

STARRS Candidate Survey comments from candidates:

7. Do you oppose sanctuary states and cities?

- According to the Constitution, federal law has authority over state and local laws. That means that there shouldn't be any sanctuary states and cities.
- Again when you look at where the lion share of problems come it is with these failed ideas that literally put the country at risk. No federal funds should be part of the sanctuary concept.
- All a sanctuary state/city allows is when an undocumented person can use emergency services without fear of retaliation, like calling the cops to report on actual violent crime without fear of getting separated from their family and their children put in cages.
Say, a billionaire from New York that hires undocumented workers and they report him for raping/assaulting children, the cops would arrest the pedophilic billionaire and not the person reporting the violent crime.
- And i would cut all federal funding to an states and cities making themselves "sanctuary" harbors to illegals. See my response to #5 above.
- Arrest the mayors and governors on Federal RICO charges.
- As these cities and states are within the United States of America, then they should not be different. They should not shield illegals at the cost to tax payers. What gives them the right to give millions upon millions of dollars to illegals and not to help Americans who struggle? Want crime down and yet you want illegals to not obey our laws?
- Cities and states can not thwart federal immigration law.
- Each state and city should have the right to offer sanctuary. We are in danger to losing the state rights granted to us by the Constitution as our federal government tries to take control of all governance. Sanctuary status is only one area the federal government is trying to control. They are also trying to take over voting rights, marriage equality rights, healthcare decisions and separation of church and state laws. The people must demand that the administration adhere to the Constitution and protect state rights.
- Economically, the efficient approach is clear priorities & cooperation: focus enforcement on violent offenders, traffickers, and repeat criminals, and share data for those cases. I oppose blanket policies that force local police to act as federal immigration agents for non-violent residents, because that can reduce crime reporting, weaken community cooperation, and misallocate limited law enforcement resources. I support a uniform federal system that is rules based, funds border and courts, and targets criminals first.
- I am calling for auditing Travis County, City of Austin and Austin ISD's use of Federal dollars. Cut off the money, kill the beast. This should be extended to every woke county, town and school.
- I believe our communities are safest when our laws are applied consistently and fairly. Sanctuary policies where local governments limit cooperation with federal immigration enforcement can create confusion, complicate law enforcement efforts, and sometimes put public safety at risk. At the same time, I understand the concerns communities have about trust between residents and local authorities. My approach is to support policies that protect public safety, uphold the law, and foster cooperation between local, state, and federal authorities, while ensuring that enforcement is humane and respects individual rights. The goal should always be a safe, orderly, and fair system that works for everyone in Louisiana's 2nd District.

- I believe states have the responsibility for local law enforcement. Cooperating with the federal government is appropriate but that needs to be a bilateral relationship.
- I don't support shielding violent criminals from deportation. At the same time, immigration enforcement is a federal responsibility. Local police should focus on keeping their communities safe, not acting as federal immigration agents. The real solution is for Congress to fix our broken immigration system.
- I feel that areas should be able to make their own choices to certain extents.
- I have second-hand knowledge (family member) via my niece on sanctuary cities, and they must be defunded. I have visited sanctuary cities myself, and the sight is atrocious. We as Americans deserve way better.
- I live in Chicago and believe in sanctuary cities.
- I oppose policies that prohibit cooperation between local law enforcement and federal authorities when it comes to individuals who have committed serious crimes and are in the country unlawfully. Public safety and coordination matter. At the same time, I believe local law enforcement should not be forced to act as federal immigration agents in routine civil matters. The focus should be on removing dangerous offenders, maintaining trust between police and communities, and ensuring immigration enforcement is lawful, targeted, and effective, not political.
- I oppose sanctuary policies because they fracture our national social infrastructure into competing jurisdictions. My 'Blueprint for Socioeconomic Evolution' requires a unified 'crew' working under a single, transparent legal framework. Just as in the Scopes Monkey Trial, we cannot allow local dogmas to override the objective standards of the Republic. However, this unity is a two-way contract: the Federal government must always act strictly according to the Constitution. The Constitution is the foundational 'manual' for our national ship. If the federal authority oversteps these bounds or fails its constitutional duties, the states have a fundamental right—and a civic obligation—to act in the interests of their populations to protect the integrity of our democracy. Sanctuary policies are a symptom of a breakdown in public trust. To move forward, we must restore a system where the law is applied uniformly across all states, provided that the law remains anchored in the constitutional blueprint that defines our shared civic mission.
- I oppose sanctuary state and city policies because public safety depends on cooperation between local, state, and federal law enforcement. When laws are applied inconsistently, it can create confusion and increase risk to our communities. Our first responsibility is to protect the safety of citizens while maintaining a lawful, orderly immigration system. We can enforce our laws fairly and humanely while ensuring our communities remain safe.
- I oppose sanctuary states and cities that blatantly defy federal law. But I support local communities trying to do right by their residents. The solution? Reform immigration laws at the federal level. Encourage cooperation between federal, state, and local authorities. Create a clear, fair, and effective immigration system
- I oppose the old system where parties, donors, and politicians decide for you — and I support a new system where every vote I cast is bound to the verified will of the people, with a public audit trail to prove it.
- I support federal legislation to end sanctuary cities and states. Immigration enforcement is a federal responsibility, and local jurisdictions should not be allowed to obstruct it. Clear, uniform cooperation is essential to uphold the rule of law and protect public safety.

