUMIRE. No, that is absolutely the case. I think you are seeing territorial control and territorial capture. That is fundamental to transnational organized crime. Territory is what they are going after. They want to capture territory, take it away from the state, and impose their own kind of criminal governance.

But what we are seeing is that put on steroids. Because when you add the state element, nation-states now using these transnational criminal organizations, you are seeing an element of ability to put these criminal organizations into overdrive.

I will give you one example, Venezuela’s Tren de Aragua. Just in the last year, we have seen it expand from 4 states to over 23 states inside the United States. That does not happen on its own. That happens because there is a government back in Venezuela that is providing guidance, direction, and resources to be able to expand throughout the country.

And that Tren de Aragua is doing exactly what you are saying, Mr. Chairman, taking over a place that never saw this kind of violent crime before.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes, sir. Thank you for that clarification.

My time has expired.

I recognize the Ranking Member, Ms. Lee, for 5 minutes for questioning.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think we need to be real about the goals of this Administration's radical and cruel immigration plans. It was shocking to hear, during the hearing last week, Republicans truly believe no one is calling for mass deportation, that only criminals are being targeted by ICE.

But we know that this is simply not the case. In fact, Trump's so-called border czar, Tom Homan, has vowed that the Trump Administration will apply "shock and awe" tactics to its immigration enforcement and will carry out "the biggest deportation operation this country has ever seen."

ICE's own statistics show that the number of immigrants detained without criminal records rose by 334 percent from mid-January to late February. That is about a month. Within the group of immigrants cruelly sent to Guantanamo Bay, 51 had no criminal record at all.

Trump and Republicans want you to think all immigrants are criminal and, therefore, they should all be deported. But the reality is that immigrants are significantly less likely to commit crimes than those born in the U.S.

So, now we are seeing some Republican-led states make their own—or, excuse me—the very existence of these folks the crime.

Sheriff Gualtieri, yes or no, Florida recently passed a law that makes it a crime for adults to enter Florida after entering the country without legal status.

Sheriff GUALTIERI. That is true.

Ms. LEE. You also have worked closely with the Trump Administration to expand cooperation between your officers and ICE agents, correct?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Yes.

Ms. LEE. In fact, one of the other portions of these sweeping immigration changes in Florida also includes bonuses to incentivize officers to work with ICE, correct?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. There was a provision in the recent law to compensate them, yes.

Ms. LEE. Thank you.

So, to recap, Florida has passed laws that target all undocumented adults, slaps them with a crime for merely entering Florida, and then offer law enforcement more money to ship them off to ICE custody. That seems like a lot of mass deportation to me.

Judge Doyle, it is fair to say you have a lot of experience in immigration law, from private practice to DHS, to ICE, and then as an appointed immigration judge. Does this kind of heavy-handed enforcement make our communities safer, in your opinion?

Ms. DOYLE. Absolutely not, Ranking Member Lee. As I discussed, a number of our cities are, in fact, perfect examples of what trust can build, what community policing can build, which is the safest big city in the country.

Ms. LEE. Does allowing ICE to enter schools, churches, and hospitals make our communities safer?

Ms. DOYLE. Absolutely does not. As I mentioned, and to quote Mayor Wu, “A scared city is not a safe city.”

Ms. LEE. From your experience, what approaches to community safety have worked, especially those with immigrant populations?

Ms. DOYLE. As I mentioned, community policing is really the cornerstone of a safe city. And that requires trust between police and the people with which they work in the community. It allows people comfortable to come forward and report crimes and work with the police to eradicate crime and harm in the communities.

Ms. LEE. Just last week, Republicans paraded the Boston Mayor out here for her city’s policies, as we have heard. But Mayor Wu made it clear that Boston has lower crime and is a safer city compared to many Republican districts.

Unfortunately, facts and data just are not on your side.

We need proactive investment and support for our communities. Parents should not have to live in fear that taking their child to school or to the doctor will result in their arrest or deportation.

It is simply un-American to turn these essential places into symbols of fear, as targets of extreme immigration enforcement.

While Trump and his Republican cronies are fearmongering with their claims of crime, drugs, cartels, it is all too clear that their mass-deportation agenda extends to millions of our loved ones, neighbors, and coworkers who have never committed crimes.

None of these policies will strengthen or help our communities. The only people who seem to be benefiting besides the talking heads at Fox News are the billionaires running the private prisons. For them, it is good business to detain people.

In addition to The GEO Group reopening a detention facility in New Jersey, it was announced last week that CoreCivic is reopening the South Texas Family Residential Center in Dilley, Texas, to hold immigrant families. Yes, that includes children. The center can hold up to 2,400 people, making it one of ICE’s largest detention centers.

CoreCivic alone stands to make \$180 million on this deal. That is taxpayer dollars going to billion-dollar corporations to detain families and children rather than being invested into your communities.

And you can bet that the priority for these private corporations will be making a profit, not treating immigrants humanely or responsibly. Maybe DOGE and Elon should, or could, set their sights on these private prisons rather than on your Medicaid and your Social Security.

Cruelty is the point. And protecting people is simply not a priority for this Administration. Our communities deserve investments and support, not terror in their safe spaces.

I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentlelady yields.

I recognize my colleague, Representative Gosar, for 5 minutes for questions.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As we heard last week, radical sanctuary cities are violating Federal immigration law by directing local law enforcement to ignore President Trump’s immigration policies. Law enforcement officers

should not be the ones wearing the bureaucratic handcuffs, Mr. Chairman, it should be the illegal aliens.

Cartels and transnational criminal organizations and foreign terrorist organizations are committing crimes and fueling the fentanyl crisis in the United States. The Wilson Center reports that trafficking of fentanyl in Arizona and California is a direct result of the Sinaloa Cartel and the Jalisco New Generation Cartel.

A January 2020 DEA report also credits these cartels at the same time with supplying of illicit fentanyl within the U.S.

How did Biden respond? In August 2023, he sent 140 additional Homeland Security Investigative [sic] agents to the southwest border—but only to assist with administrative tasks like hospital watch and transportation. We need these folks to enforce immigration laws, not facilitate illegal immigration.

But within just 1 month, the Trump Administration has seen the lowest border encounters in history. That means Biden simply was not protecting Americans by enforcing the law.

