Page 1

U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS EASTERN REGION OFFICE

IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE VIRGINIA STATE

ADVISORY COMMITTEE BRIEFING

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2007

The Subcommittee convened in the Board Chambers of the James McCoart Administration Building, One County Complex

Court, Woodbridge, Virginia, at 9:30 a.m., Linda Chavez, Committee Chairperson, presiding.

PRESENT:

LINDA CHAVEZ, Chairperson, Virginia State

Advisory Committee

EDMUND D. COOKE, JR., Co-Chair, Immigration Subcommittee

LLOYD R. COHEN, Member, Virginia State Advisory Committee

TODD F. GAZIANO, Member, Virginia State Advisory Committee

LOUISA C. GREVE, Member, Virginia State Advisory Committee

RICHARD A. SAMP, Member, Virginia State

Advisory Committee

LACY B. WARD, JR., Member, Virginia State Advisory Committee

CCR 3 Meet. 404 STAFF PRESENT:

IVY DAVIS BARBARA DE LA VIEZ

FREDA GREENE

PANEL ONE:

JEFFREY S. PASSEL

MUZAFFAR CHISHTI

PANEL TWO:

JOHN T. STIRRUP COREY A. STEWART CRAIG S. GERHART

MICHAEL J. SCHWARTZ

CHARLIE T. DEANE

PANEL THREE:

ERIC BYLER

JEFF CARTER

MIKE HETHMON

LISA JOHNSON-FIRTH

DAN STEIN

Page 3 TABLE OF CONTENTS **PAGE** 8 INTRODUCTION: PANEL ONE: JEFFREY S. PASSEL 11 MUZAFFAR CHISHTI 25 QUESTIONS BY THE SUBCOMMISSION 41 PANEL TWO: JOHN T. STIRRUP 65 COREY A. STEWART 72 CRAIG S. GERHART 78 MICHAEL J. SCHWARTZ 85 CHARLIE T. DEANE 91 QUESTIONS BY THE SUBCOMMISSION 102 PANEL THREE: ERIC BYLER 141 JEFF CARTER 147 LISA JOHNSON-FIRTH 154 DAN STEIN 162 MIKE HETHMON 169 QUESTIONS BY THE SUBCOMMISSION 176

Page 4 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 1 (9:30 a.m.)2 3 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: I'm going to begin. 4 Those of you who drove in from any 5 distance know there was a lot of fog out there 6 7 this morning, and so the commute was a little bit more difficult than we might have 8 9 anticipated. 10 First of all, I want to thank all 11 of you for being here and welcome to the 12 Virginia State Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. We are meeting 13 14 today for the first time. This is officially 15 the subcommittee on Immigration of the Virginia State Advisory Committee. 16 My name is Linda Chavez and I am 17 18 Chairman of the Committee. And in a moment I 19 will introduce to you the other Members of the 20 Committee, but first I want to thank, first of 21 all, County Executive for Prince William 22 County, Greg Gerhart and his staff that have

1 been enormously helpful to us in setting up these meetings and in providing the facilities 2 3 and working with us.

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

I also want to thank the Prince William County Sheriff's Department for providing their services as well. They were very helpful to us and I want to thank them for being here.

First of all, let me just say a word about the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights for those of you who are not familiar with this independent federal agency. It is not an enforcement agency. It is an agency whose purpose is to gather facts and to assess the degree of civil rights enforcement in the United States.

We look -- the U.S. Commission Civil Rights looks at the enforcement of Federal civil rights laws. They gather facts, 20 do studies, occasionally hold hearings on 21 voting matters, and make recommendations on 22 legislation to the Congress and to the

1 President.

Now, our purpose today is to gather facts on the extent to which the civil rights of residents of Prince William County, Virginia may be adversely affected by measures taken by the County Board of Supervisors to withhold government services and otherwise penalize and/or detain illegal immigrants in the County, or by other measures enacted by the Board of Supervisors which may, by intent or effect, encourage racial, ethnic and national origin discrimination by private parties.

We are not here to debate immigration policy and, indeed, the Members of the Virginia State Advisory Committee, in both their private and in their professional capacities hold a range of views on immigration issues.

However, there is no question that the debate over immigration and the concern over illegal immigration across communities in

America has exacerbated racial tensions, and 1 that includes here in Prince William County. 2 The FBI reported this week that 3 hate crimes against Hispanics were up 4 5 nationwide by ten percent in 2006, with 576 incidents involving 819 victims. 6 7 Hate crimes against Hispanics have risen by 35 percent since 2003, the period 8 9 during which anti-illegal alien rhetoric has 10 become the most virulent. And many Hispanics, including those who were born in the United 11 12 States and whose families may have lived here literally for generations say they now feel 13 unwelcome in their own home. 14 15 A poll released this week by New American Media suggests 85 percent of 16 17 Hispanics believe there is, in the wording of the poll, "a lot of discrimination" against 18 19 Hispanics. Similarly, a poll that was 20 released yesterday by the Pew Hispanic Center 21 found that about 40 percent of Hispanics say 22 that they have, in fact, experienced

discrimination. And we will be hearing from
one of our witness who may be able to
elucidate more on that.

Despite this, Hispanics appear to be more committed to the American dream than ever with 74 percent saying they believe that if you work hard you will succeed in the United States.

Now, today we are going to be hearing from a variety of experts, public officials, community leaders and advocacy groups. It is our hope that the expert witnesses and the information that they provide will assist both the County and the State in its duty to protect the civil rights of its residents.

Before we begin, however, I do
want to introduce the Members of the
Subcommittee on Immigration. First of all,
I'll begin to my left with the Chairman of the
Subcommittee, Ed Cooke. Next to Mr. Cooke is
Todd Gaziano, and next to him is Lacy Ward,

1 Jr.

Barbara De La Viez is the staff

person who has been working with us on setting

up these hearings. And before I forget, let

me thank you, Barbara, because you have really

put in yeoman's service.

Next to me on my right is

Professor Lloyd Cohen, and next to him is Ms.

Louisa Greve. And, finally, Richard Samp.

And we may have some other Members of the

Committee joining us as well.

We are going to be fairly strict in our time limits today. There's going to be a little light up there that will give an indication of the time having elapsed. We are allotting 15 minutes to each of the first two panelists today because they are going to be presenting us with background, a lot of statistics, some demographic profile, and some legal analysis, and so we're going to give them a little bit more time to talk, and then we will allow for a period of questions by the

various Members of the Committee, as well, and 1 so we are going to be as strict as we possibly 2 3 can. Let me introduce the two Members 4 5 of the first panel, and I think we will go ahead and start with Jeffrey Passel. 7 joined the Pew Hispanic Center in Washington, D.C. in 2005. 8 9 His accolades are too long for me 10 to read. I would take up much of his 15 11 minutes if I were to do so, but let me just 12 say that in 2004 American Demographics 13 Magazine selected him as a, "Demographic 14 diamond, one of the five demographers, our social scientist most representative of 15 16 influential work in the past 25 years."

Dr. Passel holds degrees from the Johns Hopkins University, a Ph.D., also from the University of Texas at Austin and from MIT.

And following Dr. Passel will be Muzaffar Chishti who is a lawyer. He is also

17

18

19

20

21

22

director of the Migration Policy Institute's 1 Office of New York University School of Law. 2 3 His work focuses on U.S. immigration policy, 4 the intersection of labor and immigration law, 5 civil liberties and immigrant integration. Mr. Chishti was educated at St. 6 7 Stephen's College, Delhi, University of Delhi, at Cornell Law School and at the Columbia 8 9 School of International Affairs. 10 So, if we could have Jeff Passel 11 begin, and present his testimony. 12 DR. PASSEL: Thank you very much, 13 and thank you for inviting me. Just by way of 14 taking off from your kind introduction, aside 15 from noting that American Demographics went 16 out of business shortly after they gave me the 17 award. I don't know what that means. 18 We released a report yesterday that's available on pewhispanic.org on a 19 20 survey focusing on Latino attitude towards 21 immigration. I've made mention of some of 22 that in passing, but that's not the gist of my 1 talk here today.

What I thought I would try to do

-- and when I agreed to do this I didn't know

we were releasing it. But, I have tried to

put Prince William County in the national

context of very rapid growth of Latinos, and

then try to focus in on some of the changes

that are going on here, and I will preface it

by saying I'm really not an expert on Prince

William County, but I've spent a bit of time

looking at the numbers.

The rapid growth has been fueled by immigration. What's interesting now is that's changing a bit in that actually more of the growth of the Hispanic population is coming from fertility for the first time in about four decades. But that's a byproduct of the immigration.

What has been going on is the geographic diversification of the population, and that's really what we're seeing here, mainly driven by employment opportunities, and

started -- it has its roots back in the 1 California recession of the early Nineties, 2 when a lot of Latinos moved out of California. 3 I'll talk a little about some of 4 5 the local impacts, particularly population growth, ethnic diversity and I've take a 6 little bit of a look at schools and crime, and I'll just refer you to a study that came out 8 9 about a year ago that I did with some former colleagues at the Urban Institute, looking at 10 11 tax payments in the D.C. Metropolitan area. 12 Well, Latinos, this slide's actually the data, the latest number from the 13 14 Census Bureau puts it a close to 47 million 15 now, about 15 and a half percent of the U.S. 16 Population. It's trippled -- this population has trippled since 1980, and passed -- the 17 18 Latino population passed the Black population 19 in about 2001. 20 And, like I said, immigration is 21 driving this. That has an impact in the short 22 run on the characteristics of the population

and certainly has an impact on the growth.

2 But we are seeing more growth from the second

3 generation now.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

4 I'll skip this. This looks at

5 immigrants, not Latinos, now, about -- a

6 significant share of the adult Latino

7 population are immigrants and a significant

8 share of immigrants are Latinos, but the two

9 are not exactly the same.

decreasing in size.

What we've seen is a dramatic growth in the last generation or so in the number of immigrants in the country, that we're at an all-time high. As recently as 1970, the immigrant population was actually

In 1960, 1970, the immigrant population was relatively old. It was almost all European, and decreasing in numbers that changed with the 1965 Immigration Act and reversed this trend. The immigrant population is now largely Latino and Asian. It is relatively young and it is growing rapidly.

The percentage of immigrants in the population is not at an all-time high. Ιt is approaching the high levels that we 3 maintained as a country for about 50 years, from 1870 to 1920, about one-seventh of the 5 population was made up of immigrants. We're 7 approaching that but we're not quite there 8 yet.

1

2

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Where are the Latinos found? Well, historically there is a core area in the Southwestern United States; California, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, with other large numbers in the New York Metropolitan Area, the Chicago Area and the Miami Area. And historically they represented about 85 percent of all Latinos.

In the Nineties that began to change and movement out of the core. And once that movement started, we began to see shifts in the immigration patterns so that California was no longer getting quite as many immigrants as it had gotten before, and those immigrants

were going to the new destinations, which are

2 -- I will show you around the country.

That migration builds up a momentum that draws more people into those area and we're actually seeing that now as the share of migrants going into these new areas, new immigrants going into these new areas. It used to be about ten percent of all the new immigrants. It's now about 20 percent of all new immigrants.

And this is in your hand-out, but the key here is the numbers over on the right that, between 1990 and 2005 the Hispanic population outside of this historic core went from three million to nine million, so the numbers in the new areas tripled, in essence.

Here are the new areas. These are states where the Hispanic population more than tripled between 1980 and 2005, and had significant numbers. And you'll see Virginia is one of those states. North Carolina and Georgia really lead the way here. The Latino

population of Georgia is about ten times what tit was in 1980.

This is a group of states in the Midwest and the Southeast, largely, that also experienced rapid growth in percentage terms, but the numbers involved are a bit smaller, so these states don't have quite as many, but the rate of growth has been just as rapid.

And it's these states that got very few Hispanics. I expect, actually,
Louisiana to change a bit with some of the new settlement patterns around the recovery from Katrina.

Now, interestingly, this is a group of states that got large numbers of new immigrants and it's pretty much the same. And the dark states here are states where the immigrant population is largely undocumented.

So, if you put all this together,
what you see is that the growth of the
Hispanic population in a lot of these areas
was driven by immigration and largely by

1 undocumented immigration.

This is Prince William County, and I'll try to move through this fairly quickly. But you can see, Prince William has grown a lot, basically with the growth taking off after 1980 to the point where there's about over 350,000 people in the County now. And the growth rate has been averaging about four percent a year, which is quite healthy. It gets you a — it doubles your population in about 15 years.

The Hispanic population really grew. For basically the last 15 years or so it's been growing by about ten percent a year. So, it went from about 10,000 to almost 70,000, according to the latest estimates.

And this is -- to my mind, these numbers are the single numbers that explain a lot of what -- what's been happening, a lot of the reaction. In 1990 there were -- four and a half percent of the County's population was Latino. That doubled between '90 and 2000,

and it's doubled again in the last -- this is
only six years' worth of data. It's to the
point where about 20 percent of the County is
now made up of Latinos.

And it's immigrants doing it.

This is the proportion of the County's population that consists of immigrants going from about four percent in 1980 to about 12 percent in 2000, and about 22 percent, again doubling, within about a six-year period.

The 11.8 percent was about the national average at the time. It's now up to about 13 or 14, as well as 12 percent, so you can see that the County has sort of shot past the national composition.

And this looks at the families of the immigrants, so it's the immigrants and their families and they constitute almost a third of the County's population. The majority of children of immigrants are U.S. citizens. That's true of both legal and unauthorized migrants. And so, when you take

into account these households you get an even 1 larger share of the County's population. 2 Well, who are they? They are 3 They are relatively mainly in families. 4 5 young, and almost all of them are working or trying to work. The labor force participation 6 7 rate for immigrants is -- for immigrant men is a bit higher than labor force participation 8 rate for native-born men. 9 They have relatively low levels of 10 11 education. The jobs reflect that. They have 12 relatively low incomes because of the kinds of 13 work that they can get. And, like I said, 14 they are drawn largely to these areas by the 15 availability of jobs. 16 Labor force participation is -- in this County, labor force participation is 17 quite high for pretty much everybody, but the 18 19 immigrants have slightly higher rates than the 20 natives. 21 Immigrants do pay taxes. Thev 22 don't pay quite the proportionate share that

7 they represent of the population. That's because their incomes aren't quite a 2 3 proportionate share, and not all of the undocumented immigrants pay their share of 4 A lot of them do, but not all of them. 5 taxes. Our estimates were that immigrants 6 represented about 16 percent of the adult 7 population in 2000, and they paid about 13 9 percent of the taxes. Most of these taxes 10 went to the Federal Government and then after that, another big chunk went to the state 11 12 government. Very little of it went to the 13 County. 14 Immigrants do affect the schools. 15 Most of the kids, as I said, are native, but 16 they represent -- and I'll show you an 17 increasing share of the schools' population. 18 Where this is going, it's a little hard to 19 I'll speculate a bit on that. say. 20 One of the topics that I get asked 21 about and you directed me to some interesting 22 I put together a data series, a data

series on official crime statistics and the violent crime numerically is up slightly over a ten-year period. The property crimes are down a bit over -- trending downward, anyway.