- I support home rule and state rule. And that means accepting that some localities may choose what their local laws will be. That doesn't mean they are breaking federal laws, but they are not applying state resources or municipal resources to federal programs.
- I support the opposition to sanctuary states and cities because the Constitution grants Congress the power to establish a "uniform Rule of Naturalization," which requires consistent enforcement of federal law across all jurisdictions. Having a patchwork of different immigration rules from city to city undermines the "domestic Tranquility" promised in our Preamble and creates confusion for both law enforcement and the public. As a representative for District 9, I believe that local and federal agencies must work in a transparent, cooperative manner to ensure that the Rule of Law is applied fairly and predictably. By ensuring that no jurisdiction can unilaterally opt out of federal standards, we protect the safety of our neighborhoods and uphold the integrity of the constitutional process that our veterans served to defend.
- I think that sanctuary cities should have to follow legal guidelines such that they do not support criminals.
- If Elected, I will introduce legislation to end sanctuary Status!!!
- If States and Cities do not want to cooperate with federal law enforcement, then they should not expect federal funding and support.
- Illegal immigration serves no basis nor purpose in or for the United States or any of its cities
- I'm running for Federal office. This may be a state/local issue, and whether I oppose it or not would depend on the specifics of what "sanctuary" entailed.
- In principle I believe that communities have a right to self governance, however if they are operating in violation of federal policy, it is within the rights of the Federal Government to withhold federal dollars.
- It is the job of Congress to pass and legislate immigration laws. It is the Executive Branch's job to execute the laws. Some do it, some don't. The new legislation needs to hold the Executive Branch accountable for the way they enforce the laws. It is also the job of the Judicial Branch to ensure the laws passed are Constitutionally Legal. States and cities don't get to decide this. It's the Federal Government's job to legislate, regulate and enforce immigration. Tho at this time it is flawed. Noted in question above. If immigration was reformed, this would be a non-issue.
- Liberals like big government; so now the federal government should be used: to fully cut off all federal funding for cities and states not cooperating with agencies merely enforcing federal law.
- Local governments should not obstruct federal immigration law enforcement.
- Local jurisdictions should cooperate with federal law enforcement on serious crimes, while preserving due process and avoiding indiscriminate enforcement that undermines community trust.
- Local leaders have a duty to keep their communities safe. Policies that refuse to cooperate with federal law enforcement—especially when it involves criminals—undermine that responsibility. This isn't about politics. It's about public safety and the rule of law.
- Local, state and federal law enforcement agencies should work in concert amongst one another, regardless.
- Make ICE work for it, they don't deserve Local Police collaboration, they got 2 different priorities

