Disclaimer for Rough Real-Time Transcripts

"Do not quote or rely on this uncorrected transcript without obtaining written permission from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights at: transcripts@usccr.gov."

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING UNEDITED/UNOFFICIAL

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2019

+ + + + +

The Commission convened in Suite 1150 at 1331 Pennsylvania Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D.C. at 10:00 a.m., Catherine Lhamon, Chair, presiding.

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner*

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner*

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director

MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

* Present via telephone

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

STAFF PRESENT:

LASHONDA BRENSON

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALES

BARBARA DE LA VIEZ

PAMELA DUNSTON, Chief, ASCD

ALFREDA GREENE

PILAR MCLAUGHLIN

WARREN ORR

LENORE OSTROWSKY*

JUANDA SMITH

BRIAN WALCH

MARIK XAVIER-BRIER

COMMISSIONER ASSISTANTS PRESENT:

SHERYL COZART

ALEC DUELL

JASON LAGRIA

CARISSA MULDER

AMY ROYCE

RUKKU SINGLA

ALISON SOMIN

INTERNS:

BEN FALSTEIN

LAUREN KELLY

CHRISTINE KUMAR

LILLIAN OFILI

KYLE PHAM

KORI PRUETT

MARK SAUNDERS

BROOKE SCHWARTZ

A-G-E-N-D-A

I.	APPROVAL OF AGENDA6
ΙΙ	. BUSINESS MEETING
Α.	Presentation by Montana Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Report, Border town Discrimination in Montana 8
В.	Presentation by Massachusetts Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Advisory Memorandum, Hate Crimes in Massachusetts 23
C.	Discussion and vote on State Advisory Committee appointments
D.	Discussion and vote on 2020 and 2021 project proposals
Ε.	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, announcement replacement of interpreters with a video at Immigrants First immigration hearing 60
F.	Discussion and Vote on a Proposed Statement Titled, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Strongly Condemns the Recent Statements of President Trump Telling U.S. Congresswomen to Leave the Country and "Go Back to Their Countries"
G.	Management and Operations
Н.	Speaker Series Presentation by Charles Kamasaki on his book, Immigration Reform: The Corpse That Will Not Die90
II	I. ADJOURN MEETING

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

Τ	P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S
2	(10:01 a.m.)
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. This
4	meeting of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights
5	comes to order at 10:01 a.m. on July 19th, 2019.
6	The meeting takes place at the Commission's
7	Headquarters, which is located at 1331
8	Pennsylvania Avenue Northwest, Washington, D.C.
9	I'm Chair Catherine Lhamon. And
10	Commissioners who are present in addition to me
11	are Vice Chair Timmons-Goodson, Commissioner
12	Adegbile, Commissioner Heriot, and Commissioner
13	Narasaki.
14	On the phone, if you can confirm that
15	you are present after I say your name, I'd
16	appreciate it. I believe we have Commissioner
17	Kirsanow?
18	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Present.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
20	Commissioner Kladney?
21	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Present.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
23	Commissioner Yaki?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Here.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. A quorum of
	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. A quorum of

1	the Commissioners is present. Is the court
2	reporter present?
3	COURT REPORTER: Present.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Mr. Staff
5	Director, can you confirm that you are present?
6	STAFF DIRECTOR MORALES: I am present.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. The meeting
8	now comes to order. Is there a motion to approve
9	the agenda for this business meeting?
10	I. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: So moved.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
13	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there
15	any amendments? Commissioner Narasaki?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes. I move
17	for the Commission to consider a statement
18	regarding the replacement of interpreters with a
19	video at Immigrants First immigration hearing
20	that has been circulated by my special assistant,
21	Jason Lagria, this past Tuesday evening.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
23	second?
24	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there

1	any other amendments?
2	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Madam Chair,
3	Commissioner Yaki.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead Commissioner
5	Yaki.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes, I would like
7	to amend the agenda to include a statement that I
8	drafted, circulated Tuesday night, regarding the,
9	hang on a second. I want to make sure I get it
10	right.
11	Regarding the recent statement of
12	President Trump in regard to U.S. Congresswomen
13	and going back to their countries.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
15	second?
16	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I second.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Are there
18	any other further amendments? Hearing none,
19	let's vote to approve the agenda as amended. All
20	those in favor say aye?
21	(Chorus of ayes.)
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Any opposed? Any
23	abstentions? Okay, the motion passes. One
24	Commissioner abstained, no Commissioner opposed,
25	all others were in favor.

1	We'll now hear from the Chair of our
2	Montana Advisory Committee Gwen Kircher, on the
3	Committee's most recent report titled Border town
4	Discrimination in Montana.
5	BUSINESS MEETING
6	A. PRESENTATION BY MONTANA ADVISORY
7	COMMITTEE CHAIR ON THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT,
8	BORDER TOWN DISCRIMINATION IN MONTANA
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Kircher.
10	MS. KIRCHER: Yes. Thank you, Madam
11	Chair. The Montana committee choose to continue
12	to investigate the issue of discrimination in
13	border towns in Montana. The Natives here say
14	all of Montana towns are border towns and that
15	all towns should be investigated.
16	Our project began in the fall of 2016
17	in Billings with plans for a follow-up meeting in
18	Hardin in the spring of 2017. However, due to
19	unforeseen events in our nation's capital, our
20	committee was not approved by Congress until the
21	summer of the 2017.
22	This was six months after our expected
23	appointment time in December. This setback,
24	along with the two additional shutdowns, put our

second briefing in Hardin off until the spring of

2018.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Even though there were gaps in the time of the briefing, the social and economic relationships of Native Americans, and the White community, has remained the same.

Many of the communities, such Hardin, were originally part of the reservation that surrounds them. And the Whites commissioned the Congress to grant them areas as off reservation, which created a chasm between the two sides that has continued until this day.

These areas of our state seem to have more issues with discrimination than others. But, along with all the other communities, people who come from the outside notice the discrimination right away.

We included the education portion in this briefing as a follow-up to our previous briefing. Since the current briefing was filed in May, the Department of Education is now investigating the school system in Wolf Point, Montana.

They were found to have been in violation of several laws, discrimination against Native youth 15 years ago. And it appears that

1 this activity has continued in the Wolf Point school system. 2 3 Montana has the highest of rate suicide in the nation, including the highest of 4 youth suicide. And of that number, the highest 5 6 percentage is of Native children. 7 We, like many of the urban areas, seem 8 to have a pipeline that goes straight from school 9 prison for the youth of our community. 10 Disparities in areas of education lead 11 poverty, addiction, suicide, crime and other 12 behaviors that are destroying our community. 13 For these reasons we ask that, our 14 committee asks that the Commission would take action in all of the recommendations that we have 15 issued in our brief. And I would like to thank 16 17 you for this time. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to try to answer them at this time. 18 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much, 20 Chair Kircher, I'm going to open for questions 21 fellow Commissioners. and comments from МУ 22 Commissioner Narasaki. 23 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I really want 24 thank the SAC in Montana for its really thorough analysis of what is going on. 25 Sadly, it

dovetails much with the report that the Commission recently published last December on how the challenges that Native Americans are facing because of the lack of funding and the other issues that are happening.

And I was particularly struck by a couple of things in your report. One was the difference in terms of registration access for voting. That in Big Horn, Whites had to travel about, a little less than 12 miles, where Native Americans had to travel an average of 22 miles, and in Yellowstone, Whites traveled a little less than ten miles compared to almost 32 miles for Native Americans.

I'm wondering, it looks like there was a settlement to try to start to address that, I was wondering if you had an update about how that was going?

MS. KIRCHER: They did, Big Horn County is where Hardin, Montana is, which is one of the reasons we had our briefing held there. They did come up with a Band-Aid solution I'll call it. It is not really, it does not really give the Natives access that the Whites still have.

If you realize the size of our state 1 and the size of the reservations, that is where 2 3 the problem is. They don't really want to have a voting place, or as many, on the reservations. 4 That would make it more accessible. 5 And I don't know if a lot of it has to 6 7 do with money, which I think that it does. Which 8 is what the counties say, they cannot afford to have these other voting locations. 9 10 But they are still working on it. have several different grass roots Native groups 11 here, that are working on that voting issue about 12 the difference in that. 13 14 Yellowstone County is where Billings is, and then Big Horn County is where Hardin is. 15 And that was the reason that we choose those two 16 17 communities. Those two communities have the highest 18 19 number of discriminations listed and noted over 20 the, actually, a century, if you can believe 21 that. 22 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you. that there of 23 And note lot Τ were 24 recommendations and requests for the Commission

to act in terms of making some, sharing some of

1 the findings with the various agencies. I'm also wondering whether you were able to share your 2 findings with the State Government of Montana? 3 MS. KIRCHER: I have personally shared 4 these findings with several of our legislators. 5 I keep them informed on a lot of things that I'm 6 7 involved in. The Commission is not the only 8 thing I do in this state. of 9 So Ι keep them abreast these And they were all invited to attend 10 these briefings. We did have letters from a few 11 12 of the legislators that were not able to come. Saying that they could not make it. 13 So they are 14 aware of it. I have received calls from the largest 15 16 newspaper in the state concerning the briefing. to information is 17 But. the out there t.he legislators. 18 We do have several committees within 19 20 the state that were appointed by Governor Bullock 21 to address several of the issues that affect the 22 Native Americans within our state. And those committees are working very hard. 23 24 I have been in touch with a couple of 25 the people on those committees and I am pleased

with the work that they are doing and what 1 they're trying to accomplish. Our goal is to get 2 3 the federal government involved. Our state can do what we can do but we 4 need to have federal help on some of these things 5 6 because these are federal laws that are being 7 broken. Or that are not being adhered to. 8 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: All right. Well, thank you very much for all of your hard 9 10 work. Chair Kircher, I echo 11 CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki's thanks to you for the 12 And I also just wanted to note, for what 13 use it is to you, that we can use much of the 14 material that's in this report for the various 15 that we 16 have pending reports now at 17 Commission. In particular, I've been reading a draft of our report about women in prison, and I 18 19 saw that there's material in this that we can 20 incorporate in that too. 21 So I very much appreciate the concrete 22 information and the ability to incorporate 23 into the work that we are doing here at the 24 Commission.

I want to echo Commissioner Narasaki's

questions about Montana's specific focus on some reform. There was information that I found really devastating in your brief that noted on the first page the widespread perception of unfairness in the Native American community and how pervasive it is.

And then the contrast of that with the information from the Billings police chief, who doesn't consider Billings to be in proximity to a reservation, as you note, focused expectation, external an an expectation about how people will comply with law as distinct from an expectation about how the police community can effectively coordinate with the community and be respectful of a community.

And I wonder if there are steps that your committee plans to take to follow-up on the pervasiveness of the perception of discrimination and work within the state, among state officials, about ways to address that perception?

MS. KIRCHER: The reason that we had Chief St. John return to the second briefing, was because of the answers that we received from him and Sheriff Linder during the first brief. At that point we included the police from the Hardin

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

1 Bighorn County area, and also from the Rosebud 2 County areas. Those surround the areas 3 reservation. They also have numbers that 4 are exactly the same as the Billings numbers. 5 And 6 for some reason, they also do not see that that 7 is an issue. We see that it's an issue because, 8 if you don't have that high of a population, why is your jail population so much higher. 9 10 We have not decided what our follow-up will be yet so I cannot really answer what we're 11 going to do at this point. I, myself personally, 12 would like to continue to follow-up on that. 13 14 But I do not know what the Committee will decide, and I cannot answer that. We have 15 16 not had a meeting to make that determination yet. 17 CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Thank you. I look forward to hearing what you will do, and 18 19 again, I very much appreciate the text that is in 20 your brief. Madam Vice Chair. 21 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes, 22 thank you very much. I'd like to follow-up on 23 Chair Lhamon's remarks regarding the chief there in Billings. 24 25 I was wondering, many jurisdictions,

in terms of reviewing discrimination complaints, have a review process that involves citizens of the community as well. And so, I was wondering, or thinking that perhaps as you continue your discussion with the chief, that one possible proposal might be that you, that they revamp their review process such that it includes some public, some participation by members of the public in that.

