U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

+ + + + +

BUSINESS MEETING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, JULY 19, 2019

+ + + + +

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

PRESENT:

CATHERINE E. LHAMON, Chair

PATRICIA TIMMONS-GOODSON, Vice Chair

DEBO P. ADEGBILE, Commissioner

PETER N. KIRSANOW, Commissioner*

GAIL HERIOT, Commissioner

DAVID KLADNEY, Commissioner*

KAREN K. NARASAKI, Commissioner

MICHAEL YAKI, Commissioner*

MAURO MORALES, Staff Director
MAUREEN RUDOLPH, General Counsel

* Present via telephone

STAFF PRESENT:

LASHONDA BRENSON

KATHERINE CULLITON-GONZALEZ

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 AGENDA
II.	BUSINESS MEETING
(Presentation by Montana Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Report, Bordertown Discrimination in Montana
(Presentation by Massachusetts Advisory Committee Chair on the Committee's Advisory Memorandum, Hate Crimes in Massachusetts 23
]	Discussion and vote on State Advisory Committee appointments
	Discussion and vote on 2020 and 2021 project proposals46
:	U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, announcement replacement of interpreters with a video at Immigrants First immigration hearing 60
2 1	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"
	Management and Operations
I	Speaker Series Presentation by Charles Kamasaki on his book, Immigration Reform: The Corpse That Will Not Die90
TTT	ADJOURN MEETING

1	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 could confirm
15	that 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
	NEAL R. GROSS

1	the Commissioners is present. Is the court
2	reporter present?
3	COURT REPORTER: Present.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Mr. Staff
5	Director, could 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
	NEAL D. ADAGO

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
8	I drafted and circulated Tuesday night, regarding
9	the, hang on a second. I want to make sure I get
10	it 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 Bordertown
4	Discrimination in Montana.
5	BUSINESS MEETING
6	A. PRESENTATION BY MONTANA ADVISORY
7	COMMITTEE CHAIR ON THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT,
8	BORDERTOWN 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 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
25	second briefing in Hardin off until the spring of

1 2018. Even though there were gaps in the 2 time of the briefing, the social and economic 3 relationships of Native Americans, and the White 4 5 community, has remained the same. Many of the communities, such 6 as Hardin, were originally part of the reservation 7 that surrounds them. And the Whites commissioned 8 9 them the off Congress to grant areas as reservation, which created a chasm between the 10 two sides that has continued until this day. 11 These areas of our state seem to have 12 issues with discrimination than others. 13 But, along with all the other communities, people 14 15 who from the outside notice the come 16 discrimination right away. 17 We included the education portion in 18 this briefing as a follow-up to our previous 19 briefing. Since the current briefing was filed 20 in May, the Department of Education is 21 investigating the school system in Wolf Point, 2.2 Montana. 23 found to have been They were in violation of several laws, discrimination against 24

Native youth 15 years ago. And it appears that

1	this activity has continued in the Wolf Point
2	school system.
3	Montana has the highest rate of
4	suicide in the nation, including the highest of
5	youth suicide. And of that number, the highest
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	to prison for the youth of our community.
10	Disparities in areas of education lead to
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
15	action in all of the recommendations that we have
16	issued in our brief. And I would like to thank
17	you for this time. If there are any questions,
18	I'd be happy to try to answer them at this time.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you very much,
20	Chair Kircher, I'm going to open for questions
21	and comments from my fellow Commissioners.
22	Commissioner Narasaki.
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I really want
24	to thank the SAC in Montana for its really
25	thorough analysis of what is going on. Sadly, it

1	dovetails much with the report that the
2	Commission recently published last December on
3	the challenges that Native Americans are facing
4	because of the lack of funding and the other
5	issues that are happening.
6	And I was particularly struck by a
7	couple of things in your report. One was the
8	difference in terms of registration access for
9	voting. That in Big Horn, Whites had to travel
10	about, a little less than 12 miles, where Native
11	Americans had to travel an average of 22 miles,
12	and in Yellowstone, Whites traveled a little less
13	than ten miles compared to almost 32 miles for
14	Native Americans.
15	I'm wondering, it looks like there was
16	a settlement to try to start to address that, I
17	was wondering if you had an update about how that
18	was going?
19	MS. KIRCHER: Big Horn County is where
20	Hardin, Montana is, which is one of the reasons
21	that we had our briefing held there. They did
22	come up with a Band-Aid solution I'll call it.
23	It is not really, it does not really give the
24	Natives access that the Whites still have.
25	If you realize the size of our state

1	and the size of the reservations, that is where
2	the problem is. They don't really want to have
3	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
6	to do with money, which I think that it does.
7	Which is what the counties say, they cannot
8	afford to have these other voting locations.
9	But they are still working on it. We
LO	have several different grass roots Native groups
L1	here, that are working on that voting issue about
L2	the difference in that.
L3	Yellowstone County is where Billings
L 4	is, and then Big Horn County is where Hardin is.
L5	And that was the reason that we choose those two
L 6	communities.
L7	Those two communities have the highest
L8	number of discriminations listed and noted over
L 9	the, actually, a century, if you can believe
20	that.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.
22	And I note that there were a lot of
23	recommendations and requests for the Commission
24	to act in terms of making some, sharing some of
25	the findings with the various agencies. I'm also

1	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	involved in. The Commission is not the only thing
7	that I do in this state.
8	So I keep them abreast of these
9	things. And they were all invited to attend these
L 0	briefings. We did have letters from a few of the
L1	legislators that were not able to come, saying
L2	that they could not make it. So they are aware
L3	of it.
L 4	I have received calls from the largest
L5	newspaper in the state concerning the briefing.
L 6	But the information is out there to the
L7	legislators.
L8	We do have several committees within
L 9	the state that were appointed by Governor Bullock
20	to address several of the issues that affect the
21	Native Americans within our state. And those
22	committees are working very hard.
23	I have been in touch with a couple of
24	the people on those committees and I am pleased
25	with the work that they are doing and what they're

1	trying to accomplish. Our goal is to get the
2	federal government involved.
3	Our state can do what we can do but
4	we need to have federal help on some of these
5	things because these are federal laws that are
6	being broken. Or that are not being adhered to.
7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Right. Well,
8	thank you very much for all of your hard work.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Kircher, I echo
10	Commissioner Narasaki's thanks to you for the
11	work. And also just wanted to note, for what use
12	it is to you, that we can use much of the material
13	that's in this report for the various reports
14	that we have pending now at the Commission. In
15	particular, I've been reading a draft of our
16	report about women in prison, and I saw that
17	there's material in this that we can incorporate
18	in that too.
19	So I very much appreciate the concrete
20	information and the ability to incorporate it
21	into the work that we are doing here at the
22	Commission.
23	I want to echo Commissioner Narasaki's
24	questions about Montana's specific focus on some
25	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 consider Billings to be in proximity to a reservation, as you note, focused expectation, on 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 briefing. At that point we included the police from the Hardin Bighorn County area, and also from the Rosebud County areas. Those areas surround the

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	reservation.
2	They also have numbers that are
3	exactly the same as the Billings numbers. And
4	for some reason, they also do not see that that
5	is an issue. We see that it's an issue because,
6	if you don't have that high of a population, why
7	is your jail population so much higher?
8	We have not decided what our follow-
9	up will be yet so I cannot really answer what
LO	we're going to do at this point. I, myself
L1	personally, would like to continue to follow-up
L2	on that.
L3	But I do not know what the Committee
L 4	will decide, and I cannot answer that. We have
L 5	not had a meeting to make that determination yet.
L 6	CHAIR LHAMON: Terrific. Thank you.
L7	I look forward to hearing what you will do, and
L 8	again, I very much appreciate the text that is in
L 9	your brief. Madam Vice Chair.
20	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes,
21	thank you very much. I'd like to follow-up on
22	Chair Lhamon's remarks regarding the chief there
23	in Billings.
24	I was wondering, many jurisdictions,
25	in terms of reviewing discrimination complaints,

1	have a review process that involves citizens of
2	the community as well. And so, I was wondering,
3	or thinking that perhaps as you continue your
4	discussion with the chief, that one possible
5	proposal might be that they revamp their review
6	process such that it includes some participation
7	by members of the public in that.
8	And so, I just wanted to put that out
9	there as a possible solution and have you give
10	some thought to that.
11	MS. KIRCHER: We did have a committee
12	that was, community committee that did. They
13	were the police oversight committee. That
14	committee has been disbanded by the city.
15	We do have a human relations
16	commission in Billings. And I was on that
17	committee. And they would be the ones now that
18	would take any complaint against the police.
19	While I was on that commission, we had
20	three complaints, three discrimination
21	complaints, against the police department. Two
22	involved Native Americans and one involved
23	transgender people.
24	So, the human relations commission in
25	Billings is the one that a person would have to

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

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

1	upon children is a real cause for alarm.
2	Are there any specific initiatives,
3	apart from the Department of Education
4	investigation, to provide some crisis level
5	response with respect to the mental health needs
6	and supports of these children and people in
7	Montana?
8	MS. KIRCHER: Yes, there were several
9	grants that were received. Governor Bullock has
LO	set up a committee that is working specifically
L1	on the issue of the Native youth suicides.
L2	So, we do have something in the state
L3	that is working on that. I do not have a lot of
L 4	information on it. I just know that the committee
L5	was formed.
L 6	I think the first grant that they got
L 7	was only \$700,000. And I think they were supposed
L8	to get another grant of about \$1 million to work
L 9	on that project.
20	We have seven reservations within our
21	state. We actually have eight Indian tribes.
22	One tribe has not yet been recognized by the
23	federal government.
24	So, it's a lot of area to cover. And
25	hecause our state is so large, it also adds a lot

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

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

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

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

1	difficult to know its actual scope in the
2	Commonwealth. There is significant under
3	reporting, particularly in the Muslim and
4	transgender communities, where we believe to be
5	areas of increased incidents.
6	This is certainly not surprising, but
7	it's deeply concerning beyond these two specific
8	populations. As we note in our memo, only 101 of
9	409 reporting jurisdictions in the Commonwealth,
LO	reported one or more hate crimes in the fiscal
L1	year of 2017.
L2	And one expert reported to us it's not
13	unusual to have no reports from cities with
L 4	population of 100,000 or more, which that witness
L5	found not particularly credible.
L 6	The reasons for this are complicated,
L7	we talked about them a little in the memo. But
L8	trace it to the fact that despite regulations
L 9	guiding data collections, reporting is voluntary.
20	And there is a lack of consistent training for
21	police departments responsible for data
22	collection and reporting.
23	There is also evidence that the
24	statute is not being applied consistently.
25	Experts' question whether incidents involving

