

# **“Don't let America repeat Spain's border collapse” Petition**

Angus King Response

My Final Letter To Angus

A Call for Leadership That Prioritizes American Lives

I have spent the past four years studying these issues extensively, both independently and through discussions. I was very disappointed to hear of your recent position, as I believe it reflects a move toward a troubling extremely far-left stance rather than one that prioritizes the safety and interests of the American people during this Fourth Generation War on the American people.

I am concerned that your current approach does not adequately address the protection of American lives or the importance of supporting our military. Because of these differences in values and priorities, you have lost my vote. I could never vote for someone who puts the safety of our military, ICE, Border Patrol, public servants, and Americans last. Every 1.9 days, a public servant dies, but no concern is shown for Americans. It is clear the data you have received is not the data showing concern for our American family. The one now being severely neglected and exploited in every way possible.

I hope you will continue to consider the concerns of those who believe national security and the well-being of American citizens should remain central to your decisions.

[www.unionofsaints.world](http://www.unionofsaints.world)

ANGUS S. KING, JR.  
MAINE

SUITE SH-133  
HART OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1905  
(202) 224-5344

## United States Senate

Dear Dannielle,

Thank you for contacting me regarding Temporary Protected Status (TPS) for Haitian nationals and the effects of the recent June 2026 Supreme Court ruling in *Mullin v. Doe*, which allows the Trump administration to end legal protections for Haitian noncitizens. Haitian TPS holders are deeply woven into our local economies and communities. Stripping them of legal status harms not only these families but also the employers and neighbors who depend on them.

As you may know, Congress established TPS under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1990 to provide temporary humanitarian relief and work authorization to individuals already living in the United States when extraordinary conditions—such as ongoing armed conflict, environmental disasters, or severe civil unrest—prevent their safe return home. However, as illustrated by the Supreme Court's recent decision, the scope of judicial review over executive TPS determinations remains tightly constrained, reinforcing the responsibility of Congress to step in when administrative decisions threaten to undermine the law's humanitarian purpose.

In my view, terminating TPS for Haitians under current conditions is both cruel and misguided. Haiti continues to endure an unprecedented security and political crisis, marked by widespread gang violence, severe shortages of food and medical care, and disrupted basic governance functions; in fact, the Department of State maintains a Level 4—Do Not Travel Advisory—for U.S. citizens. Think about the contradiction here: the administration's own State Department tells Americans that Haiti is simply too dangerous to visit. It just doesn't make sense for this same administration to turn around and force hundreds of thousands of people—many of whom have resided legally in the United States since the catastrophic 2010 earthquake—to return to those dangerous conditions.

For these reasons, I joined my colleagues in a letter earlier this year to urge former Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Kristi Noem to reverse the Department's initial decision to end TPS for Haitian nationals. You can read the full text of that letter here: <https://sen.gov/YQVVP>. I am also a proud original cosponsor of S. 4814, which would require DHS to designate Haiti for TPS through 2029. The bill has been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am not a member, though it is my hope the full Senate will consider this relief soon.

Thank you again for your message on this critical matter; please be in touch on other issues before the Senate in the future.

Best Regards,



ANGUS S. KING, JR.  
United States Senator

ANGUS S. KING, JR.  
MAINE

SUITE SH-133  
HART OFFICE BUILDING  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510-1905  
(202) 224-5344

## United States Senate

Dear Dannielle,

I share your serious concern regarding the Trump administration's federal immigration policies, which have been impacting our loved ones, neighbors, and employees. Like you, I have been outraged and appalled by the reckless, heartless, and destructive operations we've all seen in cities across the country and right here at home in Maine. This heavy-handed, heavily armed approach to immigration enforcement is cruel, actively endangering our local communities, leaving U.S. citizens fearful of going about their daily lives, and lacking the basic transparency the public deserves. At minimum, Maine people deserve the truth—a full and fair investigation.

To be sure, I have long said that a key aspect of immigration reform must be the creation and maintenance of lawful pathways for immigration that allow us to properly vet eligible individuals for entry into our workforce, communities, and ultimately, citizenry. Instead, the administration's sudden terminations of critical humanitarian programs—including the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program, private sponsorships, and Temporary Protected Status—have stripped away existing legal protections and work authorization. As a result, hundreds of thousands of law-abiding individuals—including Ukrainians, Afghans, Haitians, Cubans, and Venezuelans—are being forced to return to seriously life-threatening situations.