And so, I just wanted to put that out there as a possible solution and have you give some thought to that.

MS. KIRCHER: We did have a committee that was, community committee that did. They were the police oversight committee. That committee has been disbanded by the city.

We do have а human relations commission in Billings. And Ι was that committee. And they would be the ones now that would take any complaint against the police.

While I was on that commission, we had three complaints, three discrimination complaints, against the police department. Two involved Native Americans and one involved transgender people.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	So, the human relations commission in
2	Billings is one that a person would have to go to
3	if they have a complaint against the city of
4	Billings. Then that commission investigates and
5	then turns it over to whoever should actually be
6	handling the problem.
7	And that is the way the system is
8	right now in Billings.
9	However, I do need to say that there
10	have been plans to disband that commission. And
11	that commission has been fighting to stay in
12	Billings, Montana. Because right now, it is the
13	only thing we have for civil rights at all within
14	Yellowstone County.
15	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thanks.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile.
17	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Thank you for
18	your report. I just wanted to follow-up for a
19	moment on some of the facts that you shared with
20	us about health issues with respect to Native
21	Americans in Montana. And in particular, the
22	suicide rate.
23	I think you said that Montana leads
24	the nation in the suicide rate?
25	MS. KIRCHER: Yes, we do. We're

number one in suicide overall. We're number one 1 in veteran suicide and we're number one in teen 2 3 suicide. Out of the teen suicides we are, the 4 highest percentage is the Native American 5 And we're talking about children from 6 children. 7 the age of about 7. I think the youngest is 7. 8 They had five kids in the Wolf Point area that killed themselves within one year. And 9 10 they were all junior high and elementary kids. There's a very serious problem, which 11 12 is why now the DOE is investigating the Wolf 13 Point school system. Because of the problems 14 there. Some of the information that I would 15 receive was horrific of the things that they were 16 doing. Native Americans, kids that were disabled 17 would be just locked up in a room. They would 18 19 get no instruction, they received nothing. 20 were literally just being warehoused. 2.1 And that is what the Department of 22 Education is currently investigating, is that, 23 the Wolf Point school system. 24 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. It seems 25 to me that those are pretty staggering statistics

1 that no state or governmental authority would be proud of. And the idea that it's being visited 2 3 upon children is a real cause for alarm. Are there any specific initiatives, 4 from the Department of Education 5 apart 6 investigation, to provide some crisis level 7 response with respect to the mental health needs 8 and supports of these children and people 9 Montana? 10 MS. KIRCHER: Yes, there was, there were several grants that were received. And the 11 12 governor, Governor Bullock, has set committee that is working specifically on the 13 14 issue of the Native youth suicides. 15 So, we do have something in the state that is working on that. 16 I do not have a lot of it. 17 information on I just know that committee was formed. 18 19 I think the first grant that they got 20 only \$700,000. And I think they were was 21 supposed to get another grant of about \$1 million 22 to work on that project. We have seven reservations within our 23 We actually have eight Indian tribes. 24 state. 25 One tribe has not yet been recognized by the

1 federal government. So, it's a lot of area to cover. 2 3 because our state is so large, it also adds a lot of problems to try and provide, especially mental 4 health services. 5 We don't have, believe it or not, 6 7 there is no mental health service in the eastern 8 part of all of the state of Montana. That's for 9 anybody. So, we have problems providing mental 10 11 health services for everyone. And then it 12 becomes even more exasperated when you say that it's a Native American. 13 14 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. Well, 15 highlighting this you for issue and bringing a focus to it. It seems to me that this 16 is a red alert issue for this state and for the 17 people of Montana. 18 And I appreciate the SAC's effort to 19 20 try and highlight it and underscore that more 21 must be done to support the mental and physical of 22 possibilities generations health and of 23 Americans who are facing very dire situations.

Thank you.

MS. KIRCHER:

Thank you.

24

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki. 1 2 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you. 3 just wanted to note that the Commission will be releasing report the issue of 4 our on discrimination against students of color with 5 6 disabilities next week. And hopefully that might 7 help you with some of the advocacy that might be 8 happening in Montana. whether 9 I did want to ask our Chair, we need to take any action to empower the staff 10 11 to move forward on the many recommendations that 12 the SAC made and requested us to act on. I don't think we do. CHAIR LHAMON: 13 14 think it's now routine for us, when we receive 15 the SAC reports, to go ahead and forward them on to the agencies when they ask for it. 16 17 So, thank you for the request and also thank you to the advisory committee for making 18 19 the request of us. 20 Are there other questions, including 21 from Commissioners on the phone? Hearing none, Kircher, 22 Chair thank you again for your leadership on this advisory committee and for 23 24 taking your time today to present to us over the

phone. We very much appreciate it.

1	We'll next hear from the chair
2	MS. KIRCHER: Thank you for giving us
3	the opportunity.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, of course. We'll
5	next hear from the chair of our Massachusetts
6	advisory committee, David Harris, on the
7	committee's advisory memorandum on hate crimes.
8	B. PRESENTATION BY MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY
9	COMMITTEE CHAIR ON THE COMMITTEE'S ADVISORY
10	MEMORANDUM, HATE CRIMES IN MASSACHUSETTS
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Harris.
12	MR. HARRIS: Good morning and thank
13	you so much for this opportunity to speak with
14	you. I know we have a full agenda so I'm going
15	to try to concentrate on the major assertions and
16	themes that we found.
17	I know it's breaking protocol, but I
18	do want to give thanks to my committee member
19	Wendy Kaminer, who took responsibility for
20	writing this memo. And also, obviously to
21	Barbara De La Viez and
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Harris, I'm
23	sorry, we're having a
24	MR. HARRIS: Can you hear me?
25	CHAIR LHAMON: we're having a hard

time hearing you, is it possible to get closer to 1 the phone or --2 3 MR. HARRIS: Is this any better? CHAIR LHAMON: This is better, thank 4 5 you. MR. HARRIS: Is this better? 6 7 CHAIR LHAMON: Yes, thank you. 8 MR. HARRIS: Okay, I'm sorry. again, I'll just thank you for the opportunity to 9 be with you. So we undertook this issue in part 10 to support the Commission's work in the area, 11 12 looking at hate crimes. 13 knew that Massachusetts had 14 history of legislation qubernatorial and initiatives to address hate crimes. And in light 15 16 of your report of bias and incidents, we wanted 17 to explore how well we were doing in addressing it. 18 19 Overall, we found the Commonwealth's 20 falling performance short in terms of 21 standardized and consistent approach 22 addressing hate crimes. And we were particularly surprised by an issue raised by the defense bar 23 24 in terms of a lack of clarity as to what actually

constitutes a hate crime.

25

That is how closely

it's tied to the criminal act.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Although we have evidence of a rise in reported hate crime in recent years, it's difficult to know its actual scope Commonwealth. There is significant under reporting, particularly in the Muslim and transgender communities, why we believe to areas of increased incidents.

This is certainly not surprising, but it's deeply concerning beyond these two specific populations. As we note in our memo, only 101 of 409 jurisdictions, reporting jurisdictions in the Commonwealth, reported one or more hate crimes in the fiscal year of 2017.

And one expert reported to us it's not unusual to have no reports from cities with population of 100,000 or more. Which that witness found not particularly credible.

The reason for this is complicated, we talked about them a little in the memo. But despite based on the fact that regulations quiding data collections, reporting is voluntary. And there is a lack of consistent training for police departments responsible for data collection and reporting.

There is also evidence that the applied consistently. statute is not being Experts' question whether incidents involving homophobia, transphobia and Islamophobia, charged consistent with incidents of racial animus.

The lack of data forces us to rely on anecdotal evidence. But here, again, we see the impact of a lack of training so far as charging decisions remain largely dependent on an officer's assessment.

According to our experts, while prosecutors have the power to review charges, they tend to rely on the arresting officer's judgment.

There's also a compelling consensus across disciplines and perspectives on a need for increased education and about the operation of bias. Most experts called for increased community involvement and partnerships in this regard with an emphasis on training for police, mandatory public school but also anti-bias training.

Such training takes place in a limited fashion. But there's current legislation

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

mandating anti-bias education training with an emphasis on consequences of unchecked hatred.

I should note here as an aside that Massachusetts, for years, has eliminated a basic civics curriculum from our public schools. And there's also legislation pending to try to reinstate that.

There's also a recognition of the need for uniform police training. Including criteria for identification of hate crimes, the training on special handling of investigations where a hate crime is suspected and training on proper reporting of hate crime data.

As follow-up, we'd like to forward our memo to the Association of Chiefs of Police as well as to the Department of Education here in the Commonwealth. We also would like to suggest the possibility of a joint venture with other New England states to think about how we're addressing hate crimes in the New England region.

In addition, we ask the Commission to consider weighing in on the need for more rigorous data collection by states, as well as sufficient funding for education and training to combat it. Combat hate crimes.

1	So, in closing I'm reminded of the
2	wisdom of Arthur Fleming who chaired the
3	Commission when I was a civil rights analyst with
4	the agency many years ago. Chair Fleming always
5	insisted that we accept the absence of
6	enforcement powers and mandate to generate
7	information that would allow us to make change to
8	moral suasion.
9	And I commend the Commission in its
10	current state as doing that, that very thing. In
11	this instance we know that hate crimes are on the
12	rise, but must redouble our efforts to apply the
13	very tools already at our disposal to reduce its
14	incidence and harm.
15	On behalf of the Massachusetts
16	advisory committee, I'm hopeful our memo can aid
17	you in such efforts. Again, on behalf of the
18	Committee, I want to thank you for the
19	opportunity to join you this morning and welcome
20	any questions you may have.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Chair
22	Harris. I'm looking for questions and comments
23	from my fellow Commissioners. Commissioner
	l i

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI:

Narasaki.

24

25

Thank you,

Madam Chair, I have two questions. One is, that as you know, since this report was issued because the full commission is actually looking at hate crimes, that we actually took a deeper dive in looking at Boston and the practices of the police department there.

Because Boston had a long reputation as doing a fairly good job, as police departments go. I was wondering if you had a chance to look into that department specifically and had any thoughts about that, that we should take into consideration?

MR. HARRIS: So, we didn't look at Boston specifically. Our focus was really statewide. And the people we had talking to us represented state-wide organizations largely.

I do, so I don't think if the committee itself has input I can convey to you. And anything I said would be based on my own personal experience.

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, we'd be interested in that too. The second thing is, you mentioned a regional joint venture, which is intriguing, and I'm wondering what that, why and what that would look like.