Law enforcement jurisdictional issues do not help either. Almost 30 percent of Arizona is comprised of Tribal lands and is an additional optional practical 280 State law or to exercise partial state criminal jurisdiction over Tribal lands. There is a significant lack of partnership among the Federal, state, and local entities.

Mr. Humire, are you familiar with SB 1070?

Mr. HUMIRE. No, I am not.

Mr. GOSAR. It was an Arizona law. It was very controversial. It might be before your time.

Sheriff, are you familiar with SB 1070?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. No, sir, I am not.

Mr. GOSAR. OK.

How about you, Ms. Doyle?

Ms. DOYLE. No, sir, not in detail.

Mr. GOSAR. OK. Well, it—Arizona wanted to enforce its own border, and they went up to the courts, and they said, “Supremacy Clause.” OK?

So, that is why I turned on the good old mayors. Their state offered sanctuary cities, so that is against the law to do that. That is standing law.

So, let me ask you a question, Ms. Doyle. Now that you are teaching. You are teaching, right? You are still teaching?

Ms. DOYLE. Not any longer, no.

Mr. GOSAR. OK. Well—

Ms. DOYLE. But I did.

Mr. GOSAR. OK. But how did you present that to your students? Did you say what you believe now is going on in Boston is OK, or did you say it was my opinion? How did you teach that? Because how you interact there really puts an institution in jeopardy, does it not?

Ms. DOYLE. Boston follows all the state, local, and Federal laws. They are not in violation of Federal law. In fact, Philadelphia and California’s policies have been upheld by Federal courts as well.

Mr. GOSAR. The Supreme Court?

Ms. DOYLE. Not to my knowledge. It has not gone to the Supreme Court.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, that is why I asked. SB 1070 went to the Supreme Court. It went all the way up to the Court, so it is the law of the land. So, you are violating the law. And you are putting your students that you are teaching at risk. So, I find it very offensive that we see that.

Mr. Humire, we are unique in Arizona with we have over 20 Tribal jurisdictions. Because Tribal law enforcement does not always have the resources necessary to conduct immigration enforcement, criminal cartels target Tribal lands, leading to increased crime and drug trafficking in Indian Country.

Are you familiar with the Arizona Tribe called the Tohono O'odham Tribe?

Mr. HUMIRE. No, I am not.

Mr. GOSAR. It spans 62 miles of the southern border. They refused to have the border wall put on their territory. And yet this is one of the major areas—and my colleague from Arizona will also attest to this—that they bring in human trafficking and a lot of the illicit drugs.

Sheriff, are you familiar with the Tohono O'odham?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. No, I am not.

Mr. GOSAR. Is your jurisdiction on Tribal lands different?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. No. We do not have Tribal lands where we are in—

Mr. GOSAR. We have got over 20 Tribes, so it is pretty interesting.

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. But your 287(g)—you have got so many people coming across there, you have got to use these programs, right?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Correct.

Mr. GOSAR. And it is—you are utilizing all the manpower aspects, right?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Right. We—in the jail and now, soon, on the street. We will be fully cooperative with ICE in helping them do their job.

Mr. GOSAR. Now, there is a difference between, Mr. Humire, there is a difference between illegal immigration and legal immigration, right?

Mr. HUMIRE. Correct.

Mr. GOSAR. And I am in favor of legal immigration, not illegal immigration.

Mr. HUMIRE. Correct, Congressman.

Mr. GOSAR. Because we have got all these people doing the right thing standing in line, right, trying to get in this country. I would have much rather said, if we need 5 million workers, well, this is your magic day. Because it is a violation, at least a misdemeanor, to try to violate this country's laws.

Mr. HUMIRE. Correct, Congressman. If I may?

Mr. GOSAR. Go ahead.

Mr. HUMIRE. There is a perverse incentive with illegal immigration in that it incentivizes more illegal immigration. So, what you are doing is, you are actually taking incentives for migrants to choose a path of illegality that is dangerous, that is treacherous, instead of choosing a legal path.

You can make an argument to reform legal migration, but first you have to stamp out illegal immigration.

Mr. GOSAR. I will have a bunch of follow-up questions for the record.

Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentleman yields.

The Chair recognizes Congressman Bell for 5 minutes for questioning.

Mr. BELL. Good morning, and thank you, Mr. Chair.

As many of you know or are learning now, I represent the First congressional District of Missouri, the Show Me state. And today I am asking my Republican colleagues to show me where their principle stands when it comes to law enforcement, public safety, and respect for law.

Local and Federal enforcement coordinate all across the country. Specifically in my state and my district, we see that all the time. And as a Member of Congress, but also as a former judge and as a former prosecutor, these are things that happen all over the country, in every county, if you will.

And so, quickly, because my time is short, Judge Doyle, did you have any comments on the detainer—with respect to detainers? Because I heard some information that did not seem right to me that was spoken.

Ms. DOYLE. Thank you for that question, Representative Bell.

Exactly. Detainers, immigration detainers—and the sheriff had explained this, actually, in his opening statement as well—are voluntary requests for cooperation. The way detainers, immigration ICE detainers, work at the moment is that they are voluntary. It is up to the receiving entity to determine whether they will honor the detainer or not.

And, additionally, some states like Massachusetts have laws or rulings by the courts that prevent prisons and jails from holding an individual past the time that they wrap their sentence.

Mr. BELL. Thank you.

And so, what I also want to get to is, in 2021, Missouri, my home state—and I did not support this, but—they enacted the Second Amendment Preservation Act, also known as SAPA.

Sheriff, are you familiar with that?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Sorry, I am not.

Mr. BELL. No problem, no problem. It was struck down as unconstitutional. But, before we get to that, this law declared certain Federal firearm regulations as essentially illegal in the state.

So, under SAPA, if a local police department cooperated with agencies like the ATF in enforcing gun-safety laws, it could face fines of up to \$50,000. As a result, law enforcement officers across the state were forced to withdraw from Federal task forces, stop sharing critical crime data, and limit their ability to crack down on gun trafficking and violent crime.

This reckless policy was not just bad law; it was unconstitutional. And it was finally found unconstitutional by the courts.

Unlike so-called sanctuary laws, Missouri's SAPA law was ultimately struck down but because it expressly countermanded Federal law and violated the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitu-

tion, which ensures that Federal law is the law of the land and cannot simply be ignored or negated by individual states.