Let me be clear: as long as law enforcement and the judicial system adhere to the law of the land, we should deport undocumented individuals who have been convicted of violent crimes. However, it is the mass deportations of law-abiding individuals with no criminal records and without constitutionally required due process that I find violate the core principles of our legal system. The Fourth Amendment protects people, not just citizens, and I will continue to demand that federal agencies operate with the accountability, oversight, and constitutional restraint required of any police force.

ICE's aggressive use of force has led to avoidable deaths across the country, including the recent fatal shooting of Johan Sebastian Guerrero in Biddeford. Following this tragedy, I led the Maine congressional delegation in demanding a thorough, transparent investigation from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Office of Inspector General—you can read the full text of that letter here: <https://sen.gov/LVL14>. As the Department of Justice moves forward, I have also pushed federal authorities to cooperate fully with our state and local law enforcement, which is why I joined an additional letter urging that cooperation: <https://sen.gov/MZM3N>.

I also led a letter joined by 38 of my Senate colleagues to DHS Secretary Mullin, demanding guardrails on ICE's immigration enforcement protocols and hiring process for the safety of people in Maine and nationwide—the full text of this letter can be found here: <https://sen.gov/NXPZY>. Earlier this year, I cosponsored S. 3683, the Stop Excessive Force in Immigration Act, which would set clear use-of-force standards for ICE officers, restrict the use of tear gas and pepper balls, require body-worn cameras, and more. It should be noted that these guardrails are consistent with similar restrictions on police activity in virtually every city in America.

Further, I find it hard to square the administration's claims that they are targeting the "worst of the worst" with the realities we are seeing on the ground. The administration's rescission of the "sensitive locations" policy is fundamentally not targeting "the worst of the worst," as it has opened up essential spaces like schools, medical facilities, places of worship, and social service organizations to aggressive federal operations. The Tenth Amendment explicitly prevents the federal government from compelling states to enforce federal immigration law—as a former governor, I feel strongly that states have a right to use their resources as they deem best for their residents. I fiercely oppose the forced expenditure of state resources for such federal ends.

Additionally, I condemn the use of masks and plainclothes by ICE officers who often do not identify themselves as law enforcement when conducting arrests. Failing to identify themselves blurs the line between lawful enforcement and intimidation, erodes public trust, and makes it impossible to distinguish genuine officers from imposters. While ICE has argued that concealing agents' identities protects them from harassment and doxing, anonymous enforcement raises profound constitutional and due process concerns. That is why I cosponsored S. 2594, the Immigration Enforcement Identification Safety (IEIS) Act, which would require federal officers to identify themselves and prohibit them from obscuring their faces while simultaneously providing federal law enforcement agencies with the authority to better protect law enforcement officers from doxing. In my view, this strikes the right balance: ensuring that people know when they are being engaged by legitimate law enforcement while also protecting the safety of federal officers and their families.

Finally, I share your deep concern regarding the severe treatment of thousands of individuals in immigration detention. Reports describe horrific, inhumane conditions inside these facilities, yet the Trump administration has actively dismantled the oversight bodies meant to hold them accountable, including the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties. The prospect that anyone—including American citizens—could be detained in these conditions without due process, while the U.S. government deliberately abdicates its oversight responsibilities, should strike fear and outrage in every American.

Many are calling for a complete rescission of funding or the outright abolition of ICE. I understand the deep anger driving that call; a law enforcement agency that operates without basic transparency or constitutional restraint fails the public trust. In a Congress where Republicans control both chambers, our primary leverage is through the annual appropriations process. I hate shutdowns, but I cannot—and will not—in good faith vote to fund the Department of Homeland Security without the necessary strict restrictions on ICE. That's why I voted against the full-year appropriations bill for the entirety of the DHS and instead supported a temporary measure that excluded funding for ICE and CBP to allow time to debate civilian protections. As you may know, Congressional Republicans circumvented the bipartisan appropriations process using a partisan reconciliation to fund ICE and CBP operations through fiscal year 2029. This legislation, S. 2, the Secure America Act, was signed into law on June 10, 2026. My Democratic colleagues and I offered several amendments to implement guardrails, including requiring body-worn cameras, requiring unannounced detention center inspections, and protecting Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients from arrest—but these measures were blocked. I must be realistic that this funding is unlikely to be rescinded under the current majority. However, as the appropriations process continues, I will continue to do everything in my power to amend, improve, and—if I can't do either—oppose any legislation that militarizes our immigration system and harms our communities in Maine.

Thank you for your message on this critical matter; please be in touch on other issues before the Senate in the future.

Best Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Angus", followed by a horizontal line.

ANGUS S. KING, JR.  
United States Senator

To [reply](#) or get back in touch with me on another issue, please visit the [contact page](#) on my website—the address that sent this message does *not* accept incoming messages.