1 MR. HARRIS: Well, I'm not sure what it would look like or could look like. I do know 2 3 from my own experience, I was involved back in the '90s when there was an effort, when the first 4 effort took place, to create hate crime 5 а 6 capacity within the state. And over the years, there have been 7 incidents that have occurred in Massachusetts 8 that seem to flow out of Connecticut. So there 9 10 to be kind of a relationship between 11 certain hate groups and their activity in Connecticut and in Massachusetts. 12 And my sense is that we might benefit 13 by learning from one another what we're doing and 14 the different approaches that we're taking. 15 we here are very concerned 16 about absence of funding and the way in which hate 17 crimes are addressed. 18 And things get, creating a kind of a 19 20 regional approach could be helpful. And then 21 something to explore, we're kind of curious about 22 it. 23 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. 24 MR. HARRIS: And I think I, I mean, and my understanding is there might be an effort 25

1 underway in Rhode Island. And I don't know, I think that there are other efforts to look at 2 3 hate crimes elsewhere in New England and it might make sense to try to coordinate our efforts. 4 CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Harris, Ι 5 6 appreciate, as always, the nimbleness of your 7 advisory committee, and also your creative 8 thinking about ways to maximize the effectiveness of your committee among others. 9 So I appreciate 10 that insight, among others. 11 And also, I'm very grateful that your 12 committee, among others, have taken the time to address the topic that we are addressing so that 13 14 we can incorporate it into our materials. 15 In particular, you highlight in your 16 presentation, you include a Page 7 of the memo, concern about a need for community involvement 17 and partnership with law enforcement to address 18 19 bias incidents before they become hate crimes --20 MR. HARRIS: Yes, ma'am. 21 CHATR LHAMON: to and ensure 22 community safety. And I wonder if you could say more about where that recommendation comes from, 23 24 Page 7 in your memo, and why it is

significant enough concern that you highlighted

1 it for us this morning? MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, I actually was 2 3 having a hard time hearing you. So, I know you referred to the question, to some, a topic on 4 Page 7, but the question is again? 5 6 CHAIR LHAMON: Sorry, I will 7 closer to the mic as I asked you to do as well. 8 And just to say that Ι appreciated your 9 highlighting in your remarks, and then also, 10 including in the memo, a recommendation that the underlying problem of bias requires community 11 involvement and partnership with law enforcement. 12 And I wonder if you could say more 13 14 about the basis for that concern, that I take it reasonably significant because 15 you both as highlighted it in your remarks and included it in 16 the written memo. 17 18 MR. HARRIS: Okay, yes, thank you. 19 something that was specifically was 20 raised by the representative from the ADL but was 21 also indicated by, was suggested by the chair of 22 our NAACP. 23 And I think the concern was, there are

and incidents, recently here in Massachusetts, in

a couple of concerns I mean.

24

25

There are events

which police departments have been involved and engaged in kind of social media, hate speech.

And there have been incidents where police departments have actually been seen as contributing to an intolerant atmosphere. And there's a sense that there is a need to do more work, both with community members and with the police to try to think about and understand the way in which bias continues to operate, continues to infect our, the operation of our legal system, as well as our general and social atmosphere.

And I think Mr. Trestan from the ADL was, whose organization has created a number of anti-bias curricula and are kind of implementing those in the schools, is concerned about this. And I think raises a question about the extent to which the police themselves have undergone this kind of training and the need for it.

So, I mean, it reflects some things about incidents that have happened here, but also a general understanding that we on the committee have as well, that kind of addressing the operation of bias in all its forms and doing so across institutions is probably one of the best weapons we have to combat hate crimes in the

first place as opposed to just prosecuting them 1 and trying to address them at their roots. 2 3 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Madam Vice Chair. 4 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I too 5 want to join others in thanking you for your 6 7 You highlighted for us the fact that reporting of hate crimes is voluntary in the 8 I was wondering whether there have been, 9 10 are any efforts underway to possibly get that changed, either through lobbying for legislation 11 or any other efforts? 12 MR. HARRIS: So, to my knowledge there 13 14 aren't, but to tell you the truth, it would be my hope that this memorandum can actually stimulate 15 an interest in doing that. 16 17 I mean, it's clearly a problem, and the data on the kinds of reporting have shown 18 19 that the voluntary mechanism doesn't 20 However, one of the real problems has to do with 21 the extent to which these efforts are coordinated 22 and funded. So that any requirement has to be, and 23 24 again, I'm going beyond your question, I'm just giving an opinion here, but any effort in that 25

1 regard really has to be coupled with adequate 2 training and the funds to do that training. 3 Because otherwise, one of the problems is, under the voluntary method, people don't really know 4 what to do. 5 6 And so, I think there are probably 7 legislators who will be quite interested in our 8 memo and would probably consider trying introduce some legislation. 9 10 As you know from the memorandum, and one of the problems was that, that the funding, 11 we had this hate crimes taskforce, whose funding 12 was eliminated at a certain point. And it's one 13 14 thing to have a name, but if there's no funding or support for it then it can't really act. 15 CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 16 VICE 17 you. I'll open it for any 18 CHAIR LHAMON: 19 questions from fellow Commissioners, 20 including on the phone. Hearing none, Chair 21 Harris, thank you again for your service and for 22 your leadership on your advisory committee and for taking your time to speak with us today. 23 24 MR. HARRIS: Thank you all so much.

Take care now.

CHAIR LHAMON: We'll turn next to our discussion and vote on proposed slates for several advisory committees.

C. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

CHAIR LHAMON: We'll turn first to the Illinois Advisory Committee.

ILLINOIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Before we begin discussion, I remind my fellow Commissioners that objections to this nomination have already been shared with all the Commissioners. To the extent that we would like to discuss continuing objections, I remind my fellow Commissioners that the Commission has a policy to not defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

Each of these individuals has agreed to volunteer time and energy in the pursuit of the protection of civil rights, which we appreciate. With that said, I move that the Commission appoint the following individuals to the Illinois Advisory Committee based on the recommendation of the Staff Director.

Ryan Dunigan, Barbara Barreno-Paschall, Jonathan Bean, Joanna Bohdziewicz-

1	Borowiec, Cindy Buys, Mark David Calaguas, Trevor
2	Copeland, Tabassum Haleem, Raeyahd Kazmi, Matthew
3	Paprocki, Gregory Sanford, and Kyle Westbrook.
4	With this motion, the Commission would
5	also appoint Ryan Dunigan as the chair of the
6	Illinois Advisory Committee. All of these
7	members will serve as uncompensated government
8	employees.
9	If the motion passes, the Commission
LO	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
L1	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
L2	will begin on August 14th, 2019 after the current
L3	committee expires. Do I have a second for this
L 4	motion?
L5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
L6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
L7	discussion on this slate? Hearing none, I'll
L8	call the question and we'll take a roll call
L9	vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
20	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm voting no on
23	this one. Again, this is another one that has
24	not been properly balanced.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Commissioner

1	Kirsanow?
2	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
4	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
10	Goodson?
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
13	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
14	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
15	MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
16	We'll now move to the Massachusetts
17	Advisory Committee. I move that the Commission
18	appoint the following individuals to the
19	Massachusetts Advisory Committee based on the
20	recommendation of the Staff Director.
21	David Harris, Nazia Ashraful,
22	Christina Bain, Emilio Cruz, Thomas Cushman,
23	Martha Davis, Nennah Estrella-Luna, Daniel
24	Hartman, Eric Jepeal, Wendy Kaminer, S. Atyia
	maroman, brio object, woney naminor, or nogra

1	Sussman, Slobhan Sweeney and Jessica Tang. With
2	this motion, the Commission will also appoint
3	David Harris as the chair of the Massachusetts
4	Advisory Committee.
5	All of these members as uncompensated
6	government employees.
7	If the motion passes, the Commission
8	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
9	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
LO	will begin on August 14th, 2019 after the current
L1	committee expires. Do I have a second for this
L2	motion?
L3	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
L4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
L5	discussion on this appointment?
L6	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair, I
L7	just want to thank the staff for the work they've
L8	done and presenting us with an incredibly diverse
L9	slate on all fronts. Thank you very much.
20	Any further discussion? Commissioner
21	Heriot.
22	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: This was
23	actually one of the better balanced SACs until
24	Joshua Katzen was taken off of it, and I object
25	on that basis.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Any other discussion?
2	Okay, I'll call the question, take a roll call
3	vote.
4	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
5	vote?
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
10	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
18	Goodson?
19	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
21	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
22	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
23	SOUTH DAKOTA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
24	We now move to the South Dakota
25	Advisory Committee. I move that the Commission

1 appoint the following individuals to the South Advisory Committee 2 Dakota based on the recommendations of the Staff Director. 3 Tiffany Graham, Charles Abourezk, 4 Paula Antoine, Sara Frankenstein, Patrick Garry, 5 6 Taneeza Islam, Arlouine Gay Kingman, Brittany 7 Kjerstad McKnight, Travis Letellier, Mike Levsen, 8 Aaron Pilcher, Thomas Simmons, and Natalie Stites With this motion, the Commission will 9 also appoint Tiffany Graham as the chair of the 10 South Dakota Advisory Committee. 11 All of these members will serve as 12 uncompensated government employees. 13 14 If the motion passes, the Commission will authorize the Staff Director to execute the 15 appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which 16 will begin on August 14th, 2019 after the current 17 committee expires. Do I have a second for this 18 motion? 19 20 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second. 21 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any 22 discussion on this appointment? Hearing none, I'll call the question, and take a roll call 23 24 vote. 25 Commissioner Adequile, how do you

1	vote?
2	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
4	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: There are some
5	great people on this one. It is not perfect but
6	good enough for government work. Aye.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
8	Commissioner Kirsanow?
9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
11	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
15	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
17	Goodson?
18	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
20	motion passes unanimously.
21	I do want to note, just for purposes
22	of our effort not to defame or degrade, that my
23	view is that we have great people on all of our
24	advisory committees.
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And I will

second that. We do have great people on all of our advisory committees.

WISCONSIN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. We'll now move to the Wisconsin Advisory Committee. I move that the Commission appoint the following individuals to the Wisconsin Advisory Committee Staff based on the recommendation of the Director.

Angelique Harris, Bernardo Cuerto, William Flaunders, Alexander Lodge, David Nelson, O. Emil Ovbiagele, Pardeep Singh Kaleka, William Tisdale, Nancy Vue Tran and Chris Walton. With this motion, the Commission will also appoint Angelique Harris as the chair of the Wisconsin Advisory Committee.

All of these members will serve as uncompensated government employees.

If the motion passes, the Commission will authorize the Staff Director to execute the appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which will begin on August 14th, 2019 after the current committee expires. Do I have a second for this motion?

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
2	discussion on this appointment? Hearing none,
3	I'll call the question, take a roll call vote.
4	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
5	vote?
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Again, not
9	properly balanced. No.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
13	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
19	Goodson?
20	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
22	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
23	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
24	WASHINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE
25	We'll now move to consideration of

1	interim appointments for the Washington Advisory
2	Committee. I move that the Commission appoint
3	the following individuals to the Washington
4	Advisory Committee based on the recommendation of
5	the Staff Director. Joe Silem-Enlet, Endel
6	Kolde, John Safarli, and Brian Screnar. All of
7	these members will serve as uncompensated
8	government employees.
9	If the motion passes, the Commission
10	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
11	appropriate paperwork for the appointments.
12	Do I have a second for this motion?
13	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
15	discussion on this appointment? I'll call the
16	question, take a roll call vote.
17	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
18	vote?
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
2	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
6	Goodson?
7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
9	motion passes unanimously.
10	The next item on our agenda is to
11	consider project proposals for Fiscal Year 2020
12	and the Statutory Enforcement Report for Fiscal
13	Year 2021.
14	D. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON 2020 AND
	D. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON 2020 AND 2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS
15	
15 16	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS
15 16	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020,
15 16 17 18	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as
15 16 17 18	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as approved last year with a briefing likely in
15 16 17 18 19 20	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as approved last year with a briefing likely in November 2019 on sub-minimum wages for workers
15 16 17 18 19 20	2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as approved last year with a briefing likely in November 2019 on sub-minimum wages for workers with disabilities.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as approved last year with a briefing likely in November 2019 on sub-minimum wages for workers with disabilities. I appreciate, again, Commissioner
19 20 21	CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already had one project moving forward as approved last year with a briefing likely in November 2019 on sub-minimum wages for workers with disabilities. I appreciate, again, Commissioner Heriot's suggestion that we identify statutory

on time. So we will continue with that process 1 in today's vote and for the coming years. 2 3 Moving forward with Fiscal Year 2020 program planning. I understand from the Staff 4 5 Director that currently have we capacity, financial 6 and otherwise, to take two on 7 additional projects. To open the floor 8 discussion based on the rankings circulated by Commissioners in the last few weeks. 9 10 I move that the Commission approve, for Fiscal Year 2020, the projects on bail reform 11 12 and maternal mortality. Is there a second? COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: 13 Second. 14 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second. COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I yield to the 15 Vice Chair. 16 17 (Laughter.) VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 18 Second. 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll begin 20 with a few points about the bail reform project 21 since that is my project proposal. 22 civilized Ιn 2017 report on our implications of municipal fines and fees, 23 24 explicitly noted that the report would not take 25 up issues of bail and re-trial incarceration.