1	homophobia, transphobia, and Islamophobia, are
2	charged consistent with incidents of racial
3	animus.
4	The lack of data forces us to rely on
5	anecdotal evidence. But here, again, we see the
6	impact of a lack of training so far as charging
7	decisions remain largely dependent on an
8	officer's assessment.
9	According to our experts, while
LO	prosecutors have the power to review charges,
L1	they tend to rely on the arresting officer's
L2	judgment.
L3	There's also a compelling consensus
L 4	across disciplines and perspectives on a need for
L 5	increased education about the operation of bias.
L 6	Most experts called for increased community
L7	involvement and partnerships in this regard with
L 8	an emphasis on training for police, but also
L 9	mandatory public school anti-bias training.
20	Such training takes place in a limited
21	fashion. But there's current legislation
22	mandating anti-bias education training with an
23	emphasis on consequences of unchecked hatred.
24	I should note here as an aside that
25	Massachusetts, for years, has eliminated a basic

civics curriculum from our public schools. 1 And also legislation pending to 2 there's reinstate that. 3 There's also a recognition of the need 4 5 for uniform police training, including criteria for identification of hate crimes, the training 6 on special handling of investigations where a hate crime is suspected and training on proper 8 9 reporting of hate crime data. As follow-up, we'd like to forward our 10 memo to the Association of Chiefs of Police as 11 12 well as to the Department of Education here in We also would like to suggest 13 the Commonwealth. the possibility of a joint venture with other New 14 15 think about how England states to we're 16 addressing hate crimes in the New England region. 17 In addition, we ask the Commission to 18 consider weighing in on the need for more 19 rigorous data collection by states, as well as sufficient funding for education and training to 20 21 combat hate crimes. 2.2 So, in closing I'm reminded of the 23 Arthur Fleming chaired wisdom of who the Commission when I was a civil rights analyst with 24 25 the agency many years ago. Chair Fleming always

1	insisted that we accept the absence of
2	enforcement powers and mandate to generate
3	information that would allow us to make change to
4	moral suasion.
5	And I commend the Commission in its
6	current state as doing that very thing. In this
7	instance we know that hate crimes are on the rise,
8	but must redouble our efforts to apply the very
9	tools already at our disposal to reduce its
LO	incidence and harm.
L1	On behalf of the Massachusetts
L2	Advisory Committee, I'm hopeful our memo can aid
L3	you in such efforts. Again, on behalf of the
L 4	Committee, I want to thank you for the
L 5	opportunity to join you this morning and welcome
L 6	any questions you may have.
L7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you, Chair
L8	Harris. I'll open for questions and comments
L 9	from my fellow Commissioners. Commissioner
20	Narasaki.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you,
22	Madam Chair, I have two questions. One is, that
23	as you know, since this report was issued because
24	the full commission is actually looking at hate
25	crimes, that we actually took a deeper dive in

Τ	TOOKING At BOSTON and the practices of the police
2	department there.
3	Because Boston had a long reputation
4	as doing a fairly good job, as police departments
5	go. I was wondering if you had a chance to look
6	into that department specifically and had any
7	thoughts about that, that we should take into
8	consideration?
9	MR. HARRIS: So, we didn't look at
L 0	Boston specifically. Our focus was really state-
L1	wide. And the people we had talking to us
L2	represented state-wide organizations largely.
L3	So I don't think that the committee
L 4	itself has input I can convey to you. And
L5	anything I said would be based on my own personal
L 6	experience.
L7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Well, we'd be
L 8	interested in that too. The second thing is, you
L 9	mentioned a regional joint venture, which is
20	intriguing, and I'm wondering why and what that
21	would look like.
22	MR. HARRIS: Well, I'm not sure what
23	it would look like or could look like. I do know
24	from my own experience, I was involved back in
25	the '90s when the first effort took place to

1	create a hate crime capacity within the state.
2	And over the years, there have been
3	incidents that have occurred in Massachusetts
4	that seem to flow out of Connecticut. So there
5	seems to be kind of a relationship between
6	certain hate groups and their activity in
7	Connecticut and in Massachusetts.
8	And my sense is that we might benefit
9	by learning from one another what we're doing and
L 0	the different approaches that we're taking. I
L1	think we here are very concerned about the
12	absence of funding and the way in which hate
L3	crimes are addressed.
L 4	And creating a kind of a regional
L 5	approach could be helpful. And then something to
L 6	explore, we're kind of curious about it.
L7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you.
L 8	MR. HARRIS: And my understanding is
L 9	there might be an effort underway in Rhode
20	Island. And I don't know, I think that there
21	have been other efforts to look at hate crimes
22	elsewhere in New England and it might make sense
23	to try to coordinate our efforts.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Chair Harris, I
25	appreciate, as always, the nimbleness of your

1	Advisory Committee, and also your creative
2	thinking about ways to maximize the effectiveness
3	of your committee among others. So I appreciate
4	that insight, among others.
5	And also, I'm very grateful that your
6	Committee, among others, have taken the time to
7	address the topic that we are addressing so that
8	we can incorporate it into our materials.
9	In particular, you highlight in your
10	presentation, and you include at Page 7 of the
11	memo, concern about a need for community
12	involvement and partnership with law enforcement
13	to address bias incidents before they become hate
14	crimes
15	MR. HARRIS: Yes.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: and to ensure
17	community safety. And I wonder if you could say
18	more about where that recommendation comes from,
19	at Page 7 in your memo, and why it is of
20	significant enough concern that you highlighted
21	it for us this morning?
22	MR. HARRIS: I'm sorry, I actually was
23	having a hard time hearing you. So, I know you
24	referred to a topic on Page 7, but the question
25	is again?

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Sorry, I will lean
2	closer to the mic as I asked you to do as well.
3	And just to say that I appreciated your
4	highlighting in your remarks, and then also,
5	including in the memo, a recommendation that the
6	underlying problem of bias requires community
7	involvement and partnership with law enforcement.
8	And I wonder if you could say more
9	about the basis for that concern, that I take it
L 0	as reasonably significant because you both
L1	highlighted it in your remarks and included it in
L2	the written memo.
L3	MR. HARRIS: Okay, yes, thank you.
L 4	And that was something that was specifically
L 5	raised by the representative from the ADL but was
L 6	also suggested by the chair of our NAACP.
L7	There are a couple of concerns. There
L 8	are events and incidents, recently here in
L 9	Massachusetts, in which police departments have
20	been involved and engaged in kind of social
21	media, hate speech.
22	And there have been incidents where
23	police departments have actually been seen as
24	contributing to an intolerant atmosphere. And
25	there's a sense that there is a need to do more

1	work, both with community members and with the
2	police to try to think about and understand the
3	way in which bias continues to operate, continues
4	to infect the operation of our legal system, as
5	well as our general and social atmosphere.
6	And I think Mr. Trestan from the ADL,
7	whose organization has created a number of anti-
8	bias curricula and are kind of implementing those
9	in the schools, is concerned about this. And I
10	think raises a question about the extent to which
11	the police themselves have undergone this kind of
12	training and the need for it.
13	So, I mean, it reflects some things
14	about incidents that have happened here, but also
15	a general understanding that we on the Committee
16	have as well, that addressing the operation of
17	bias in all its forms and doing so across
18	institutions is probably one of the best weapons
19	we have to combat hate crimes in the first place
20	as opposed to just prosecuting them, trying to
21	address them at their root.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Madam Vice
23	Chair.
24	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: I too
25	want to join others in thanking you for your

1	efforts. You highlighted for us the fact that
2	reporting of hate crimes is voluntary in the
3	state. I was wondering whether there have been,
4	are any efforts underway to possibly get that
5	changed, either through lobbying for legislation
6	or any other efforts?
7	MR. HARRIS: So, to my knowledge there
8	aren't, but to tell you the truth, it would be my
9	hope that this memorandum can actually stimulate
10	an interest in doing that.
11	I mean, it's clearly a problem, and
12	the data on the kinds of reporting we have show
13	that the voluntary mechanism doesn't work.
14	However, one of the real problems has to do with
15	the extent to which these efforts are coordinated
16	and funded.
17	So that any requirement has to be, and
18	again, I'm going beyond your question, and giving
19	an opinion here, but any effort in that regard
20	really has to be coupled with adequate training
21	and the funds to do that training. Because
22	otherwise, one of the problems is, under the
23	voluntary method, people don't really know what
24	to do.
25	And so, I think there are probably

1	legislators who will be quite interested in our
2	memo and would probably consider trying to
3	introduce some legislation.
4	As you know from the memorandum, and
5	one of the problems was that, that the funding,
6	we had this hate crimes taskforce, whose funding
7	was eliminated at a certain point. And it's one
8	thing to have it in name, but if there's no
9	funding or support for it then it can't really
10	act.
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank
12	you.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: I'll open for any other
14	questions from fellow Commissioners, including or
15	the phone. Hearing none, Chair Harris, thank you
16	again for your service and for your leadership or
17	your advisory committee and for taking your time
18	to speak with us today.
19	MR. HARRIS: Thank you all so much.
20	Take care now.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll turn next to our
22	discussion and vote on proposed slates for
23	several advisory committees.
24	C. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON STATE ADVISORY
25	COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

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

1	CHAIR LHAMON: We'll turn first to the
2	Illinois Advisory Committee.
3	ILLINOIS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
4	Before we begin discussion, I remind
5	my fellow Commissioners that objections to this
6	nomination have already been shared with all the
7	Commissioners. To the extent that we would like
8	to discuss continuing objections, I remind my
9	fellow Commissioners that the Commission has a
10	policy to not defame, degrade, or incriminate any
11	person.
12	Each of these individuals has agreed
13	to volunteer time and energy in the pursuit of
14	the protection of civil rights, which we
15	appreciate. With that said, I move that the
16	Commission appoint the following individuals to
17	the Illinois Advisory Committee based on the
18	recommendation of the Staff Director.
19	Ryan Dunigan, Barbara Barreno-
20	Paschall, Jonathan Bean, Joanna Bohdziewicz-
21	Borowiec, Cindy Buys, Mark David Calaguas, Trevor
22	Copeland, Tabassum Haleem, Reyahd Kazmi, Matthew
23	Paprocki, Gregory Sanford, and Kyle Westbrook.
24	With this motion, the Commission would
25	also appoint Ryan Dunigan as the Chair of the

1	Illinois Advisory Committee. All of these
2	members will serve as uncompensated government
3	employees.
4	If the motion passes, the Commission
5	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
6	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
7	will begin on August 14, 2019 after the current
8	committee expires. Do I have a second for this
9	motion?
LO	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
L1	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
L2	discussion on this slate? Hearing none, I'll
L3	call the question and take a roll call vote.
L 4	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you vote?
L5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
L 6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
L7	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm voting no on
L8	this one. Again, this is another one that has
L 9	not been properly balanced.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner
21	Kirsanow?
22	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
24	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: And Vice Chair Timmons-
5	Goodson?
6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
8	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
9	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
10	MASSACHUSETTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
11	We'll now move to the Massachusetts
12	Advisory Committee. I move that the Commission
13	appoint the following individuals to the
14	Massachusetts Advisory Committee based on the
15	recommendation of the Staff Director.
16	David Harris, Nazia Ashraful,
17	Christina Bain, Emilio Cruz, Thomas Cushman,
18	Martha Davis, Neenah Estrella-Luna, Daniel
19	Hartman, Eric Jepeal, Wendy Kaminer, S. Atyia
20	Martin, Eva Millona, John Sivolella, Jake
21	Sussman, Siobhan Sweeney and Jessica Tang. With
22	this motion, the Commission will also appoint
23	David Harris as the Chair of the Massachusetts
24	Advisory Committee.
25	All of these members as uncompensated

1	government employees.
2	If the motion passes, the Commission
3	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
4	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
5	will begin on August 14, 2019 after the current
6	committee expires. Do I have a second?
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
9	discussion on this appointment?
10	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Madam Chair,
11	I just want to thank the staff for the work
12	they've done and presenting us with an incredibly
13	diverse slate on all fronts. Thank you very much.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Any further discussion?
15	Commissioner Heriot.
16	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: This was
17	actually one of the better balanced SACs until
18	Joshua Katzen was taken off of it, and I object
19	on that basis.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Any other discussion?
21	Okay, I'll call the question, take a roll call
22	vote.
23	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
24	vote?
25	COMMISSIONER ADECRILE: Ave

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
4	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
6	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
10	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
12	Goodson?
13	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
15	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
16	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
17	SOUTH DAKOTA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
18	We now move to the South Dakota
19	Advisory Committee. I move that the Commission
20	appoint the following individuals to the South
21	Dakota Advisory Committee based on the
22	recommendations of the Staff Director.
23	Tiffany Graham, Charles Abourezk,
24	Paula Antoine, Sara Frankenstein, Patrick Garry,
25	Taneeza Islam, Arlouine Gay Kingman, Brittany

1	Kjerstad McKnight, Travis Letellier, Mike Levsen,
2	Aaron Pilcher, Thomas Simmons, and Natalie Stites
3	Means. With this motion, the Commission will
4	also appoint Tiffany Graham as the Chair of the
5	South Dakota Advisory Committee.
6	All of these members will serve as
7	uncompensated government employees.
8	If the motion passes, the Commission
9	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
10	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
11	will begin on August 14, 2019 after the current
12	committee expires. Do I have a second?
13	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
15	discussion on this appointment? Hearing none,
16	I'll call the question, and 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: There are some
22	great people on this one. It is not perfect but
23	good enough for government work. Aye.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
25	Commissioner Kirsanow?