If we put this together with a rapidly-growing population, the crime rate has been dropping fairly consistently for the last ten years, and even shows a drop over the last six years.

This is one of the -- this isn't immigrants, per se, it's Hispanics, but as we've seen, this is driven by immigration.

One of the big impacts on local areas of immigrants and of our growing Latino populations in the schools, and you can see here a really dramatic change in a very short period of time.

According to the '93, '94 school year data, five percent of the students in the County were Hispanic. That doubled by 2000 and it's more than doubled since then to the point where about a quarter of the students in

- will continue in the face some of the virulent 1 2 opposition to immigration, I think we'll have 3 to see. 4 And, they're certainly having an 5 impact here. They pay taxes. They work, and they're present in the schools. Again, a lot 7 are undocumented. My data don't really permit 8 me to separate that out, but a lot of the 9 undocumented immigrants have children. 10 Nationally, about two-thirds of their children are U.S. natives. 11
- 12 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you
 13 very much.
- Welcome Muzaffar Chishti. Good to
 have you with us. I introduced you at the
 beginning, so I won't do that again.

I will make mention that the

Migration Policy Institute did release a study

yesterday, or an analysis yesterday called

"Testing the Limits: A framework for

assessing the legality of State and local

immigration measures," and I presume you will

1 years.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

And we, at the Migration Policy 2 Institute should release this support 3 yesterday, which is basically a legal analysis 4 5 of the framework with which one must assess 6 the legality of some of the most popular measures adopted by states and localities in the area of immigration. That is submitted to 8 9 your review.

I think we all know historically immigration has been seen as the exclusive domain of Federal Government. It's akin to foreign policy, that we can't have states and localities make foreign policy, that the results must be a consistent, coherent policy which must be dictated at the Federal level.

17 It's also true that our
18 jurisprudence has recognized that states and
19 localities have some role to play in
20 immigration matters. It's also clear that
21 it's highly circumscribed and some of it is
22 written into our jurisprudence in the laws of

1 federalism, some of it is demonstrated by the way Congress has circumscribed the authority, 2 and some have evolved in terms of an 3 interpretation of individual rights, as the 5 Courts have interpreted them over the years. We, in this study, look at five 7 major areas which is the regulation of employment by states and localities, the 8 9 regulation of housing of undocumented by 10 states and localities, the enforcement of 11 immigration law by states and localities, the 12 restrictions of public benefits adopted by the 13 states and localities, and the restrictions on 14 day laborers to seek employment at street corners or parking lots. 15 16 These are the five major areas 17 where we have seen recent trends and 18 devolution. I think here today, just because, 19 given what Prince William County's resolution 20 is focused on, I will talk about two measures, 21 about law in this area has evolved and what it 22 may mean in terms of the implementation of it

in this County, which will be in the areas of the enforcement of immigration law, and the restrictions on the access to certain public benefits.

First of all, I mean, lawyers hate to agree on anything, but there are at least two areas of these five that I identified, which is the law enforcement and in the solicitation of ordinances, that one is safe to say that in this area law is quite settled compared to other areas where it is still contested.

On the issue of the enforcement of immigration law by states and localities, the trends are the three basic trends all over the country. There are trends where there are agreements signed by the Federal Government and the local or the state police to allow local and state police to enforce immigration law. That's one trend.

The second trend is allowing -- which is consistent with what Prince William

1 County has done, is allowing people, local cops to inquire into the immigration status of 2 people they detain and then inform the Federal 3 authorities about people they find in violation of status. 5 And there's a third trend, equally 6 important, where localities and states tell their cops not to interfere in the enforcement 9 of immigration law, which is -- some are 10 called sanctuary cities in our popular 11 parlance. All these three tendencies we see 12 13 in the national debate today. Now, how does 14 the legal analysis on this operate? First, I 15 think only Attorney General Ashcroft today believes that local and state police have 16 17 inherent authority to enforce immigration law. 18 There are three Attorney Generals 19 prior to him in Republican and Democratic administrations who came exactly to the 20 21 opposite view, that given a structure of 22 federalism, local and state cops do not have

1 inherent authority to enforce immigration law. In a legal opinion that his 2 administration issued in 2002, they concluded 3 that they have inherent authority. I think 5 most legal scholars disagree with that, especially given the three prior opinions of Attorney Generals stacked against that. No court has resolved that issue. 9 It hasn't come to fruition before any court. 10 But, keep that sort of constitutional 11 confusion aside, it's clear that Congress has 12 spoken about it in reasonably specific terms. 13 There are two areas of Federal immigration 14 enforcement. There's civil immigration and 15 there's criminal immigration. In civil immigration enforcement, 16 17 Congress, in 1996, in a major immigration reform law basically said that if the state 18 19 and local cops want to enforce civil 20 immigration law they must sign memorandas of 21 agreement with the Federal Government under 22 which you are specifically trained and

supervised by the Federal Government so that 1 you could then have some role in enforcement 2 of civil immigration violations. 3 That's what we call the Section 4 5 287(g) agreements. Popularly, this is a section of the Immigration Nationality Act. 6 With respect to the criminal violations of immigration, a lot of people --8 9 I think there's a general perception that 10 there is unlimited authority for local cops to 11 enforce criminal aspects of immigration law. 12 Actually, if you look at 13 congressional history on this, it's actually 14 very specific and very narrow. Congress has 15 said that only two areas in which local and 16 state cops can enforce federal aspects of 17 immigration law, which is 274 of the 18 Immigration Act which refers to harboring and 19 transporting of illegal aliens, and Section 20 276 of the Immigration Act which says it's a 21 felony for people to re-enter the country 2.2 after they have been sent abroad by -- after

deportation, if they seek a re-entry, then they have committed a crime.

Only in these two areas of law do the state and local cops have authority to enforce immigration law.

So, it's sort of these three areas that I talked about, I think, the Congress has been quite specific that this is a limited authority. And that's why, I think, most of the state laws that you have seen in this area are written narrowly to -- in the confines of Section 287(g).

Now, there's a second area which is more relevant to Prince William County, is what authority does police have in ancillary to their normal police function. And this is where some of the controversy rests.

I think it is quite clear under law that local police can ask anyone that they detain in their normal police function, if they arrest someone for a crime. After they arrest someone for a crime, they can ask the

1 person for their immigration status.

I think in many jurisdictions
that's considered a normal practice. What's
important, that you cannot arrest someone only
on the basis of a suspicion that that person
is undocumented. The underlying reason to
detain the person must be a state or a local
crime.

And if you detain that person for a state and local crime and you ask them about their immigration, you cannot prolong the detention beyond what you would be normally authorized to do in the context of the underlying crime.

So, these are two very specific, I think, restrictions with respect to the ancillary behavior -- ancillary extension of the immigration questioning. First, it must be ancillary to an underlying arrest for a criminal, and then the detention must not prolong what they would normally do for the underlying crime.

And I think there are clearly public policy reasons -- despite the fact that you can legally do it, there are important public reasons why even if police can do it that they should not do it.

And I think this is where I think this is where the police chiefs of the country have been the most outspoken. I think it's quite extraordinary in the last 18 months the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the major cities' chiefs of police, these are the police chiefs of the big, urban centers of the country, have come quite unanimously on this issue, that even if the law allows us to do it, it's not good public policy for us to do it.

And their reasoning is actually quite simple, familiar, but quite compelling, and they are saying basically that, "Look, we are not really trained to do this stuff, so therefore, if you ask us to do it we will automatically engage in racial profiling.

"And if we automatically engage in 1 racial profiling, we will frequently arrest 2 3 people and make unlawful arrests. do unlawful arrests, then we'll be sued. 4 5 if we are sued, then we'll be draining these rather limited resources of the counties and the localities if we actually have to defend those lawsuits." 8 9 So, I think on the public policy, 10 the analysis of the police power here -- I 11 think it's not just immigrant advocates, but 12 I think the police chiefs of the country, I 13 think, are quite unanimous on this. 14 I think there's also an important 15 public policy concerned with respect to how 16 people may behave in a county like Prince 17 William County if they know that police have 18 this now additional power. 19 And it comes from an analysis, 20 actually, from police authority themselves, 21 that if someone knows that police can now ask 22 him or her about their immigration status,

1 they are likely to flee.

Like if you have someone for a disorderly conduct on the street, that police officer would have a right to arrest them for that, but if they know that they'll get arrested, but be also asked for their immigration status, and could be turned over, they would flee.

So, you would -- you are also actually creating a public danger related to the new powers that police have been given, and I think that has also caused a lot of police chiefs around the country to have a pause in whether this should really become a policy or no.

Let me, for a minute, shift to the public benefits issue, and more glad to talk about the police stuff later on.

I think we know that the Welfare

Law of 1996 is an important frame in analyzing

what localities and states can do in this

area. The restrictions with respect to the

to stand the test. But if they are going to

be applied in racially-suspect ways, and I

think, then, we'll have a problem with respect

to equal protection guarantees under our

constitution.

The second thing, I think, to note here is that the provisions of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996, by themselves, mandate that public services should be available to the undocumented for issues of life and safety.

So, one really has to go specifically into areas that have been prescribed here to see whether at the very end of this actually will have an impact on life and safety.

And one can imagine that some old person sitting at home who has to have dialysis and their life would determine on whether they have access to dialysis or no.

And if this resolution says you can't give that person access to dialysis because that person is unauthorized, that may not meet the

legal test.

So, one would really have to do
this analysis by benefit-by-benefit. And the
last thing I want to say on this is that even
if it's lawful to excluded undocumented from
these services, the analysis around the
country showing the issues of costs are
playing a very important role on lawmakers
making decisions on this.

Colorado, as you know, in 2006

passed a very important omnibus bill banning

undocumented from a number of public benefits.

In an analysis they asked 14 of the

departments to see how much money they had

spent just executing these new provisions and

how much money had they saved by barring

undocumented from this access.

And it was actually hands-down.

They almost saved nothing and they had spent
two million bucks just implementing new
procedures for making sure that undocumented
were screened.

1 So, the issue here is there's an 2 assumption among a lot of lawmakers those 3 undocumented people access these services. 4 think most people who known undocumented know 5 they don't access these services. The last thing they want to do is be caught in a 6 situation where their status will come to 7 notice and they will come into the hands of 9 federal authorities. 10 So, I think on the straight issues of cost benefit analysis on this is an 11 12 important public policy concern, which I think 13 people should be aware of when they even --14 when they talk about the ban on the undocumented for the access. 15 Let me stop there and see if I can 16 17 answer any questions. 18 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you 19 both very much. We will have about half an 20 hour, I think, for questions from the various 21 Members of the Committee. I'm going to defer 22 my questions and see if there's anyone else

1 One question, though, is over your statement that a detention can't exceed the 2 duration that it would otherwise take if 3 there's reason to be -- let's say a situation 4 is a local official has reason to arrest 5 someone for a local offense, he checks the 6 immigration status, notifies the INS, and the 8 INS says "Please detain that person until we 9 can pick them up." 10 Let's assume that it's a re-entry violation and there's no MOU. It seems to me 11 12 that all the states have signed with the 13 Federal Government the international compact 14 or the -- I should say the interstate compact on detainers. 15 Doesn't that either allow or 16 possibly require, under the terms of the 17 compact that a detention might exceed the --18 not that I'm advocating, again, right now that 19 20 they should do that, but isn't that --21 MR. CHISHTI: I think especially 22 with respect to the crime that you mentioned,

- which is 276, which is protected by the INA.
- I think it's very different analysis, I think,
- 3 when the Federal Government can request you to
- 4 detain someone.
- 5 I think there the police may be
- 6 obliged, actually, to keep the person as long
- for the Federal Government to then come. But,
- 8 again, it's limited in the context of the
- 9 underlying crime for which that person has
- 10 been detained. It's 276, which Congress has
- 11 specifically authorized.
- 12 And two, that the request then
- comes from the Federal agency to hold that
- 14 person. I think that probably would be fine
- under the compact.
- It's respect to crimes that are
- not covered and where the local cops,
- themselves, decide to detain a person. I
- think those are the areas which are
- 20 problematic.
- 21 MEMBER GAZIANO: Like any law
- 22 professor, I was going to begin with the easy

and just get maybe one more to the slightly 1 harder, and that is, any other criminal 2 penalty where -- and let's say even the --3 it's the County policy to inquire in the INS 4 database and then contact the federal 5 officials and ask if they want to pick them 6 up, wouldn't the compact possibly either 8 authorize or require that they be obtained? 9 MR. CHISHTI: Not in the absence 10 of, in my opinion -- there are obviously legal 11 authorities on this side. Not in my opinion. 12 In my opinion, I think if there was a criminal 13 arrest warrant which, if the person gets into 14 the NCIC, which is what I think you're talking about --15 16 MEMBER GAZIANO: Yes. 17 MR. CHISHTI: -- and then the NCIC is the National Crime Information Center 18 19 database. If the NCIC shows a criminal 20 warrant against the person, then I think most 21 people believe that you would have the right 22 to detain the person.