- My opposition extends to those who give shelter and comfort to those that have entered in violation of the law. Sanctuary states and cities are acting against the very oath, to "defend and protect...the Constitution..." as well as their civic duties to its citizens by favoring those not citizens but illegally here.
- No provided they establish a Patriotic Pathway to Taxpaying and Citizenship...
- No, I do not oppose sanctuary states and cities. I support states rights, which includes the right of states and cities to enact sanctuary policies. States and localities are under no constitutional obligation to assist federal immigration enforcement. Local authorities can choose whether or not to cooperate, focus on local crime, and release individuals according to their own policies and laws. I fully respect a state's or city's decision to tell federal agencies they will not help with immigration matters.
- Nothing good has come from it. Higher crime, higher taxes, higher fraud.
- Of course I want to live in a city where my undocumented neighbor does not hesitate to call the fire department because he knows he wont be hassled over a civil infraction.
- One law for all.
- Our entire country was founded on the principle of being a sanctuary to anyone and everyone willing to work for the American Dream. The fact sanctuary states or cities exist, goes back to the betrayal of our own government against the people who believed in that very promise.
- Our nation's laws must be followed at all levels.
- Policies that obstruct federal immigration enforcement or shield violent offenders from accountability undermine the rule of law and put communities at risk. Immigration enforcement is a federal constitutional responsibility under Article I, Section 8, and local leaders must not interfere with lawful federal efforts. I oppose sanctuary policies that prevent cooperation with federal authorities or result in releasing violent offenders back into our neighborhoods. Protecting families must always come before politics. My priority is clear: secure the border, enforce the law, remove violent criminals, and maintain a lawful immigration system that rewards those who follow the rules.
- Rule of law should be national.
- Sanctuary cities and states should be eradicated. Leadership should be removed and replaced as part of a broader reconstruction effort. Alternatively, zero federal funding should be awarded to those states and the funds should be redirected toward outbound traffic enforcement. Ie. Defund California and use those funds to put ICE at every outbound highway.
- Sanctuary cities are a mechanism of Gerrymandering on a national scale, using the census to distort Federal representation for non-citizens.
- Sanctuary cities provide grave public safety risks. Under no circumstance should the state, local, and federal governments NOT be coordinating to make our cities and states safer places. It is unfortunate and unacceptable that some states like New York are choosing politics over public safety on the sanctuary city front and not sharing data with the federal government to catch the worst of worst offenders. I will continue to publicly and privately push back on this.
- Sanctuary cities violate the federal Supremacy Clause by subverting federal law. In my state of New Jersey, eight years of sanctuary statehood have left law enforcement and residents less safe and contributed to an overall disrespect for the administration of the law.

- Sanctuary city and state policies create real tension between local governments and federal immigration authorities, and that confusion doesn't help anyone. When jurisdictions limit cooperation with federal agencies, it can complicate public safety efforts and put added financial pressure on local taxpayers who are already stretched thin. I understand the argument about building community trust, but we also have to respect the rule of law and ensure policies are applied consistently across the country. Immigration reform should be handled clearly and responsibly at the federal level so states and cities aren't left trying to navigate conflicting priorities on their own.
- Sanctuary is nothing more than a term for not supporting federal law enforcement. Criminals love these states and cities. Child pornographers, child rapists, murderers, rapists, are all well protected in these areas.
- Sanctuary policies endanger Texans, undermine law enforcement, and violate federal law.
- Sanctuary policies put communities at risk by shielding criminals and obstructing federal law enforcement. I support cooperation between local and federal authorities to uphold the law.
- Sanctuary policies put politics ahead of public safety. Local governments should not interfere with federal immigration enforcement, especially when it comes to criminals. We need cooperation between agencies to keep communities safe, and yes I live in a state that just codified sanctuary laws. NJ taxpayers pay 7.3 billion a year for this. This is a big issue for me.
- Sanctuary policies should be made illegal; sanctuary states and cities should be punished financially for sanctuary policies.
- Sanctuary states and cities are actively violating federal law by shielding illegal aliens from deportation. If elected, I will seek to have all federal funding disbursement be contingent on compliance with federal immigration law.
- Sanctuary states and cities are against out laws
- Sanctuary states and cities are creating third world areas in the US, allowing socialism to creep into our great country, weakening our faith, families, and our freedom. It needs to end.
- Sanctuary states and cities are ignoring federal law and should be defunded immediately
- Sanctuary states and cities are the result of local communities defining for themselves the immigration policy they think their citizens want. Better federal law will prevent the need for rogue city- and state-level actions.
- State legislatures and city councils that pass laws to oppose immigration law should be arrested for seditious conspiracy. Anyone who (including local officials) takes action to block removal of these foreign invaders should be tried for treason.
- States and cities are different levels of government from the federal level. I am running for federal level office.
- The job of apprehending, detaining, and deporting undocumented immigrants is not a task that is funded in local and state police budgets nor does it improve their ability to accomplish their agency's goal of maintaining public safety.
- The people, states, and the federal government are the structural make-up of the United States. The creation of the Constitution hinged on keeping these three areas in balance. States have the right to not enforce, or cooperate, with the federal government. They may not break the law and impede federal officials. But they do not have to cooperate. This goes back to many areas in our history, but the one that stands out is the Fugitive