So, now here is where the hypocrisy becomes impossible to ignore. So, just last week in this very Committee, I listened to my Republican colleagues argue at length that state and local law enforcement should step into the shoes of Federal immigration enforcement and do the Federal Government's job for them.

They insisted that cities undermine the rule of law by exercising their sovereign right to put public safety over immigration enforcement and decline ICE's voluntary civil requests—because that is what they are—to detain someone longer than the law permits.

They even went so far as to argue that cities and states that fail to meet Donald Trump's immigration-policy demands should lose all Federal funding.

The reality is that, unlike the SAPA law, none of these laws conflict with Federal law. None of them prevent ICE from doing its job or carrying out Federal immigration policy, and none of them prevent cities from cooperating closely with Federal law enforcement across a range of areas, as cities have been doing every day.

But when it comes to gun laws, suddenly those same Republican lawmakers are nowhere to be found. They actively supported the SAPA law, a law that actually did prevent the Federal Government from executing its policies by prohibiting local law enforcement from enforcing Federal gun laws and, incredibly, threatening police officers with penalties for simply working to keep illegal firearms out of the hands of violent offenders.

So, it seems like Republicans are trying to have it both ways. So, I am asking, where do Republicans stand? Deprioritizing public safety and burning the relationships that they have built with their communities? Are we—where is the consistency?

And I did not hear anyone say, oh, this is a problem with that law, with the coordination of local law enforcement and Federal law enforcement. But now, all of a sudden, we are seeing this requirement that local law enforcement do the job—not the coordination and working together, but the requirement to do the job. And so—

Mr. BIGGS. Point of order.

Ms. BOEBERT. His time has expired.

Mr. BELL. I yield back.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentleman yields.

Point of order?

Mr. BIGGS. Yes. The time had expired, Mr. Chairman. I hope I get that same extra 30 seconds.

Mr. HIGGINS. Oh, yes, sir. Absolutely. I had—the Chair had acknowledged earlier the generous use of time.

Mr. BIGGS. You are a generous—

Mr. HIGGINS. And I am honored to extend that generous use of time to my colleague Mr. Biggs for 5 minutes or so for questions.

Mr. BIGGS. You are a generous Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My first question will go to you, Mr. Humire. Can you discuss how the cartels have been able to build stronger illicit networks within the United States?

Mr. HUMIRE. Essentially, the cartels have been utilizing all kinds of revenue streams. It started with cocaine. It has moved to synthetics. It is now into human smuggling, human trafficking. And pretty—there is a range of illicit enterprises that the cartels are taking over.

They are not just operating in Mexico; they are operating all throughout the Western Hemisphere, in fact, the world. They are appearing in Europe. They are appearing in Canada. And what they are doing is they are creating an enterprise that is upwards of—cocaine itself, \$170 billion annually, a year.

So, these are things that many governments have a hard time to outpace in terms of the financial resources. So, our hope is not to outpace them dollar for dollar, but yet to understand how they operate and dismantle those logistics.

Mr. BIGGS. And when was the last time you were at the border, Mr. Humire?

Mr. HUMIRE. About 3 weeks ago.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Sheriff, a question for you is: Will you please just briefly discuss the importance of the 287(g) program, how you have utilized it, and whether you think it is working?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Well, it is absolutely working.

And one of the things that is important with these immigration detainees is that what Ms. Doyle did not acknowledge in her response was that, under policy, every single time that one of these, quote, “voluntary” detainees is issued, it is accompanied by an arrest warrant, an I-205 or an I-200. So, they are not voluntary, in the sense that they have a warrant that is accompanying them.

So, there are three models: There is the Warrant Service Officer Program to get these warrants served in the jails. There is the jail enforcement model, which is full-blown investigations in the jail. And there is the DIO, designated immigration officer, on the street.

Where we help ICE—and we are helping ICE to take these criminal illegals off the street. It is very important, and it does go to public safety. And it is shortsighted and it is wrong to have sanctuary-city policies, because it creates officer-safety issues and public-safety issues.

These sanctuary-city policies are saying that we are not going to hold these criminal illegals, we are going to put them back out on the street. And then ICE has to go back into the community and find these criminal illegals.

If they would just allow ICE to come into the jails and take the rapists and the murderers and the robbers and the burglars and the child-porn people out of the jails and deport them, they would keep them from going into the street.

And everybody is all up in arms about these collaterals, these people who do not commit any crime. Well, let them go into the jails and focus on the criminals, and then that would not happen.

They are shortsighted in these sanctuary-city policies.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

And you get to the point, which is, if you hand over the individual in the jail, everybody is safer. The officer is safer, the criminal is safer, and the community is safer.

Sheriff GUALTIERI. One hundred percent, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I just have to ask this question of you, Mr. Humire. Is it radical to open up your border? Is it extreme to open up your border? Is it “cruelty is the point” when you open up your border, and that causes something like 60 percent of every female coming across the border to be raped, and no matter what the age is, and about 35 percent of every male coming across to be raped? Does that sound like a humane policy?

Mr. HUMIRE. Absolutely not.

If you want to dismantle your democracy, you have to dismantle the sovereignty. A border protects the sovereignty of your country. The first step to dismantling democracy is to erode a sovereign border.

And, in fact, migrants are oftentimes the victims of all this. They are the ones that get killed, raped, trafficked. And so, the best form of migrant care is actually border security.

Mr. BIGGS. And, Sheriff, when is the last time you were at the border? Any border—Texas, Arizona?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. It has been a while.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Ms. Doyle, when is the last time you were at the border?

Ms. DOYLE. I would say about 10 months ago.

Mr. BIGGS. Ten months ago?

Ms. DOYLE. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. Which border did you go to?

Ms. DOYLE. I have been both to the San Diego Sector as well as El Paso Sector.

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Ms. DOYLE. And the northern border as well, I should mention—

Mr. BIGGS. OK.

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. In Seattle.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I was there about 3 or 4 weeks ago, myself, down at the border, and it is night and day. Because I have been down to the border—I grew up in what was in a border district in Arizona. It is night and day.

And what causes that? Is it because we enacted new legislation? No. I do not care what former President Biden said. He said, you have to have new legislation. That was false. It was a lie. What it took was enforcing the law.