1	If the NCIC does not show a
2	criminal warrant, then you wouldn't have the
3	right to detain a person. In fact, I think
4	police chiefs have been clear on this, that
5	when you see a warrant flashing across the
6	NCIC database, that itself does not the
7	fact that you see a warrant doesn't give you
8	the authority to detain the person. Then be
9	more careful in analyzing the warrant further
10	to see whether it's a civil violation of
11	immigration law or a criminal.
12	If it's a civil violation, don't
13	hold the person. If it's a criminal
14	violation, you may get the right to hold the
15	person. So, that I think is the distinction.
16	MEMBER GAZIANO: Okay. Thank you.
17	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Do you have
18	another question?
19	Ed?
20	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Yes. I have a
21	brief question for Dr. Passel.
22	Was I correct in hearing you say

		Page	46
1	that illegal immigration, Hispanic immigration		
2	is what's driving the growth of the Hispanic		
3	population, that it is illegal as opposed to		
4	birth that's driving the rapid increase in the		
5	growth of the Hispanic population?		
6	DR. PASSEL: It's the the		
7	movement out of the historic settlement areas		
8	was largely driven by undocumented		
9	immigration. The overall growth is roughly		
10	equal in terms of the overall Hispanic growth,		
11	but this disbursal outside of the Southwest		
12	and the core really can be traced to		
13	undocumented Mexicans moving out of California		
14	initially about 15, 20 years ago.		;
15	CO-CHAIR COOKE: And that's true		
16	of the overall growth of the population		
17	nationwide, not just the migratory group?		
18	DR. PASSEL: Of the Hispanic		
19	population? No. The majority of legal		
20	immigrants not the the largest group of		
21	legal immigrants are Hispanic, and by far the		
22	largest numbers of illegal immigrants are		

for you, Dr. Passel.

The wording of the resolution here in Prince William County says "Whereas, the Prince William Board of County Supervisors has determined that illegal immigration is causing economic hardship and lawlessness in this County, and that illegal immigration may be encouraged by public agencies within the County by failing to verify immigration status as a condition of providing public services." That was one of the preconditions to the resolution itself.

I'm just curious, looking at some of the charts that you provided us today, whether or not in your expert demographic opinion, it is fair to say that there is economic hardship in Prince William County and whether or not there is lawlessness.

It seemed to me that your chart showed, for example, that crime rates have actually been going down in Prince William County, and I just want to -- if you could

- just briefly say something about economic
- 2 hardship.
- Where does this county fit in?
- 4 Are we, you know, somewhere Mississippi in
- 5 terms of the earnings and other factors in
- 6 this County, or not?
- 7 DR. PASSEL: Well, if you look
- 8 broadly at immigration, what you find is that
- 9 the places that immigrants go to are generally
- doing better economically than other places,
- and that has to do with why the immigrants
- 12 come.
- The immigrants come almost -- they
- 14 come because they have family. They come
- 15 because they can get jobs. And so places
- where -- that are experiencing job growth tend
- 17 to attract immigrants.
- 18 There's very little evidence in my
- opinion that immigrants are drawn by social
- services. Some colleagues of mine, former
- 21 colleagues at the Urban Institute classified
- 22 the states by the generosity. This is an

analysis in the late Nineties, and the states were classified by how generous their social service systems were towards immigrants.

And then we looked at both the settlement patterns of new immigrants and the patterns of immigrants moving from state-to-state, and what we found was that immigrants were, in fact, moving from more generous states to less generous states and the rapid growth in new migration patterns was towards the less generous states.

Now, those are the states that were experiencing the most job growth at the time. So, you know, my conclusion was that immigrants generally go where the economy is strong and where they can find jobs.

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Just quickly,
a question for Mr. Chishti as well.

Our concern in this committee, as
I said, at the onset, is not immigration

policy and how many immigrants we should admit

or anything having to do with immigration

1 policy, per se.

Our concern is whether or not by virtue of enacting state or local initiatives aimed at controlling illegal immigration, the civil rights of residents of the state may, in fact, be being violated. And so I want to ask you a question about the way in which some of these initiatives can be implemented.

If, in fact, the intention is to deny benefits to people illegally in the country, whether if it's benefits for welfare services or, for example, not allowing landlords to rent to people who are not legally in the country, is it fair to say that in order for that to meet, you know, 14th Amendment and other -- and civil rights law considerations that broad inquiries would have to be made of every single individual applying for such benefits or applying to rent a house as to their legal status in the United States, or could you simply just choose people that you thought might not be legally in the

MR. CHISHTI: To make it depend on

they were legally entitled to reside in the

United States?

20

21

,			
	1	Page	54
1	the status, then everyone would have to be		
2	asked.		
3	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Okay. Yes,		
4	Mr. Cohen.		
5	MEMBER COHEN: Am I on? Yes.		
6	A follow-up to that: Do I		
7	understand you to be saying that using any		
8	indicia of immigrant status would violate		
9	equal protection in these inquiries?		
10	MR. CHISHTI: I think		
11	MEMBER COHEN: And does this apply		
12	more generally to other issues, other than		
13	immigration? For example, in a violent		
14	assault, can you simply inquire of adult		
15	males, or must you inquire equally of aged		
16	females?		•
17	7 Is there no distinction		
18	representing indicia of likelihood of the		
19	person being in violation that can be taken		
20	into account?		
21	MR. CHISHTI: I think if you if		
22	the indicia are race-based or ethnicity-based		

1	they are really suspect. I don't think
2	there's any doubt about that, that if you only
3	ask Hispanic-sounding names questions, or if
4	you only ask people who look Hispanic to you
5	questions, or if you only ask people that you
6	think dress like undocumented questions, those
7	are clearly all suspect. None of them can be
8	protected indicia.
9	MEMBER COHEN: What about fluency
10	in English.
11	MR. CHISHTI: Cannot be. A large
12	number of people who don't speak English
13	perfectly are U.Sborn people, people living
14	in Puerto Rico. Puerto Ricans don't have to
15	speak when they're born.
16	MEMBER COHEN: Well, then, in
17	relation to the notion of, let's say, a
18	violent crime, many people who are healthy,
19	vigorous young males don't commit crime, but
20	yet we would not think it suspect or am I
21	wrong? Is it in violation of the 14th
22	Amendment to simply inquire of healthy young

dealing with issues related to race or

- have sanctuary policies, basically don't ask,
- 2 don't tell. I'm wondering whether that is
- 3 really legal.
- 4 My understanding of the 1996 law
- 5 that you referred to said that local
- governments may not use federal funds to
- 7 provide benefits to undocumented aliens.
- 8 Presumably it's simply because the
- 9 local government said, "Well, we didn't bother
- to ask, so we don't really know where those
- benefits are going," would not be a defense,
- if the Federal Government were to say, "You
- are failing to enforce the law, therefore,
- 14 we're going to cut off all Medicaid benefits,
- for example, to Prince William County and to
- 16 the State of Virginia.
- 17 And I'm wondering what obligation
- 18 under federal law local governments may have
- to enforce the ban on provision of services to
- 20 undocumented aliens.
- MR. CHISHTI: As you know, this is
- being litigated a lot. I'm not sure of the

- "lot," but it's been litigated. The 1996 1 provision says, if you know the information 2 3 you can't prevent the Federal Government from
- knowing it.

8

16

17

18

19

20

So, it's quite clear that the way 5 the provisions of the IRAIRA are written, they 6 apply with respect to telling the Federal Government of something that you know.

9 That's why many of these cities 10 that have been sort of broadly characterized 11 as sanctuary cities and the definition is, itself, kind of fluid and fuzzy. They don't 12 13 have restrictions with respect to not telling the government, the Federal Government. 14 15 have restrictions against asking the

government -- asking the people.

So, it's sort of, if they don't have information, they don't have anything to give to the Federal Government, is how this is applied.

21 Having said that, I should also 22 note that the highest courts in the country

- that has reviewed this is the Second Circuit
- in New York. There was actually, oddly, a
- 3 case brought by Mayor Giuliani against the
- 4 Federal Government in the context of his
- 5 present position on immigration is
- 6 particularly odd.

He actually sued the Federal

Government for asking the cities to share the

information. He thought it was a violation of

the 10th Amendment. He lost that case in the

District Court in the Southern District. It

went on appeal to the Second Circuit Court of

13 Appeals.

19

20

21

22

And the Second Circuit Court of

Appeals basically disagreed with Giuliani,

said that, no, if you know the information you

have to tell. That's why we've gotten to the

don't ask, don't tell issue.

But, even in that Second Circuit opinion, the Court said that if you have generalized confidentiality policy of the city, that if you don't share information with

respect to a number of issues, not just
immigration, a broad number of issues, then
probably the confidentiality issues will be
protected by the 10th Amendment.

That's actually -- if you look at

the City of New York's law today on this which is signed by Mayor Bloomberg, it lists not just immigration. It looks at victims of crime, victims of sexual discrimination, all that stuff, among the many grounds which for confidentiality.

And I suspect that many lawyers today think that if Mayor Bloomberg were to -- had to defend it, he probably would be able to defend that on the basis of 10th Amendment because I think the 10th Amendment does protect the confidentiality of requirements between the state and the Federal Government.

So we don't know, frankly, the last word on the law on this, but we know that the Second Circuit has clearly hinted that if there are broader confidentiality provisions

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you 1 very much. This panel is comprised primarily 2 of public officials, either elected officials 3 or appointed officials and our purpose is to 4 try again to find out information about what 5 went into the passage of the principal 6 resolution and how it is, in fact, being implemented. 9 I think there are a number of 10 people who were to be on this panel who will not be here. One is Mr. Gerhart, whom we 11 12 thanked earlier. Mr. Gerhart is attending the Firefighters' graduation and we are glad that 13 he is doing that. 14 15 He is going to be late. He may, in fact, be able to join us, but he is not 16 here at this moment. 17 18 We have also heard from Colonel Land who was to talk to us about the Prince 19 20 William, Manassas Regional Adult Detention 21 Center, that he has had a family emergency, 22 and therefore he is not going to be able to be

blood of our nation, legal immigration. 2 It's not about denying the fact 3 4 that many dedicated and hard-working individuals have entered the United States 5 legally, because they want to share the American dream and because they want their children to have a better opportunity than 8 9 they have had. That's exactly what America is 10 about. 11 But any sovereign nation, 12

about shutting doors and stopping the life

1

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

especially in an era when national security is such a high priority, must abide by the rule of law. That means a system and standards to process and to assimilate the millions of people who immigrate to the United States legally every year.

These people have done the right thing. They've followed the law. They've made their application. They've fulfilled their legal obligations. They didn't come sneaking in through the back door in the

1 middle of the night and then demand goods and 2 services for themselves.

We can go back and forth on this issue all day, and I expect we might, but I believe in this next coming -- in this coming election in 2008, candidates at the presidential level, the congressional level and local level will do just that.

Unfortunately, I think that they, candidates generally, lag well behind the American public in recognizing what's at stake here. Simply, we're talking about the very identity and the soul of our country. Who are we, what are we about, and will we survive as a sovereign nation?

How is it that men and women can get up every day, go to work, pay their bills, vote, raise their children and they are very proud to be Americans. And then suddenly they find themselves cornered by a chattering class of elites in business, politics and the media who seem to have abandoned the common sense.

1 If you think this is an 2 exaggeration, just please consider -- consider 3 this scenario. Imagine if you will, Americans in great numbers might begin showing up in 5 France or in China or Spain or Argentina or 6 Japan or any other country in the world, and 7 these individuals expect to be given driver's 8 licensed, to apply for welfare benefits, they 9 refuse to learn the local language, and conduct and live their lives and their 10 11 businesses as they desire. 12 Those individuals, these 13 Americans, would be laughed out of town. 14 Unfortunately, there's no laughter in the United States on this issue. It's become a 15 16 very thorny and a very depressing issue. 17 Let's be clear on this subject. 18 Despite the efforts of some people from the 19 White House on down, the American people do 20 not want to give away their country. They're 21 not interested in one world government or 22 edicts from the United Nations. They have no

interest whatsoever in eliminating borders or 1 forming some kind of ridiculous North American 2 Union with Mexico and Canada. And they are 3 sick and tired of feeling insults from those 4 who oppose them on this viewpoint. 5 Americans have a unique and rich 6 7 heritage. We are the world's first democracy. We gave the world its first constitution. 8 9 We've been very particular about checks and balances within our political system, whether 10 it's the Federal level, Congressional level, 11 White House or in our own local town council. 12 13 My point is that we, as Americans have evolved with law, with the law as our 14 15 road map. Certainly we debate, we dissent, we 16 challenge. Many times in our history it's 17 been ugly and it's been violent, but we move forward and we build on the rule of law. 18 19 We build on our values and our 20 spiritual resources. What emerges from this 21 human distillation process is a philosophical

and cultural landscape that has served our

<u> </u>]
		Page	9 71
1	country and this world well for more than 200		
2	years.		
3	Now for us to say come one, come		
4	all, forget about the rule of law is a		
5	devastating detour from the path that led us		
6	to the freedom and prosperity that we enjoy in		
7	this country in the first place.		
8	When the founding fathers finished		
9	their work in Independence Hall in		
10	Philadelphia in September of 1787, Benjamin		
11	Franklin was approached by a woman in the		
12	crowd who asked him she asked him		
13	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Your time is		
14	up, Mr. Stirrup, so if you could just		
15	concluded.		
16	SUPERVISOR STIRRUP: "What have we		
17	accomplished?"		
18	"A republic, Madam," is what		
19	Franklin replied, "if we can keep it."		
20	Americans, even if they don't know		
21	the details of their own history know by		
22	instinct that the issue of illegal aliens is		

ageist remarks here, Corey. And could -- I 1 just asked someone on the staff if maybe you 2 could move the chart that is up there, maybe, 3 and turn it around so that I can see the 4 caution button. I can't tell where we're 5 getting in terms of times. 6 Actually, it would be helpful just 8 to sort of put it over where that -- great. 9 Thank you. Thank you, Chief Deane. 10 Yes. Corey Stewart. 11 CHAIRMAN STEWART: Madam Chairman, 12 Members of the Committee, I'm glad you're 13 here, keeping our seats warm. And I want to 14 thank you for coming to Prince William County 15 to help us explain why this community has 16 tried to deal with the problem of illegal 17 immigration and its effects on our community. It's not a unique problem. 18 19 one that's replicated all across the United 20 States, in communities in Texas, in Arizona, 21 but yes, in Virginia, it states that the 22 border, our southern border.

Prince William County is a diverse 1 community. It is historically diverse. 2 been diverse for over a century. We welcome 3 diversity in Prince William County. 5 welcome legal immigration. And I must say 6 that I better say that since my own wife is a 7 legal immigrant to the United States. What we do not welcome in this 8 community is illegal activity. What we do not 9 10 welcome is illegal immigration and its effects 11 on Prince William County. The problem if illegal immigration 12 13 was not identified by John Stirrup. It was not identified by Corey Stewart. 14 It was not identified by any politician. It was, in 15 16 fact, identified by the residents of Prince William County who began to notice some of the 17 18 problems that are associated with illegal 19 immigration. 20 That is not to say that illegal 21 immigrants caused all of these problems or 22 even that they are responsible for a majority

of those problems. But the fact is that
somebody who is here illegally shouldn't have
been here in the first place and is adding to
those problems.