1	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
3	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
5	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
9	Goodson?
10	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
12	motion passes unanimously.
13	I do want to note, just for purposes
14	of our effort not to defame or degrade, that my
15	view is that we have great people on all of our
16	advisory committees.
17	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: And I will
18	second that. We do have great people on all of
19	our advisory committees.
20	WISCONSIN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. We'll now
22	move to the Wisconsin Advisory Committee. I move
23	that the Commission appoint the following
24	individuals to the Wisconsin Advisory Committee
25	based on the recommendation of the Staff

1	Director.
2	Angelique Harris, Bernardo Cueto,
3	William Flaunders, Alexander Lodge, David Nelson,
4	O. Emil Ovbiagele, Pardeep Singh Kaleka, William
5	Tisdale, Nancy Vue Tran, and Chris Walton. With
6	this motion, the Commission will also appoint
7	Angelique Harris as the Chair of the Wisconsin
8	Advisory Committee.
9	All of these members will serve as
10	uncompensated government employees.
11	If the motion passes, the Commission
12	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
13	appropriate paperwork for the appointments, which
14	will begin on August 14, 2019 after the current
15	committee expires. Do I have a second?
16	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
18	discussion on this appointment? Hearing none,
19	I'll call the question, take a roll call vote.
20	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
21	vote?
22	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
24	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Again, not
25	properly balanced No

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner 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: 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	WASHINGTON ADVISORY COMMITTEE
16	We'll now move to consideration of
17	interim appointments for the Washington Advisory
18	Committee. I move that the Commission appoint
19	the following individuals to the Washington
20	Advisory Committee based on the recommendation of
21	the Staff Director. Joe Silem-Enlet, Endel
22	Kolde, John Safarli, and Brian Screnar. All of
23	these members will serve as uncompensated
24	government employees.
25	If the motion passes, the Commission

1	will authorize the Staff Director to execute the
2	appropriate paperwork for the appointments.
3	Do I have a second?
4	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
6	discussion on this appointment? I'll call the
7	question and take a roll call vote.
8	Commissioner Adegbile, how do you
9	vote?
10	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
11	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
14	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
16	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
18	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
21	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
22	Goodson?
23	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
25	motion passes unanimously.

1	The next item on our agenda is to
2	consider project proposals for Fiscal Year 2020
3	and the Statutory Enforcement Report for Fiscal
4	Year 2021.

D. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON 2020 AND

2021 PROJECT PROPOSALS

CHAIR LHAMON: For Fiscal year 2020, we already have 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 enforcement reports two years in advance to give staff and the Commission sufficient time to review those materials and to be able to publish on time. So we will continue with that process in today's vote and for the coming years.

Moving forward with Fiscal Year 2020 program planning. I understand from the Staff Director that currently have capacity, we financial and otherwise, to take on two additional projects. To open the floor for discussion based on the rankings circulated by Commissioners in the last few weeks, I move that

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1	the Commission approve, for Fiscal Year 2020, the
2	projects on bail reform and maternal mortality.
3	Is there a second?
4	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
5	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second.
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I yield to the
7	Vice Chair.
8	(Laughter.)
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Second.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll begin
11	with a few points about the bail reform project
12	since that is my project proposal.
13	In our 2017 report on civil rights
14	implications of municipal fines and fees, we
15	explicitly noted that the report would not take
16	up issues of bail and pre-trial incarceration.
17	Nevertheless, the report noted that
18	the March 2016 Dear Colleague Letter, issued by
19	the United States Department of Justice, and
20	later rescinded by then Attorney General
21	Sessions, stated the principle that, quote,
22	courts must not employ bail or bond practices
23	that caused indigent defendants to remain
24	incarcerated solely because they cannot afford to
25	pay for their release, end quote.

Similar to the issue of fines 1 in which we found that some jurisdictions 2 targeting low income communities 3 and communities of color, in the assessment of high 4 5 fees for low level offenses, there is evidence of injustice with respect to bail practices that 6 hold the defendant in jail, if the defendant a certain 8 cannot pay amount, regardless 9 ability to pay or a nexus with public safety, even where the defendant has not been charged 10 with any offense. 11 12 real-life impact of pre-trial underestimated. 13 detention should not be Individuals, quote, may lose their jobs, default 14 15 on vehicles, lose their homes, get behind on 16 child support payments, lose custody of dependent 17 children, and more, as found by the Justice Policy Institute. 18 19 The past couple of years have seen 20 varying stages of reform on this issue, including 21 in the great State of California, where I now 2.2 live, and in various states around the country. 23 This issue has seen coalitions built across the political aisle with proponents of 24 25 criminal justice reform, including reform

1 pre-trial detention and money bail, coming from both progressive and conservative advocates. 2 This project would evaluate the 3 state of money bail in operation 4 5 states and local jurisdictions around t.he it impacts the fair 6 country, and how administration of justice as well as whether it operates in a manner that denies equal protection 8 9 of the law to individuals on the basis of race or another protected class. 10 It will also evaluate the role of the 11 12 private bail industry and how the involvement of 13 the private sector exacerbates or mitigates these look forward to taking 14 impacts. Ι up 15 critical issue with a bipartisan lens and hope 16 that my fellow Commissioners will support it. 17 Commissioner Adegbile, as a sponsor of the project on maternal mortality, would you like 18 19 to begin our discussion on that topic, and we can 20 then discuss both together, if there's any 21 discussion? 2.2 COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Absolutely. 23 The issue of maternal mortality is one that is receiving some increased attention, and indeed, 24 25 in my judgement, needs to receive still more.

1	There is evidence that there are some
2	significant disparities in the experience of
3	maternal mortality. And the fact that there are
4	disparity levels that are quite severe impacting
5	minority populations, African American
6	populations and others, is something on which I
7	would like us to train our focus, to dig into
8	some of the underlying causes, examine some of
9	the pending legislation and assess whether or not
10	there are opportunities for the Commission to use
11	its analytical force and power to help illuminate
12	the importance of this issue.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll ask
14	those who are on the phone to please mute your
15	lines if you're not speaking, we're getting a
16	little bit of feedback. And I'll open for
17	discussion of these topics if there is any.
18	Hearing none Again, with the
19	respect to put your line on mute if you are on
20	the phone because we are hearing significant
21	background noise.
22	I'll call the question and take a roll
23	call vote on this motion. Commissioner Adegbile,
24	how do you vote?
25	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.

1 2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot? COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no on
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I vote no on
3	these.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
5	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
7	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
9	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Really no,
10	even on bail?
11	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: It's together.
12	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
14	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
16	Goodson?
17	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
19	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
20	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
21	If you are not speaking and you are on the phone,
22	please mute your line.
23	The next item for discussion and vote
24	is our Fiscal Year 2021 program planning for the
25	statutory enforcement report for Fiscal Year

1	2021. As I mentioned, we'll continue our
2	practice of voting two years in advance.
3	And I'll open the floor for motions
4	now on projects for consideration.
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair?
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile.
7	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I would like
8	to move for consideration of a disaster relief
9	and FEMA concept paper and analysis that
10	Commissioner Yaki and I are proposing jointly. I
11	circulated a draft, or I should say we circulated
12	a draft, of this proposal.
13	I did, shortly before our meeting,
14	circulate a minor revision correcting some
15	typographical and stylistic points that I have
16	shared with the Commissioners.
17	I take it that those who are on the
18	phone have the revision in their email. And I
19	would be happy to read those minor changes into
20	the record at an appropriate time.
21	But I move consideration of this
22	concept paper, jointly, with Commissioner Yaki.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there a
24	second?
25	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I second.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: So, I'll open the floor
2	for discussion. Commissioner Yaki or
3	Commissioner Adegbile, would you like to begin
4	our discussion of the topic?
5	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Commissioner
6	Yaki, would you like me to begin?
7	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Sure.
8	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: 2017 was a
9	year that saw some major natural disasters hit
L 0	various regions of our country and wreak very
L1	substantial devastation that required the
L2	substantial mobilization of FEMA and local
L3	resources to attend to American populations that
L 4	were in distress.
L5	The Stafford Act and certain other
L 6	federal provisions dictate and provide some
L7	guidance about how FEMA is supposed to go about
L 8	in discharging its duties.
L 9	And this natural disaster response
20	concept paper is intended to shine a light on
21	FEMA's preparedness and response to major natural
22	disasters in different parts of the country and
23	to see how they are affecting different
24	populations and whether or not there are any
25	disparities or concerns that this Commission

1	should be aware of and that we should highlight
2	for the benefit of the federal government and of
3	the population, so that we can improve in the
4	future at these times of crisis.
5	I thank Commissioner Yaki for his
6	substantial guidance on framing this concept
7	paper. And I look forward to the Commission's
8	effort to try and shed some light.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Thanks. Any discussion
LO	on this proposal? Vice Chair.
L1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Yes. This is
L2	Commissioner Yaki.
L3	CHAIR LHAMON: Go ahead, Commissioner
L 4	Yaki.
L 5	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I want to thank
L 6	Commissioner Adegbile for his leadership in
L7	reviving a concept paper that I put together,
L8	approximately this time last year. I would say
L 9	that one of the interesting things that has
20	occurred in my life is that I may be the only
21	current United States Commissioner on Civil
22	Rights who has actually ever had to directly work
23	with FEMA in response to a natural disaster,
24	which I did after the earthquake in the San

25

Francisco Bay area in 1989.

1	And as Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi's
2	Chief of Staff, I was tasked with attempting to
3	work with them. And after a somewhat bad response
4	to a hurricane called Hugo on the North Carolina
5	coast, it was incumbent upon us to attempt to
6	steer them in the right direction and to teach
7	them things such as, what is a condominium and
8	what is seismic, things they had never
9	understood before.
10	Almost 30 years later, FEMA is still
11	learning, or is still on a learning curve. And
12	I think that the points brought up in our
13	proposal, regarding the comparable response
14	aspect of this agency to different areas,
15	different populations, is something that is
16	worthy of our discussion and our inquiry.
17	And I thank my fellow Commissioner for
18	bringing this back, and I look forward to working
19	with him to shed light on an agency that is
20	responsible for responding at some of the worst
21	times in people's lives. And ensuring that it
22	does so in a way that respects the diversity of
23	our country. Thank you.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
25	Commissioner Narasaki?