And that is not what the sanctuary cities are doing. We had a nice discussion, your mayor and I did. I had a nice discussion with all the mayors. They all have criminal culpability. I think you misinterpreted the statutes, the three Federal statutes that I referenced last week.

The bottom line is, if you want to have safer communities, you control your border. You have to control your border. And you enforce the law. That is what has dried it up.

If you go down to the T.O. Res, and what you see there—and I met with some folks from there today—I will tell you, I like those people a lot, but they—through the Vekol Valley, that is the number-one human-trafficking, drug-trafficking, and human-smuggling corridor in the world, even now because we cannot enforce the law adequately in that 62 linear miles.

You want safety? That is what you profess you want. Then you better enforce the law. And that is not cruelty. It is not——

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, he has had his extra 30 seconds.

Mr. BIGGS. It is not cruelty. It is not, you know, in spite of the rudeness of my——

Ms. LEE. Point of order.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. Colleague across the aisle,——

Ms. LEE. We did not give Mr. Bell an extra minute.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. It is not extreme; it is not radical.

Mr. HIGGINS. If the gentleman would pause.

I recognize your point of order. The Chair has allowed Members on both sides to speak——

Ms. LEE. Certainly, but he was not——

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. In some cases, I believe, over a minute.

Ms. LEE. No, actually, he was only over 30 seconds, and the gentlewoman interrupted him, and he did not get to finish his thought.

Mr. HIGGINS. We do not need to check the record.

Ms. LEE. We can.

Mr. HIGGINS. The Chair is going to allow the gentleman to conclude his questioning.

Ms. LEE. And I think we should do that, but I do think that we should——

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman?

Ms. LEE [continuing]. Do things with fairness.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Biggs is recognized.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you.

And I am happy to yield back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, sir. I shall continue to extend that indulgence, including——

Ms. LEE. Oh, I just wanted to——

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. To Ms. Simon, who is now recognized for 5 minutes for questions.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you, Ranking Member Lee.

I just have a couple of quick questions.

Some folks on our side of the aisle know that I dig into the congressional Record daily. And in 1942 there was an executive order, Executive Order 9066.

And I am sure, Professor, you know that order.

You also may remember, if you have studied 1942, there was also the congressional act—it was an act passed by Congress; it was called Public Law 503.

Just like Public Law 503 and just like the Executive Order 9066, I would assert that, at some point, this Nation, too, will have to reckon with the shame of what we are doing.

You might recall, in 1942, that members of the Japanese community as a whole were interned based on who they were, because this Congress, at that time, as did the President, said that they were all, indeed, criminals.

They were interned in my district. They were taken out to the streets, with keys on their necks, and incarcerated for months and months and months, not given the civil rights that they deserved.

I have a quick question for Professor—or, I should say, Judge Doyle. Actually, it is a two-part question. I will ask it, and you can answer.

We have talked a lot about detainers here. I worked in a jail for quite some time, particularly around DV, and I know, even in the most progressive of cities, judges have a lot of power here. When someone comes in for—they are arrested and they are charged. They come in the morning; the charging attorney charges them. They are still in custody. They do not have, usually, a preliminary hearing for quite some time. But if you are arrested for rape, if you are arrested for child pornography, are you getting out that same day or a couple of weeks?

I just want you to just answer, if you are charged with a serious crime by a district attorney—I know you are on the civil side, but I am just curious—we are just not throwing people out.

Ms. DOYLE. And you are talking about in the immigration system or in—

Ms. SIMON. No. I am asking in the criminal system.

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. The criminal system?

Again, my experience there is less, but I would say, extremely unlikely that someone with a violent criminal charge would be released, in my experience.

Ms. SIMON. My other question is really around detainers. I want you—actually, it is a three-part question. I want you to talk a little bit about the detainment process.

You know that, in some jurisdictions around the country, the public defender's office, who is on the criminal side, is also working with the civil side. In the immigration court, we know that folks do not have rights to attorneys on the immigration side. I want you to talk a little bit about that.

But, moreover, in your experience, after you were pushed away from the bench, I am curious to understand your understanding of what is wrong, in part, with our immigration system, particularly the asylum process, knowing that there is over 160,000 people without papers right now waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting to be able to access what we believe as Americans is a right to an asylum process. Some folks in this room call them illegal and dehumanize them, but these are folks who are escaping persecution.

So, again, those two questions around detaining and really what we really need to do to break open a criminal justice system that actually works and an immigration system that is not broken.

Ms. DOYLE. So, to take the second question first, the system—the asylum system, the immigration court system, OPLA—needs additional funding. There are 3.7 million cases currently in the immigration court backlog. There are 700 judges. Department of Justice has asked for additional judges, yet they have been firing judges, inexplicably.

Ms. SIMON. You, too, ma'am, were fired. Is that correct?

Ms. DOYLE. Yes, I was.

And it is very important, also, that—

Ms. SIMON. In your court—actually——

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. We have more——

Ms. SIMON [continuing]. In your courtroom, would you ever see children by themselves without an attorney?

Ms. DOYLE. Absolutely. A number of the undocumented children do appear without counsel.

We had provided a juvenile court docket so that children would not be mixed in with adults and that the OPLA attorneys could put their eyes on them and work with——

Ms. SIMON. So, funding——

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. Homeland Security Investigations——

Ms. SIMON. We know funding, and we know that folks who are——

Ms. DOYLE. We do not have funds for any of that.

Ms. SIMON. We need funding to create a system that actually works——

Ms. DOYLE. Absolutely. And——

Ms. SIMON [continuing]. For folks. But talk about——

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. Ultimately, we need comprehensive immigration reform, because there has to be legal pathways. As Representative Gosar mentioned, there has to be legal pathways for legal immigration that the employers and that the individuals that are fleeing fear can utilize and such that our border is safe and that our communities can be responsive.

Ms. SIMON. Judge Doyle, you have 3 seconds. Talk about the detainers.

If I can have 5 seconds?

Ms. DOYLE. I am sorry. Can you remind me——

Ms. SIMON. The detainer issue.

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. What you wanted me to say?

Ms. SIMON. The civil rights around detainers.

Ms. DOYLE. Detainers issues, yes.