From our hospitals -- and Mr.

Schwartz will discuss that in a few moments -to overcrowded housing in our neighborhoods,
to our problem in our jails, we know that a
significant portion of the crime committed in
the County is by illegal immigrants, to gang
activities.

First and foremost, the reason that this community and the reason that Mr. Stirrup, myself and the rest of the Board of County Supervisors decided to address the problem is because of public safety.

One of the suspects in the triple murder in New Jersey of some three college students was, in fact, a resident of Prince William County. Hector Molina, a suspect in a case earlier this summer, in Prince William County, who was brought into our jail system

- on a lesser crime, his immigration was not checked.
- He was released on bond and a

 couple of weeks later he murdered a Prince

 William County resident. Just recently there

 was a triple murder in Woodbridge, it was last

 week, actually, by an illegal alien here in

 Prince William County.

9 The reason that the locality needs 10 to address this issue is because, frankly, the Federal Government has failed to do so. 11 12 Corporate Republicans and liberal Democrats, 13 alike, for their own reasons, have failed to 14 address this problem, refused to do so and as a result communities like ours are forced to 15 pay the price. 16

So, what limited powers we do have, we intend to use to address the problem.

We have cooperated with the Federal authorities.

17

18

19

20

We have to say from the outset,

that Immigration and Customs enforcement, from

- our perspective, has been very cooperative.
- 2 They've been picking up illegal immigrants who
- 3 have served their sentences in our jails.
- 4 They've been picked up within hours from the
- 5 jails and brought into Federal custody.
- 6 Our resolution was essentially a
- 7 twofold process. Last year we adopted the
- 8 resolution to initiate the 287(g) program in
- 9 the jails, to cooperate with Federal
- authorities to deport prisoners after they've
- 11 served their sentences, and in July Mr.
- 12 Stirrup's resolution extended the 287(g)
- authority to our police on the streets and to
- 14 our sheriff's office.
- We expect to begin enforcement of
- that resolution as soon as possible which we
- think will be January or February of next
- 18 year.
- 19 I'd welcome, again, you all being
- 20 here. I think the US Civil Rights Commission
- 21 has done great work for the past 50 years. We
- 22 welcome your presence here today and we look

irrespective of resident status of the recipient.

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Those benefits that we are -- we may not provide to folks who are in the community illegally, those benefits for which the locality has discretion, and the relative merits of exercising that discretion in terms of restricting service delivery, and they made certain that the direction included that our staff work and recommendations should come forward in a manner fully consistent with Federal law, in a manner so as not to be construed as prohibiting the rendering of emergency medical care or any other federally or state-mandated benefits, and not to do anything to discourage the reporting of crime or criminal activity to any law enforcement agency.

The County staff examined the entire gamut of services that we provide and that included over 236 services which we grouped -- are offered in four different

categories. Eighty of them were in our

functional area of community development, 84

were in general government, 52 were in public

safety, and 126 were in -- I'm sorry, 120 were

in human services.

As we began our work, the County
Attorney identified a series of issues that
guided our work from a legal perspective.
These included the complexity of verifying
citizenship and legal or illegal status, a due
process clause pursuant to the 14th Amendment
of the Constitution, the equal protection
clause, again, in the 14th Amendment to the
Constitution, Supreme Court rulings, such as
Plyer v. Doe, the Dillon Rule here in Virginia
which limits local authority and discretion,
the Freedom of Information Act, which governs
information as it must be provided to the
community, and property ownership laws.

With that as backdrop, we asked our County staff to look at all of those 200-plus programs, identify the program by name,

Page 81 1 give us any information they could about current laws that guide and service delivery, 2 gave us -- give us any information they might 3 have in terms of the efforts they have in 5 place to verify legal status as well as letting us know where those -- we had no verification system in place. And then we asked them to discuss 9 the impacts of restricting those services on 10 our regulatory function, on our customer service delivery, and on our customer service 11 12 delivery as it relates to serving the 13 community at large, versus specific services to individuals. 14 15 We came back with our report to 16 the Board and we gave the Board all of those 17 services categorized as follows: 18 identified a range of services which are 19 already restricted, primarily by Federal law. 20 These would include things such as temporary 21 aid to needy families, food stamps, et cetera. 22 We identified services that may

not be restricted pursuant to Federal or state law. An example here would be health services provided to infants.

We identified services that we thought we had the legal discretion to restrict, but where we thought the impact on the community, the potential legal questions and fiscal impacts would be extraordinarily high and recommended that those not be considered.

Those would include services like parks and libraries for which we have open facilities, no sense of eligibility systems or anything, and the cost to put those in place we thought were prohibited.

We also had some services that we categorized in an area called services that should not be restricted, and these were services such as mental health where failure to provide service to a client, irrespective of legal or illegal status could have serious impacts on the larger community.

1 Another example would be some 2 services we provide to children who may very well be US citizens but our clinical model 3 suggests we need to work closely with the family and we can't do our job if we try to sort through whether the family is legal or 7 not, so we suggested not going there. 8 Then we had services that benefit the community as a whole, such as road 9 10 construction. It's very difficult to sort out 11 who is using roads at any point in time. 12 then services that benefit our County 13 employees such as payroll, fleet services, which really are part of our service mix, but 14 15 don't directly support any individual within 16 the community. 17

The last category was a list of services that we thought could and perhaps should be restricted, given the Board's policy guidelines, and those services included adult services to the elderly and disabled in allowing them to remain in their homes, in-

18

19

20

21

22

abuse program in our adult detention center, 2 tax relief to elderly and disabled, homeless 3 intervention programs which are really 5 designed to allow people to remain in their homes and therefore in the community, identification services to adults provided by the Sheriff's Department, which is not our 9 primarily law enforcement. We thought that 10 gave an imprimatur of identification provided 11 by government, and then a tax exemption program we have for folks who renovate either 12 13 commercial or residential properties. 14 In each of those cases, the Board 15 did direct that we develop procedures for how we would go about restricting those services 16 so that they're not delivered to folks who are 17 in our community illegally and I ask that we 18 come back to them after the first of the year 19

care services for our elderly, a substance

1

20

21

22

with those procedures, at which point we

how they want us to proceed.

believe the Board will make a decision as to

	rage o
1	I should note that none of these
2	services have been restricted to date. The
3	only services we are restricting are those
4	that are directed by the Federal and state
5	government for restriction.
6	That ends my comments. Of course,
7	I look forward to your questions.
8	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you.
9	Thank you very much.
10	Mr. Schwartz.
11	MR. SCHWARTZ: Thank you, Madam
12	Chairlady, and Members of the Committee for
13	inviting me.
14	The County has two hospitals,
15	Prince William Hospital and Potomac Hospital.
16	Both hospitals are voluntary, not-for-profit.
17	So, this name on the card indicates County.
18	Both of our hospitals are 501(c)(3) under the
19	Internal Revenue Code.
20	Community hospitals such as Prince
21	William are the backbone of America's health
22	care system. We provide quality care to all

1 who come through our doors, whether or not 2 they are citizens or from other countries, 3 whether or not they have insurance. 4 Our county is one of the fastest-5 growing, not only in Virginia, but in the United States. In the last ten years we've grown about 30 percent, the last 12 years. 7 8 We estimate by 2012 we will have 9 grown another 18 percent coming to a population of about 425,000. Now, this growth 10 11 in population offers great opportunities and 12 it also presents challenges. We obey the laws of the United 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

States and the Commonwealth of Virginia, as
I've said, and we do not seek to find out the
immigration status of any of our patients, nor
do we keep statistics on the immigration
status of our patients. We do, however, keep
statistics on our self-pay and Medicaid
patients.

Overall, 20 percent of the gross charges at Prince William Hospital are self-

pay or Medicaid which means out of \$400 million in gross revenues per year 80 million are self-pay or Medicaid.

Last year there were 2665 births at Prince William Hospital. Nearly 40 percent of those were unassigned births, which means that the mother was not under the care of an obstetrician, and thus, there was very little prenatal care.

Unfortunately, without prenatal care, a large number of those newborns require treatment in our neonatal intensive care unit.

And I think, as you know, without prenatal care lifelong problems may also result, and these can be debilitating and costly to society.

In addition to the financial burden that this type of situation places on hospitals such as Prince William and Potomac, it also takes an enormous toll on our professionals who are hard-working labor and delivery room nurses, for example, the lack of

- prenatal care is heart-breaking and, in fact,
- 2 frustrating.
- 3 And I might add that the Health
- 4 Department of Prince William County does a
- 5 superb job taking care of many of the
- 6 undocumented, but the Health Department is
- 7 just inundated with the numbers.
- Now, prior to 2005, at Prince
- 9 William Health System, we had a local
- 10 obstetrical group handle the unassigned cases.
- 11 As the number of births of unassigned patients
- increased, the demands became so great that
- they asked to be relieved of this
- 14 responsibility.
- And in 2005, we actually hired --
- 16 we had to hire a group, a private group who
- 17 exclusively takes care of our indigent OB's
- and related services. And the cost of
- 19 providing these services in 2001 was about
- 20 \$560,000. Five years later, last year, we
- 21 paid \$1.5 million for these obstetrical
- 22 deliveries.

about 1.1 million -- and I'm rounding off --2 for the neonatal intensive care. 3 Forty-seven percent of our NICU patients are self-pay or 4 Medicaid. The cost of subsidizing 5 anesthesiologists for these same services is 7 about \$500,000. In addition to these operating 8 9 costs of course we've had to expand our 10 delivery room and our operating rooms and our 11 emergency room. Our emergency room, when I 12 came to the community in 2000 was seeing 13 roughly 50,000 patients a year. By 2010 we 14 estimate we're going to see 71,000 emergency 15 room patients a year. And many of these, 40 16 percent, roughly, are uninsured. 17

1

18

19

20

21

22

In addition, we paid last year

And this obviously causes other problems because many of them do not have primary care physicians and if they become ill they use the emergency room for primary care. Sometimes these visits are emergencies, but as I say, many times they are for primary care.

In 2006 there were more than 1 2 56,000 visits to our emergency room. Not in my notes, but growing as a national problem --3 4 it's certainly a problem in Prince William County and it will be in Virginia and it will 5 be in the United States, is the increasing 7 reluctance of private physicians to take emergency room call without subsidies from the 8 9 hospitals or someone -- there really is no one 10 else other than the hospital because of the 11 increasing load in the emergency rooms. 12 Now, as a non-for-profit, Prince 13 William Hospital will continue to fulfill our 14 obligation to provide health services to all 15 regardless of their ability to pay, although 16 it is having a severe financial impact on us. 17 In 2006 the cost of all services 18 provided for free or at reduced value were 19 more than \$15 million. And I believe in my 20 hand-out there is a summary that we put 21 together called a community benefit package 22 and you can read that.

		Page 91
1	Thank you, Madam Chairperson.	
2	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you	
3	very much.	
4	Next joining us will be Charlie	
5	Deane and he is chief of police and I believe	
6	you are the one who did you bring this	
7	particular chart with you? Is that	
8	CHIEF DEANE: Yes, ma'am. It	
9	doesn't need to be there unless	
10	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: No. I just	
11	see it now. I just didn't want it obscuring	
12	the	
13	CHIEF DEANE: It had been asked	
14	someone in the previous presentation had	
15	mentioned the crime rate and I just wanted to	
16	put that on the graphic for you.	
17	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Right.	
18	CHIEF DEANE: Would you like for	
19	me to proceed?	
20	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Yes, please.	
21	CHIEF DEANE: Madam Chairman,	
22	Members of the Committee, I'm pleased to be	
ĺ		

criminal gang immigrants, illegal aliens that

22

were here related to that criminal activity.

That criminal activity started in about 1992,

so we started developing a more close with

Immigration authorities, and I might say that

they have been very cooperative with us over

the years.

authorities.

Prior to getting involved with Immigration related to gangs, we dealt with fugitives. If they fled out of the country sometimes we would talk with Immigration

But as we've seen the gang issue and as we've seen the demographic shifts in the County and significant influx of foreign-born individuals here, we have seen -- we have received an increasing number of complaints concerning quality of life issues and crime issues that are associated or perceived to be associated with the issue of influx of immigrants.

Some of those issues have involved overcrowded housing, noise, drinking in

public, parking in yards and changing oils in driveways and loud parties and all those kinds of things. A lot of quality of life kind of issues that the police department has responded to.

As to crime, we have certainly investigated a number of crimes committed by illegal aliens, and a number of crimes that have -- where illegal aliens have been victimized.

Two years ago I focused a lot of attention and brought some media attention to the issue of people who were being robbed because they were here in an illegal status because they were carrying cash, they are walking alone often in an area of the County, and they were victimized specifically because they were known to be high-risk victims, if you will.

As time has gone on the Board of Supervisors last December asked the police department for comment concerning the 287(g)

program as to whether we should take that in the police department at that time, or how we should deal with that issue, to -- as a first step in trying to deal with the illegal alien issue in the County.

The police department recommended that that go forward. The Jail Board put that in place with the Board of Supervisors' direction. The 287(g) has been put in place in the jail and is working effectively.

It's been mentioned earlier, but just to give you some numbers as of today, 213 individuals are being held in the jail today who have detention orders on them. They may be being held on the criminal charge until that detention order is effective once their sentence has been -- has ended or they have been sentenced.

And a total of 482 have been put in -- have had detention orders placed on them, that is Immigration detention orders placed on them this year.

Some of those are under the new program. Some of them would have been identified as illegal and subject to deportation under the old system where we were working with ICE related to criminal gang

members.

Then, in last July the Board of Supervisors passed a resolution that had been discussed earlier. From a police perspective, as the Chairman has mentioned, it required us to do two things. One was to establish 287(g) authority within the police department, a cross-designation.

And secondly, we needed to impose or implement a new policy that basically we can talk about more, I'm sure, but it basically requires that if we, the police, detain someone lawfully for a state or local charge and there is probable cause to believe that individual is here illegally, the police department must do more to inquire into that and if it is determined that the person, in

fact, is here unlawfully, communicate with

Immigration in some way. So, we need to do

3 more than we've ever done in the past.

Of course this, as I mentioned, is a new area of responsibility for us so, suffice it to say, I've spent and my staff has spent the last twelve months, or since we started with the jail program, but the last several months intentionally studying this

issue, reaching out to all authorities.