Nevertheless, the report noted that the March 2016 dear colleague letter, issued by the United States Department of Justice, later rescinded by then Attorney General Sessions, stated the principle that, courts must not employ bail or bond practices caused indigent defendants incarcerated solely because they cannot afford to pay for their release, end quote.

Similar to the issue of fines and fees, in which we found that some jurisdictions were targeting low income communities and communities of color, in the assessment of high fees for low level offenses, there is evidence of injustice.

With respect to bail practices that hold the defendant in jail, if the defendant cannot pay a certain amount, regardless of ability to pay or a nexus with public safety, even where the defendant has not been charged with any offense.

The real-life impact of pre-trial detention should not be underestimated.

Individuals, quote, may lose their jobs, default on vehicles, lose their homes, get behind on

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

child support payments, lose custody of dependent children, and more, as found by the justice policy institute.

The past could of years have seen varying stages of reform on this issue, including in the great State of California, where I now live. And in various states around the country.

This issue has seen coalitions built across the political aisle wither proponents of criminal justice reform. Including reform in pre-trial detention and money bail, coming from both progressive and conservative advocates.

This project would evaluate state of money bail in operation in current local jurisdictions around states and the how And it impacts the fair country. administration of justice. As well as whether it operates in a manner that denies equal protection of the law to individuals on the basis of race or another protected class.

It will also evaluate the role of the private bail industry and how the involvement of the private sector exasperates or mitigates these impacts. I look forward to taking up this critical issue with the bipartisan lens and hope

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that my fellow Commissioners will support it.

Commissioner Adegbile, as a sponsor of the project on maternal mortality, would you like to begin our discussion on that topic, and we can then discuss both together, if there's any discussion?

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Absolutely. The issue of maternal mortality is one that is receiving some increased attention, and indeed, in my judgement, needs to receive still more.

There is evidence that there are some significant disparities in the experience of maternal mortality. And the fact that there are disparity levels that are quite severe impacting minority populations, African American populations and others, is something on which I would like us to train our focus, to dig into some of the underlying causes, examine some of the pending legislation and assess whether or not there are opportunities for the Commission to use its analytical force and power to help illuminate the importance of this issue.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll ask those who are on the phones to please mute your lines if you're not speaking, we're getting a

1	little bit of feedback. And I'll open for
2	discussion of these topics if there is any.
3	Hearing none Again, with the
4	respect to put your line on mute if you are on
5	the phone because we are hearing significant
6	background noise.
7	I'll call the question and take a roll
8	call vote on this motion. Commissioner Adegbile,
9	how do you vote?
10	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no on
13	these.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
15	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No. No.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
17	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
19	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Really no,
20	even on bail?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's together.
22	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-

Goodson? 1 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 2 3 CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no 4 Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor. 5 6 If you are not speaking and you are on the phone, 7 please mute your line. The next item for discussion and vote 8 is our Fiscal Year 2021 program planning for the 9 10 statutory enforcement report for Fiscal As I mentioned, will continue our practice 11 2021. of voting two years in advance. 12 And I'll open the floor for motions 13 now on projects for consideration. 14 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: 15 Madam Chair? CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adeqbile. 16 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I would like 17 to move for consideration of a disaster relief 18 19 and FEMA concept paper analyst and 20 Commissioner Yaki and I are proposing jointly. circulated a draft, or I should say we circulated 2.1 22 a draft, of this proposal. did, shortly before our meeting, 23 24 circulate а minor revision correcting some

typographical and stylistic points that I have

1	shared with the Commissioners.
2	I take it that those who are on the
3	phone have the revision in their email. And I
4	would be happy to read those minor changes into
5	the record at an appropriate time.
6	But I move consideration of this
7	concept paper, jointly, with Commissioner Yaki.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
9	second?
10	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I second.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: So, I'll open the floor
12	for discussion. Commissioner Yaki or
13	Commissioner Adegbile, would you like to begin
14	our discussion of the topic?
15	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Commissioner
16	Yaki, would you like me to begin?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure.
18	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: 2017 was a
19	year that saw some major natural disasters hit
20	various regions of our country and wreak very
21	substantial devastation that required the
22	substantial mobilization of FEMA and local
23	resources to attend to American populations that
24	were in distress.
25	The Stafford Act and certain other

1	provisions dictate and provide some guidance
2	about how FEMA is supposed to go about in
3	discharging its duties.
4	And this natural disaster response
5	concept paper is intended to shine a light on
6	FEMA's preparedness and response to major natural
7	disasters in different parts of the country and
8	to see how they are affecting different
9	populations. And whether or not there are any
10	disparities or concerns that this Commission
11	should be aware of and that we should highlight
12	for the benefit of the federal government and of
13	the population, so that we can improve in the
14	future at these times of crisis.
15	I thank Commissioner Yaki for his
16	substantial guidance on framing this concept
17	paper. And I look forward to the Commission's
18	effort to try and shed some light.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks. Any discussion
20	on this proposal? Vice Chair.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. This is
22	Commissioner Yaki.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead, Commissioner
24	Yaki.
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I want to thank

Commissioner Adegbile for his leadership in reviving a concept paper that I put together, approximately this time last year of -- I would say that one of the interesting things that has occurred in my life is that I may be the only current United States Commissioner in Civil Rights who has actually ever had to directly work with FEMA in response to a natural disaster. In which I did after the earthquake in the San Francisco Bay area in 1989.

And as Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi's chief of staff, I was tasked with attempting to work with them. And after a somewhat bad response to a hurricane called Hugo on the North Carolina coast, it was incumbent upon us attempt to steer them in the right direction and teach them things such as, what is condominium and what is seismic. Things they had never understood before.

Almost 30 years later, FEMA is still learning. Or is still on a learning curve. And I think that the points brought up in our proposal, regarding the comparable response aspect of this agency to different areas, different populations, is something that is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

worthy of our discussion and our inquiry. 1 And I thank my fellow Commissioner for 2 3 bringing this back, and I look forward to working with him to shed light on an agency that is 4 responsible for responding at some of the worst 5 times in people's lives. And ensuring that it 6 7 does so in a way that respects the diversity of 8 our country. Thank you. 9 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. 10 Commissioner Narasaki? 11 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Oh, Madam Vice Chair. 12 CHAIR LHAMON: CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 13 14 I would like to thank Commissioner Adequile and Commissioner Yaki for putting this forward. 15 intend to support the natural disaster 16 17 response concept paper. Last year, North Carolina was among 18 19 the jurisdictions that were strongly affected by 20 Hurricane Florence. In fact, just 30 miles or so 21 from my home, folks are still reeling from the 22 effects of that natural disaster. And I think the only way that we get 23 24 better, and improve our services, regardless of 25 what area you're talking about, but governmental

1	services is for us to review of what we did well
2	and what we perhaps could improve upon. That's
3	the only way that we get better. And I thank you
4	for having the Commission shine the light on
5	this.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki.
7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I also intend
8	to support this as the statutory report. Sadly,
9	I won't be around to actually attend the
10	briefing.
11	It is shocking to me that this much
12	time after the disaster in Puerto Rico that
13	Puerto Rico is being treated so badly. And that
14	the people of Puerto Rico, who are American
15	citizens, are being left without the full support
16	of their government. I think it's shocking and
17	so it's time for the Commission to take it up.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any further
19	discussion on this proposal?
20	Okay, I'll call the question and we'll
21	take a roll call vote. Commissioner Adegbile,
22	how do you vote?
23	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair,
24	two quick questions. One, does the record
25	reflect a second?

1	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I seconded.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Okay. And
4	thirdly, instead of secondly in that case, is the
5	Commission
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fourthly.
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Fourth.
8	(Laughter.)
9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Is the
10	Commission satisfied with the redline that I
11	provided or is there any need for me to read the
12	largely ministerial changes into the record?
13	CHAIR LHAMON: I think we would all
14	appreciate if you did not.
15	(Laughter.)
16	CHAIR LHAMON: So, thank you.
17	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: It makes me
18	sad that my voice is so cacophonous that it leads
19	my fellow Commissioners to that position, but
20	CHAIR LHAMON: I cast no aspersions on
21	your voice.
22	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: But I
23	recognize it none the less.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It is very
25	soothing, Commissioner Adegbile.

1	(Laughter.)
2	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: If it's time
3	to vote
4	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In fact, the
5	problem with a 7:00 a.m. meeting on the West
6	Coast is I have a dire urge to fall back asleep,
7	so we're all
8	(Laughter.)
9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I've been told
10	my voice has that impact.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Before you vote, I
12	under Commissioner Heriot has a comment or a
13	question?
14	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No. I decided
15	it's not worth it.
16	(Laughter.)
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. Okay,
18	so now we are back to the vote. Commissioner
19	Adegbile, how do you vote?
20	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye. And
21	goodnight, Commissioner Yaki.
22	(Laughter.)
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I've got real
25	doubts that we've got the capability of doing

1	this well, but like, what the heck, let's vote
2	yes here.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Commissioner
4	Kirsanow?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes. Yes.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
9	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, oh, yes.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
13	Goodson?
14	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
16	motion passes unanimously and with levity.
17	The next item on our amended agenda is
18	a discussion and vote on a proposed statement
19	titled, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights,
20	announcement replacement of interpreters with a
21	video at immigrants first immigration hearing,
22	introduced by Commissioner Narasaki.
23	E. U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
24	ANNOUNCEMENT REPLACEMENT OF INTERPRETERS
25	WITH A VIDEO AT IMMICDANTS FIDST

IMMIGRATION HEARING

CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki, could you please read the statement proposed for consideration?

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. And consistent with our accepted practice, I will not be reading the footnotes.

It's entitled, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights to Announcement its Replacement of Interpreters with a Video at Immigrants First Immigration Hearing. The Commission on civil rights strongly objects to the Department of Justice's plans to replace in-person interpreters at immigrants' first immigration hearing with a video recorded in multiple languages.

The elimination of interpreters is a significant impediment to the fair administration of justice. And is a blatant violation of the due process and civil rights of immigrants with limited English proficiency who are entitled to understand what is happening at their hearings.

Under the new policy, the master calendar hearings where immigration judges schedule future hearings and advise immigrants of

their rights will no longer have in-person interpreters. Instead, interpreters will replaced with а video recorded in multiple languages that would purport to inform immigrants of their rights and the of the course proceedings.

If a limited English proficient immigrant does not understand the video or has questions, or if the immigrant and judge need to communicate with each other, judges will have to rely on the chance that someone in the building speaks the immigrant's language. Which may be a less common indigenous language, or rely on a telephone service that judges say is inadequate or delayed.

Or the judge may have to reschedule the hearing, which will add costly delays rather than add efficiency.

The Department of Justice claims that this move is due to limited resources. While the Commission acknowledges that all federal agencies have physical pressures, cost pressures do not exempt agencies from their responsibility to ensure due process and civil rights requirements are met. Especially when the serious

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

consequences of being deported are involved.

Under executive order 13166, federal agencies must provide meaningful access to the programs and services they provide to limited English proficient individuals, under the national origin discrimination provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Which include language access.

Immigrants already face many barriers to a fair hearing and immigration court. They only have the right to counsel on immigration proceedings at their own expense. And most have no attorneys because of the remoteness of many of the detention centers, the expense and the difficulty of being able to find representation while in detention.

The immigration court system also faces a large backlog. And immigrates, including those seeking asylum or fighting deportation, often wait years for the cases to be decided.

Immigration judges have already complained that not having in-person interpreters at these initial hearings will disrupt proceedings and waste time.

Since the 1960s, the Commission and

its state advisory committees have chronicled the 1 implications 2 rights of nation's our 3 immigration laws and policies. We strongly urge the Department of Justice to its 4 reverse decision. 5 6 And we urge Congress to require the 7 department to provide interpreters at all stages 8 of immigration cases. 9 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do we have to open the 10 a motion to approve the statement, floor for discussion? 11 VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: 12 So moved. 13 CHAIR LHAMON: Do we have a second? 14 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second. CHAIR LHAMON: 15 Thank you. Is there any discussion on the statement? I'll begin with 16 17 you, Commissioner Narasaki, as a sponsor of the 18 statement COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: 19 T think the It's a 20 statement stands for itself. fairly 2.1 simply proposition that people who are going 22 through a legal process should have the right to understand, in their language, what is going on. 23 24 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any further

discussion? Commissioner Heriot.

