

# AMERICAN VOICES MATTER

## A Stark Comparison Of Immigration Policies by Two United States Presidents

### ***A Guide to the Biden –> Trump Transition***

***by: Brenda Lee***

Since President Trump took office on January 20, 2025, there has been significant changes to immigration policies that reflect a shift towards stricter enforcement and regulations. A stark contrast in immigration policy than our previous administration.

Within hours of reciting his Oath of Office, Trump immediately went to work for the American people in an effort to fulfill the mandate given to him by voters on November 5, 2024; to regain control of our borders.

Through Executive Order, He immediately suspended the entry of anyone “engaged in the invasion” of the United States at the US-Mexico border under provision 212(F). This Executive Order asserts that Migration via the US-Mexico Border will now constitute an “invasion, and he also eliminated the use of the controversial Biden Era CBP1 App.

In 2024, The CBP1 app was paused due to an internal report that revealed more than 100,000 applicants were supported by approximately 3200 US sponsors identified in the report as serial sponsors. However, the Biden Administration restarted the program despite not completing the review of all the potentially fraudulent applications. The CBP1 app was plagued with issues, and there were around 270,000 people waiting to enter the United States through the use of this app when DHS shut it down.

### **United States Border Security & Military Personnel**

President Trump has signed several executive orders that further tightens immigration policies. He immediately revoked all of Biden’s immigration policies, challenged the constitutional guarantee of birthright citizenship, and he made a decisive move to bolster border security by deploying approximately 1,500 troops to the U.S.-Mexico border.

An action that is part of a broader strategy to address what he describes as a national security crisis that stems from illegal immigration and drug trafficking, and the deployment of these troops aims to support the efforts of Border Patrol as well as other law enforcement agencies in an effort to provide logistical assistance, surveillance, and intelligence gathering.

The new administration argues that the presence of military personnel will deter illegal crossings and enhance the security of the border as well as reflect his commitment to fulfill his campaign promises related to immigration reform and national security.

### **The Public Charge Rule & Asylum Ban**

Another notable change includes the reinstatement of the “public charge” rule, which makes it more difficult for immigrants who may rely on public assistance to obtain green cards. This policy aims to deter low-income immigrants from seeking residency here in the United States, and President Trump has ordered the Office of Management & Budget to ensure that no public benefits are provided to illegal migrants. This will ultimately lead to a decrease in the U.S. immigrant population as we remove these incentives.

President Trump also implemented an immediate Asylum ban. U.S. refugee admissions have been halted until the US government creates a new program that meets their criteria with the Homeland Security Secretary's responsible to provide progress reports on it every 90 days. The Humanitarian Parole program known as CHNV (Cuban, Haitian, Nicaraguan, and Venezuelan parole Program) is also at risk, as he redirected the Department of Homeland Security to end another Biden Era parole program. On January 21, 2025, DHS Announced that officials have been instructed to Phase it out, along with several others.

President Trump has also increased funding and resources allocated to border security. This includes the construction of barriers and enhanced surveillance technologies that aim to reduce illegal crossings and bolster enforcement against illegal migrants. By declaring a National Emergency, the Department of Defense has the legal authority to redirect military funds for these efforts.

### **Immigration Policy Changes: Handling Drug Cartels and the American Drug Crisis**

Trump has also taken significant steps to address the growing influence and violence of drug cartels in the United States and abroad. He has instructed the U.S. State Department to recommend within 14 days whether to designate the Cartels as foreign terrorist organizations. This designation aims to enhance the government's ability to combat these groups through increased law enforcement resources, international cooperation, and prepares for the possible use of the Alien Enemies Act.

By officially categorizing the cartels in this manner, Trump seeks to draw attention to their brutal tactics, which include violence against civilians, corruption, and their role in the American Drug crisis. The designation also opens the door for more stringent sanctions and legal measures against cartel members and reflects a tough-on-crime approach that resonates with his base and aims to protect communities from the devastating impacts of drug trafficking and related violence.

These policies are seen as common sense measures that were avoided by the previous administration. The Biden administration favored open borders, and they unfortunately prioritized it over our nations public safety, so naturally this led to voter dissatisfaction and ultimately a shift in leadership. The American people grew tired and voted against it.