You've heard mention of the ICP and the Police Executive Research Forum and other entities, major city chiefs who have studied these issues, and we think we have a handle on what the legal issues are and some of the issues.

I've commented to the Board about some of those issues. But, the Board resolution came to us. As police chief, my staff and I worked on how we should respond to that, and our response that I proposed back to the Board of Supervisors was that we address

this in a three-phased approach.

One would be that we methodically

-- we change the rules, our policy, and we
carefully craft the policy that's fair, lawful
and reasonable, that we train all of our
officers in that policy.

It's one thing to pass a policy and the most important thing is for us to talk about our philosophy in how we carry that policy out, and it's very important that we carefully train our officers in that respect.

So, we have designed, since the -since September -- we've been using it the
last two months in designing training. We're
going to provide our officers one full day,
eight hours of training, each individual -each officer of the police department in that
new policy.

That will start in January. We are not going to put the policy in place piecemeal. We're going to put it in place after everyone has been trained.

So, we've put a lot of thought into that. We're going to have small training groups of 30 people. Maybe that's more detail than you need, but it's important to know that we are very careful in how we are dealing with that issue.

The second part of that change
that we're going to make in kind of the phase
one of our approach, if you can follow me, is
we are creating a criminal alien unit which is
a small unit of six detectives or sergeant and
five detectives who will focus on the most
serious criminal aliens that are in the
community, and they will make sure that we do
what we can to get these people out of the
country once they've served their sentence or
to identify them and deport them if they pose
a threat to the community and if they've been
convicted of serious crimes they have to
remain in our community.

So, that will be a small criminal alien unit that will be cross-designated under

Page 100

the 287(g) program. So, the 287(g), in our view, is not going to be provided to all

2 vien, is not going to so provided to dir

officers, but will -- we will use that

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

17

18

19

20

21

4 effectively to focus on criminal aliens.

The second component of our suggested approach, which the Board has endorsed, is public education. It's vitally important that we do everything we can to say what this program is and what it isn't, that it's not going to be -- we're not going to

have roadblocks, ICE roadblocks and round-up's

and those kinds of things, but we are going to

focus on criminal aliens and we are going to

hold people more accountable for -- if they

violate the law, for their immigration status.

We are going to do more in that area.

So, I'm concerned about the expectation issue there. You know, we can't do everything to solve this, what I see as a national problem, but we can do some things if we focus carefully.

22 And the third component of that

three-phased approach is an evaluation 1 Too often we put public policies in 2 process. 3 place and don't follow through to make sure they really are impacted where we want to 5 impact, and we are as effective as we can be. We are affiliating ourselves with the Police Executive Research Forum and the 7 8 University of Virginia to design a program 9 that will track what we are doing and we'll 10 look at data -- help us establish what data we 11 need to capture -- like one of the issues you 12 all were mentioning earlier is that of how 13 long we detain people. Are we detaining some 14 people more than others? Is that fair? 15 So, we need to track that and What's the law? 16 pay attention to the details. And I'll quickly try to summarize. 17 18 So, our policy will focus on criminal aliens, 19 the protection of victims of crime, regardless 20 of their immigration status, the protection of 21 cooperative witnesses, regardless of their 22 immigration status.

1	And, of course, the issue that we
2	all know is one that will be alleged, is that
3	of racial profiling. We have a strong policy
4	that we do not allow racial profiling. That
5	policy's been in place probably ten years in
6	the police department.
7	But, racial profiling is not
8	appropriate. We have trained our officers in
9	that and we will re-emphasize that training in
10	this training that's coming up on this issue,
11	that it's not appropriate because it's against
12	Federal law, it's against our general orders
13	and it's simply wrong.
14	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you
15	very much.
16	CHIEF DEANE: Yes, ma'am.
17	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: And thank you
18	to all of the panelists. I'm going to take
19	the prerogative of the Chair and ask the first
20	questions and then turn to my colleagues.
21	Thank you all for your statements.
22	Thank you especially to the two members of the

- Board of Supervisors who were instrumental in
- 2 the passage of this.
- 3 I appreciate particularly Chairman
- 4 Stewart, your focusing on the issues that
- 5 we're concerned about here. I must say, Mr.
- 6 Stirrup, you and I might want to have a debate
- 7 some place under other circumstances about
- 8 proper immigration policy, but that is not our
- 9 interest here.
- 10 Our interest here today is, in
- 11 fact, the civil rights implications of the
- 12 actions taken by the Board. And I will say
- that, in looking at the wording of the
- resolution, at least the "whereas's" I was a
- 15 little bit reminded of the childhood tale of
- 16 Alice in Wonderland and the Red Queen who, as
- 17 I recall said, "Off with their heads. Off
- 18 with their heads." A sentence first, verdict
- 19 later.
- 20 And I say that because of the
- "whereas" that I mentioned earlier today,
- "Whereas, the Prince William Board of County

If you look at the unemployment figures

suggests, for example, that crime has gone

21

22

-- well, we can read it into the record if you

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: -- let's not

20

21

22

it right here.

- 1 words, we have anecdotal evidence that was
- 2 presented by the Board.
- 3 CHAIRMAN STEWART: And -- and as a
- 4 result of that, Mr. Stirrup, myself and others
- on the Board did, in fact, take a look at the
- 6 issue to see whether we have a problem with
- 7 illegal immigration.
- We do. We know from Immigration
- 9 and Customs Enforcement that up to one-third
- of all the gang members in Northern Virginia
- are, in fact, illegal aliens. We know, at
- least we knew at the time, we estimated that
- -- and we underestimated, actually, that the
- 14 percentage of the people in our jail were, in
- fact, illegal aliens -- at the time we thought
- 16 it was smaller.
- Now a recent snapshot at the time
- 18 that we undertook -- when we voted on the
- resolution it was approximately 21 percent of
- the inmates in our jail were, in fact, illegal
- 21 aliens.
- That was the primary reason for

	Page 109
1	this resolution, is to address the real life
2	quality of life concerns. And, I would say
3	this: Now, how do you value or quantify the
4	lives of Juan Manual Guevera, Rosario Uropa,
-5	Heraldo Lopez Garcia?
6	These are three Prince William
7	County residents, Madam Chairman, in today's
8	newspaper who were murdered by an illegal
9	alien, somebody who should not have been in
10	this country in the first place.
11	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: And what was
12	their legal status, the victims?
13	CHAIRMAN STEWART: Does that make
14	a difference?
15	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: No. I'm just
16	asking.
17	CHAIRMAN STEWART: Are there lives
18	any less valuable because they were legal or
19	illegal?
20	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: No. I'm just
21	curious.
22	CHAIRMAN STEWART: What are you
1	

1 trying to say here?

2 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: I'm just

3 curious whether or not they were also illegal

4 aliens. We have heard some testimony today

that illegal aliens are victims of crime as

6 well as perpetrators.

CHAIRMAN STEWART: I don't

8 disagree with you on that.

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Let me ask one other question, because you have placed a tremendous amount of emphasis on legal versus illegal immigration, and Mr. Stirrup did the

same thing.

7

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Legal immigration policy is, of course, a Federal matter, a national matter.

There was, in fact, legislation that was under consideration this last Congress which did not pass, but had it passed, had we decided to pass a law that would have increased the number of legal immigrants into the United States -- we admit about 400,000 legal immigrants into the United States each year.

		Page 111
1	We create about a million and a	
2	half to two million new jobs each year, so	
3	that's somewhat of a gap between our economic	
4	needs and the number of people that we admit	
5	each year, and our population is stable. It's	
6	not it is not growing.	
7	If, in fact, legislation had	
8	passed and the number of persons in Prince	
9	William County who are now here illegally were	
10	given legal status would you have any problems	
11	with their presence here?	
12	In other words, is it really the	
13	illegality and if they were to become tomorrow	
14	legal residents, would that in any way change	
15	their impact on the economy? Would it in any	
16	way change their impact in terms of the use of	
17	the hospitals or their participation, either	
18	as victims or perpetrators of crime?	
19	How would that change? And how	
20	would that change your actions?	
21	CHAIRMAN STEWART: The fundamental	
22	purpose of this resolution is to remove the	

					\neg
		P	age	112	
1	bad guys, to remove the people who are here				
2	illegally and commit crimes.				
3	The fact is, is that if Congress				
4	had passed the broad amnesty and the people				
5	were no longer that commit the crimes were				
6	no longer illegal we wouldn't be able to use				
7	Federal Immigration Law to remove them from				
8	the community.				
9	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Actually, it				
10	wouldn't have been eligible to be legal				
11	CHAIRMAN STEWART: Well, the point				
12	is that we are using Federal Immigration Law				
13	as a tool to remove bad guys from our				
14	community. If Congress had removed that took				
15	by granting them amnesty, obviously we				
16	wouldn't have been able to pass this				
17	resolution and it wouldn't have done any good.				
18	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: I'm going to				
19	ask				
20	CHAIRMAN STEWART: I'm not going				
21	to say that I support amnesty. I don't.				
22	That's a personal view. From a perspective				

- 1 I'm giving you my perspective as a County
- 2 Chairman.
- 3 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: And I'm going
- 4 to ask Lloyd Cohen to ask the next question.
- 5 MEMBER COHEN: Yes, I'm going to
- 6 change gears a bit here. This is a question,
- both for Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Gerhart, because
- 8 I couldn't quite get the sense of some of Mr.
- 9 Schwartz's testimony as to where that was
- leading, and I want to get more of a feel of
- 11 how the entire policy would be implemented.
- Mr. Schwartz made a number of
- points about the prenatal care and that the
- 14 problems of women not having prenatal care
- leads to high neonatal costs and then probably
- lifetime costs in what would then be citizens
- of the United States and residents of Prince
- 18 William County.
- Now, so Mr. Gerhart, on your list
- 20 of those services that could be restricted but
- impact cost is high, or services that should
- 22 not be restricted.

If they are not eligible for

Medicare because they are undocumented, the mother, then she will not get prenatal care except through the auspices of the County Health Department which is a division of the State Health Department.

1.9

And the problem is they are overwhelmed with the volume of patients. So, if you are lucky enough as an undocumented to get to the Health Department, you will receive prenatal care.

Once you come into the emergency room we will deliver you and you will get the highest quality care that anybody else gets. The baby is immediately an American citizen and eligible for Medicaid, but we are not reimbursed for the cost of the mother's delivery. That's basically the way it works.

So, to summarize, if a person is undocumented, they are not, themselves, eligible for Medicaid. And the only way they can get the prenatal care is, unless they pay out of their pocket, is through the auspices

of the Health Department.

The Health Department is very,

3 very overwhelmed with the number of patients

or traditionally has been, and therefore, not

5 all of these women get prenatal care.

But whether they are documented or

7 undocumented or whatever, the minute they

8 deliver in the hospital, the baby is an

9 American citizen and covered for Medicaid.

10 MEMBER COHEN: So, to clarify for

my own understanding.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.

13 MEMBER COHEN: So the thrust of

14 much of your testimony and what you're saying

now is that there are great costs that are

imposed on the County by the presence of

illegal immigrants, you know, in this

18 particular instance, and the thrust of what

19 you're saying is that this County policy that

20 we're here discussing would not -- does not

21 affect this one -- would not affect this one

22 way or the other as to these -- the treatment

resident or if they were US citizens if, for

but it does seem like a wise policy when it's

1 possible. 2 Do you at least inquire of 3 immigration status currently or in your future 4 plans for all arrestees? I know police 5 officers come in contact with citizens in a lot of different ways, but do you at least 7 inquire of all arrestees? 8 CHIEF DEANE: Yes. When they go 9 to -- if they are detained and go to the jail 10 they would be screened for their immigration 11 status. 12 MEMBER GAZIANO: Okay. I'd like 13 to understand, then, in what other situations 14 do you sometimes inquire and sometimes don't, 15 what kind of facts might give rise to what 16 your training for police officers suggests? 17 CHIEF DEANE: The threshold that 18 the Board of Supervisors has established is probable cause that would require officers to 19

20

21

22

take that further step. Of course, before you

articulable suspicion, and what you are asking

get to probable cause, there's reasonable,

1 I think --MEMBER GAZIANO: A Terry-type 3 stop. Can you give me any ideas --CHIEF DEANE: What you are asking, 5 I think, is an example, and I'll try to do that. MEMBER GAZIANO: 7 Sure. 8 CHIEF DEANE: An individual is 9 stopped for traffic violation, runs through 10 radar. The officer doesn't know who they are 11 and they flag the person over. The person 12 presents an international driver's license. 13 For example, an El Salvadorian driver's 14 license. The person cannot speak English. 15 The officer is suspicious and asks 16 more questions and determines that the person 17 is, either through running a record check or

lawfully.

The vehicle is not registered to

through the interview process, or they may

makes it clear that the person is not here

find something, may see something there that

18

19

20

21

the person. Thererson gives a false address 1 or something, jut raising the suspicion. 2 the point that that becomes probable cause, 3 the officer is ging to do his -- is going to be required to dimore. 5 Thatmay be merely notifying 6 Immigration authrities that this individual 7 is probably unlafully here. That may involve 8 -- if that individual is -- if the records 9 indicate that the individual has failed to 10 11 appear for a deptation hearing, that 12 individual may barrested rather than being given a summons. 13 Vir**g**ia is a "will summons" state 14 15 which basically equires that if someone is 16 stopped on a traic violation or certain 17 minor misdemeand criminal charges, they will 18 be released on asummons except for certain circumstances. 19 20 MEMER GAZIANO: There's a case 21 pending in the Spreme Court in a few weeks on 22 this.