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair,
2	Commissioner Kladney. I'd just like to note that
3	I've taken part in hearing the administrative
4	hearings where interpreters have been on the
5	phone and it is very difficult and disruptive for
6	the client to, well, my client at the time,
7	clients, to get a complete comprehension of
8	what's going on and understanding. And it does
9	take an inordinate, more time in the courtroom
10	process. Thank you.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Commission
12	Heriot.
13	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm going to be
14	voting no on this one. I'm concerned that we're
15	getting our news from the newspapers here.
16	I would like to see in writing what
17	the policy is. And I think we should be
18	consulting with the Department of Justice and get
19	their side of the story better than simply quotes
20	from the newspapers.
21	And it's very hard to get translators
22	for indigenous languages.
23	My understanding is that these first
24	hearings are basically cattle calls, where you
25	get a date. And I'm concerned that we're a

1	little premature on this and that I'm not certain
2	what side of this we ought to be on.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any other
4	discussion? I'll call the question and take a
5	roll call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do
6	you vote?
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
9	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
11	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
13	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
15	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
17	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
19	Goodson?
20	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
22	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
23	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
24	The next item on our amended agenda is
25	a discussion and vote on a proposed statement

1	titled, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Strongly
2	Condemns the Recent Statements of President Trump
3	Telling U.S. Congresswoman to Leave the Country
4	and, quote, Go Back to Their Countries,
5	introduced by Commissioner Yaki.
6	F. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON A PROPOSED STATEMENT
7	TITLED, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS STRONGLY
8	CONDEMNS THE RECENT STATEMENTS OF PRESIDENT TRUMP
9	TELLING U.S. CONGRESSWOMEN TO LEAVE THE COUNTRY
10	AND "GO BACK TO THEIR COUNTRIES"
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki,
12	could you please read the proposed statement for
13	consideration?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very
15	much, Madam Chair. And in, perhaps a Commission
16	first, I decided not to use any footnotes at all.
17	First paragraph. The U.S. Commission
18	on Civil Rights, by a majority vote, strongly
19	condemns statements by the President declaring
20	that elected United States Congresswomen should,
21	quote, go back, end quote, to countries they,
22	quote, originally came from, end quote.
23	Notwithstanding that all, therefore
24	all four congresswomen, the county is in fact the
25	United States. Such racist and nativist and

xenophobic statements undermines the quality principles to which this country aspires, instill and promote division and fear among Americans and seeks to denigrate some among us as less American than others.

paragraph. Next Throughout the history of this country, racism and bigotry has often manifested itself in jingoistic, sloganeering, asking immigrants others, or regardless of citizenship or birthright, quote, return home, end quote.

The Know Nothing party, which began its life as the Native American party, campaigned openly against Catholicism and advocated that Irish and German Catholics to return to their native countries, and it is in quotes. Various movements in the 1800s sought to, quote, resettle freed African-American and slaved people in West Africa, notwithstanding generations are living in the United States. Latin and Asian Americans often made the recipients of slurs, ending in quote, go back home, end quote.

Next paragraph. Particularly for many Americans whose roots, recent or deep, are not from White European ancestors. There's been an

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

1 unfortunately truth that at some point in their 2 someone, because of racism, bigotry or 3 ignorance, has told them to, quote, go back home. So a country not of their birth, often 4 of their ancestry. Solely because 5 even 6 someone does not like their skin color, their 7 ethnicity or their accent. 8 Next paragraph. As claims separation 9 of true Americans from others is divisive, 10 logically flawed and undermines core American values. Americans, all of us, are at home here. 11 12 us has some place else οf 13 should go back to where we disagree with 14 elected leader. And certainly, no elected leader 15 should suggest otherwise. Free speech, including the freedom to 16 17 dissent and the ability of all Americans participate in a robust marketplace of ideas, are 18 19 Hallmark American ideals. In our democracy, the 20 right of the legislative and executive branches 21 and the individuals within each to disagree, is a 22 bedrock principle of the separation of powers enshrined in our constitution. 23 24 The Commission, which Congress has for

six decades, charged to advise the President and

Congress of our status of civil rights, wrongly condemned irresponsible rhetoric that cascades disagreement in a matter that renders Americans less safe, less welcome in their own country and divides this country based on stereotype, attribution of values, based on historic or recent national origin.

This Commission has already urged the administration to increase hate crime enforcement to combat the rise of White nationalism. The President's recent comments only exasperate the problem of White nationalism by normalizing one of their most recent tropes.

On this issue I want to -- there's a typo. I have the word S, the S should be stricken on racist.

Final paragraph. With this statement, the Commission used their voice to reaffirm American values and inclusion and respect for dignity of all persons in our midst. We call on the President to use his platform likewise to lead rather than to tear down this country.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do we have a motion to approve the statement to open the floor for discussion?

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So moved.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second?
3	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
5	discussion on this statement? Commissioner Yaki,
6	I'll begin with you as the sponsor of the
7	statement.
8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I mean, I
9	would actually like to defer first to my
10	colleagues. And I wanted to thank many of my
11	colleagues for their input on participation.
12	For when I wrote this, I wrote it
13	late. It was a little ragged and I want to thank
14	all of you for your assistance.
15	But I'd like to hear from you first,
15 16	But I'd like to hear from you first, and then I'd like to sort of give a closing,
	A Y
16	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing,
16 17	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair.
16 17 18	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice
16 17 18 19	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice Chair.
16 17 18 19 20	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice Chair. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. I
16 17 18 19 20 21	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice Chair. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. I struggle on, and with, the frequency with which
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam Chair. CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice Chair. VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. I struggle on, and with, the frequency with which the Commission should issue public comments and

1	And I have struggled with this
2	particular one. It seems that at the rate that
3	we're going this Commission could spend much of
4	its time issuing statements condemning or
5	criticizing our President's statement.
6	But on this one, after some struggle,
7	I don't see how I cannot support it. That is
8	because of the additional, there has been so much
9	fallout from this. So, you have other folks
10	picking up on this direction.
11	As recently as a couple of days ago,
12	our President was in my home state of North
13	Carolina, and during the course of his remarks a
14	rally chant began, send her back. Or something
15	to that effect.
16	And I think this marks just the
17	beginning. And so I'll be joining in this
18	statement. And I thank you, Commissioner Yaki,
19	for taking the leadership on this. And I see the
20	merit in what you began early on. Thank you.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
22	Commissioner Narasaki.
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Like the Vice
24	Chair, I have been hesitant about supporting this
25	statement. Not because I don't believe in it,

but like her, I believe that the subject of the statement is making incendiary statements on a regular basis. And I'm concerned that we'll have to expend substantial energy and time responding to tweets.

However, my social media feeds exploded with statements from friends and colleagues, recalling their personal hurt and outrage about being told to go back to where they came from, though they were U.S. citizens. I, myself, have felt that pain.

The pain felt by friends not born here, but whose families chose America as their home, is no less than those who were born citizens. There is no question in any of our minds that the tweet is racist.

It is distressing to see members of the party of Lincoln trying to defend them. President Reagan said, you can live in France, but you cannot become a Frenchman.

You can live in Germany or Turkey or Japan, but you cannot become a German, a Turk or a Japanese. But anyone from any corner of the earth can live in America and become an American. That is the beauty of this country.

My father believed, as the four Congresswomen believed who were the target of the tweets, that real patriotism is standing is bullies and loving the United States enough to call it out where it can do better and make the sacrifices necessary to help it to live up to its promises and its founding documents.

My father volunteered to fight in Europe during World War II to defend America's freedom, even though the country of his birth put him and his American born mother behind barbed wire because of the color of their skin and their ancestry.

Commissioner Yaki, who's often the conscious of this Commission, has convinced me that silence is read by White supremacist as acceptance and agreement. However, where we are, the barrage of bigotry from a President who is embolden White supremacist, we cannot let it become normal.

Unchallenged racism and bigotry led to the interment of over 120,000 Japanese Americans in concentration camps and the deaths of millions of Jewish people in the holocaust.

The Commission's job is to be the

conscious of the nation on civil rights. And unfortunately, silence in this case is simple not an option. Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any other discussion? Commissioner Yaki, did you want to give your --

COMMISSIONER YAKI: All right, thank you very much colleagues. And I first want to thank both Commissioners Timmons-Goodson and Commissioner Narasaki for supporting this.

It is a sad state of affairs when we have to ask ourselves, as a Commission and as an American, as individuals, do we need to respond, yet again, to another outrage that goes to the heart of trying to, attempting to redefine who or what is an American in this country.

And it is tiring, it is fatiguing, it is humiliating, it is angering. But like them, in this particular instance, when a vicious, well worn, racist trope of telling people who do not look like you, who do not talk like you, who do not come from the same neighborhood or city or country or anywhere, to go back home as if you, as an American, have any other home, but this country, prompted me to take this action.

2.1

This was even before, as Commissioner Timmons-Goodson pointed out, the horrible chanting at the rally the other night, chants, spontaneous chants of, send her back, referring to one of the Congresswoman, and the refusal of the person speaking at that event, who prompted these chants, to do anything to stop, prevent or rebuke that chant.

We cannot normalize this kind of wording in our country. We cannot normalize this kind of response in this country.

part of the darker side of our nature for generations. And this country has always sought to rise above that and adhere to its ideals and understand that, as Commissioner Narasaki said, being an American is not bound by race, it is not bound by color or creed or national origin or religion, it is who we are put together by people 200 years ago in a magnificent experiment called constitutional democracy.

When someone attempts to create a dividing line at the who or what constitutes an American, the civil rights commission has to act, it has to stand, and it has to stand united. I

urge my colleagues, all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, to support this measure.

This is not about whether or not you agree or disagree with all the policies and principles of the current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, it is about the fact that as a Commission and as a country, no occupant at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue should ever utter these types of words or this type of phrase or create this kind of expectation or normalcy around a statement such as these.

We are better than that. That is not have we been, that is not what we have struggled to do. It is not what, as Abraham it does not rise to the better Lincoln said, angels of our nature. It is not who we are as Americans. And Ι thank you for your consideration. And I thank you for your support.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

Commissioner Heriot.

COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm not going to be able to join this statement as it's written right now, but let me say a few words at least here. While I disagree with parts of the majority statement today, I agree with my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

colleagues point that the Presidents recent tweets were ill considered.

Whether intended or not, it was

predictable that these statements would be interpreted by many the way the Commission now interprets them. Still, it needs to be pointed out that the words racist and white nationalist are tossed around entirely too promiscuously these days. The temperature needs to be brought down.

Like the President, I have profound disagreements on just about every major policy issue with the four Congresswomen who were the subject of the tweets condemned by the Commission statement. Nonetheless, it's my view that he should not have said what he said, in the way he said.

All four Congresswomen are American citizens. Three of the four were born in the United States. The United States is their home.

One can disagree strenuously with the four Congresswomen's policy views without implying that they are somehow less American than any of the rest of us.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

Commissioner Adegbile.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Yaki, for your work on this statement. Ι would just add that, understand it, at the rally the other day where this chant and sentiment was renewed, you can see pictures and video that there were children present.

And there are many things that we call upon leaders to do, but a principle thing is to set a tone from the top that we all aspire to. And when we have a rally where American children are being taught, literally taught, to espouse and embrace these types of racist sentiments, we're not only debasing the office, but we are debasing the lived experience of the country, from its founding to the present day.

And the people who have sat before this Commission over decades, some of whom are the relatives of people who have given their lives in service of the principles of equality.