1	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: No.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Oh, Madam Vice Chair.
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Thank
4	you. I would like to thank Commissioner Adegbile
5	and Commissioner Yaki for putting this forward.
6	I do intend to support the natural disaster
7	response concept paper.
8	Last year, North Carolina was among
9	the jurisdictions that were strongly affected by
LO	Hurricane Florence. In fact, just 30 miles or so
L1	from my home, folks are still reeling from the
L2	effects of that natural disaster.
13	And I think the only way that we get
L 4	better, and improve our services, regardless of
L5	what area you're talking about, but governmental
L 6	services is for us to review what we did well and
L7	what we perhaps could improve upon. That's the
L8	only way that we get better. And I thank you for
L 9	having the Commission shine the light on this.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki.
21	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I also intend
22	to support this as the statutory report. Sadly,
23	I won't be around to actually attend the
24	briefing.
25	It is shocking to me that this much

25

1	time after the disaster in Puerto Rico that
2	Puerto Rico is being treated so badly. And that
3	the people of Puerto Rico, who are American
4	citizens, are being left without the full support
5	of their government. I think it's shocking and
6	so it's time for the Commission to take it up.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any further
8	discussion on this proposal?
9	Okay, I'll call the question and we'll
10	take a roll call vote. Commissioner Adegbile,
11	how do you vote?
12	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Madam Chair,
13	two quick questions. One, does the record
14	reflect a second?
15	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I seconded.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Yes.
17	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Okay. And
18	thirdly, instead of secondly in that case, is the
19	Commission
20	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Fourthly.
21	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Fourth.
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Is the
24	Commission satisfied with the redline that I
25	provided or is there any need for me to read the

1	largely ministerial changes into the record?
2	CHAIR LHAMON: I think we would all
3	appreciate if you did not.
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIR LHAMON: So, thank you.
6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: It makes me
7	sad that my voice is so cacophonous that it leads
8	my fellow Commissioners to that position, but
9	CHAIR LHAMON: I cast no aspersions on
LO	your voice.
11	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: But I
L2	recognize it none the less.
L3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: It is very
L 4	soothing, Commissioner Adegbile.
L5	(Laughter.)
L 6	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: If it's time
L7	to vote
L8	COMMISSIONER YAKI: In fact, the
L 9	problem with a 7:00 a.m. meeting on the West Coast
20	is I have a dire urge to fall back asleep, so
21	we're all
22	(Laughter.)
23	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: I've been told
24	my voice has that impact.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Before you vote, I

1	under Commissioner Heriot has a comment or a
2	question?
3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No. I decided
4	it's not worth it.
5	(Laughter.)
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, thank you. Okay,
7	so now we are back to the vote. Commissioner
8	Adegbile, how do you vote?
9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye. And
L 0	goodnight, Commissioner Yaki.
L1	(Laughter.)
L2	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
L3	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I've got real
L 4	doubts that we've got the capability of doing
L5	this well, but like, what the heck, let's vote
L 6	yes here.
L7	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Commissioner
L 8	Kirsanow?
L 9	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: Yes.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
21	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes. Yes.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
23	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
25	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Oh, oh, yes.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
2	Goodson?
3	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
5	motion passes unanimously and with levity.
6	The next item on our amended agenda is
7	a discussion and vote on a proposed statement
8	titled, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights denounces
9	replacement of interpreters with a video at
10	immigrants' first immigration hearing,
11	introduced by Commissioner Narasaki.
12	E. U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
13	ANNOUNCEMENT REPLACEMENT OF INTERPRETERS
14	WITH A VIDEO AT IMMIGRANTS FIRST
15	IMMIGRATION HEARING
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki,
17	could you please read the statement proposed for
18	consideration?
19	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes, thank
20	you, Madam Chair. And consistent with our
21	accepted practice, I will not be reading the
22	footnotes.
23	It's entitled, the U.S. Commission on
24	Civil Rights Denounces Replacement of
25	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 will no their rights 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 course of the 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

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

1 speaks the immigrant's language, which may be a less common indigenous language, or rely on a 2 telephone service that judges say is inadequate 3 or delayed. 4 5 Or the judge may have to reschedule the hearing, which will add costly delays rather 6 7 than add efficiency. The Department of Justice claims that 8 9 this move is due to limited resources. While the Commission acknowledges that all federal agencies 10 have fiscal pressures, cost pressures do not 11 12 exempt agencies from their responsibility to 13 ensure due process and civil rights requirements are met, especially when the serious consequences 14 15 of being deported are involved. 16 Under executive order 13166, federal 17 agencies must provide meaningful access to the and services they provide to limited 18 programs 19 English proficient individuals, under the 20 national origin discrimination provisions 21 Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which 2.2 include language access. 23 Immigrants already face many barriers to a fair hearing in immigration court. 24 25 only have the right to counsel in immigration

1	proceedings at their own expense. And most have
2	no attorneys because of the remoteness of many of
3	the detention centers, the expense, and the
4	difficulty of being able to find representation
5	while in detention.
6	The immigration court system also
7	faces a large backlog. And immigrants, including
8	those seeking asylum or fighting deportation,
9	often wait years for the cases to be decided.
LO	Immigration judges have already
L1	complained that not having in-person interpreters
L2	at these initial hearings will disrupt
L3	proceedings and waste time.
L 4	Since the 1960s, the Commission and
L5	its state advisory committees have chronicled the
L 6	civil rights implications of our nation's
L7	immigration laws and policies. We strongly urge
L8	the Department of Justice to reverse its
L 9	decision.
20	And we urge Congress to require the
21	Department to provide interpreters at all stages
22	of immigration cases.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do we have
24	a motion to approve the statement, to open the
25	floor for discussion?

1	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: So moved.
2	CHAIR LHAMON: Do we have a second?
3	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Is there
5	any discussion on the statement? I'll begin with
6	you, Commissioner Narasaki, as the sponsor of the
7	statement.
8	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I think the
9	statement stands for itself. It's a fairly
10	simple proposition that people who are going
11	through a legal process should have the right to
12	understand, in their language, what is going on.
13	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any further
14	discussion? Commissioner Heriot.
15	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair,
16	Commissioner Kladney. I'd just like to note that
17	I've taken part in hearing the administrative
18	hearings where interpreters have been on the
19	phone and it is very difficult and disruptive for
20	the client to, well, my client at the time,
21	clients, to get a complete comprehension of
22	what's going on and understanding. And it does
23	take an inordinate, more time in the courtroom
24	process. Thank you.
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.

1	Commissioner Heriot.
2	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm going to be
3	voting no on this one. I'm concerned that we're
4	getting our news from the newspapers here.
5	I would like to see in writing what
6	the policy is. And I think we should be
7	consulting with the Department of Justice and get
8	their side of the story better than simply quotes
9	from the newspapers.
10	And it's very hard to get translators
11	for indigenous languages.
12	My understanding is that these first
13	hearings are basically cattle calls, where you
14	get a date. And I'm concerned that we're a little
15	premature on this and that I'm not certain what
16	side of this we ought to be on.
17	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any other
18	discussion? I'll call the question and take a
19	roll call vote. Commissioner Adegbile, how do
20	you vote?
21	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
23	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: No.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
25	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.

1	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
2	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Yes.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
4	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Yes.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki?
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Aye.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Vice Chair Timmons-
8	Goodson?
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
11	motion passes. Two Commissioners opposed, no
12	Commissioner abstained, all others were in favor.
13	The next item on our amended agenda is
14	a discussion and vote on a proposed statement
15	titled, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights Strongly
16	Condemns the Recent Statements of President Trump
17	Telling U.S. Congresswomen to Leave the Country
18	and, quote, Go Back to Their Countries,
19	introduced by Commissioner Yaki.
20	F. DISCUSSION AND VOTE ON A PROPOSED STATEMENT
21	TITLED, U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS STRONGLY
22	CONDEMNS THE RECENT STATEMENTS OF PRESIDENT TRUMP
23	TELLING U.S. CONGRESSWOMEN TO LEAVE THE COUNTRY
24	AND "GO BACK TO THEIR COUNTRIES"
25	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki,

1	could you please read the proposed statement for
2	consideration?
3	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Thank you very
4	much, Madam Chair. And in, perhaps a Commission
5	first, I decided not to use any footnotes at all.
6	First paragraph. The U.S. Commission
7	on Civil Rights, by a majority vote, strongly
8	condemns statements by the President declaring
9	that elected United States Congresswomen should,
10	quote, go back, end quote, to countries they,
11	quote, originally came from, end quote.
12	Notwithstanding that all, therefore
13	all four congresswomen, their county is in fact
14	the United States. Such racist and nativist and
15	xenophobic statements undermine the equality
16	principles to which this country aspires, instill
17	and promote division and fear among Americans and
18	seeks to denigrate some among us as less American
19	than others.
20	Next paragraph. Throughout the
21	history of this country, racism and bigotry has
22	often manifested itself in jingoistic
23	sloganeering, asking immigrants or others,
24	regardless of citizenship or birthright, to,
25	auote, return home, end auote.

1 The Know Nothing party, which began its life as the Native American party, campaigned 2 openly against Catholicism and advocated that 3 Irish and German Catholics to return to their 4 5 native countries, and native in quotes. Various movements in the 1800s sought to, quote, resettle 6 freed African-American enslaved people in West Africa, notwithstanding generations of living in 8 9 the United States. Latin and Asian Americans have often been the recipients of slurs, ending 10 11 in quote, go back home, end quote. 12 Next paragraph. Particularly for many 13 Americans whose roots, recent or deep, are not 14 from White European ancestors, there's been an 15 unfortunate truth that at some point in their 16 lives someone, because of racism, bigotry, 17 ignorance, has told them to, quote, go back home 18 to a country not of their birth, often not even of 19 20 their ancestry, solely because someone does not 21 like their skin color, their ethnicity, or their 2.2 accent. 23 This Next paragraph. claimed true Americans 24 separation of from others 25 divisive, logically flawed, and undermines core

1 American values. Americans, all of us, are at home here. 2 None of us has some place else 3 should go back to when we disagree with an elected 4 5 leader. And certainly, no elected leader should suggest otherwise. 6 Free speech, including the freedom to and the ability of all Americans 8 dissent 9 participate in a robust marketplace of ideas, are In our democracy, the hallmark American ideals. 10 right of the legislative and executive branches 11 12 and the individuals within each to disagree, is 13 a bedrock principle of the separation of powers enshrined in our Constitution. 14 15 The Commission, which Congress has for 16 six decades, charged to advise the President and 17 Congress about status of civil rights, roundly condemns irresponsible rhetoric that castigates 18 19 disagreement in a manner that renders Americans 20 less safe, less welcome in their own country and 21 divides this country based on stereotyped 2.2 attribution of values, based on historic or 23 recent national origin. This Commission has already urged the 24 Administration to increase hate crime enforcement 2.5

1	to combat the rise of White nationalism. The
2	President's recent comments only exacerbate the
3	problem of White nationalism by normalizing one
4	of their most racist tropes.
5	On this issue I want to there's a
6	typo. I have the word S, the S should be stricken
7	on racist.
8	Final paragraph. With this statement,
9	the Commission uses our voice to reaffirm
10	American values of inclusion and respect for
11	dignity of all persons in our midst. We call on
12	the President to use his platform likewise to
13	lead, rather than to tear down, this country.
14	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Do we have
15	a motion to approve the statement to open the
16	floor for discussion?
17	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So moved.
18	CHAIR LHAMON: Is there a second?
19	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Second.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any
21	discussion on this statement? Commissioner Yaki,
22	I'll begin with you as the sponsor of the
23	statement.
24	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Well, I mean, I
25	would actually like to defer first to my