### **Immigration Reform and its Impacts to American Sanctuary Cities**

As a result of all these changes to immigration, these decisions will affect the lives of many who seek Asylum, and the overall immigration landscape will be influenced as tensions rise between federal policies and the practices of sanctuary cities like New York City, Chicago, and Denver.

The implications of these executive orders will continue to shape the discourse around immigration and the responsibilities of local jurisdictions to accommodate migrants. In Chicago, some residents have volunteered to help ICE with deportations, and a town called Huntington in California has voted to end Sanctuary City Status.

New York City, a sanctuary city that prides itself on its inclusive policies will also feel the profound impact of these changes. Mayor Eric Adams has reiterated his commitment to protect illegal migrants, and he has also emphasized that his administration will not cooperate with ICE, (Immigration and Customs Enforcement) a move expected, given the city's sanctuary status.

As NYC continues to provide a safe haven for illegal migrants and modern day Asylum seekers, heightened tensions between federal authorities and local law enforcement are likely to arise. Communities will definitely see increased fear and uncertainty because many of NYC communities host and house illegal migrants as residents, so this could potentially affect their access to essential services and participation in their civic life.

The city's infrastructure and support systems has to adapt to address the unique challenges posed by these federal policies, and blue cities across America will definitely have to be creative to meet the needs of their sanctuary city requirements. Amid the change of national landscapes, this can foster an environment where the rights of illegal aliens are prioritized again over native NYC City residents. A practice that New Yorker's have become accustomed with under Democratic policies. If New Yorkers want change, they have to change the City Council.

A recent memo distributed within New York City has highlighted the city's stance on the cooperation between schools and hospitals with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) in regard to civil immigration matters.

The memo underscores the importance to maintain a safe and welcoming environments for all residents, regardless of their immigration status. It emphasizes that educational institutions and healthcare facilities should prioritize the well-being and rights of students and patients over immigration enforcement and prohibits staff from asking about immigration status or assisting ICE in enforcement actions.

This directive aims to foster trust within immigrant communities, and encourages illegal aliens to seek education and healthcare without fear of deportation. It also reflects New York City's commitment to being a sanctuary for all its residents in the face of increased federal immigration crackdowns. Residents of New York City and Sanctuary Cities alike who have grown tired of the costs associated with illegal immigration and the rise in crime in their cities will definitely face challenges to see mass deportations. However, the impact of these federal immigration policies will likely contribute to some change.

## **The Remain in Mexico Policy**

The Remain in Mexico Policy, a policy formally known as the Migrant Protection Protocols (MPP) that was disregarded by the Biden Administration, has been reintroduced by President Trump and will now be reinforced. This policy will now require asylum seekers who arrive at the U.S.-Mexico border to wait in Mexico while their immigration cases are processed in U.S. courts.

The reinstatement of this policy aims to deter individuals from attempting to cross the border, as it places the burden of living in Mexico on those who seek asylum, and the new administration argues that this approach is necessary to address the overwhelming number of asylum claims and reduce the overwhelming amounts of "frivolous" applications.

The "Remain in Mexico" policy has historically faced significant criticism from human rights advocates and immigrant rights organizations. Critics argue that it exposes vulnerable migrants to dangerous conditions that include violence and exploitation, while they await their hearings. Additionally, the policy's impact on local communities, particularly in border regions, has raised concerns as it has strained resources of the communities in those areas.

By reinstating and reinforcing this policy, the Trump administration aims to solidify its hardline immigration stance and generates further debates on the balance between national security and our humanitarian obligations.

Unfortunately, we cannot continue to allow illegal immigrants to enter our country and claim asylum. Due to the Biden administration's policies, many of these individuals were not adequately vetted. They received court hearings that extended for years, which allowed them to roam freely in our country at taxpayer expense, and this contributed to the irresponsible abuse of asylum. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris permitted illegal migrants to claim asylum, yet these claims had a very low approval rate.

## **The Expedited Removal Order**

Another significant order known as Expedited Removal, institutes measures aimed to expedite the deportation process for illegal migrants. Expedited removal includes streamlining legal proceedings and increased resources allocated to immigration courts to address the backlog of cases. This particular order aims to enhance the efficiency of deportation efforts and ensures that individuals who enter the country illegally face swift legal consequences.