So, again, detainers are voluntary. They are administrative warrants; they are not judicial warrants. And that each community should be able to work together with their communities to either enforce warrants as they see fit—again, Boston, being the safest large city in the country, works closely, community trust, with their city and their community and their police and with ICE, also, when needed, but——

Ms. SIMON. I appreciate the example. I am going to have to yield back.

Ms. DOYLE. Yes.

Ms. SIMON. Thank you so much for your testimony today, all of you.

Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentlelady yields.

Congresswoman Mace is recognized for 5 minutes for questioning.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to keep it to 5 minutes.

Ms. Doyle, you taught—you are an immigration attorney?

Ms. DOYLE. Yes.

Ms. MACE. OK. And you teach immigration law?

Ms. DOYLE. I have in the past, yes.

Ms. MACE. And you were a legal advisor to ICE?

Ms. DOYLE. I was, yes.

Ms. MACE. Question: Do you support President Trump's policy to designate cartels as terrorist organizations?

Ms. DOYLE. I think that by designating——

Ms. MACE. It's a "yes" or "no." Do you support President Trump's policy to designate cartels as——

Ms. DOYLE. I support focusing on national security in——

Ms. MACE. Do you support President——

Ms. DOYLE. dealing with our immigration.

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Trump's policy to designate cartels as terrorist organizations,

Ms. DOYLE. I think it is important——

Ms. MACE [continuing]. "Yes" or "no"?

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. To focus on national security.

Ms. MACE. OK.

Should rapists—should illegals who are here illegally who rape American women and girls—should they be deported, "yes" or "no"?

Ms. DOYLE. Individuals with serious criminal convictions such as that are deported every single day.

Ms. MACE. Oh, no, they are not.

What about murderers? Do you think murderers should be deported?

Ms. DOYLE. Murderers are also subject to deportation.

Ms. MACE. OK.

So, there is a sanctuary sheriff named Kristin Graziano in Charleston County, South Carolina, who refused to work with ICE—refused to work with ICE. And she was letting criminal illegals out on the street who are raping my constituents, raping women in Charleston, in South Carolina—pedophiles, child molesters, murderers out onto the streets of South Carolina. This is happening in bright-red South Carolina, this sanctuary sheriff.

So, they are not being deported, because there are sanctuary mayors. You want to quote Mayor Wu as being this gift from God about safety. I mean, she was literally, like, praising or sending her condolences to a knife-wielding maniac trying to murder people on the streets of Boston. It is crazy to me.

And here, you have a law degree, you have advised on immigration to ICE, and you cannot even say whether or not you want the cartels to be designated as terrorist organizations. You are hiding behind some little lofty quote about national security, which is not really making a whole lot of sense.

One of the things I did want to fact-check some of my colleagues on today is this idea—and it has been said by multiple people, on-line and in this hearing today—that it is not illegal to come here illegally. Well, under Title 8, it actually is—Title 8, U.S.C. 1325, about the improper entry of an alien. It is breaking the law when you enter here illegally.

And our witness Ms. Doyle cited in her opening presentation the 10th Amendment, that it gives absolute control to states and cities and counties to handle the immigration issue. It actually does not. And I am shocked, as an attorney, that you do not know the law. Because it says, under the law, and in multiple places, especially in longstanding Supreme Court precedent—but the 10th Amend-

ment says, the power is not delegated to the Federal Government or reserved for the states. Congress's power to regulate immigration primarily stems from Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, and that is the power to establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

I am not even an attorney, and I could easily look that up. I think we need to have higher standards for those who are lawyers and also practicing law and teaching law to our students, because—there is a longstanding Supreme Court precedent, also, that has recognized Congress as having plenary power over immigration and not, actually, the states. And “plenary” means absolute control.

So, last year, I exposed a sanctuary sheriff who was doing, day after day after day, months after months—I exposed her for releasing the worst of the worst, the most violent, those illegals that were committing the worst possible crimes. I fought to get rid of this sanctuary sheriff, Kristin Graziano, when I had documents sent to me by a whistleblower, and I ended up talking to multiple sources about this.

I was one of the only elected officials that called out our sanctuary sheriff in South Carolina, Kristin Graziano. No one in statewide elected office—not my attorney general, Alan Wilson; not my lieutenant Governor, Pam Evette—if you are listening and you are watching, you stood by, silent, as a sanctuary sheriff let out murderers, let out rapists, let out child molesters and pedophiles out onto the streets of South Carolina. It was wrong. It was unethical. It was illegal.

I had 145 Democrats vote against my bill, the Violence Against Women by Illegal Aliens Act. 145 Democrats voted against deporting those who are here illegally, the worst of the worst—murderers, rapists, pedophiles.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back. I did it in record time today.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentlelady yields.

Congresswoman Boebert is recognized for 5 minutes for questioning.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Hu—“Humire”?

Mr. HUMIRE. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT. So, we have seen under the Biden Administration the failed open-border policies that really fueled and exasperated the immigration crisis, the illegal immigration crisis in my home state of Colorado.

And the previous Administration released at least 11 million illegal aliens and at least 100 known terrorists and, estimates indicate, 250,000 to 585,000 pounds of fentanyl into our communities, Colorado being the number-two state in the Nation for fentanyl overdoses—really, fentanyl poisoning. Most of these folks are not seeking after fentanyl but they are being tricked into taking it.

How do you believe that the Biden Administration's policies empowered terrorists and these terrorist organizations, like Tren de Aragua, to commit violent crimes against American citizens, especially in places like Colorado and Aurora?

Mr. HUMIRE. The Biden Administration's immigration and border policies provided a magnet for all kinds of criminals and terrorists to basically say, "Oh, the border is open. We are going to move in." And that empowered enemies and adversaries of the United States, including nation-states, to then steer those migrants to be able to come into our country.

And, Ms. Congresswoman, you mentioned the Tren de Aragua.

Ms. BOEBERT. Uh-huh.

Mr. HUMIRE. The Tren de Aragua is uniquely a phenomenon of the Biden Administration. It did not exist inside the United States prior to 2021.

In fact, most of the Venezuelan migration that was leaving that country since 2014 fled south, through South America. Because the Venezuelan Government was able to establish both a land bridge through the Darien Gap, a once-uncrossable border between Panama and Colombia, and an air bridge into Mexico, they timed that because they knew that President Biden was going to open the border.