Slave Act of 1850. This federal law required that all escaped slaves, upon capture, be returned to the slave-owner and that officials and citizens of free states had to cooperate. In response, free states in the north passed legislation stopping state support for this federal act.

- The Preamble says that Liberty is to be secured by the Constitution, as well as Domestic Tranquility, and the Common Defense, and the common welfare is to be upheld. Having cities and states have some sort of different rights than States Rights goes against the Constitution.
- There shouldn't even be such a thing and I know I'm a Democrat saying that, but the fact is if they want to keep people safe, they need to have people who are legally allowed to be here and who are not committing crimes and if they want to keep people here and families together, then there it needs to be a modification of the immigration act to allow for exemptions so that they can legally be here instead of harming states and cities by creating a toxic environment underneath the guise of sanctuary.
- This is a violation of federal law. We must use the RICO statute to go after them.
- We are a nation of laws — and that includes constitutional law. While immigration law should be enforced, the federal government cannot violate people's constitutional rights in the process. Due process, equal protection, and lawful treatment apply to everyone under U.S. jurisdiction. We also have a legal asylum system that must be respected. Any enforcement effort that ignores constitutional protections undermines the very rule of law it claims to defend. Enforcement must be legal, constitutional, and humane.
- We banned them in Texas while I was in the Texas Legislature.
- We must protect our American citizens and vets first!
- We need to stop calling them "sanctuary states and cities" and call them what they are "terrorist states and cities."
- When it comes to federal policy such as national defense, and authorization to be in a country, cities cannot override what has been decided by our national legislature. Congress was elected by the people to represent them, allowing cities to undermine their statutes, undermines the authority of the U.S. Congress.
- While I personally oppose sanctuary policies, I respect that the 10th Amendment prohibits the federal government from commandeering state resources, meaning California has the same sovereign right to set its local enforcement priorities as Kansas does to ban them, provided those states operate within the bounds of the U.S. Constitution.
- Yes, but these cities would be non-existent with the strong dollar. They came into existence only after 1999 when entering the era of the weak dollar (wokism). Again, pursuant to Answer 6, see my letter to Mayor Mamdani. It's the public not understanding the weak dollar\monetary policy that led to our state of affairs today. The global elites become "nearly impotent" with the strong U.S. dollar.
- Yes, I oppose sanctuary states and cities. We saw it firsthand here in the Lowcountry with a former Charleston County sheriff refusing to cooperate with ICE. Policies that limit cooperation between local jurisdictions and federal immigration authorities undermine the rule of law and make it harder to enforce our immigration system effectively. Local and state governments should work in partnership with federal law enforcement to ensure that individuals who are in the country illegally, particularly those who commit crimes, can be properly identified and, when appropriate, removed.
- Yes, there should not be any city or state that goes against federal law.

- Yes. Sanctuary cities and states should be unconstitutional.
- Yes. Sanctuary policies undermine federal immigration law and can prevent cooperation between local law enforcement and federal authorities.