And so, it is a very serious thing that is much bigger than tweets. It goes to the core of who we aspire to be as a nation. And it troubles me that children are being taught that

1	this is what America stands for in the year 2019.
2	Thank you, Commissioner Yaki.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki, I
4	just
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair?
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney.
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Commissioner
8	Kladney here. I too would like to add my thanks
9	to Commissioner Yaki's leadership on this matter.
10	And I would like to say that one of
11	our charges is that of national origin, and many
12	of us, and our families, have immigrated to the
13	United States in the 20th century. And that
14	that's far in the past.
15	And many of our relatives have
16	suffered at the hands of those people who
17	intentionally want to create animus between
18	people within our country and within the races in
19	our country. And it is difficult for me to
20	believe that these pronouncements were not
21	intentional in nature and did not want to have
22	the result, effect that they did have in North
23	Carolina.
24	Therefore I'm supporting this
25	statement 100 percent. Thank you.

CHAIR LHAMON: Thank 1 you. Commissioner Yaki, to take us down to the truly 2 3 mundane, I noticed one other typo. And with your permission, we would change seek to seeks, at the 4 end of the first paragraph in the statement. 5 COMMISSIONER YAKI: I accept that as a 6 7 friendly amendment. 8 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. And I also 9 want to note, I appreciate Commissioner 10 Heriot's commitment to, and statement commitment to concern about the harm that such a 11 statement from the President makes. 12 I also think it's important for us to 13 recognize that the EEOC, which is the nation's 14 15 authority employment discrimination, about includes these words, go back home, as an example 16 discrimination 17 ofrace and national origin discrimination. That is so archetypal that it is 18 19 explicit in their guidance. 20 And there is, I think no question, 21 that the intent and the receipt of the text from 22 the President is racial harm. And it is our job to call it that, to speak against it and to make 23 24 sure that we, as a nation, don't live that life.

So, I will support this statement.

1	Do we have any further discussion?
2	I'll call the question and we'll take a roll call
3	vote. Commissioner Adegbile?
4	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
6	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Abstain.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
8	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
16	Goodson?
17	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
19	motion passes. One Commissioner abstained, one
20	Commissioner opposed, all others were in favor.
21	Next we will hear from Staff Director
22	Mauro Morales for the monthly Staff Director's
23	report.
24	G. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
25	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT

1	STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam
2	Chair. In respect for the limited time we have
3	left before the next presentation, I have nothing
4	further to add than is already contained in the
5	report. If any Commissioner has a specific
6	question concerning a matter contained in the
7	report, I welcome the opportunity to speak to you
8	about it.
9	I would like to take just a brief
10	moment, Madam Chair and Commissioners, just to
11	thank our law clerks and interns that have been
12	with us this summer. Many of them, this will be
13	their last Commission business meeting.
14	We've enjoyed having you here. We
15	appreciate your hard work in assisting the
15 16	appreciate your hard work in assisting the special assistants, the Office of General
16	special assistants, the Office of General
16 17	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement,
16 17 18	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement, and my office as well.
16 17	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement,
16 17 18	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement, and my office as well.
16 17 18	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement, and my office as well. I hope you got a lot of good
16 17 18 19	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement, and my office as well. I hope you got a lot of good experience out of your time with us, and I wish
16 17 18 19 20 21	special assistants, the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Enforcement, and my office as well. I hope you got a lot of good experience out of your time with us, and I wish you all the best. Please keep in touch with us

CHAIR LHAMON:

25

Thank you. I'll echo

those thanks to our summer interns who have done us a terrific service in being here.

And I'd like also to use this minute to take a point of personal privilege, with Commissioner Narasaki's permission. I understand that this is our last business meeting in which Commissioner Narasaki's special assistant, Jason Lagria, will be with us. And I, okay, we can hope that it's not ---

(Laughter.)

CHAIR LHAMON: -- but on the off chance that it is, I want to say, while Jason is still with us, how very much I have enjoyed working with you, Jason, what incredible service you have given to us.

As a Commission, I think that we Commissioners, who are by statute part-time in doing our work, could not do the work as effectively as we do without the assistance of our extraordinary special assistants.

And Jason has been willing from Day 1 for me to go well above the call to help me when I didn't yet have a special assistant, and to help all of us in providing extraordinary research and terrific service. We will miss you.

I will miss you. Thank you. Commissioner Narasaki?

add, since I won't be in person for the August business meeting, and it is quite likely that he will have left, I want to say that it has been an honor and a pleasure to work with him. I stole him from my former place of employment. So in all fairness to him, he knew what he was getting he agreed to work with me.

And he's done an incredible job, not just the work, you know, the written work, and the research, and all of that important stuff, but I asked him when I started to help build a spirit of camaraderie in the Commission between the appointees and the staff, and to sort of bridge the political divides and have an open door.

And I think that he has contributed a lot to the environment of the Commission. And I'm very proud of his work, and I look forward to seeing the, I'm sure, the impact that he will continue to have on the world and on civil rights. So thank you, Jason.

CHAIR LHAMON: Madam Vice Chair?

1	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Is it
2	okay to
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Pile on.
4	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: to
5	pile on
6	(Laughter.)
7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Jason has
8	done all of this, made this incredible effort
9	that you've been hearing about with his work
10	while at the same time building a family. And so
11	I think he gets extra credit.
12	How many babies have you had since
13	you've been here?
14	(Laughter.)
15	CHAIR LHAMON: We're veering into
16	discriminatory land.
17	(Laughter.)
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Maybe we should stop.
19	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Well, I
20	was just going to say, I don't know if it's the
21	pressures that we brought to bear on him
22	PARTICIPANT: He had time to make the
23	babies.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, really we should
25	stop.

1	(Laughter.)
2	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: But thank
3	you, thank your wife, and your children. That's
4	where I was going, Madam Chair
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: for
7	sharing you and allowing such great effort. All
8	the best to you. And when I look at you, I see
9	what our future leaders look like. Thank you.
10	Madam Chair?
11	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Madam Chair, I
12	need to pile on at this point.
13	(Laughter.)
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Please don't talk about
15	the baby making.
16	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I will not get
17	into the biological functions of our Commission.
18	But I will say that Jason has been, I think,
19	really the rock of so much of what has happened.
20	And as someone who has been deprived of a
21	special assistant for many months, which is now
22	finally been remedied just as he leaves, thank
23	God, that his work on the upcoming immigration
24	detention update that we were doing has been

phenomenal.

1	But even aside from that, he is just a
2	phenomenal human being, someone who understands
3	the world of public service in every single
4	positive aspect that you can think of. And we
5	have been benefitted by him, the government will
6	be benefitted by him.
7	And, Jason, you know, it goes without
8	saying, but if I can ever do anything for you in
9	future, please know that I can and I will.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
11	Commissioner Heriot?
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: This is
13	Commissioner Kladney, I'd also like to add my
14	best wishes to Jason and his family, a wonderful,
15	well, to me a young man, ha, ha, ha, and a very
16	hard worker and committed person as well. So,
17	Jason, thank you and best of luck.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
19	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just want to
20	thank Jason, who has been blushing a lot since
21	all this started. I want to thank him for all
22	his work in bridging the ideological divide. And
23	he's been wonderful to work with, and I'll miss
24	him. And, you know, thanks very much, Jason.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?

1	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: In the spirit
2	of our ongoing work together at the Commission,
3	Jason, me too.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIR LHAMON: All right, Mr. Staff
6	Director?
7	STAFF DIRECTOR: You know, I can't
8	thank you enough, Jason, for your commitment to
9	us to work with the professional staff, and
LO	special assistants, more importantly with me in
L1	my transition when I got here and throughout the
L2	years. You're going to be missed. So thank you
L3	for your service.
L 4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. So with
L5	that, I think we'll take a five-minute break.
L6	And then reconvene just at 11:40, a six-minute
L7	break, for our next iteration of our speaker
L8	series to which I very much look forward. Thank
L9	you.
20	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
21	went off the record at 11:34 a.m. and resumed at
22	11:43 a.m.)
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. I will get us
24	stated for our next iteration of our speaker
25	series. The title for today is the History and

Legacy of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. And thank you, Commissioner Narasaki, for suggesting this month's speaker topic and for coordinating Mr. Kamasaki's appearance.

The need for immigration reform and to protect against particular civil rights violations has long been an issue of concern for the Commission. The Commission, along with our advisory committees, has issued policy statements and full reports addressing various concerns ranging from enforcement practices across the country as well as at the border, the need for fair, and thorough adjudication of efficient, immigration cases, protection for undocumented immigrants, and detention center policies.

I am glad that today we will reflect on the last successful movement for major immigration reform from 1986. Before I introduce our speaker, I'll turn to Commissioner Narasaki for some brief opening remarks.

H. SPEAKER SERIES PRESENTATION BY CHARLES KAMASAKI ON HIS BOOK,

IMMIGRATION REFORM: THE CORPSE THAT WILL NOT DIE

COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you, Madam Chair. I want to add my thanks to Charles

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

Kamasaki for briefing us today on the history of the 1986 Legalization Law and some of the legislation that followed.

While it occurred well over 30 years ago, it has relevance and lessons for policy makers and immigration reform advocates today. Then as now, the immigration system was badly broken as policies had not kept up with the global and domestic realities that create the push and pull factors that drive migration to the United States.

The history of immigration in American has been the pull of America's labor needs and the push of the political economic environmental crises around the world, some of which American foreign military and trade policies help to drive.

America has often recruited immigrant labor, but American communities have not always been prepared to welcome immigrants, particularly those with different religions, languages, and cultures and particularly when they're not White.

For example, the Chinese laborers came to help build the railroads. And then when that was done, they were banned. The Japanese then

came to the West Coast to fill the demand for fishing and farming, and then they were banned. And then the Filipinos came in numbers after both of the Chinese and Japanese were banned. Eventually, all Asian immigration was curtailed.

The story in this book is well told, I got to read some advance drafts, and extensively researched by an author who's lived through it. It's more than a story of an extraordinary piece of legislation, it's the story of a community, whose struggles have been largely invisible and whose voice has largely been ignored, finally coming of age and becoming a force in the nation's capital.

And to all is me, this more interesting that it's coming from a Japanese American who grew up in Texas more among Latinos than Asians. I've had the honor of working with Charles Kamasaki for over a quarter of a century, was fortunate, along with hundreds of I coming into the field of civil immigrant rights, to have had him tutor me on how DC really works.

The book is a master class on how democracy actually functions from an expert who's

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 committed his life to helping America live up to its most fundamental values and promises. 2 3 thank you for documenting the time in America's history and sharing it with us today. 4 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. So we now 5 welcome Charles Kamasaki who is Senior Cabinet 6 7 Advisor for UnidosUS and resident fellow at the 8 Migration Policy Institute. At UnidosUS, Mr. Kamasaki is a senior member of management with a 9 10 range of responsibilities including supervising legal 11 immigration services and citizenship 12 strategies and overseeing the program organization's other immigration initiatives. 13 14 Mr. Kamasaki is also the author of the 15 recently published book titled Immigration Reform: The Corpse that Will Not Die, a History 16 of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. 17 It that book, Mr. Kamasaki shares his 18 19 personal insights as, quote, a direct participant 20 in the many meetings, hearings, markups, debates, 21 and other developments that led to the passage, 22 end quote, of the 1986 legislation. Kamasaki, we 23 Mr. look forward to hearing from you. 24

Sorry

KAMASAKI:

MR.

25

that.

about

After having been instructed twice on how to turn the microphone on, I forgot.

Thank you to the Commission for this opportunity, to Commissioner Narasaki especially, and her aid, Jason, who I will not pile on more accolades, Staff Director, Mauro Morales.

And I would just note, I observed his comments to the interns and law clerks who assisted the Commission. There are two of us in this room who began our careers as interns at then National Council of La Raza, now UnidosUS. share, think, some And SO we Ι of your experiences.

I do need to start with a caveat. Although I am proudly employed by UnidosUS, and a fellow at the Migration Policy Institute, the views and opinions in the book and in my talk today are solely my own.