Now we have Tren de Aragua in 23 states, including your state of Colorado. And they have captured, killed, and raped all kinds of Americans throughout the country.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you for highlighting that this is a new problem that we were not encountering before, with this gang presence in our country.

And now, recent reports have been about leaks taking place within law enforcement, sensitive information detailing the ICE raids targeting illegal criminal aliens.

How do these leaks affect law enforcement efforts to keep the country safe?

Mr. HUMIRE. I am familiar with the leak that happened in your state, in Colorado, that was a major raid. That was more than 400 agents that were deployed to basically take down the Tren de Aragua in apartment complexes.

That not only puts at risk the law enforcement officials that are engaged in that raid, but it puts at risk the entire community, because it allows that gang to figure out the leaks, the vulnerabilities in our law enforcement system.

What I am very concerned about, the Tren de Aragua in particular, is very adept at co-opting government officials. They have done this throughout countries all throughout South America. Because they use this later to be able to create media apparatuses, other kinds of propaganda, to defend their interests, which is through illegal migration.

Ms. BOEBERT. Yes.

And a question that I did want to ask you: How does it help or hurt when Members of Congress see this and engage in the leaks and prop them up and then even have special townhall-like events where they are telling illegal aliens how to remain in the country?

Mr. HUMIRE. Well, they are either wittingly or unwittingly aligning themselves with that transnational criminal organization's strategic objectives.

Ms. BOEBERT. Thank you.

Ms. Doyle, in Aurora, Colorado, we have been talking about the Venezuelan gang Tren de Aragua, and they were tied to incidents

at multiple apartment complexes where violent gangs—they had events like home invasions, shootings, kidnappings, assaults, and extortion for rent payments. And just last year, nine suspected TDA members were charged after a violent home invasion into an apartment complex and left two victims seriously injured.

As a legal advisor under the Biden Administration, did you ever advise anyone that we should be doing something to prevent this kind of gang activity in our communities?

Ms. DOYLE. I am unable to discuss due to my ethical obligations to confidentiality any advice I gave, but I—

Ms. BOEBERT. Are you not here as a Principal Legal Advisor?

Ms. DOYLE. But I cannot break my confidentiality for any specific advice.

I will tell you that we always focused on national security and public safety and supported the brave and hardworking law enforcement officers of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Homeland Security Investigations.

Ms. BOEBERT. Did you ever advocate for coordination between Federal law enforcement officers and local and state—

Ms. DOYLE. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Law enforcement officers?

Ms. DOYLE. Yes.

Ms. BOEBERT. Well, we have in Denver and in Colorado two different—multiple statutes that prevent that coordination.

So, were there conversations and are you still advocating, if you were, to have those sanctuary policy laws removed so we can have that coordination?

Ms. DOYLE. Each community should be able to determine themselves what works for their community. As we mentioned, holding Boston up as the safest large city in the country—

Ms. BOEBERT. Oh, I think our Federal laws—

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. Which does not allow—

Ms. BOEBERT [continuing]. Would keep our communities the safest. Our Federal laws are on the books and say that they should require state and local law enforcement officers to collaborate with Federal immigration authorities.

Ms. DOYLE. I think local—

Ms. BOEBERT. However, the Biden Administration empowered sanctuary cities.

And as a legal advisor, I would just assume that you were part of the empowering of places like Denver to pass these ordinances. Is that true?

Ms. DOYLE. Local mayors, cities, towns, and the states should be able to determine their own policies and their own approaches. And while we worked for ICE, yes, we always encouraged cooperation as far as—

Ms. BOEBERT. I believe Federal law should be followed at all costs. Thank you, ma'am.

My time has expired.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentlelady yields.

My colleague, Mr. Perry, Congressman Perry, is recognized for 5 minutes for questioning.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Sheriff, according to ICE—you are the sheriff, right?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. Florida, yes, Pinellas County?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. According to ICE, as of July 21 last year, there were 662,566 illegal aliens with criminal histories free in the United States. And, of course, those are just the ones that ICE knows about.

Now, I happened to be present at a hearing a week or a week and a half ago with the mayors of some of what people would describe as "sanctuary cities." Now, I found it interesting that none of the folks that were testifying, the mayors, they would not refer to them as "sanctuary cities." They referred to them as "welcoming cities." But that is another story. Maybe we will get into that.

But be that as it may, they all claimed that there was no correlation between increased crime rates and illegal immigration. Fascinating.

At the same time, none of them—well, they all admitted to not keeping any records regarding immigration status of the people that they arrested or that were arrested in their cities for criminal activity.

And I am just wondering—look, you are a law enforcement guy. This is your vocation.

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Uh-huh.

Mr. PERRY. This is what you do. This is your passion. What are we supposed to think, what are members of the public supposed to think when they see that?

The claim is made that there is no correlation. Yet it seems pretty obvious to me that you cannot know the answer if you are not going to ask the question.

Am I out of the ballpark here, or what is happening?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. No, you are completely in the ballpark. It is ridiculous to think that the people who are here illegally and are also committing crime are not a horrific impact to every community in this country.

And when you have these sanctuary policies—that are not welcoming policies, because even people who are here illegally who are not committing crime, they do not want to be victims of crime.

And so, it is disingenuous to say that we are not going to ask, we are not going to track these people who we are arresting who are committing all these crimes to know their immigration status, because those are the people that we need to get rid of. If you come into this country illegally and you are not here because of proper legal status, you need to go, and you need to go yesterday.

And that is what law enforcement needs to be focused on, and that is what every city should be focused on, is not to encourage, not to allow, not to permit these people to wreak havoc in our communities. And that is what they are doing.

Mr. PERRY. So, I suspect you have pledged an oath to keep the citizens that you—you are an elected sheriff, right?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Right.

Mr. PERRY. You pledged to keep them safe under the authority of your law enforcement position.

You know, what is the impetus for an elected official to not want to know—like, to not collect that information?

And, you know, we are the Federal Government, right? So, we do not want to be telling—listen, law enforcement is a state and local issue, generally speaking, as it should be. So, we do not want to tell you how to run your railroad here.