1	colleagues. And I wanted to thank many of my
2	colleagues for their input on participation.
3	For when I wrote this, I wrote it
4	late. It was a little ragged and I want to thank
5	all of you for your assistance.
6	But I'd like to hear from you first,
7	and then I'd like to sort of give a closing, Madam
8	Chair.
9	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. Madam Vice
10	Chair.
11	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes. I
12	struggle on, and with, the frequency with which
13	the Commission should issue public comments and
14	statements regarding tweets and other statements
15	by our President, who often says things that I
16	deem offensive and harmful.
17	And I have struggled with this
18	particular one. It seems that at the rate that
19	we're going this Commission could spend much of
20	its time issuing statements condemning or
21	criticizing our President's statement.
22	But on this one, after some struggle,
23	I don't see how I cannot support it. That is
24	because of the additional, there has been so much
25	fallout from this. So, you have other folks

1	picking up on this direction.
2	As recently as a couple of days ago,
3	our President was in my home state of North
4	Carolina, and during the course of his remarks a
5	rally chant began, send her back. Or something
6	to that effect.
7	And I think this marks just the
8	beginning. And so I'll be joining in this
9	statement. And I thank you, Commissioner Yaki,
10	for taking the leadership on this. And I see the
11	merit in what you began early on. Thank you.
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
13	Commissioner Narasaki.
14	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Like the Vice
15	Chair, I have been hesitant about supporting this
16	statement. Not because I don't believe in it,
17	but like her, I believe that the subject of the
18	statement is making incendiary statements on a
19	regular basis. And I'm concerned that we'll have
20	to expend substantial energy and time responding
21	to tweets.
22	However, my social media feeds
23	exploded with statements from friends and
24	colleagues, recalling their personal hurt and
25	outrage about being told to go back to where they

1	came from, though they were U.S. citizens. I,
2	myself, have felt that pain.
3	The pain felt by friends not born
4	here, but whose families chose America as their
5	home, is no less than those who were born
6	citizens. There is no question in any of our
7	minds that the tweet is racist.
8	It is distressing to see members of
9	the party of Lincoln trying to defend them.
10	President Reagan said, you can live in France,
11	but you cannot become a Frenchman.
12	You can live in Germany or Turkey or
13	Japan, but you cannot become a German, a Turk or
14	a Japanese. But anyone from any corner of the
15	earth can live in America and become an American.
16	That is the beauty of this country.
17	My father believed, as the four
18	Congresswomen believed who were the target of the
19	tweets, that real patriotism is standing up to
20	bullies and loving the United States enough to
21	call it out where it can do better and make the
22	sacrifices necessary to help it to live up to its
23	promises and its founding documents.
24	My father volunteered to fight in
25	Europe during World War II to defend America's

1	freedom, even though the country of his birth put
2	him and his American born mother behind barbed
3	wire because of the color of their skin and their
4	ancestry.
5	Commissioner Yaki, who's often the
6	conscience of this Commission, has convinced me
7	that silence is read by White supremacists as
8	acceptance and agreement. However, where we are,
9	the barrage of bigotry from a President who is
LO	emboldening White supremacists, we cannot let it
L1	become normal.
L2	Unchallenged racism and bigotry led to
L3	the internment of over 120,000 Japanese Americans
L 4	in concentration camps and the deaths of millions
L 5	of Jewish people in the Holocaust.
L 6	The Commission's job is to be the
L7	conscience of the nation on civil rights. And
L 8	unfortunately, silence in this case is simply not
L 9	an option. Thank you.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. Any other
21	discussion? Commissioner Yaki, did you want to
22	give your
23	COMMISSIONER YAKI: All right, thank
24	you very much colleagues. And I first want to
25	thank both Commissioners Timmons-Goodson and

1	Commissioner Narasaki for supporting this.
2	It is a sad state of affairs when we
3	have to ask ourselves, as a Commission and as
4	Americans, as individuals, do we need to respond,
5	yet again, to another outrage that goes to the
6	heart of attempting to redefine who or what is an
7	American in this country.
8	And it is tiring, it is fatiguing, it
9	is humiliating, it is angering. But like them,
10	in this particular instance, when a vicious, well
11	worn, racist trope of telling people who do not
12	look like you, who do not talk like you, who do
13	not come from the same neighborhood or city or
14	country or anywhere, to go back home as if you,
15	as an American, have any other home, but this
16	country, prompted me to take this action.
17	This was even before, as Commissioner
18	Timmons-Goodson pointed out, the horrible
19	chanting at the rally the other night,
20	spontaneous chants of, send her back, referring
21	to one of the Congresswomen, and the refusal of
22	the person speaking at that event, who prompted

cannot normalize this kind of

these chants, to do anything to stop, prevent, or

rebuke that chant.

23

24

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 of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue should ever utter these types of words or this type of phrase or create

2.2

1	this kind of expectation or normalcy around
2	statements such as these.
3	We are better than that. That is not
4	who we have been, that is not what we have
5	struggled to do. It is not what, as Abraham
6	Lincoln said, it does not rise to the better
7	angels of our nature. It is not who we are as
8	Americans. And I thank you for your
9	consideration. And I thank you for your support.
10	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
11	Commissioner Heriot.
12	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I'm not going to
13	be able to join this statement as it's written
14	right now, but let me say a few words at least
15	here. While I disagree with parts of the majority
16	statement today, I agree with my colleagues'
17	point that the President's recent tweets were ill
18	considered.
19	Whether intended or not, it was
20	predictable that these statements would be
21	interpreted by many the way the Commission now
22	interprets them. Still, it needs to be pointed
23	out that the words racist and white nationalist
24	are tossed around entirely too promiscuously
25	these days. The temperature needs to be brought

1	down.
2	Like the President, I have profound
3	disagreements on just about every major policy
4	issue with the four Congresswomen who were the
5	subject of the tweets condemned by the Commission
6	statement. Nonetheless, it's my view that he
7	should not have said what he said, in the way he
8	said it.
9	All four Congresswomen are American
10	citizens. Three of the four were born in the
11	United States. The United States is their home.
12	One can disagree strenuously with the
13	four Congresswomen's policy views without
14	implying that they are somehow less American than
15	any of the rest of us.
16	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
17	Commissioner Adegbile.
18	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Yes. Thank
19	you, Commissioner Yaki, for your work on this
20	statement. I would just add that, as I understand
21	it, at the rally the other day where this chant
22	and sentiment was renewed, you can see in the
23	pictures and video that there were children
24	present.

And there are many things that we call

1	upon leaders to do, but a principal thing is to
2	set a tone from the top that we all aspire to.
3	And when we have a rally where American children
4	are being taught, literally taught, to espouse
5	and embrace these types of racist sentiments,
6	we're not only debasing the office, but we are
7	debasing the lived experience of the country,
8	from its founding to the present day.
9	And the people who have sat before
10	this Commission over decades, some of whom are
11	the relatives of people who have given their
12	lives in service of the principles of equality.
13	And so, it is a very serious thing
14	that is much bigger than tweets. It goes to the
15	core of who we aspire to be as a nation. And it
16	troubles me that children are being taught that
17	this is what America stands for in the year 2019.
18	Thank you, Commissioner Yaki.
19	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Yaki, I
20	just
21	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair?
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney.
23	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Commissioner
24	Kladney here. I too would like to add my thanks
25	to Commissioner Yaki's leadership on this matter.

1	And I would like to say that one of
2	our charges is that of national origin, and many
3	of us, and our families, have immigrated to the
4	United States in the 20th century. Not that far
5	in the past.
6	And many of our relatives have
7	suffered at the hands of those people who
8	intentionally want to create animus between
9	people within our country and within the races in
L 0	our country. And it is difficult for me to
L1	believe that these pronouncements were not
L2	intentional in nature and did not want to have
13	the effect that they did have in North Carolina.
L 4	Therefore I'm supporting this
L 5	statement 100 percent. Thank you.
L 6	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
L7	Commissioner Yaki, to take us down to the truly
L 8	mundane, I noticed one other typo. And with your
L 9	permission, we would change seeks to seek, at the
20	end of the first paragraph in the statement.
21	COMMISSIONER YAKI: I accept that as
22	a friendly amendment.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. And I also
24	just want to note, I appreciate Commissioner
25	Heriot's commitment to, and statement of

1	commitment to, concern about the harm that such
2	a statement from the President makes.
3	I also think it's important for us to
4	recognize that the EEOC, which is the nation's
5	authority about employment discrimination,
6	includes these words, go back home, as an example
7	of race discrimination and national origin
8	discrimination. That is so archetypal that it is
9	explicit in their guidance.
LO	And there is, I think no question,
L1	that the intent and the receipt of the text from
L2	the President is racial harm. And it is our job
L3	to call it that, to speak against it, and to make
L 4	sure that we, as a nation, don't live that harm.
L5	So, I will support this statement.
L 6	Do we have any further discussion?
L7	I'll call the question and take a roll call vote.
L8	Commissioner Adegbile?
L 9	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: Aye.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
21	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: Abstain.
22	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kirsanow?
23	COMMISSIONER KIRSANOW: No.
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: Vice Chair Timmons-
6	Goodson?
7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Yes.
8	CHAIR LHAMON: And I vote yes. The
9	motion passes. One Commissioner abstained, one
10	Commissioner opposed, all others were in favor.
11	Next we will hear from Staff Director
12	Mauro Morales for the monthly Staff Director's
13	report.
14	G. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS
14 15	G. MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
15	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT
15 16	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam
15 16 17	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have
15 16 17 18	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have left before the next presentation, I have nothing
15 16 17 18	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have left before the next presentation, I have nothing further to add than is already contained in the
15 16 17 18 19 20	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have left before the next presentation, I have nothing further to add than is already contained in the report. If any Commissioner has a specific
15 16 17 18 19 20	STAFF DIRECTOR'S REPORT STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have left before the next presentation, I have nothing further to add than is already contained in the report. If any Commissioner has a specific question concerning a matter contained in the
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. In respect for the limited time we have left before the next presentation, I have nothing further to add than is already contained in the report. If any Commissioner has a specific question concerning a matter contained in the report, I welcome the opportunity to speak to you

1	thank our law clerks and interns that have been
2	with us this summer. Many of them, this will be
3	their last Commission business meeting.
4	We've enjoyed having you here. We
5	appreciate your hard work in assisting the
6	special assistants, the Office of General
7	Counsel, the Office of Civil Rights Evaluation,
8	and my office as well.
9	I hope you got a lot of really good
10	experience out of your time with us, and I wish
11	you all the best. Please keep in touch with us
12	as you continue on in your careers and in your
13	law school studies. So thank you very much.
14	That's all I have, Madam Chair.
15	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. I'll echo
16	those thanks to our summer interns who have done
17	us a terrific service in being here.
18	And I'd like also to use this minute
19	to take a point of personal privilege, with
20	Commissioner Narasaki's permission. I understand
21	that this is our last business meeting in which
22	Commissioner Narasaki's special assistant, Jason
23	Lagria, will be with us. And I, okay, we can
24	hope that it's not
25	(Laughter.)