This is yet another executive order focused to limit the number of refugee admissions to the United States, and it further emphasizes a shift toward the prioritization of national security concerns over the needs of these individuals. An act that is consistent with President Trump's America First Slogan.

Under Trump's new policy, ICE officers can also deport migrants who have been in the U.S. for less than two years using the "Expedited Removal" process without a court hearing. This aims to enhance National security and reduce government costs, and It also allows for the removal of recent arrivals that have poured into sanctuary cities like Chicago, Denver, and New York.

Initially, Trump faced legal challenges to implement this policy which was ultimately sanctioned by a court in 2020. When Biden took office, it was rescinded. Activists may challenge this rule again, but it is currently more stable due to prior legal validation.

Additionally, the Department of Justice has directed federal prosecutors to scrutinize "sanctuary" jurisdictions for compliance with federal immigration laws. Trump has threatened the revocation of all federal funding to states and localities that do not comply, and this allows ICE to take the necessary actions to remove illegal aliens and prosecute those that commit crimes in the U.S., including Sanctuary cities.

The DOJ has emphasized that state and local entities must comply with lawful immigration commands and they encourage investigation into any non-compliance.

## **The Laken Riley Act**

Ms. Laken Riley, a 22-year-old, was found dead in February 2024 on the University of Georgia campus after she didn't return home from a jog. An illegal migrant, who had been previously arrested twice for unrelated crimes, was later convicted of her murder.

In response to this horrific crime, the bipartisan Laken Riley Act was passed by the Senate. It mandates the detention of migrants who are charged with specific crimes, and allows state attorney generals the right to sue the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General to enforce the act's provisions and other grounds.

Critics, mainly from the Democratic Party, argue that the bill lacks funding for enforcement and unjustly targets individuals not yet convicted of any crimes, while some Democrats support it as a reasonable measure.

## **Changes In Immigration Policy and Judicial impacts**

President Donald Trump also implemented significant changes to the immigration court system that aims to expedite case processing and alter the judicial landscape.

One of the key modifications includes the establishment of a new policy that prioritizes the adjudication of certain categories of immigration cases, particularly those that involve individuals with criminal backgrounds or multiple immigration violations. This policy was designed to reduce the backlog of cases that has plagued immigration courts for years, and it enables judges to focus on what are deemed higher-priority cases.

Additionally, Trump's administration sought to increase the number of immigration judges through the reallocation of resources and the streamline of the hire process. This will help address staffing shortages that has contributed to lengthy wait times for hearings.

Furthermore, Trump's policy changes also includes measures that affect the independence of immigration judges and their ability to make decisions without external pressures. The administration introduced new performance metrics for judges, tying their evaluations to the number of cases completed and the speed of adjudications.

Critics argue that this approach could compromise the quality of justice, as judges might feel pressured to rush through cases to meet quotas.

Moreover, the administration's efforts to implement stricter rules around asylum claims and to limit the grounds for appeals further shifts the immigration court landscape, and this has led to concerns about the fairness of the judicial process for individuals who seek refuge and due process here in the United States.

These changes have sparked significant debates about the balance between efficient immigration enforcement and the rights of individuals who navigate our Immigration legal system.

In conclusion, the stark comparison of immigration policies between President Trump and the previous Biden administration highlights a significant ideological shift in the United States' approach to border security and immigration reform. Trump's administration has taken decisive steps to enforce stricter regulations, suspend programs deemed ineffective, and prioritize national security over humanitarian considerations.

From the reinstatement of the "Remain in Mexico" policy to the expedited removal process for illegal migrants, these measures reflect a commitment to fulfill his campaign promises and addresses public concerns about illegal immigration and its associated challenges.

However, these policies also raise critical questions about the implications for asylum seekers, local jurisdictions, and the broader immigration landscape. As cities like New York grapple with the consequences of these federal directives, the ongoing tension between federal authority and local sanctuary practices will likely shape the discourse around immigration for years to come. Ultimately, the decisions made in this pivotal moment will not only affect the lives of many individuals seeking refuge but also define the future of America's immigration system.