But what are we to do? How are we going to get the information to make good decisions and good policy decisions, other than just conjecture, if you are not going to collect that information? Do you have any advice for us? Do you have a recommendation for us?

I mean, the Mayor of Chicago said he is a welcoming city, and over and over again complained that the Governor of Texas was sending all these people to his city. But he was saying he is a welcoming city; he is welcoming them. And, apparently, he did not get the memo that those people were not forced to come to Chicago; they chose to go to Chicago. And I suspect they chose to go to Chicago because he was welcoming them because they were seeking sanctuary—and that is, sanctuary from law enforcement.

How do we—if we have local officials who are sworn to protect their citizens and uphold the law but refuse to collect information regarding the law and infractions by people here illegally, how do we get that information?

Sheriff GUALTIERI. Well, you cannot reconcile that. Why would you be welcoming to people who are here illegally and here committing crime?

You know, there is also 1.4 million people that have final orders of deportation with I-205s, which are the removal warrants, who have just thumbed their nose at the immigration courts, the immigration system, and said they are not leaving.

So, there are a whole lot of people who are not the people that they want to talk about, which are the people that have been here for 15, 20 years who are a product of failed immigration policies and are just going about their business. That is what they want to talk about. They do not want to talk about all the people who are thumbing their nose at the system, that have warrants outstanding for them, that are committing crime, that are wreaking havoc in the communities, and the ones that we are desperately trying to get rid of and to remove and to deport because they are a problem for all of us.

And, again, like I said, they are a problem for U.S. citizens. They are a problem even for those that are here illegally who are not committing crime. And to say we welcome them? That makes no sense.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentleman yields.

After consultation with the Ranking Member, I request unanimous consent that each side be given 2 minutes of additional time to question the witnesses.

Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Gosar for 2 minutes. And if you have 30 seconds to yield, we will appreciate it, at the end of your 2 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. OK.

Mr. Humire, you brought up NGOs. So—and this is an interesting topic for me, because I want to find out, you know, if you took any Federal money for an NGO, whether you got it directly

or indirectly—that we should know about that to make our decisions.

Would you agree with that?

Mr. HUMIRE. I would.

Mr. GOSAR. So, transparency is a big deal?

Mr. HUMIRE. Correct.

Mr. GOSAR. OK.

Let me ask you—I want to put it in for the record, 8, U.S. Code 1324, for the record.

Mr. HIGGINS. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. GOSAR. Are you familiar with that code, Mr. Humire?

Mr. HUMIRE. I am not. I am sorry.

Mr. GOSAR. It is bringing in and harboring illegal aliens—certain illegal aliens.

Are you familiar with it now?

Mr. HUMIRE. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. OK.

So, before I go to this question, Ms. Doyle, I think you misunderstood me. The only thing I changed about the immigration system is the OPT program. Are you familiar with the OPT program?

Ms. DOYLE. I am, yes.

Mr. GOSAR. So, what we did is we gave the richest of the rich the opportunity to bypass quotas, right? We allowed the big platforms to bring in anybody you want, there is no caps, and they got a 15-percent discount after paying these people a lot less.

So, they are not paying their fair share. They are not paying their fair share. Let me say that again. They are not paying their fair share of taxes, Social Security, and Medicare. Right?

Ms. DOYLE. When you are saying “OPT,” you mean Optional Practical Training—

Mr. GOSAR. Oh, yes, absolutely.

Ms. DOYLE [continuing]. For students? OK.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

So, it—and coming back to my question for Mr. Humire, that is a flagrant violation of law, isn't it?

So, I am looking forward to finding out more about this, about who is aiding and abetting who here. Because a lot of this was trafficking children, right? We heard Mr. Biggs talk about it—women and children.

And last but not least, tell me, does everybody qualify for asylum?

Mr. HUMIRE. No.

Mr. GOSAR. What is the determination?

Mr. HUMIRE. Political, religious, or racial persecution.

Mr. GOSAR. They have to prove it, right?

Mr. HUMIRE. Correct.

Mr. GOSAR. OK.

Well, I yield back to Mr. Chairman. Thanks for the opportunity to get that in the record, and I yield back.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes, sir.

The gentleman yields.

And the Chair recognizes the Ranking Member for 2 minutes for additional questions.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to take a moment to clarify a couple of the things that we heard throughout this Committee, particularly on detainer requests and the legality of them.

My Republican colleagues are once again propagating the myth that state and local laws that decline ICE detainer requests or prevent the sharing of certain information with ICE are in violation of the Constitution and Federal law, so I would like to set the record straight.

The courts have repeatedly affirmed the legality of these state and local laws. For example, in 2020, the U.S. Supreme Court had an opportunity to overturn the California Values Act but instead upheld the Court of Appeals decision that the law was unconstitutional. And the Third Circuit Court of Appeals has held that immigration detainers, quote, “do not and cannot compel a state or local government agency to detain suspected aliens subject to removal.”

I will also remind my colleagues that the Supreme Court has repeatedly held that the Constitution prohibits the Federal Government from commandeering state and local law enforcement, exactly as the Trump Administration is doing right now.

If I could ask a question very quickly, changing gears a bit: Judge Doyle, you were recently appointed under President Biden to serve as an immigration court judge but were dismissed.

Can you tell me about the immigration court backlog and how the actions of the Trump Administration, like your dismissal, are hurting the immigration system?

Ms. DOYLE. Yes, Ranking Member Lee.

As I mentioned, there is 3.7 million cases currently in the backlog. With the aggressive enforcement that is going on, that number will balloon. In addition to the termination of TPS and the parole status, that number will continue to grow.

The 13 people that were in my class that were all fired on February 14, we each represented the completion of between 500 and 700 cases in a year. That is between 7,000 and 9,000 cases that will now no longer be heard in the immigration courts, adding to the backlog and to the difficulty of getting people through the system, those that are eligible being able to get their relief, and those that are not eligible being ordered removed.

Ms. LEE. Thank you.

And with the remainder of my time, I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter a couple things into the record.

Mr. HIGGINS. What all is it?

Ms. LEE. I have an NPR article that shows immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than U.S.-born citizens.

Another report about the effects of sanctuary cities on crime, one showing that sanctuary cities are actually safer than others, specifically that, on average, 35.5 fewer crimes committed per 10,000 people in sanctuary counties compared to non-sanctuary counties.