1 CHAIR LHAMON: -- but on the off chance that it is, I want to say, while Jason is 2 still with us, how very much I have 3 enioved working with you, Jason, what incredible service 4 5 you have given to us. a Commission, I think that 6 As we 7 Commissioners, who are by statute part-time work, could not do the work 8 doing our as 9 effectively as we do without the assistance of our extraordinary special assistants. 10 And Jason has been willing from Day 1 11 12 for me to go well above the call to help me when 13 I didn't yet have a special assistant, and to 14 all of us in providing extraordinary help 15 research and terrific service. We will miss you. 16 will miss you. Thank you. Commissioner Narasaki? 17 COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: I'd like to 18 19 add, since I won't be in person for the August 20 business meeting, and it is quite likely that he 21 will have left, I want to say that it has been an 2.2 honor and a pleasure to work with him. I stole 23 him from my former place of employment. So in all fairness to him, he knew what he was getting 24

when he agreed to work with me.

1	And he's done an incredible job, not
2	just the work, you know, the written work, and
3	the research, and all of that important stuff,
4	but I asked him when I started, to help build a
5	spirit of camaraderie in the Commission between
6	the appointees and the staff, and to sort of
7	bridge the political divides and have an open
8	door.
9	And I think that he has contributed a
LO	lot to the environment of the Commission. And
L1	I'm very proud of his work, and I look forward to
L2	seeing the, I'm sure, the impact that he will
L3	continue to have on the world and on civil rights.
L 4	So thank you, Jason.
L5	CHAIR LHAMON: Madam Vice Chair?
L 6	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Is it
L7	okay to
L8	CHAIR LHAMON: Pile on.
L 9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: to
20	pile on
21	(Laughter.)
22	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Jason has
23	done all of this, made this incredible effort
24	that you've been hearing about with his work
25	while at the same time building a family. And so

1	I think he gets extra credit.
2	How many babies have you had since
3	you've been here?
4	(Laughter.)
5	CHAIR LHAMON: We're veering into
6	discriminatory land.
7	(Laughter.)
8	CHAIR LHAMON: Maybe we should stop.
9	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: Well, I
L 0	was just going to say, I don't know if it's the
L1	pressures that we brought to bear on him
L2	PARTICIPANT: He had time to make the
L3	babies.
L 4	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay, really we should
L5	stop.
L 6	(Laughter.)
L7	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: But thank
L 8	you, thank your wife, and your children. That's
L 9	where I was going, Madam Chair
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
21	VICE CHAIR TIMMONS-GOODSON: for
22	sharing you and allowing such great effort. All
23	the best to you. And when I look at you, I see
24	what our future leaders look like. Thank you.
) 5	Madam Chaira

1	COMMISSIONER YAKI: Madam Chair, I
2	need to pile on at this point.
3	(Laughter.)
4	CHAIR LHAMON: Please don't talk about
5	the baby making.
6	COMMISSIONER YAKI: No, I will not get
7	into the biological functions of our Commission.
8	But I will say that Jason has been, I think,
9	really the rock of so much of what has happened.
10	And as someone who has been deprived of a special
11	assistant for many months, which has now finally
12	been remedied just as he leaves, thank God, that
13	his work on the upcoming immigration detention
14	update that we were doing has been phenomenal.
15	But even aside from that, he is just
16	a phenomenal human being, someone who understands
17	the world of public service in every single
18	positive aspect that you can think of. And we
19	have been benefitted by him, the government will
20	be benefitted by him.
21	And, Jason, you know, it goes without
22	saying, but if I can ever do anything for you in
23	the future, please know that I can and I will.
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you.
25	Commissioner Heriot?

1	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: This is
2	Commissioner Kladney, I'd also like to add my
3	best wishes to Jason and his family, a wonderful,
4	well, to me a young man, and a very hard worker
5	and committed person as well. So, Jason, thank
6	you and best of luck.
7	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Heriot?
8	COMMISSIONER HERIOT: I just want to
9	thank Jason, who has been blushing a lot since
LO	all this started. I want to thank him for all
L1	his work in bridging the ideological divide. And
L2	he's been wonderful to work with, and I'll miss
L3	him. And, you know, thanks very much, Jason.
L 4	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Adegbile?
15	COMMISSIONER ADEGBILE: In the spirit
L 6	of our ongoing work together at the Commission,
L7	Jason, me too.
L 8	(Laughter.)
L 9	CHAIR LHAMON: All right, Mr. Staff
20	Director?
21	STAFF DIRECTOR: You know, I can't
22	thank you enough, Jason, for your commitment to
23	us to work with the professional staff, the
24	special assistants, more importantly with me in
25	my transition when I got here and throughout the

1	years. You're going to be missed. So thank you
2	for your service.
3	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. So with
4	that, I think we'll take a five-minute break.
5	And then reconvene just at 11:40, a six-minute
6	break, for our next iteration of our speaker
7	series to which I very much look forward. Thank
8	you.
9	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
10	went off the record at 11:34 a.m. and resumed at
11	11:43 a.m.)
12	CHAIR LHAMON: Okay. I will get us
13	started for our next iteration of our speaker
14	series. The title for today is the History and
15	Legacy of the Immigration Reform and Control Act
16	of 1986. I thank Commissioner Narasaki, for
17	suggesting this month's speaker topic and for
18	coordinating Mr. Kamasaki's appearance.
19	The need for immigration reform and to
20	protect against particular civil rights
21	violations has long been an issue of concern for
22	the Commission. The Commission, along with our
23	advisory committees, has issued policy statements
24	and full reports addressing various concerns
25	ranging from enforcement practices across the

1	country as well as at the border, the need for
2	efficient, fair, and thorough adjudication of
3	immigration cases, protection for undocumented
4	immigrants, and detention center policies.
5	I am glad that today we will reflect
6	on the last successful movement for major
7	immigration reform from 1986. Before I introduce
8	our speaker, I'll turn to Commissioner Narasaki
9	for some brief opening remarks.
10	H. SPEAKER SERIES PRESENTATION BY
11	CHARLES KAMASAKI ON HIS BOOK,
12	IMMIGRATION REFORM: THE CORPSE THAT WILL NOT DIE
13	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: Thank you,
14	Madam Chair. I want to add my thanks to Charles
15	Kamasaki for briefing us today on the history of
16	the 1986 legalization law and some of the
17	legislation that followed.
18	While it occurred well over 30 years
19	ago, it has relevance and lessons for policy
20	makers and immigration reform advocates today.
21	Then, as now, the immigration system was badly
22	broken as policies had not kept up with the global
23	and domestic realities that create the push and
24	pull factors that drive migration to the United

States.

The history of immigration in America 1 has been the pull of America's labor needs and 2 of the political, 3 the push economic, and environmental crises around the world, some of 4 5 which American foreign military and policies help to drive. 6 7 America has often recruited immigrant labor, but American communities have not always 8 9 been prepared to welcome immigrants, particularly those with different religions, languages, and 10 cultures and particularly when they're not White. 11 12 For example, the Chinese laborers came to help build the railroads. 13 And then when that was done, they were banned. 14 The Japanese then came to the West Coast to fill the demand for 15 16 fishing and farming, and then they were banned. 17 And then the Filipinos came in numbers after both 18 of the Chinese and Japanese banned. were 19 Eventually, all Asian immigration was curtailed. 20 The story in this book is well told, 21 read advance drafts, aot to some 2.2 extensively researched by an author who's lived 23 it. It's more than a story of through extraordinary piece of legislation, 24 it's the 25 story of a community, whose struggles have been

1 largely invisible and whose voice has largely been ignored, finally coming of age and becoming 2 a force in the nation's capital. 3 all this 4 And to me, is more 5 interesting that it's coming from a Japanese American who grew up in Texas more among Latinos 6 7 than Asians. I've had the honor of working with Charles Kamasaki for over a quarter of a century, 8 9 was fortunate, along with hundreds of Ι into the field of civil 10 coming 11 immigrant rights, to have had him tutor me on how 12 DC really works. The book is a master class on how 13 democracy actually functions from an expert who's 14 15 committed his life to helping America live up to 16 its most fundamental values and promises. 17 thank you for documenting the time in America's history and sharing it with us today. 18 19 CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you. So we now welcome Charles Kamasaki who is Senior Cabinet 20 21 Advisor for UnidosUS and resident fellow at the 2.2 Migration Policy Institute. At UnidosUS, Mr. 23 Kamasaki is a senior member of management with a range of responsibilities including supervising 24

services

and

legal

immigration

25

citizenship

1	program strategies and overseeing the
2	organization's other immigration initiatives.
3	Mr. Kamasaki is also the author of the
4	recently published book titled Immigration
5	Reform: The Corpse that Will Not Die, a History
6	of the Immigration Reform and Control Act.
7	In that book, Mr. Kamasaki shares his
8	personal insights as, quote, a direct participant
9	in the many meetings, hearings, markups, debates,
L 0	and other developments that led to the passage,
L1	end quote, of the 1986 legislation.
L2	Mr. Kamasaki, we look forward to
L3	hearing from you.
L 4	MR. KAMASAKI: Sorry about that.
L 5	After having been instructed twice on how to turn
L 6	the microphone on, I forgot.
L7	Thank you to the Commission for this
L 8	opportunity, to Commissioner Narasaki
L 9	especially, and her aide, Jason, who I will not
20	pile on more accolades, Staff Director, Mauro
21	Morales.
22	And I would just note, I observed his
23	comments to the interns and law clerks who
24	assisted the Commission. There are two of us in
25	this room who began our careers as interns at

1	then National Council of La Raza, now UnidosUS.
2	And so we share, I think, some of your
3	experiences.
4	I do need to start with a caveat.
5	Although I am proudly employed by UnidosUS, and
6	a fellow at the Migration Policy Institute, the
7	views and opinions in the book and in my talk
8	today are solely my own.
9	What I'd like to do is cover three
10	sets of issues today in my remarks. First, I'll
11	attempt to provide a brief overview of my book
12	which is, as you can tell, a pretty lengthy tome
13	about the passage, implementation, and aftermath
14	of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of
15	1986, or IRCA, as it's known to insiders.
16	Second, because I am speaking to the
17	US Commission on Civil Rights, I'll try and
18	outline a few of the civil rights implications of
19	the policy debates during the IRCA era and maybe
20	some thoughts about the future.
21	And finally, I'll conclude with a
22	brief thought about the relevance of IRCA for
23	those, many of us included, yearning for
24	immigration reform today.
25	As an overview, I'm really struck by

how many otherwise very well informed people know 1 little about the Immigration Reform 2 SO and Control Act of 1986. 3 It's often called, quote, unquote, the 4 5 Reagan Amnesty Bill. B11 t. in fact, his 6 administration was internally divided on the legislation, generally hostile to the idea of 7 legalizing unauthorized immigrants, and played a 8 9 fairly minimal role in its passage importantly, as the picture on the screen notes, 10 signing the final legislation. 11 12 Many people today blame IRCA for the growth of the undocumented population since 1986. 13 But that growth actually accelerated far faster 14 15 after passage in 1996 of a tough enforcement-only 16 immigration law. 17 it successfully legalized Because nearly three million people and, along with its 18 19 follow-on bill in 1990, protected perhaps two 20 million more from deportation, many people simply assumed that it must have been supported by 21 22 progressives and conservatives and must have been 23 supported by Latinos and the entire civil rights

community. The reality is actually far different

and far more nuanced.