1	CHIEF DEANE: Okay. And one of
2	those circumstances
3	MEMBER GAZIANO: From Virginia.
4	CHIEF DEANE: And one of those
5	circumstances is that if the officer has
6	reason to believe he will not show up, the
7	individual will not show up for court. The
8	fact that we will have a use as a factor
9	the fact that the person did not show up for
10	a deportation hearing. That's kind of the
11	full cycle on just one example.
12	MEMBER GAZIANO: Okay. And just
13	my final thought on this, is this part of the
14	eight-hour training for every officer?
15	CHIEF DEANE: Yes, sir.
16	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Let me just
17	follow up on that because I want to pin you
18	down a little bit on this probable cause
19	standard.
20	I was driving in a real rush to
21	get here this morning, and it was fog, and
22	let's say I made a terrible mistake and I went

1 right through a red light. I didn't, but 2 let's say I had, and one of your officers pulled me over. 3 And let's pretend for a moment that my English was not as good as it is --5 it's not all that great, anyway, but let's pretend that I have a rather thick accent and 7 that perhaps my skin is a little bit darker, 8 9 and I hand them my license and the license, 10 it's a Virginia license, but it says "Linda 11 Chavez" on it. 12 And I'm a little confused and I'm 13 nervous and, you know, I'm just very unsettled 14 by this. Is the fact that my name is Linda 15 Chavez, my skin is dark, I've got a very thick 16 Spanish accent and I'm seeming very nervous, 17 probable cause for you to ask me to produce 18 proof of citizenship? 19 CHIEF DEANE: No. 20 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Okav. 21 MEMBER GREVE: I'd like to use 22

this opportunity to clarify something that our

intersect, and I know it's very early in the

process, but I'd be curious for any comments 1 2 you have as to what the response has been at either the state or Federal level to the body 3 4 of evidence you're beginning to gather. 5 MR. GERHART: It is very early in 6 the process. The Board has not directed that we restrict any specific services to date, other than those from which the direction 8 9 comes from, either the state or Federal 10 government. 11 So, at this point, I really can't 12 -- I can't share anything with you about what 13 the Federal and state perspective is. 14 really need to hear that from them. 15 Obviously, the state has some commissions that 16 are at work as we speak, and we are looking 17 forward to seeing what they say about some of 18 these things. 19 But, I don't have anything 20 specific to share with you. 21 MEMBER WARD: Any inquiries at 22 this point or noted, or a heightened sense of

interest in where you're going from --1 I think we rely very MR. GERHART: 2 heavily on the legal advice we have from very, 3 4 very capable County attorneys in our County Attorney's Office, and I daresay I think, to 5 the extent they may err, they're erring in the side of being very conservative about articulating what our local options are, local 8 9 legal options are. I've seen a number 10 MEMBER SAMP: 11 of press accounts in the last couple of months 12 since Prince William County adopted its 13 legislation suggesting that among the immigrant population, particularly among the 14 15 illegal immigrant population, but among the immigrant population generally that there has 16 17 been a feeling that they are unwelcome to some 18 extent and that some people have left the 19 County. 20 Has this legislation actually had 21 that effect that has been reported in the 22 Has anybody seen evidence of that press?

here? 1 SUPERVISOR STIRRUP: Thank you for 2 3 your question, Mr. Samp. I would say anecdotally I've heard from a number of 5 individuals, as well as staff professionals in the County that there is -- there seems to be 7 evidence that illegal aliens have moved or have left Prince William County for other 8 9 sanctuary jurisdictions or jurisdictions where 10 they feel more comfortable -- a more 11 comfortable environment. 12 But we don't anticipate having any 13 quantifiable numbers on that until probably 14 August of 2008. I believe that that is the 15 first formal presentation that we'll get in 16 terms of numbers and any impact on the results 17 of the impact of our resolution. 18 MEMBER SAMP: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Could I 19 20 follow up with that, Mr. Stirrup? You say 21 that you will have some evidence, some 22 quantifiable evidence. I'm just wondering

sometime ago the Board asked -- directed

Page 129 County staff to try to come back with 1 information about the cost of providing 2 services to illegal immigrants. 3 The only place where we had data 5 that we felt confident in reporting back to the Board and reporting publicly was largely 6 within the criminal justice system. folks are in our adult detention center we 9 could count them and we knew who they were, and we attached a cost to that as well as a 10 couple of ancillary criminal justice 11 12 processes, that it was plus or minus \$3 million. And I don't have that exact number, 13 14 but that's the ball park range. 15 We very clearly said to the Board 16 at that point in time that we are not willing, 17 nor -- we are unable and unwilling to 18 extrapolate to the general population anything 19 about the percentages of those folks in our 20 jail who were identified as illegal 21 immigrants. 22 We didn't think that was a

1	Was there any studies or any data
2	analyses done prior to the implementation
3	regarding the various issues that you both
4	of you raised in your opening remarks in
5	support of the resolution? Any kind of
6	studies or analyses done, other than the one
7	that Mr. Gerhart has referred to?
8	CHAIRMAN STEWART: Yes, Mr. Cooke.
9	You're right. There have been. And, in fact,
10	earlier this year, I think it was January, or
11	potentially February of 2007, the County did
12	attempt to quantify the costs of illegal
13	immigration on Prince William Prince
14	William County Government.
15	With the hospitals, of course,
16	it's they need to speak for themselves, but
17	we found it very difficult to quantify the
18	problem, but at the same time we knew that
19	simply because it was difficult to quantify
20	doesn't mean we don't have a problem.
21	We clearly did, and where we could
22	quantify the problem at that time,

1 were unable to go beyond the adult detention 2 center specifically in the criminal justice system where generally -- we simply weren't asking questions relative to immigration 5 status. So we didn't have hard data to 6 7 determine whether a customer or client A was 8 illegal, versus customer or client B, and in 9 the absence of hard data we were unwilling to 10 suggest any information. 11 CO-CHAIR COOKE: And so, without 12 inferring any validity of any of this, some of 13 the basis for the resolution was anecdotal, as 14 opposed to hard data? I mean, some of your 15 basis was, in fact, anecdotal as opposed to hard data? 16 17 CHAIRMAN STEWART: Well, like I 18 said, it's very difficult --19 CO-CHAIR COOKE: Oh, I understand 20 I understand that. that. 21 CHAIRMAN STEWART: To quantify, 22 for example, in the school system --

		Page 134
1	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Sure.	
2	CHAIRMAN STEWART: the question	
3	simply isn't asked because, as the County	
4	Executive noted earlier	1
5	CO-CHAIR COOKE: You didn't have	
6	the	
7	CHAIRMAN STEWART: the Supreme	
8	Court prohibits localities from denying	
9	educational services.	
10	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Sure.	
11	CHAIRMAN STEWART: So, it is	
12	yes, admittedly, a very difficult problem to	
13	quantify. But in those areas where we could	
14	quantify it	
15	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Yes.	
16	CHAIRMAN STEWART: we knew we	
17	had a problem.	
18	CO-CHAIR COOKE: I see. Okay.	
19	Thank you.	
20	CHAIRMAN STEWART: We did the very	
21	best that we could.	
22	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Let me follow	

up on that, and I'm really sorry that the 1 Chief of the detention center is not here, 2 because he probably could answer this question 3 better than any of you, but I'm going to ask 4 5 it anyway. In that -- in those figures for 6 those held in the adult detention center who were determined to be illegal aliens, what 9 portion of those were being held because of 10 their immigration status? In other words, were these all 11 12 persons who had committed other crimes, and if 13 so, what -- what were the categories of crime? 14 Was there any difference between property crime and violent crime? Do you have those 15 stats for us? 16 17 CHIEF DEANE: I do. 18 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Okay. 19 I can provide you a CHIEF DEANE: list of those. There's a range of charges. 20 21 Many of them are lower-level charges that 22 would not show up on the normal crime stats.

22

this list.

1	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: So there
2	aren't people there who are might be
3	serving a sentence for, you know, drunk and
4	disorderly or something, and normally they
5	would have been let back into the general
6	population, but because they are in the
7	country illegally, they're being held? There
8	are not those persons there?
9	CHIEF DEANE: Oh, I would say
10	there are some of those.
11	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: And I guess
12	that's the portion I'm trying to figure out
13	what percentage that constitutes.
14	CHIEF DEANE: I can't answer that.
15	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Because that
16	would inflate the number. It would make it
17	look like more people were being held on
18	criminal offenses if they were simply being
19	detained after those sentences because of
20	their immigration status.
21	CHIEF DEANE: Well, maybe I'm not
22	I'm not saying that's I'm not being

		Pa	ge	139
1	there aren't anpeople who are simply being			
2	held beyond them			
3	CHI DEANE: I don't think so. I			
4	think that ICE is being very prompt in picking			
5	people up so the re not lagging if the			
6	question is arethey lagging there just on the			
7	ICE charge, I det think we have an			
8	experience with that so far.			
9	CHAPPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you.			
10	Any other questins?			
11	Well I want to thank all of you			
12	very much for yer testimony and for being			
13	here today.			
14	CHAMMAN STEWART: Thank you.			
15	MR. ERHART: Thank you.			
16	CHI DEANE: Thank you.			
17	CHAMPERSON CHAVEZ: We are not			
18	going to take are going to bring			
19	the next panel , so we'll try and do this			
20	rather expeditionsly.			
21	If 1 could please call forward			
22	Eric Byler, JeffCarter, Mike Hethmon, Lisa			

1 Johnson-Firth and Dan Stein.

Thank you very much, and I want to welcome you and ask those who have not done so to please take their seats.

As you can see, there is a method in this madness. We began the day by trying to put together a fact basis, talking about the legal issues involved and the demographics involved, taking a look from empirical data at the evidence of the impact of immigrants and specifically illegal immigrants in Prince William County.

And then we heard from persons who were involved in passing the resolution by the Prince William County Board, and for some of the -- from some of those who are now going to be tasked with implementing that resolution.

Now, we hope to hear from members of the community and from some advocacy groups as well. And we have, again, a distinguished list of panelists, and of course, I'm disorganized and I've got to try now to find

I'm going to begin at this end
with you, Eric. We are each going to have
about five minutes and we'll ask you to try
and obey the little light there. You'll get
a yellow light and then when the red buzzer
comes on I will cut you off.

MR. BYLER: Okay. Well, first of all, thanks for having me here. I was really surprised to be called. I'm not a civil rights expert by any means. Until recently I was just a filmmaker.

I think the primary reason why we started posting videos ahead of the production schedule of, you know, shooting a film and then posting a film and then going to the film festivals and all of that, is that we saw sort of a breakdown in the deliberative process in Prince William County, and people were afraid to participate, a lot of members of this community.

Either you had everything at stake and you had to speak out because, you know,

your life was going to dramatically change or,
you know, you had, you know, a very -- a

certain agenda that you wanted to push against
the immigrant community, but if you were in
the middle, people were completely turned off
by the way that the debate was going forth.

And I think that for Annabel and I, our allegiance really is to the democratic process, and when we saw that breaking down in the vacuum of information that was existing, we started to post our videos.

And I wanted to say that we have developed friendships, you know, on both sides of the issue. I would be invited into people's homes, and I have respect for everyone that is involved, and I actually feel sorry that I have to, you know, give my view on this in some ways, just because I don't want to hurt people's feelings and I don't want people to be angry.

Just about everything I'm going to talk about is on film. So, if you really want

- to see it, you can talk to me afterwards or we can arrange a screening for you.
- My observation was that the debate
 was being dominated by a local affiliate for
 a national organization. The national
 organization is called FAIR, and the local
 sort of franchise was called "Help Save

Manassas."

8

18

19

20

21

22

And when, for instance, a church
leader would speak out on the issue they would
be really attacked on the internet in really
frightening ways that people weren't
accustomed to.

And so we talked to many people
who were afraid to be interviewed and felt
helpless to do anything about what was
happening to the community.

At the same time I have to admire the organization and the efforts that they made. I think that a lot of the Board Members actually felt intimidated by them. The email blasts that they would get, the phone calls,

1 their dominance of the citizen time sessions

2 that were held.

And so it really, in some ways, speaks to what a democracy should be, but on the other hand, when people are afraid to participate, I think we all suffer because we suffer from not having the benefit of the full community's experiences.

Having this kind of vantage point,

I want to try to share with you why people are
so angry here and also why people are so
afraid. The members of Help Save Manassas
have valid concerns, thanks to our
Supervisors' testimony, I'm sure I don't have
to list them.

One concern that I had about the concerns is that they -- when they described the population of people that they wanted to remove, they would use these kinds of, you know, reasons, speaking Spanish, playing Latin music, owning a chicken, growing corn or a fruit tree, not having health insurance or

living in crowded conditions. 1 These are not a sign of your 2 immigration status. This is a sign of a 3 particular immigrant community that is 5 struggling to overcome poverty. 6 But, when you ask some of these 7 people why it is that they feel it's fair to characterize the undesirable population in 8 this way, well, some of them will say, "Well, 9 10 it's the Federal Government's fault, and 11 because they've failed us, we're forced to use our eyes and our ears to discern who's a legal 12 13 and who isn't." 14 In other words, their eyes tell them by the color of their skin and their ears 15 tell them by the way that they speak. 16 17 Others will say that it's 18 perfectly obvious. I'm sorry, no, that's the 19 first one. The other ones will say that --20 well, sorry. I can't believe that was the 21 whole five minutes. Was it really five?

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: It really was

- that I and my family have chosen to stay in
 Northern Virginia.
- Over the years I have found Prince

 William County and the cities of Manassas and

 Manassas Park to be blessed with an abundance

 of gifted people, beautiful land and resources

 that add value and significance to our common

 life.

In my ministry and volunteer work,

I have encountered some of the most generous,

thoughtful and decent people committed to

serving our community and adding to our

general well-being.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Recently I was asked why I want to remain in Prince William County, implying our county's current xenophobic attitude. I simply replied, "This is my home." And I hope that in these proceedings we keep that in mind, that this is, for many of us, our home.

It's my honest hope that we, the

It's my honest hope that we, the citizens of this County are not being stereotyped as indecent, intolerant or

law and question the validity of news reports
and the general assumptions of public opinion.

Consequently, for the last six weeks we at the
Manassas Church of the Brethren have been
studying the issue of immigration and have

invited credible resources to share with us information on the subject.

Representatives from the legal profession, police department and the highest level of County government have spoken to us on the issues pertaining to immigration, both legal and illegal.

We learned of the five to 20-year wait for a visa, the civil, not criminal offense of being an illegal alien, the economic need for immigrant labor and the impact of illegal immigration on our schools, hospitals and jails.

We've learned of the confusing and debilitating boundaries between Federal, state and local jurisdictions relating to law and the curious rationale for immigration quotas.