Mr. HIGGINS. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. LEE. Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. In closing, I would like to thank our panelists—

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Once again for their testimony today. Have I missed someone?

Mr. PERRY. Do we not get the 2 minutes?

Mr. HIGGINS. Oh, we had the total of 2 minutes agreed to by unanimous consent——

Ms. BOEBERT. We are OK with that——

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Not 2 minutes of additional questions——

Mr. PERRY. Oh, OK.

Ms. BOEBERT. We are OK with that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. A total of 2 minutes.

I yield to Ranking Member Lee for closing remarks.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you to our panel of witnesses for coming in and testifying at today's hearing.

What we heard today was Republicans lumping in whole communities and cultures into one faceless label that they can blame all of the country's problems on. They can create the narrative that it is us versus them.

Republicans push again and again this myth that all immigrants are violent criminals, which is simply not true. We know that immigrants are significantly less likely to commit crimes than people born in the U.S. But painting them with a broad brush makes it easier to villainize them.

I know we are going to be spending a lot of time this Congress talking about immigration, and Republicans are going to continue to talk about public safety, as we should. I think we can all agree that we want to live in a safer world. I think we can all agree that we want policies that make us safer, but because of policy choices, we do not have that safety.

I did not hear any Republicans talking about tackling the root causes of migration or the root causes of global instability. Republicans know that mass-deportation policies do nothing to actually fix these problems.

But they are not proposing real fixes, because it is expensive—or, rather, it is quite lucrative for those exploiting the status quo.

If my Republican colleagues were serious about reducing crime, this hearing would have been about investing in our communities and addressing the root causes of crime. But these things cost money and take time. Instead, they are working to divest from our communities and to only fund ICE mass-deportation raids and tax cuts for their billionaire donors.

Real change is hard. And “us versus them” makes a better sound bite for Fox News.

So many of the crimes Republicans are speaking about, like thefts or muggings, are crimes of desperation. If we get rid of the things that cause the desperation, we could get rid of the crime.

Food insecurity, housing insecurity, a lack of high-quality public schools, our polluted air and water, having to work multiple jobs and barely scraping by—those are problems that cause crime. The true enemy is poverty, not immigration status.

We need jobs that pay a living wage so that people can afford their necessities and to spend time with their loved ones and their families. We need affordable mental health and addiction treatment to help those suffering. We need humane immigration policies that lift those communities up and address the root causes of immigration.

Until we work on investing in wraparound services—healthcare, after-school programs, and balance interrupters—we are not having a serious conversation about crime.

But the reality is that those things cost money, again. And in this age of DOGE, it is cheaper to “other” a community.

For Republicans, sometimes it may seem easier to send ICE agents into hospitals than to make sure that those inside can afford the healthcare they need. It is easier to send and station ICE agents right outside of your school, your child’s school, instead of spending money on resources to educate your child.

Children are afraid to go to school. One reportedly wrote a goodbye note to their friend, saying, “If ICE takes me, do not forget about me.”

If we are going to talk about criminals, we should maybe talk about the things that Elon Musk is doing, such as ransacking this country right before our eyes. He is slashing and burning government programs, putting our personal data at risk, and fattening his own bank account with government contracts.

Musk and other billionaires are the ones benefiting from keeping people poor and desperate. They keep your wages low and your rent high. They price-gouge and exploit workers and pollute the environment.

We should talk about how Donald Trump has levied steep tariffs on our closest allies, tanked the stock market, and refused to consider that his policies threaten to plunge this country into a recession.

But y’all do not want to talk about that.

This cycle of scapegoating marginalized communities is lazy and dangerous and does nothing to make our country a safer and better place to live.

I hope in future hearings we can focus less on demonizing immigrant communities and more on ways to truly better our communities. I know that that is what we want. I know that if you have taken the oath of office in this country, that you want all of our neighbors in all of our districts to live a safer life.

With that, I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentlelady yields.

I recognize myself for closing remarks.

I have been stating very clearly in committees and in my public conversations in service to “we, the people” for many years, reflective of my background in law enforcement, that effective policies that lean toward enforcing the law lead to safer communities and more economically prosperous communities. It is difficult to do business when violent crime or out-of-control property crime is a threat. Clearly, every American understands that.

And for the last 4 years, our Nation has suffered from quite a porous southern border. And we were advised that the executives—there was nothing they could do about it.

And they even created what they referred to as “legal pathways”—America, listen to this. They created “legal pathways,” they would call it, for illegal immigration. This is where a corroboration between the previous Administration’s Executive and the cartel human-trafficking business and drug trafficking—it is where you

saw actual corroboration between our Federal Government and cartel operations.

So, folks would ask me, how long would it take to secure the border if we were to enforce the law? I would say, if you have a change in policy, 2 weeks. In 2 weeks, we will have things shut down. Right? The cartels will need a new business model, man. Because they have been making a lot of money. I am talking about a billion dollars a week, by some estimates. And they have been building that business model for years, wide-open, running into our country. Our entire country has been the victim of cartel human and drug trafficking.

And now these—the illegal immigrants that are what we call in law enforcement “in the game,” if they are involved in criminal networks, I would tell them right now, ICE is coming. You can either self-deport and maybe make it back across the border with some of the possessions that you have got, or you can wait for ICE to hit your neighborhood.

And the local law enforcement and state law enforcement that is of a mind to participate with Federal law enforcement operations, I am telling all of them to get geared up, get your mind right, get your training and certifications squared away, because you will very soon be given the opportunity to join a task force with ICE in your state, in your community, to remove criminal illegals from your state and your community. And this is going to be an ongoing operation.

I must say, as part of my closing, that I think we are going to have vibrant, vigorous debate in this Subcommittee. As long as I am the Chairman, I am going to encourage that debate.

And I very much appreciate the Ranking Member meeting with me prior to this first Subcommittee hearing. And I am going to do my best to manage both sides. And I am just respectful of your engagement, Ms. Ranking Member.

And I thank the witnesses for being here today.

We have a lot of work to do. This Subcommittee is going to be a part of the restoration of law and order in our country.

And, with that, I will remind that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and to submit additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses for their response.

If there is no further business, without objection, the Subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:54 p.m., the Subcommittee was adjourned.]