24

Immigration 1 Μv book, Reform: The Corpse That Will Not Die, is about IRCA's life 2 It's full of details. and times. 3 Because, legislative process, details 4 matter. Ιt 5 includes lengthy portrayals of key actors. because people obviously matter. It tells the 6 7 story of how the last major immigration reform came to be through every single procedural step. 8 9 Because in the legislative process, the procedure matters a lot. 10 finally, it covers the bill's 11 And 12 implementation, not just because implementation matters too, but also because it was in that 13 period that the battle lines of today's debate 14 15 about immigration reform were being drawn. Especially when considered together 16 17 with its follow-on bill, the 1990 Act, the last comprehensive immigration reforms, 18 of 19 every standard, were highly consequential. 20 the first time in American history, those laws 21 made it unlawful for an employer to knowingly 2.2 hire or employ an unauthorized immigrant, 23 so-called employer sanctions provisions of IRCA. bill authorized 24 The more border 25 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.

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, а recognized problem stream, significant legislation, enough to require second, a mature policy stream of proposals that might solve the problem, and third, the third P,

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

political will sufficient to overcome the forces 1 comfortable with or entrenched in the status quo. 2 it comes to immigration, 3 When of unauthorized migration, 4 stream 5 policy stream of reforms to address it, and sufficient political will to move it through at 6 least one house of Congress have clearly been in place for more than over a dozen times over the 8 9 past five decades. Yet only in 1986 and again in 1990 did 10 Congress enact sweeping, comprehensive reforms. 11 12 The stories in my book attempt to explain how and 13 why that happened. But unlike most standard legislative chronicles, this book is told not 14 15 from the perspective of lawmakers but from the 16 perspective of a small coalition of non-profit 17 advocates that called itself The Group. unofficial leader 18 Its was Arnoldo 19 Torres of the League of United Latin American 20 Citizens, once the most conservative of 21 Latino civil rights organizations. While they 2.2 work largely outside the process, if generally in 23 parallel, representatives of the Mexican American 24 Legal Defense and Educational Fund were also key

players.

1 These Latino groups were joined by the the American Immigration 2 ACLU. Lawyers Association, Church World Service, 3 the immigration and refugee arm of the National 4 5 Council of Churches. And all of them were members of an organization that today is called the 6 7 National Immigration Forum. A few months after this group was 8 9 formed in 1983, a guy named Kamasaki, unlikely, with less than a year of experience in DC, was 10 default 11 assigned literally by to cover 12 immigration policy for the National Council of La Raza, now UnidosUS. 13 14 The Group faced enormous policy 15 They wanted to defeat or mitigate challenges. 16 employer sanctions, what House bill sponsor Ron Mazzoli called the heart of the bill. 17 They sought 18 a far more generous legalization program than the 19 million or so undocumented the original bill might have offered legal status to. 20 reducing 21 Instead of family-based 2.2 legal immigration, which the first two versions 23 of the Simpson/Mazzoli bill would have done, they wanted to increase it. 24 They opposed greater 25 restrictions asylum seekers that IRCA on

1	originally would have opposed.
2	The Group wanted to prevent the
3	creation of a major new Agricultural Guest Worker
4	Program which, although it wasn't in the original
5	legislation, passed the House in 1984 and the
6	Senate in 1985.
7	Several in The Group audaciously
8	demanded protections from deportation for
9	Salvadorans fleeing massive civil strife in the
10	region. And some envisioned building a whole new
11	field of pro-immigrant and Latino advocates in
12	the process.
13	And The Group initially opposed the
14	legislation that proffered these proposals. This
15	coalition had very few resources.
16	The powerful Leadership Conference on
17	Civil Rights, the preeminent voice for minorities
18	in the policy process, sat out the debate in large
19	part because its most powerful and influential
20	members, the NAACP and, with few exceptions,
21	Organized Labor, along with other powerful
22	progressive elites, including virtually every
23	editorial board in the country, supported the
24	bill.
25	The Group's resources were dwarfed by

1 opposina interests, like Labor, agricultural big business, 2 arowers, and emeraina an conglomerate of anti-immigrant groups beginning 3 with an organization called the Federation for 4 5 American Immigration Reform. And in fact, all of the Latino organizations, LULAC, 6 MALDEF, and 7 NCLR, were literally teetering on the edge of bankruptcy during the entire IRCA era. 8

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 a major Agricultural Guest Worker Program. It resulted in, as I said, legalizing nearly three million previously undocumented people to become permanent lawful residents of the United States.

It extended administrative and eventually permanent protection from deportation for a million close family members of those legalized. It doubled legal immigration from the 1980s levels, kept an asylum system largely intact and, through a new temporary protected

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

1	status created in the 1990 Act, provided relief
2	for perhaps another 800,000 to a million Central
3	Americans fleeing civil strife or natural
4	disaster.
5	Except for the exclusion of a large
6	temporary worker program, I think it's fair to
7	say that not a single knowledgeable observer
8	would have predicted any of these outcomes when
9	the debate began in 1981.
LO	So the question arises, how did The
L1	Group and its allies inside and outside of
L2	Congress do it? And unfortunately, for that
L3	answer you have to read the book.
L 4	Honestly, I do hope the book has value
L 5	strictly as an historical document or as a
L 6	legislative case study. It's a story filled with
L 7	intrigue, ups and downs, secret deals in
L 8	smoke-filled rooms. But I also think it raises
L 9	important civil rights implications and it has
20	lessons for future reformers.
21	And since this is a meeting of the US
22	Commission on Civil Rights, I'm obligated, I
23	think, to discuss some of the major civil rights
24	implications of that debate as well as this
) 5	Commission's work significant role in that

debate.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

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.

That story actually begins mid-1850s after the Mexican American War in which some 100,000 or so people of Mexican origin became subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. For the next 100 vears, 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 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.

One important instrument of this 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

1	of Mexican origin were, quote, unquote,
2	repatriated to Mexico, most without any form of
3	due process.
4	Perhaps half of those removed were
5	American citizens. Virtually all would have had
6	some valid claim to lawful presence had they been
7	given the opportunity to assert it. But none
8	were.
9	Another key immigration policy of the
LO	period was the infamous Bracero Temporary
L1	Agricultural Worker Program which operated from
L2	1942 through 1964 under which several million
L3	Mexican workers were allowed into the country to
L 4	work.
L5	While many, arguably most, were well
L 6	treated by the standards of the era, the program
L 7	was also fraught with abuse and exploitation.
L 8	But the program, even after it ended in 1964,
L 9	cemented in place an agricultural system
20	dependent on cheap labor from Mexico.
21	And finally, in 1976, Congress enacted
22	legislation that cut legal immigration from
23	Mexico in half, literally at the same time that
24	country's population was booming and its economy
25	was tanking, which left a perfect storm of

1 factors.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Repatriates seeking to return to their 2 and unite with their families, 3 homes former Bracero Program workers recruited to work in the 4 5 fields. and Mexico's failing economy all generated massive migration pressures. 6 But 7 instead of meeting this demand by increasing the supply of visas, Congress cut that supply of 8 9 visas in half.

> Having closed the proverbial front door entry to the United States, to not surprisingly immigrants attempted to enter through the back door, and unauthorized migration Congress then attempted to enact rose rapidly. legislation beginning in the 1970s, through employer sanctions, the penalties 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.

1 Which leads me to my second theme which is the evolution of the Hispanic civil 2 rights organization and of the civil rights field 3 writ large on the issue of immigration reform. 4 5 As I described in my book, up through 6 the early 1970s, Latino civil rights leaders, 7 and thought organizations like most Americans, were almost uniformly supportive of 8 9 tough immigration enforcement. 10 began to change with 11 widespread abuses associated with Operation 12 Wetback and accelerated through the Chicano 13 movement which, even after it faded away in the late 1960s, left a Mexican American leadership 14 15 that I say in my book was, quote, markedly more 16 ethnocentric pro-immigrant in its and orientation. 17 18 Notwithstanding its opposition 19 employer sanctions and its pro-immigrant orientation, in the mid-1980s two of the three 20 21 major Latino civil rights groups, the League of the United Latin American Citizens and the 2.2 23 National Council of La Raza, led by Congressman

Esteban Torres, broke with ideological orthodoxy

and helped produce the reforms that ultimately

24

1	protected some five million previously
2	unauthorized immigrants from deportation.
3	Many mainstream civil rights
4	institutions began the IRCA era, like their
5	Latino counterparts, as ardent restrictionists.
6	But by the turn of the century, I believe it's
7	fair to say, that virtually the entire civil
8	rights community became united around generally
9	pro-immigrant principles.
LO	The last civil rights related theme
L1	I'd like to address is the role of this Commission
L2	in that debate. This Commission was among the
L3	very first mainstream institutions to recognize
L 4	and call for increased policy attention to
L 5	discrimination against Latinos in the mid-1960s
L 6	and supported NCLR and others in their call for
L7	Hispanics to be counted for the first time in the
L8	1980 census.
L 9	With respect to immigration, this
20	Commission's landmark 1980 report, the Tarnished
21	Golden Door, broke with conventional wisdom and
22	presciently predicted the failure of employer
23	sanctions to reduce unlawful immigration and its
24	propensity to increase employment

25

discrimination.

1	After IRCA was enacted in 1989, this
2	Commission again issued a report documenting
3	discrimination related to employer sanctions
4	which was later verified by the General
5	Accounting Office, now a Government
6	Accountability Office report, in 1990 that
7	estimated some nine percent of employers, that's
8	nearly half a million, had adopted discriminatory
9	hiring practices after IRCA was enacted.
L 0	And in the years since, this
L1	Commission has often spoke out against civil and
L2	human rights abuses in immigration enforcement,
L3	examples of which we had literally this morning.
L 4	There is more the Commission can do to
L 5	build on this proud legacy, and let me offer three
L 6	suggestions. First is to examine the extent to
L 7	which the current enforcement system is fatally
L 8	flawed by discrimination.
L 9	For the past several years, research
20	has documented that well over half of all new
21	unauthorized immigrants don't come across the
22	southern border but enter lawfully and then
23	overstay their visas. Yet year after year, well
24	over 90 percent of all deportations are Latinos
) 5	who so called entered without inspection agrees

1 the southern border.

2.2

While I recognize that traditional 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.