What I'd like to do is cover three sets of issues today in my remarks. First, I'll attempt to provide a brief overview of my book which is, as you can tell, a pretty lengthy tome about the passage, implementation, and aftermath of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, or IRCA, as it's known to insiders.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Second, because I am speaking to the US Commission on Civil Rights, I'll try and outline a few of the civil rights implications of the policy debates during the IRCA era and maybe some thoughts about the future.

And finally, I'll conclude with a brief thought about the relevance of IRCA for those many of us included yearning for immigration reform today.

As an overview, I'm really struck by how many otherwise very well informed people know so little about the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

It's often called, quote, unquote, the Bill. fact, Reagan Amnesty But in his administration was internally divided on the legislation, generally hostile to the idea of legalizing unauthorized immigrants, and played a minimal role in its passage except importantly, as the picture on the screen notes, signing the final legislation.

Many people today blame IRCA for the growth of the undocumented population since 1986.

But that growth actually accelerated far faster after passage in 1996 of a tough enforcement-only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

immigration law.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Because it successfully legalized nearly three million people and, along with its follow-on bill in 1990, protected perhaps two million more from deportation, many people simply assumed that it must have been supported by progressives and conservatives and must have been supported by Latinos and the entire civil rights community. The reality is actually far different and far more nuanced.

Reform: My book, Immigration The Corpse That Will Not Die, is about IRCA's It's full of details. and times. Because, the legislative process, details Ιt matter. lengthy portrayals includes οf key actors, because people obviously matter. It tells the story of how the last major immigration reform came to be through every single procedural step. Because in legislative the process, procedure matters a lot.

And finally, it covers the bill's implementation, not just because implementation matters too, but also because it was in that period that the battle lines of today's debate about immigration reform were being drawn.

Especially when considered together with its follow-on bill, the 1990 Act, the last set of comprehensive immigration reforms, by every standard, were highly consequential. For the first time in American history, those laws made it unlawful for an employer to knowingly hire or employ an unauthorized immigrant, so-called employer sanctions provisions of IRCA.

The bill authorized more border enforcement leading to what my colleagues at the Migration Polity Institute today call a formidable enforcement machinery that far exceeds spending on all other federal law enforcement combined.

At the same time, it legalized nearly three million people, and the two bills together protected at least two million more from deportation, at least temporarily. And the two bills together set the stage for a doubling of the number of legal immigrants authorized to come into the United States compared to its 1980s levels.

To understand how that bill came to be from a political science perspective, one might start with what political scientists call the

three Ps.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

John Kingdon, who is one of the most astute and influential political scientists of the modern era, once stated that the enactment of major reforms like IRCA occur only with the convergence of three streams which he called the three Ps, recognized problem stream, legislation, significant enough to require second, a mature policy stream of proposals that might solve the problem, and third, the third P, political will sufficient to overcome the forces comfortable with or entrenched in the status quo.

When it comes to immigration, the problem stream of unauthorized migration, a policy stream of reforms to address it, and sufficient political will to move it through at least one house of Congress have clearly been in place for more than over a dozen times over the past five decades.

Yet only in 1986 and again in 1990 did
Congress enact sweeping, comprehensive reforms.
The stories in my book attempt to explain how and
why that happened. But unlike most standard
legislative chronicles, this book is told not
from the perspective of lawmakers but from the

perspective of a small coalition of non-profit advocates that called itself The Group.

Its unofficial leader was Arnoldo Torres of the League of United Latin American Citizens, once the most conservative of the Latino civil rights organizations. While they work largely outside the process, if generally and parallel, representatives of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund were also key players.

These Latino groups were joined by the American ACLU, the, Immigration Lawyers World Association, Church Service, the immigration and refugee arm of the National of Churches. Council And all of them were members of an organization that today is called National Immigration Forum.

A few months after this group was formed in 1983, a guy named Kamasaki, unlikely, with less than a year of experience in DC, was assigned literally by default to cover immigration policy for the National Council of La Raza, now UnidosUS.

The Group faced enormous policy challenges. They wanted to defeat or mitigate

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

employer sanctions, what House bill sponsor Ron Mazzoli called the heart of the bill. They sought a far more generous legalization program than the million or so undocumented the original bill might have offered legal status to.

Instead of reducing family-based legal immigration, which the first two versions of the Simpson/Mazzoli bill would have done, they wanted to increase it. They opposed greater restrictions on asylum seekers that IRCA originally would have opposed.

The Group wanted to prevent the creation of a major new Agricultural Guest Worker Program which, although it wasn't in the original legislation, passed the House in 1984 and the Senate in 1985.

Several in The Group audaciously demanded protections from deportation for Salvadorans fleeing massive civil strife in the region. And some envisioned building a whole new field of pro-immigrant and Latino advocates in the process.

And The Group initially opposed the legislation that proffered these proposals. This coalition had very few resources.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The powerful Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, the preeminent voice for minorities in the policy process, sat out the debate part because its most powerful and influential members, the NAACP and, with exceptions, Organized Labor, along with other powerful progressive elites, including virtually every editorial board in the country, supported the bill.

The Group's resources were dwarfed by opposing interests, like Labor, agricultural business, growers, biq and an emerging conglomerate of anti-immigrant groups beginning with an organization called the Federation for American Immigration Reform. And in fact, all of Latino organizations, LULAC, MALDEF, were literally teetering on the edge of NCLR, bankruptcy during the entire IRCA era.

And with respect to public opinion, pro-immigrant policy goals that The Group supported were uniformly far less popular than they are today. And yet, while the advocates couldn't stop employer sanctions, they succeeded almost everywhere else.

IRCA, in the 1990 Act, did not include

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

a major Agricultural Guest Worker Program. 1 Ιt resulted in, as I said, legalizing nearly three 2 3 million previously undocumented people to become permanent lawful residents of the United States. 4 Ιt extended administrative and 5 6 eventually permanent protection from deportation 7 for a million close family members of those legalized. It doubled the legal immigration from 8 the 1980s levels, kept an asylum system largely 9 10 intact and, through a new temporary protected status created in the 1990 Act, provided relief 11 for perhaps another 800,000 to a million Central 12 13 Americans fleeing civil strife or natural 14 disaster. Except for the exclusion of a large 15 temporary worker program, I think it's fair to 16 17 say that not a single knowledgeable observer would have predicted any of these outcomes when 18 19 the debate began in 1981. 20 So the question arises, how did The 2.1 and its allies inside and outside 22 Congress do it? And unfortunately, for that 23 answer you have to read the book.

Honestly, I do hope the book has value

historical document

strictly

as

an

24

25

as

or

legislative case study. It's a story filled with intrigue, ups and downs, secret deals in smoke-filled rooms. But I also think it raises important civil rights implications and it has lessons for future reformers.

And since this is a meeting of the US Commission on Civil Rights, I'm obligated, I think, to discuss some of the major civil rights implications of that debate as well as this Commission's very significant role in that debate.

I'd like to specifically address three civil rights related themes. First is the adverse effects of immigration enforcement on the civil rights of Hispanic American citizens and others lawfully present in the US.

story actually begins in mid-1850s after the Mexican American War in which 100,000 or so people of Mexican origin some became subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. For the next 100 years, Mexican Americans experienced widespread systemic discrimination that many scholars have described as akin to those in the Jim Crow south.

One scholar, Rodolfo Acuna, famously

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

described this period as an occupation under which Mexican Americans were subjects of, somewhat analogous to those of the European colonies, but never full citizens of the nations of their Colonial masters.

this One important instrument of occupation was a kind of immigration policy in reverse. In four separate campaigns from the 1920s through the mid-1950s, which ended with the notorious Operation Wetback, millions of people Mexican of origin quote, unquote, were, repatriated to Mexico, most without any form of due process.

Perhaps half of those removed were American citizens. Virtually all would have had some valid claim to lawful presence had they been given the opportunity to assert it. But none were.

Another key immigration policy of the period was the infamous Bracero Temporary Agricultural Worker Program which operated from 1942 through 1964 under which several million Mexican workers were allowed into the country to work.

While many, arguably most, were well

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

treated by the standards of the era, the program was also fraught with abuse and exploitation. But the program, even after it ended in 1964, cemented in place an agricultural system dependent on cheap labor from Mexico.

And finally, in 1976, Congress enacted legislation that cut legal immigration from Mexico in half, literally at the same time that country's population was booming and its economy was tanking, which left a perfect storm of factors.

Repatriates seeking to return to their and unite with their families, former Bracero Program workers recruited to work in the Mexico's all fields, and failing economy massive migration pressures. But generated instead of meeting this demand by increasing the supply of visas, Congress cut that supply of visas in half.

Having closed the proverbial front door to entry to the United States, immigrants surprisingly attempted to enter through the back door, and unauthorized migration rose rapidly. Congress then attempted to enact legislation beginning in the 1970s, mainly

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

through employer sanctions, the penalties or employers for hiring unauthorized immigrants.

And through the 1980s, Latino advocates opposed employer sanctions because they were thought to be both ineffective and would lead to increased employment discrimination, preferring instead a combination of tough labor law enforcement, stronger border controls, and increased legal immigration as a more rational response.

Which leads me to my second theme which is the evolution of the Hispanic civil rights organization and of the civil rights field writ large on the issue of immigration reform.

As I described in my book, up through the early 1970s, Latino civil rights organizations and thought leaders, like most Americans, were almost uniformly supportive of tough immigration enforcement.

That began to change with the widespread associated abuses with accelerated through the Chicano Wetback and movement which, even after it faded away in the late 1960s, left a Mexican American leadership that I say in my book was, quote, markedly more

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ethnocentric and pro-immigrant in its orientation.

Notwithstanding its opposition to employer sanctions and its pro-immigrant orientation, in the mid-1980s two of the three major Latino civil rights groups, the League of United Latin American Citizens National Council of La Raza, led by Congressman Esteban Torres, broke with ideological orthodoxy and helped produce the reforms that ultimately five million protected some previously unauthorized immigrants from deportation.

Many stream main civil rights institutions began the IRCA era, like their Latino counterparts, as ardent restrictionists. But by the turn of the century, I believe it's fair to say, that virtually the entire civil rights community became united around generally pro-immigrant principles.

The last civil rights related theme T'd like to address is t.he role ofthis Commission in that debate. This Commission was among the very first mainstream institutions to recognize and call for increased policy attention discrimination to against Latinos in the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 mid-1960s and supported NCLR and others in their call for Hispanics to be counted for the first 2 3 time in the 1980 census. With respect to immigration, this 4 Commission's landmark 1980 report, the Tarnished 5 Golden Door, broke with conventional wisdom and 6 7 presciently predicted the failure of employer 8 sanctions to reduce unlawful immigration and its propensity to increase employment discrimination. 9 10 After IRCA was enacted in 1989, this Commission again issued 11 a report documenting 12 discrimination related to employer sanctions verified 13 which was later by the General 14 Accounting Office, now Government а 15 Accountability Office 1990 report, in that estimated some nine percent of employers, that's 16 17 nearly half а million, have adopted discriminatory hiring practices after IRCA was 18 enacted. 19 20 And in the years since, this 21 Commission has often spoke out against civil and 22 human rights abuses in immigration enforcement, examples of which we had literally this morning. 23 There is more the Commission can do to 24

build on this proud legacy, and let me offer

three suggestions. First is to examine the extent to which the current enforcement system is fatally flawed by discrimination.

For the past several years, research has documented that well over half of all new unauthorized immigrants don't come across the southern border but enter lawfully and then overstay their visas. Yet year after year, well over 90 percent of all deportations are Latinos who, so called, entered without inspections across the southern border.

that traditional While Ι recognize disparate impact measures for a variety of very complicated technical reasons may not always be applied to immigration enforcement, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that, regardless of which administration is in power, enforcement is exclusively imposed on offenders that just happen to be Latino.