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 up 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

1	nothing wrong, have some right to pursue life,
2	liberty, and happiness in the country of their
3	birth. Yet there is literally no remedy for the
4	toxic stress that they feel every day.
5	Finally, I'd note that reports of
6	racial profiling, apprehension, detention, and
7	even deportation of US citizens and others
8	lawfully present in the United States are
9	significant.
10	Similarly, systems like E-Verify
11	regularly produce false positives whereby people
12	authorized to work cannot be verified due to
13	marriage, or divorce, or other name change, or
14	even a typo on a DHS record. These people are
15	routinely denied a job, often even without
16	knowing why.
17	Many of you are distinguished legal
18	practitioners in your own right, and you know how
19	burdensome and difficult it can be to obtain
20	redress through the legal system if you are
21	wrongfully apprehended, or detained, or denied a
22	job.
23	And so the question is, are there less
24	burdensome administrative remedies that could
25	both prevent this from happening by holding

1	offending agencies and officials accountable
2	while also providing appropriate and timely
3	redress for those adversely affected.
4	Surely there are other questions this
5	Commission could consider, but allow me to
6	return, as I close, to a theme in my book. I
7	suspect many of you here are wondering what the
8	story of IRCA, a bill that passed more than 30
9	years ago, whether that story is at all relevant
LO	to today's debate.
L1	I for one think it has a lot of
L2	relevance. And I would ask for you just to step
L3	back and think of how quickly the politics of the
L 4	issue have changed in the last 15 years.
L 5	In 2006 the Senate passed a
L 6	comprehensive immigration reform bill, but then
L7	the House refused to act. In 2007 a similar bill
L 8	died on the Senate floor when the House almost
L 9	certainly would have been able to produce a bill
20	when it was headed by the new speaker, Nancy
21	Pelosi.
22	In 2010 it reversed again. The House
23	passed the DREAM Act, but it died in the Senate.
24	And three years later, it reversed again when the
25	Senate passed a comprehensive bill that was never

1	brought up for vote in the House.
2	I think most of us, certainly most
3	immigration advocates, see this record and see
4	failure. But to me, it looks a lot like the 15
5	years that preceded IRCA's passage in 1986.
6	So I'll close, for me, on what's an
7	unusually optimistic note. In the 1970s, Peter
8	Rodino introduced immigration reform measures
9	three times, twice passing the House and dying in
10	the Senate. In 1979, the new Immigration
11	Subcommittee Chair, Al Simpson, from Wyoming,
12	half joked that he'd been thrown into leadership
13	of that subcommittee because no one else wanted
14	it.
15	In his wonderful book, The Last Great
16	Senate, Ira Shapiro lamented that the era of
17	bipartisanship in Congress had ended with the
18	election of Ronald Reagan in 1980. In 1982, the
19	new House Immigration Subcommittee Chair said he
20	had to, quote, virtually shanghai, unquote, other
21	members of Congress to even join his
22	subcommittee.
23	The immigration reform measures
24	sponsored by Simpson and Mazzoli passed the
25	Senate twice but died in 1982 and in 1984. And

1	in mid-October of 1986, after his own immigration
2	reform bill died on the House floor, House
3	Judiciary Committee Chairman Rodino told aides
4	that he was ready to, quote, wash his hands of
5	the legislation.
6	That same week, the ranking
7	Immigration Subcommittee member, Dan Lungren, of
8	California, who had led the fight to kill the
9	bill, called the legislation, quote, a corpse,
10	unquote.
11	But just three years later, in
12	November 1986, in that picture that you have on
13	your screens, Simpson, Mazzoli, Rodino, Lungren,
14	and others gathered in the Roosevelt Room at the
15	White House and watched President Reagan sign
16	that corpse into law.
17	Thank you again for the invitation to
18	discuss my book. And I'd be happy to answer any
19	questions.
20	CHAIR LHAMON: Thank you so much for
21	your presentation. And I will open for questions
22	and comments from my fellow Commissioners.
23	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Madam Chair?
24	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Kladney?
25	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you,

1	Madam Chair. One of my questions is when you
2	started your presentation, you talked about
3	employer sanctions in the '86 bill. How
4	effective have they been in light of the I-19, I
5	think it's an I-19, I can't remember the number,
6	that actually gives employers protection when
7	they copy two forms of identification and fill
8	out a form?
9	MR. KAMASAKI: Well, without speaking
10	to the merits of the specific, it's the I-9 form
11	that employers use
12	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Oh.
13	MR. KAMASAKI: to verify new hires.
14	I think it's obvious that employer sanctions have
15	not been effective in stemming the flow of
16	unauthorized immigration.
17	And it's, I guess, ironic that only in
18	Washington that those who go against the
19	conventional wisdom and are proven right by
20	subsequent events get no credit, while those who
21	go along with the conventional wisdom that's
22	proven wrong somehow aren't held accountable.
23	It was actually immigration
24	restrictionists who first proposed employer
25	sanctions and predicted they would be effective.

1	And it was Latino civil rights organizations that
2	predicted that they would not be effective and
3	that they would cause discrimination.
4	I guess it's a very complicated
5	subject. But I guess what I would say is, to be
6	fair, the proponents of employer sanctions argue
7	that, like the tax laws, most employers, most
8	people are good actors. And they will try in
9	good faith to comply with the law. And I believe
10	that assumption is actually largely correct.
11	The issue is that it's only a tiny
12	fraction of employers who hire the vast majority
13	of undocumented immigrants. So even if you have
14	something like 90 percent compliance, if the ten
15	percent of employers who are not complying with
16	the law, who are evading the law, who are calling
17	their employees contractors and not employees and
18	thus not new hires, then I think you have a recipe
19	for a system that cannot possibly work.
20	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: And I would ask
21	you what would be your, in any immigration reform
22	bill going forward, what would be the top five
23	issues and any proposed solutions that you would
24	have for such a proposal?

MR. KAMASAKI: And if possible, full

25

1	text.
2	(Laughter.)
3	MR. KAMASAKI: No problem.
4	(Laughter.)
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Well, just the
6	five issues, why don't we start with that. How's
7	that?
8	MR. KAMASAKI: Well, I think, you
9	know, the outlines of what's called comprehensive
10	immigration reform, I think, have been well
11	established for some time. So I believe any
12	comprehensive measure has to include effective
13	enforcement.
14	And that would include not just border
15	enforcement but heightened labor law enforcement
16	that actually gets at that ten percent of
17	employers who knowingly hire unauthorized
18	immigrants so that they can be exploited. And
19	for whatever reason, this country's commitment to
20	labor law enforcement has weakened considerably
21	in the last four or five decades.
22	I think it's also fair to say that
23	immigration results from not just pull factors in
24	the United States but push factors from abroad.
25	So any comprehensive set of reforms has to look

1	at push factors that send people to the United
2	States. And I think the current debate about
3	Central America underscores that.
4	Second, we believe that there should
5	be more avenues for lawful migration. And what
6	exactly those numbers are, and in what categories
7	they should be, are hotly contested. But I think
8	there is consensus on that point.
9	Third, for those undocumented people
LO	who have put down roots in this country, many of
L1	whom have children, I think it's fair to say that
L2	a process to legalize their status is far
L3	preferable to any of the alternatives, including
L 4	mass deportation.
L 5	So I think those are the three core
L 6	provisions. There are any number of other
L7	issues. Whether there should be broader
L8	temporary worker programs as part of a legal
L 9	immigration stream, the size of those programs
20	and so forth, whether there should be a point
21	system, all of those are, I think, matters of
22	debate.
23	But enforcement, dealing humanely and
24	thoughtfully with the unauthorized already here,
25	and matching our future labor market and social

1	needs with a legal immigration system that
2	accurately and adequately meets those needs, I
3	think, have been and remain the fulcrum of
4	comprehensive reform.
5	COMMISSIONER KLADNEY: Thank you.
6	CHAIR LHAMON: Commissioner Narasaki?
7	COMMISSIONER NARASAKI: So it would be
8	interesting to hear your thoughts about how
9	national origin discrimination played out during
L 0	IRCA and how you see it continuing to play out
L1	now. And also, to note that, while IRCA's thought
L2	about mainly in terms of its legalization of
L3	Latinos, it actually also had a large impact for
L 4	Asian Americans.
L 5	MR. KAMASAKI: Indeed. So maybe
L 6	beginning with the second question first, Latinos
L7	were, I think, about 75 percent of those
L 8	legalized under IRCA. And obviously the
L 9	remaining 25 percent included large numbers of
20	Asians and others.
21	You know, the interplay of national
22	origin discrimination and immigration
23	enforcement is almost inextricable. And some of
24	the history, Karen, that you articulated earlier,
25	I'm sorry, Commissioner Narasaki, earlier I think

1	speaks to that fact.
2	I will say that I'm a little concerned
3	about making the immigration debate only about
4	race or national origin. Because I personally
5	don't believe it is. And while it is hard to
6	avoid outright racism or accusations of outright
7	racism in immigration policy debates, I think the
8	country is best served if those are, while
9	recognized, don't become the central or only
10	element of those debates.
11	To specifically answer your question
12	about national origin discrimination, you might
13	think about, again, speaking to those three major
14	pillars.
15	With respect to enforcement, I think
16	in my statement I covered much of those issues.
17	I think it's very, very difficult to enforce
18	immigration laws as they are currently drafted
19	without imposing very significant disparate
20	burdens on specific populations, especially
21	Latinos.
22	I for one would like to take a step
23	back and look at whether there are different
24	strategies that we could pursue that could

effectively enforce the immigration laws without

25

1	selectively enforcing them on a single
2	population.
3	Secondly, with respect to dealing with
4	the unauthorized population here, I do think,
5	particularly with respect to the children of
6	undocumented people, again, there is a clear
7	disparate impact on and in this case not just
8	Latinos but Asians.
9	And I think thinking through the
10	balancing of equities and the balancing of values
11	of what rights do they have, regardless of the
12	offenses that their parents may have committed,
13	is something that is often missing from today's
14	debates.
15	And then finally, the question of
16	national origin and legal immigration has been
17	omnipresent since the beginning of our first
18	immigration laws. And whether we choose to
19	alter, consciously or unconsciously, the
20	demographic makeup of this country, is dependent,
21	at least in part, on how we design the legal
22	immigration system.
23	CHAIR LHAMON: Mr. Staff Director?
24	STAFF DIRECTOR: Thank you, Madam
25	Chair. Charles, I want to thank you for your

1	presentation. You've been a good friend and
2	mentor to me for over 30 years when we first came
3	to Washington, D.C., something along those lines.
4	So during those 30 years, you have become an
5	important policy expert, on not only immigration
6	but other vital issues for Unidos, but for all
7	civil rights advocates.
8	My question is what motivates you to
9	remain involved in the struggle for civil rights?
LO	CHAIR LHAMON: Remember, our interns
L1	are here.
12	(Laughter.)
13	MR. KAMASAKI: You know, I'd like to
L 4	say that I grew up with a strong passion for civil
L5	rights, and I knew as soon as I got out of school
L 6	that was my future destiny. And the truth,
L7	however, would be very far from that.
L8	So I started as an intern at NCLR
L 9	actually working on housing policy. I was given
20	an opportunity to come to DC, and I thought only
21	for a couple of years before I found my real
22	career. And while I was working on housing
23	policy, the legislative director for NCLR,
24	someone you know well, Francisco Garza, decided
25	to leave DC to go back to California and get

Τ	married.
2	And I was just kind of sitting around
3	the office when the boss said you're covering
4	immigration. And that was really kind of the
5	beginning of how I entered the field.
6	I think what's kept me in the field is
7	maybe two or three things. And I will try and
8	avoid Commissioner Narasaki's example and keep
9	from being sentimental here. But one of those is
10	you get to do important work.
11	You know, it's pretty rare in one's
12	lifetime that you can work on a piece of
13	legislation and then a few years later be walking
14	down the street, or talking to a cab driver, and
15	they'll turn around and say that's the bill that
16	I got legal status through. And that's obviously
17	extraordinarily rewarding.
18	Second, it's less common now but
19	certainly when I first started, when I would be
20	sitting in a meeting and we'd go around the room
21	and introduce ourselves, people would kind of
22	give me an interesting look, like, what are you
23	doing working for that organization?
24	And I would say it's always felt quite
25	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 anything else, it always felt more natural and a place where I could contribute the most was by doing different jobs, albeit in the same organization.

CHAIR LHAMON: I'll follow that on with thanks for what you documented in your book, and then also what you presented to us today, for the optimism and the reminder that what can feel quixotic isn't always and that there's value in sticking with it and in continuing to work toward an end goal that will make us more just. So thank

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	you for the concrete reminder that sometimes it
2	happens and also for documenting what it took to
3	make it happen.
4	MR. KAMASAKI: Thank you.
5	CHAIR LHAMON: Any comments or
6	questions?
7	(No audible response)
8	III. ADJOURN
9	CHAIR LHAMON: With that, I will thank
10	you for your presentation, and for your book, and
11	we will adjourn our meeting at 12:29.
12	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter
13	went off the record at 12:29 p.m.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	