Second, a crucial subset of those adversely impacted by immigration enforcement are the nearly six million US citizens and others lawfully present who have one or more undocumented family members. The toxic stress imposed on these children is incalculable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

To paraphrase my boss, Janet Murguia, who is joining us today, imagine what it must be like to know that the next knock on your door may be ICE agents coming to deport your mom, that the next time the phone rings, it could be your dad who was picked in a traffic stop and is calling to say goodbye, or that the next letter in the mail is one demanding that one of your parents appear at a deportation proceeding.

Surely these children who have done nothing wrong, have some right to pursue life, liberty, and happiness in the country of their birth. Yet there is literally no remedy for the toxic stress that they feel every day.

I'd note that reports Finally, racial profiling, apprehension, detention, deportation of US citizens and others even present lawfully in the United States are significant.

Similarly, systems like E-Verify regularly produce false positives whereby people authorized to work cannot be verified due to marriage, or divorce, or other name change, or even a typo on a DHS record. These people are routinely denied a job, often even without

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

knowing why.

Many of you are distinguished legal practitioners in your own right, and you know how burdensome and difficult it can be to obtain redress through the legal system if you are wrongfully apprehended, or detained, or denied a job.

And so the question is, are there less burdensome administrative remedies that could both prevent this from happening by holding offending agencies and officials accountable while also providing appropriate and timely redress for those adversely affected.

Surely there are other questions this Commission could consider, but allow me to return, as I close, to a theme in my book. I suspect many of you here are wondering what the story of IRCA, a bill that passed more than 30 years ago, whether that story is at all relevant to today's debate.

I for one think it has a lot of relevance. And I would ask for you just to step back and think of how quickly the politics of the issue have changed in the last 15 years.

In 2006 the Senate passed a

comprehensive immigration reform bill, but then the House refused to act. In 2007 a similar bill died on the Senate floor when the House almost certainly would have been able to produce a bill when it was headed by the new speaker, Nancy Pelosi.

In 2010 it reversed again. The House passed the DREAM Act, but it died in the Senate.

And three years later, it reversed again when the Senate passed a comprehensive bill that was never brought up for vote in the House.

I think most of us, certainly most immigration advocates, see this record and see failure. But to me, it looks a lot like the 15 years that preceded IRCA's passage in 1986.

So I'll close, for me, on what's an unusually optimistic note. In the 1970s, Peter Rodino introduced immigration reform measures three times, twice passing the House and dying in the Senate. In 1979, the new Immigration Subcommittee Chair, Al Simpson, from Wyoming, half joked that he'd been thrown into leadership of that subcommittee because no one else wanted it.

In his wonderful book, The Last Great

Senate, Ira Shapiro lamented that the era of bipartisanship in Congress had ended with the election of Ronald Reagan in 1980. In 1982, the new House Immigration Subcommittee Chair said he had to, quote, virtually shanghai, unquote, other members of Congress to even join his subcommittee.

The immigration reform measures sponsored by Simpson and Mazzoli passed the Senate twice but died in 1982 and in 1984. And in mid-October of 1986, after his own immigration reform bill died on the House floor, House Judiciary Committee Chairman Rodino told aids that he was ready to, quote, wash his hands of the legislation.

That same week, the ranking Immigration Subcommittee member, Dan Lungren, of California, who had led the fight to kill the bill, called the legislation, quote, a corpse, unquote.

But just three years later, in November 1986, in that picture that you have on your screens, Simpson, Mazzoli, Rodino, Lundren, and others gathered in the Roosevelt Room at the White House and watched President Reagan sign

1	that corpse into law.
2	Thank you again for the invitation to
3	discuss my book. And I'd be happy to answer any
4	questions.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you so much for
6	your presentation. And I will open for questions
7	and comments from my fellow Commissioners.
8	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair?
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
10	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you,
11	Madam Chair. One of my questions is when you
12	started your presentation, you talked about
13	employer sanctions in the '86 bill. How
14	effective have they been in light of the I-19, I
15	think's an I-19, I can't remember the number,
16	that actually gives employers protection when
17	they copy two forms of identification and fill
18	out a form?
19	MR. KAMASAKI: Well, without speaking
20	for the merits of the specific, it's the I-9 form
21	that employers use
22	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Oh.
23	MR. KAMASAKI: to verify new hires.
24	I think it's obvious that employer sanctions
25	have not been effective in stemming the flow of

unauthorized immigration.

And it's, I guess, ironic that only in Washington that those who go against the conventional wisdom and are proven right by subsequent events get no credit, while those who go along with the conventional wisdom that's proven wrong somehow aren't held accountable.

It was actually immigration restrictionists who first proposed employer sanctions and predicted they would be effective.

And it was Latino civil rights organizations that predicted that they would not be effective and that they would cause discrimination.

I guess it's a very complicated subject. But I guess what I would say is, to be fair, the proponents of employer sanctions argue that, like the tax laws, most employers, most people are good actors. And they will try in good faith to comply with the law. And I believe that assumption is actually largely correct.

The issue is that it's only a tiny fraction of employers who hire the vast majority of undocumented immigrants. So even if you have something like 90 percent compliance, if the ten percent of employers who are not complying with

1 law, who are evading the law, or calling their employees contractors and not employees and 2 3 thus not new hires, then I think you have a recipe for a system that cannot possibly work. 4 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And I would ask 5 6 you what would be your, in any immigration reform 7 bill going forward, what would be the top five 8 issues and any proposed solutions that you would have for such a proposal? 9 And if possible, full 10 text. 11 (Laughter.) 12 MR. KAMASAKI: No problem. 13 (Laughter.) 14 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Well, just the five issues, why don't we start with that. How's 15 16 that? Well, 17 MR. KAMASAKI: I think, you know, the outlines of what's called comprehensive 18 19 immigration reform, Ι think, have been well 20 established for some time. So I believe any 21 comprehensive measure has to include effective 22 enforcement. And that would include not just border 23 24 enforcement but heightened labor law enforcement 25 that actually gets at that ten percent

employers who knowingly hire unauthorized immigrants so that they can be exploited. And for whatever reason, this country's commitment to labor law enforcement has weakened considerably in the last four or five decades.

I think it's also fair to say that immigration results from not just pull factors in the United States but push factors from abroad. So any comprehensive set of reforms has to look at push factors that send people to the United States. And I think the current debate about Central America underscores that.

Second, we believe that there should be more avenues for lawful migration. And what exactly those numbers are, and in what categories they should be are hotly contested. But I think there is consensus on that point.

Third, for those undocumented people who have put down roots in this country, many of whom have children, I think it's fair to say that a process to legalize their status is far preferable to any of the alternatives, including mass deportation.

So I think those are kind of, like, the three core provisions. There are any number

2.1

1 of other issues. Whether there should be broader temporary worker programs as part of a 2 3 immigration stream, the size of those programs and so forth, whether there should be a point 4 all of those are, I think, matters of 5 6 debate. 7 But enforcement, dealing humanely and thoughtfully with the unauthorized already here, 8 and matching our future labor market and social 9 10 with а legal immigration system 11 accurately and adequately meets those needs, I 12 think, have been and remain the fulcrum comprehensive reform. 13 14 COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you. CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki? 15 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So it would be 16 17 interesting to hear your thoughts about how national origin discrimination played out during 18 19 IRCA and how you see it continuing to play out 20 And also, to note that, while IRCA's now. 21 thought about mainly in terms of its legalization 22 of Latinos, it actually also had a large impact for Asian Americans. 23

Indeed.

KAMASAKI:

MR.

24

25

So maybe

were, I think, about 75 percent of those legalized under IRCA. And obviously the remaining 25 percent included large numbers of Asians and others.

You know, the interplay of national origin discrimination and immigration enforcement is almost inextricable. And some of the history, Karen, that you articulated earlier, I'm sorry, Commissioner Narasaki, earlier I think speaks to that fact.

I will say that I'm a little concerned about making the immigration debate only about race or national origin. Because I personally don't believe it is. And while it is hard to avoid outright racism or accusations of outright racism in immigration policy debates, I think the country is best served if those are, while recognized, don't become the central or only element of those debates.

To specifically answer your question about national origin discrimination, you might think about, again, speaking to those three major pillars.

With respect to enforcement, I think in my statement I covered much of those issues.

I think it's very, very difficult to enforce immigration laws as they are currently drafted without imposing very significant disparate burdens on specific populations, especially Latinos.

I for one would like to take a step back and look at whether there are different strategies that we could pursue that could effectively enforce the immigration laws without selectively enforcing them on a single population.

Secondly, with respect to dealing with the unauthorized population here, I do think, particularly with respect to the children of undocumented people, again, there is a clear disparate impact on --- and in this case not just Latinos but Asians.

And I think thinking through the balancing of equities and the balancing of values of what rights do they have, regardless of the offenses that their parents may have committed, is something that is often missing from today's debates.

And then finally, the question of national origin and legal immigration has been

2.1

1	omnipresent since the beginning of our first
2	immigration laws. And whether we choose to
3	alter, consciously or unconsciously, the
4	demographic makeup of this country, is dependent,
5	at least in part, on how we design the legal
6	immigration system.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Staff Director?
8	STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam
9	Chair. Charles, I want to thank you for your
10	presentation. You've been a good friend and
11	mentor to me for over 30 years when we first came
12	to Washington, D.C., something along those lines.
13	So during those 30 years, you have become an
14	important policy expert, on not only immigration
15	but other vital issues for Unidos, but for all
16	civil rights advocates.
17	My question is what motivates you to
18	remain involved in the struggle for civil rights?
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Remember, our interns
20	are here.
21	(Laughter.)
22	MR. KAMASAKI: You know, I'd like to
23	say that I grew up with a strong passion for
24	civil rights, and I knew as soon as I got out of
25	school that was my future destiny. And the

1 truth, however, would be very far from that. So I started as an intern at NCLR 2 actually working on housing policy. 3 I was given an opportunity to come to DC, and I thought only 4 for a couple of years before I found my real 5 6 career. And while I was working on housing 7 policy, the legislative director for NCLR, 8 someone you know well, Francisco Garza, decided to leave DC to go back to California and get 9 10 married. And I was just kind of sitting around 11 the office when the boss said you're covering 12 immigration. And that was really kind of 13 14 beginning of how I entered the field. I think what's kept me in the field is 15 maybe two or three things. And I will try and 16 17 avoid Commissioner Narasaki's example and keep from 18 19 being sentimental here. But one of those is you 20 get to do important work. 21 You know, it's pretty rare in one's lifetime 22 that you can work а piece on legislation and then a few years later be walking 23 24 down the street, or talking to a cab driver, and

they'll turn around and say that's the bill that

I got legal status through. And that's obviously extraordinarily rewarding.

Second, as a, you know, it's less common now but certainly when I first started, when I would be sitting in a meeting and we'd go around the room and introduce ourselves, people would kind of give me an interesting look, like, what are you doing working for that organization?

And I would say it's always felt quite natural to me. And I think that's been helped along by the fact that the Latino organizational community, and I think the Latino community in general, is a very welcoming one.

And as to the question of why I've stayed so long, one that I occasionally ask myself, honestly it's less a question of civil rights and more a question of, I think, professional advancement.

At each stage of my career, when I thought, okay, I've done this, and I'm about to move on to something different, something was happening at UnidosUS that gave me an opportunity to literally change careers while being in the same organization. And I think as much as anything else, it always felt more natural and a

1	place where I could contribute the most was by
2	doing different jobs, albeit in the same
3	organization.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: I'll follow that on
5	with thanks for what you documented in your book,
6	and then also what you presented to us today, for
7	the effort and the daily reminder that what can
8	feel quixotic isn't always and that there's value
9	in sticking with it and in continuing to work
10	towards and end goal that will make us more just.
11	So thank you for the concrete reminder that
12	sometimes it happens and also for documenting
13	what it took to make it happen.
14	MR. KAMASAKI: Thank you.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Any comments or
16	questions?
17	(No audible response)
18	III. ADJOURN
19	CHAIR LHAMON: With that, I will thank
20	you for your presentation, and for your book, and
21	we will adjourn our meeting at 12:29.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
23	went off the record at 12:28 p.m.)
24	
25	

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701