		Page	151
1	Most importantly, we learned why		
2	people risked their lives and divide their		
3	families to enter the United States, both		
4	legally and illegally.		
5	Overall, our conclusion, we		
6	learned that this is not a simple problem with		
7	straightforward solutions. The issue of		
8	illegal immigration has been further		
9	complicated by the failure of our Federal		
10	Government to provide a comprehensive		
11	immigration reform bill.		
12	The longer our Federal Government		
13	takes to deal with the issue in a responsible		
14	and judicious way, I believe the higher the		
15	tension will run, and we will see more and		
16	more of our communities divided.		
17	Prince William County, as we heard		
18	in the news today, is not the only		
19	municipality dealing with the economic and		
20	sociological pressures associated with		
21	immigration.		
22	As evidenced by the recent		

1 election, political rhetoric is partially 2 responsible for the rising tide of anxiety surrounding illegal immigration. 3 Such rhetoric of simple solutions and an "us versus them" mentality fuels the 5 flame of hostility and gives birth to a 7 climate of division. 8 While every candidate promised to 9 get tough and take action on illegal 10 immigration and provide ready solutions, the 11 reality is very different and far more 12 difficult. 13 Just this week, our local paper, 14 the Manassas Journal-Messinger, reported the 15 challenge of enforcing current housing codes 16 and the Federal government's rejection of the 17 three local jurisdictions engaging immigration 18 custom enforcement on a local and incorporated 19 level.

We must take into consideration how we are forming our community with the same zeal and passion as we do in enforcing current

20

21

and future law. 1 2 The rule of law is only effective 3 in building community and affirming our common good when it is matched with an equal regard 4 5 for human dignity, respect and tolerance. tolerance of the criminal activity we often hear, but tolerance of others and other views. 7 I lament the polarization that is 8 affecting our community. It seems that we are 9 losing our ability to work together in order 10 11 to establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, 12 13 promote the general welfare and secure the 14 blessings of liberty. 15 I have just one more paragraph. 16 In the words of my tradition I would say to 17 love our neighbors as ourselves. Is it not possible to discuss illegal immigration while 18 19 respecting the dignity of all people? Linda Johnson once said "Doing 20 21 what's right isn't the problem. It's knowing

what's right." My hope is that through this

- 1 public discussion, you being here, we might 2 work together to know what is the right thing 3 so that we can do the right thing. 4 My hope is that this hearing moves 5 us beyond the politics of immigration to see that there is a deeper fundamental human and 6 moral issue. My hope is that we, together, can agree on a rule of law as we seek to 9 uphold the dignity and rights of all people 10 and find proactive solutions to local 11 problems. 12 And lastly, my hope is that we can 13 begin to talk to and with one another so that
- 14 we can strengthen this place that I call my 15 home.
- 16 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you 17 very much Reverend Carter.

18

- 19 Firth is a managing member of the Immigration 20 and Human Rights Law Group.
- 21 MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: Good morning.
- 22 It is an honor for me to be present with you

Now, Lisa Johnson-Firth.

with such venom and vigor.

The civil rights violations, by US 1 Government officials, state and county 2 officials that I have faced with my clients and other immigrants are egregious and they smack of governments of a lesser stature. This resolution and government 7 actions, since its passage have destroyed trust, because the community was told that the 9 resolution would be enforced after January 10 1st, 2008, after the police have been trained and in accordance with the Constitution and 11 12 laws of this land. Allow me to illustrate what is 13 happening. I need look no further than the 14 15 experiences of my law partner. She is from Eritrea, however, she is a lawful permanent 16 17 resident. 18 She's been pulled over in the last 19 two months three times by Prince William 20 County police officers and Manassas police 21 officers for apparently no lawfully-stated 22 reasons that either of us as lawyers could

1 ascertain. The first time she was pulled over 2 was on September 26th, 2007 when she was 3 driving about a block away from my law office 4 5 in Old Town, Manassas. The cop asked her "What are you doing in this side of town?" 6 Shocked and shaken she replied that she was a lawyer and was -- her law 9 offices was a block away. The officer looked 10 at her registration and let her go. 11 The second stop occurred on 12 November 12th, 2007. My law partner was 13 driving with our Cameroonian asylum client. A Prince William County police officer 14 15 followed her for quite a while and then pulled 16 her over and asked if she had weapons and 17 drugs in the car. 18 After informing the officer that 19 she was an attorney he told her that he had 20 pulled her over for, quote, making a sharp 21 right turn. Later that same night while 22 driving on Sudley Road, back to her home in

Alexandria, the Manassas police pulled her 7 This time the stated reason was that over. 3 her license plate was a little bent. Because I do a lot of work with 4 5 immigration advocates, organizers and the immigrant community, I have learned of several other cases of rights violations. I'm only focusing on the legal -- on the violations 9 against lawful permanent residents and US 10 citizens in this presentation, however, I have 11 submitted a longer testimony that goes into 12 great detail of the numerous pull-over's of 13 police by targeting people of color, many of whom are -- don't have residence in this 14

country but yet are protected by our

Constitution.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

However, this instance deals with a Latino man who was pulled over on November 26th. He is a lawful, permanent resident. He was walking out of a convenience store when he was stopped by Prince William County police.

He was questioned for

approximately 30 minutes and then let go
without charge. A week ago, a Latino man was
being given a ride to work when the police
stopped the driver in Manassas. He was not
the driver. He was a passenger.

The officer asked the driver for
his license, and when he could not produce it,

the officer asked the rider for his license.

He did not have one and the police made a

comment, "Illegal," and proceeded to ask for

other identification documents.

No context of a crime here that we can ascertain. The officer then asked him to get out of the car, searched him and cuffed him. The incident took approximately two hours. The man was charged with obstruction of justice, but released because he had lawful immigration status.

In a seminar that I gave two weeks ago, I do a lot of "know your rights" seminars to the immigrant community. Two Latino women, one a United States citizen, the other a

lawful permanent resident interrupted me to
talk about how they have each been stopped
several times in Prince William County for no
apparent reason.

And when the officer has come to their car they have been questions at length about their immigration status and asked for identification documentation other than a driver's license. They asked me if white people were also being forced to produce evidence of their status.

Just quickly, beyond the racial profiling issues in Prince William County, there are so many other effects of what this resolution has done, both in terms of the police and also in terms of what is happening in the jails.

People are being detained by ICE after even their criminal charges have been dismissed. They are not being given access to counsel or family members. That's in violation both of their due process and even

1 ICE standards for detaining immigrants.

And then there's the effect on the communities at large. 79 houses are now for sale in Georgetown South, usually, according to a realtor that we work with, he's been here for ten years, only five houses are on the market.

The ESL classes are down by a half percent. Children are not being sent to school. A school principal was afraid to speak to me on school property because I'm an immigration rights advocate, so not only couldn't I do training for the parents, but I couldn't even train him on immigration issues.

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: I'd like to ask you, please, to wrap up. Thanks.

MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: My final point is the Constitution of this country protects all those within its borders and immigrants, illegal, not legal, have all rights afforded them under the Constitution except those expressly reserved for U.S. citizens, and I

		Page 162
1	hope we can maintain that.	
2	Thank you.	
3	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Dan Stein,	
4	president of the Federation for American	
5	Immigration Reform.	
6	MR. STEIN: Thank you, Madam	
7	Chair.	
8	Well, now, I appreciate the	
9	opportunity to be here. My name is Dan Stein.	
10	I am president of the Federation for American	
11	Immigration Reform, the nation's largest	
12	national immigration reform organization	
13	working to advance what we believe are the	
14	priorities of an enlarged view of the national	
15	interest in favor of setting immigration	
16	levels consistent with both the national need	
17	and our domestic agenda as well as better	
18	controlling illegal immigration.	
19	We have, as I say, several hundred	
20	thousand members across the nation and we have	
21	worked closely to work and develop local	
22	organizations to work on this issue in varying	

degrees of relationship with the organization to try to bring about better understanding of what's needed to better regulate and control illegal immigration.

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I would like to point out initially that this country has a proud tradition of procedural due process and fundamental fairness that respects the dignity of all persons regardless of immigration status.

And FAIR supports that tradition and believes that persons residing illegally are still entitled to the constitutionally-protected procedural process that is due in whatever given circumstance.

However, a person in this country illegally does not have a civil right to remain in this country simply because they have succeeded in avoiding discovery of that status for several years.

We strongly support the action of the Prince William County Board of Supervisors

this past July to enact Resolution 09-609, and
although they are not affiliated with FAIR
directly, the local Manassas group did a
wonderful job in trying to bring public
understanding to this issue.

And we're proud of the leadership

And we're proud of the leadership that they showed in the face of very, very challenging emotional issues.

Ultimately, illegal immigration is never going to be properly controlled in this country unless there is a full state-Federal partnership that enables us to have states operate more as a force multiplier and identify and holding illegal alien residents until ICE can come and take them.

How we got -- we shouldn't be in this situation which is really the big problem. I mean, I've been working on this thing, as you know, for some 25, 27 years now. And I watched as organizations litigated both the question of whether or not the census would count people in such a way that would

enable states to know how many people were

2 illegally resident in the community.

At the same time I watched these same organizations litigate to try to prevent states from asking basic questions about legal status, or checking voting records or anything else. This went on through the Seventies and Eighties and Nineties.

States roles were then essentially diminished as states agreed not to get involved, "Don't ask, don't tell," policies.

We had the sanctuary resolutions in 1980, with the effect that at a time when global migration pressures were sky-rocketing because of international population growth, states were not players anymore in assisting in the process of regulating immigration.

And I understand that there's an issue of how much regulation they can do, but in our view this instant resolution is well within the scope of the state power, and ultimately we believe states across the

1 country can and will be enacting similar

2 resolutions.

But nevertheless, this idea that because we lack certain data, bits of data, datum, to know certain facts is therefore an argument not to act is kind of a self-fulfilling prophesy. We don't know because there's been an orchestrated desire not to know in this country.

Well, as illegal immigration has sky-rocketed taxpayers are being asked to continue to pay for benefits and services for people with no right to remain in the United States.

People are asking to have to compete in an unfair labor market. Now, businesses are part of the big opponents here who want to promote illegal immigration. I know the public advocates seem to be on the left side of the political agenda, but the bottom line is business is the primary lobby force in pushing to hire illegal workers.

		Page 171
1	alienage." The only time the word "alien" is	
2	mentioned is when the regulations, your	
3	regulations clarify that only citizens and	
4	legal permanent residents are covered by the	
5	Privacy Act.	
6	So, this is testimony or witnesses	
7	or evidence is totally ultra-virus. This is	
8	a dialogue	
9	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Excuse me?	
10	MR. HETHMON: This is, in my view,	
11	a dialogue between interested parties with the	
12	added moral hazard that you guys are	·
13	associated with the government.	
14	That said	
15	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Having said	
16	that, perhaps you'd like to defer testifying	
17	before us, then.	
18	MR. HETHMON: I am not testifying.	
19	I am speaking, Madam. So, your interest in	
20	this is totally in the context of is	
21	immigration law and is the are these	
22	activities a pretext for racial	

discrimination, and we discussed this with the panel in quite a bit of detail.

Let me simply say that there is a long and complicated historical interaction in this country between the Civil Rights Act and the Immigration Act of 1965.

I recommended this book, which is the comprehensive study on this by Professor Hugh Graham, "Collision Course," published by Oxford University. I would suggest that anyone who has not taken a look at Professor Graham's book really cannot consider themselves informed on the aspects of this issue. I will leave that point right there.

Second of all, when we met with the Human Rights Commission we did go into quite a bit of discussion about the technical issues and really the bottom line in terms of this is that immigration law really is the law of citizenship discrimination.

It's a law based on discrimination

little books here, they passed out yesterday

about this problem nationally. If you go

21

- 1 through that, all the statutes cited in there, they do come out of our shop. So, to the 2 extent that there is some kind of mad 3 scientist behind all this, we'll be happy to take credit for this. 5 As to the racism behind -- charges behind this ordinance, the Eastern District answered that just a few weeks ago when they 8 9 dismissed the case, like many similar cases 10 that were brought against it, and they 11 basically said that there was no prima facie
- or fear of services being denied.

 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Just for a

 point of clarification, he just simply said

 the Plaintiff did not have standing. Is that

case at all in the sense of fear of

deportation, fear of families being split up

18 right?

12

13

MR. HETHMON: That they do not
have standing, but standing involves making a
prima facie case of injury, as I'm sure you
understand.

1 MEMBER COHEN: Not always. Not

2 always.

MR. HETHMON: So, they are going to be able to refile their case when someone actually comes up with some evidence which, of course, we're not talking about today.

But this has been a similar trend.

Just yesterday the similar challenge was
thrown out to the Oklahoma statute which is
considered to be the toughest, meanest one of
its kind in the country by some people which,
of course, we were involved in.

And the judge made some comments that I think that are absolutely appropriate to the context of this whole discussion, and he said that this court is convinced that the proper remedy for the injuries alleged by the remaining plaintiffs, which were businesses, churches, the National Coalition of Latino Clergy and a long list of illegal aliens, all of whom are in willing violation of Federal Immigration Law, is not judicial intervention,

		age	176
1	rather it is simple compliance with Federal		
2	Immigration Law.		
3	Thank you very much.		
4	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Thank you		
5	very much.		
6	MR. HETHMON: I'll be happy to		
7	answer any questions.		
8	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Yes,		
9	Professor Cohen.		
10	MEMBER COHEN: Yes. I have a		
11	couple of questions. This one is for Ms.		
12	Johnson-Firth. It's two questions.		
13	The first is these wrongs that you		
14	allege in your testimony. Have you initiated		
15	civil suits for any remedy with regard to them		
16	and if not, why not, and would that provide a		
17	remedy.		
18	The second is: My understanding		
19	from the earlier panel is that and I'm		
20	something of a neophyte on all of this. I'm		
21	learning what the whole issue was today,		
22	largely.		

1	This new policy has not actually
2	gone into effect yet, so what's the connection
3	between the alleged wrongs and the policy, if
4	the policy isn't in effect yet?
5	MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: Very good
6	question, but I'll handle the first question
7	that you asked about the civil rights lawsuit.
8	These cases are being brought
9	together and civil action will be taken and
10	lawyers are working on it, we're gathering.
11	We have about at least 17 cases right now,
12	incidents beyond what, you know, I've reported
13	here.
14	Some weren't appropriate for me to
15	share, even in my longer testimony, but may be
16	subject to the lawsuit, so yes, we are working
17	on that with other lawyers.
18	And then in terms of the nexus
19	between the passage of the resolution and its
20	actual effect in January excellent
21	question. The racial profiling, as I
22	understand, has long been an issue in Prince

- 1 William County, but it seems that the focus
- 2 has shifted to Latinos even more strongly.
- 3 They are the most noticeable immigrant group
- 4 in this County.
- 5 So, I can't honestly answer that
- 6 nexus question for you except to say it's
- 7 happening. And we get calls.
- And moreover, once the police have
- 9 detained someone and put them into the Prince
- 10 William County facility, the rights violations
- are continuing to occur and that's a whole
- 12 'nother dialogue of whether there is racial
- 13 profiling because some of these crimes that
- they're being detained for, other people would
- not be detained for, such as loitering.
- That's not usually a detainable crime. Or,
- 17 you know, a public disturbance offense.
- So, I can only report that it's
- 19 happening.
- 20 MEMBER COHEN: I'm still a bit
- 21 confused here. Are you alleging that -- are
- 22 you arguing that this new policy itself

constitutes some sort of legal wrong or is it
that it will permit other legal wrongs and if
so, you know, what is the connection that
you're asserting.

MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: The complaint of my testimony is that if you are going to have a law like this, and it has been passed and it will become law in January, at the very least you must abide by the supreme law of our land, which is the Constitution, and other civil rights Federal laws that are already in place to protect people, as well as abide by your own law that you have passed, and that is — that is not happening.

So, if you are going to have a resolution like this, which I, you know, question the legitimacy of it and, in fact, the police have not entered into a 287(g) arrangement at this point, so they do not have Federal authority to be asking and being sort of de factor ICE officers in Prince William County at this moment.

1 The prison has trained seven 2 people at this point so they are in a different arrangement. They do have a 287(q). The police, to my understanding, and it was a 5 press release, you know, as of a couple days 6 ago, do not. 7 And so, I'm concerned about the 8 racial profiling that's happening and I'm 9 concerned about their authority in the first 10 place to be asking people immigration-based 11 questions. 12 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: I'd like to 13 follow up on that and actually ask Mike 14 Hethmon and/or Dan Stein to comment. 15 You heard a list of allegations by 16 Ms. Firth that alleges that, in fact, some racial profiling may be going on. 17 Let's just 18 accept as a hypothetical that everything that 19 she's told us is absolutely correct. 20 I presume, and maybe this is a 21 wrong presumption, that you would disapprove 22 of these actions. Is that right, Mr. Hethmon,

discussed, we actually set up a hypothetical

whether or not ten you were drafting these

various initiative around the country, you 1 anticipated that there might be this effect 2 3 and whether or not you approve of that effect and if not, what did you do in the drafting 5 process to try to anticipate that and prevent it from happening? 6 7 MR. HETHMON: The effect is -will you restate what you're --8 9 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: The effect is 10 having people targeted based on their skin 11 color or their national origin for specific denial of benefits or in this case, law 12 13 enforcement scrutiny based solely on their 14 appearance or their national origin or their 15 race. 16 MR. HETHMON: Okay. That's an 17 easy answer. There have been thousands of state and local initiatives -- Professor 18 Chishti's database is a good one, and just in 19 20 the last two years alone. 21 And the practice of including a 22 specific ban on consideration of racial,

religious or national origin considerations
when complaints are being processed in those
statutes, that comes from me.

I have insisted on that in every one, and to the extent, as Professor Chishti's testified yesterday, that these things are being cloned, I'm very proud of that consideration.

To show the bad faith of the other side, we included that in the Hazleton Ordinance, for example, and the ACLU says, "Well, they mentioned" -- you know, "they added this extra layer of protection, but it's really a secret conspiracy to go after illegal aliens."

So, you know, I put that in every ordinance that I have the ability to influence or draft, and it's a protection above the level of what Federal Government provides.

And to give you a good example of how this is played out in Virginia, the lawful presence test in the driver's license, which

1	is one of the very first ones we worked on
2	right after 2011, do you remember the illegal
3	alien sold the breeder documents to the
4	Saudi's who used it to get the driver's
5	license to fly the plane into the Pentagon.
6	That's what provoked this whole
7	modern cycle. But, what happened after that,
8	I mean, all these kinds of charges and claims
9	and hand-wringing went on and stuff like this,
10	and the Department of Motor Vehicles has
11	since, to my understanding, collected data and
12	statistics on that, and there's not been a
13	single civil rights complaint about that
14	procedure in Virginia since it was set up.
15	And as far as harassment to the
16	ordinary citizen and the idea that this was,
17	you know, some kind of Draconian influence,
18	the waiting time at motor vehicle departments
19	in Virginia has decreased.
20	So, it really is a
21	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: So you
22	disapprove of any police officers acting in
i .	

1 evidence. 2 I'm wondering specifically what 3 restrictions on data collection you think would be good right now. And, for example, is 5 there right now something that would prevent the Prince William School Department from 6 saying, "Okay. We recognize under the Constitution that everybody who lives in this 9 community has a right to send their child to 10 the public school regardless of their 11 immigration status, but nonetheless, just 12 because we want to collect the data we're 13 going to request that parents provide 14 information about their immigration status." 15 Is that legal right now? Either 16 one. 17 MR. STEIN: I was in the court 18 when Plyer was read from the Bench, and I 19 remember it quite distinctly and I remember 20 what the Court was essentially getting at, 21 which is that, you know, there didn't seem to 22 be a lot of evidence of strain in public

1 schools.

going to deport someone, the children should be enrolled in school. But somehow that got interpreted by states to mean that, therefore, nobody should ask what the status of anyone is, and so it naturally became -- I mean, the primary source of student population growth in this country is immigration and a lot of that -- a lot, probably most of it, is illegal immigration.

And California had one of the -well, anyway, the answer to your question is,
yes, that should be legal. I think it is
legal and I certainly believe -- we certainly
believe it fair that states not only can, but
should -- must have a role in collecting this
information, getting this data, these data
collected, as well as an integral part of the
census.

There's no excuse, after the 1987

Amnesty legislation passed that we've failed

to have machine-readable verification 1 2 procedures and, say, driver's licensed so that you and I can verify our citizenship easily in 3 this country without that kind of integrated 4 5 strategy. I mean, there's no reason why we have this wall between the states and the Federal Government in all these different 9 areas and it's the advocates who, for whatever 10 reason or another, seem to support continued illegal immigration are the same ones who seem 11 12 to object to any reasonable credential measures that might be established at the 13 14 state level to assist in setting up this 15 Federal-State partnership. CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: 16 Let me follow 17 up because you mentioned population, Dan, and 18 you and I have known each other for many, many 19 years. 20 You express some concern that the 21 term "xenophobic" has been thrown around, and 22 I will state right up front that I am a

		Page 191
1	growth as a factor in setting annual	
2	immigration limits.	
3	But you have stated this publicly	
4	repeatedly	
5	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Well, it's	
6	been on your it used to be on your website	:
7	until I started stating	
8	MR. STEIN: Well, no. The ones	
9	I'm separating is the abstract, what might be	
10	a nice, optimum population.	
11	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: And it was	
12	150 million.	
13	MR. STEIN: You seem to feel that	
14	that must mean that we want to mandate as a	
15	matter of, you know, legal policy	
16	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Just a point	
17	of clarification. I don't want you to be	
18	I don't want, since the focus of our issue is	
19	race, I wanted to make it clear that your	
20	concern is population.	
21	MR. STEIN: Well, I though you	
22	asked me to come here with respect to the	

MR. BYLER: We have a member of

the Board of Supervisors who did the same and adopted two children who were, quote, unquote, anchor babies.

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Mr. Byler, I have just a couple of questions for you. One of the things that you have done in your various documentary is to go out into the community. We've heard some anecdotal evidence. Obviously what you have been able to pull together is also anecdotal information.

And what -- what can you -- if you can, describe just anecdotally what you've seen in terms of the racial animus that has expressed itself during the course of this debate on illegal immigration, and some of the incidents that you've been able to document.

MR. BYLER: Well, if the concern is the toxification of the social climate here, then definitely the footage that is, a lot of it, available on You-Tube. Many things that aren't -- would be very instructive on

1 how this community has been basically ripped

2 apart.

You know, I mentioned anchor babies, because it's a very effective term that de-humanizes children so that you don't have to deal with the complication of the sense of sympathy you might have for a child were they equally human to those of us who are here, you know, legally.

But just the word "legal" versus
"illegal," an illegal person, you know. Those
kinds of terms have sort of, you know, have
been disseminated down to local advocates,
been repeated again and again, and it's become
part of our discourse.

We say that there's an illegal person standing there. So, I think there's really three groups of people in our community right now. There are those who have become completely blind to prejudice because it's almost become accepted as part of the climate here that this one community is deserving of

1 prejudice because of their documentation

2 status.

And because we -- you know, as far as I know, there's nothing visible, there's nothing obvious about a person's documentation when you see them on the street. It really means that all 20 percent of the Latino population that's here is subject to that feeling.

I spent some time in Los Angeles to post-produce another film of mine in the last month, and it took me a week to get used to walking down the street and seeing a Latino person in public who doesn't look afraid. I had to reset my mind because I was so accustomed to living that way.

There's another group of people

who do see the prejudice but they don't

acknowledge it because it creates

complications for their agenda. And so they

find themselves often, reasonable otherwise

good people, in the position of encouraging

So, yes, so at this place where a

legal family, a Mexican-American family, the parents are both legal, the children are all

3 born here, has put up a sign that gives their

4 view that racial profiling will result from

5 this.

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Okay. If you stand at that sign for, you know, 20 minutes, somebody will drive by and scream a racial epithet. The children there, you know, who often that -- it's kind of a community center for them.

And, by the way, the Manassas police, which is a different jurisdiction, they do not feel -- they actually protect this sign as something that's important to the Latino community. The police chief has gone on record as saying that.

But, I mean, the things that I've seen there -- and some of them are on tape and some of them aren't. I'll talk about something that's not on tape. After the sign was destroyed by people who failed to blow it up, so they chain-sawed it. Okay. This is

1 talking about freedom of speech.

The Community decided just a few days before the election which was the most toxic, most frightening time, to redo the sign, fortify it and redo it. And so Mr. Fernandez called me and I was video-taping.

And there were complications and so it took longer than it was supposed to and the sun went down. And so confrontations like you see in the daylight that are extremely scary with grown men screaming at children were happening at night and it was scary.

Cars would drive by. People would yell things. Cars parked across the street and just watched us. The photographs that they took of us ended up on Black Velvet Bruce Lee, a popular website that's designed to help the anti-immigrant, anti-illegal immigrate cause immediately was on there. I'm sure they were taking photographs.

The Manassas police actually called my mother to tell her what was

- 1 happening and st called the Manassas police.
- 2 They actually came out to help us and they
- 3 parked a car someople would know not to mess
- 4 with us.
- 5 Butafter the police left there
- 6 was another confontation in the parking lot
- 7 across the strew, so --
- 8 CHAMPERSON CHAVEZ: I'm going to
- 9 interrupt you thre, because we are
- 10 essentially runing out of time and I think
- 11 Professor Cohenias one more question.
- 12 MEMER COHEN: Yes. This is, once
- more, for Ms. Jinson first, and perhaps for
- 14 Reverend Carters well.
- 15 I'mjust wondering if it sort of
- 16 crossed your mil to be affirmative advocates
- of this County plicy, rather than opponents
- in the sense the the wrongs, things you might
- consider to be tongs carried out by public
- officials, by plice officers in the absence
- of legal standars, in the absence of an
- articulated policy, in the absence of an

Page 200

education program by the Sheriff's Department, 1 2 of its officers, you know, as to the details of its policy would be mitigated, lessened, 3 diminished in the presence of a well-4 5 articulated, well-formed County policy, as to distinguish between the treatment of illegal 6 7 immigrants and people here with a regular legal status. 9 Did that thought ever cross your 10 mind? 11 MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: I'm a Sure. 12 Things like that cross my mind all lawyer. 13 the time, and I'm also capable of understanding all the different viewpoints to 14 this debate. 15 16 However, I honestly believe I 17 don't think it's possible to have a well-18 crafted resolution without running afoul of the Constitution. I don't think that second 19 level of probable cause that, you know, the 20 21 County has failed to really define, and I've 22 talked to police officers and they don't

CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Mr. Hethmon.

Yes. 1 MR. HETHMON: I have written somewhat on this in a lot of the article 2 that's on our website called "The Chimera and 3 the Cop, Local Enforcement of Federal Immigration Law." 5 6 And as I understand this standard, the profiling standard in the context of immigration law, it has evolved primarily 9 through case law of over about 20 years is 10 that foreign appearance, foreign language, these kind of indicia are permissible for 11 consideration of -- if the other circumstances 12 13 of the -- referring to Terry stop, for 14 example, are lawful. 15 Those conditions can be considered 16 in the totality of the circumstance analysis 17 that the officer makes, as long as -- and here was what seems to be as much of a bright line 18 19 rule as the courts have been able to reach, as 20 long as they are not the primary consideration, and the primary consideration 21 22 the officer has to be able to articulate that

1 in what the courts say is a relatively specific standard. 2 3 So, I -- this, you know, a lot of people, you know, said this is not -- this is 5 not a perfect bright line rule, but certainly 6 the, you know, the Fourth Amendment, 7 jurisprudence and the way the courts --8 Supreme Court deals with this indicates that 9 that's not -- may not ever be a possible sort 10 of thing, and it's a shifting standard that --11 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: So, if I were 12 a little bit darker skinned and had a little 13 bit more of an accent I better start carrying 14 my passport or my birth certificate with me, 15 is that what you're saying? 16 MR. HETHMON: No. I'm not saving 17 that. I'm just saying that, you know, if you 18 run a red light, you know, everybody has to 19 deal with the police --20 CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: 21 apparently I don't-- from the standard you 22 just suggested, you and I, if I fit those

people of faith stand, is that so quickly we

are characterized as being on one side of the argument or the other, we're either proponents or opponents.

And quite frankly, the concern is that the way the resolution came about with an added election in the middle of it, it created an atmosphere of division and the community was divided.

Either people divided themselves into two camps or others said, "Well, they are making this statement, so therefore they are part of this community or they're making this statement, they're a part of this community."

There are folks in my community who, after spending time studying just a little bit of immigration law, and even in this conversation we've added layers of complexity for me. It just -- it's further -- it confuses the issue.

Folks said that if we look at the rule of law, there's something fundamentally broken there in the sense of it -- the

complication and the history and how can we fix it, and there's no quick fix.

On the other hand, the discussion that's in the community, particularly in the editorial section of the paper, lacks a certain tenor of decorum, and can be harsh at times. And for my congregants, reading the paper, there's this whole other discussion that is not as sterile as the discussion happens in this board room.

And that's the discussion that is built off of perception and assumption, as well as some truth and some well-founded concern that has heightening the anxiety for those of us who are in the middle, as well as those that are on the extremes.

And I think for the faith

community, that is our deepest concern, and so

there are 30 other leaders who are joining me

in a letter to our County government asking if

we could be part of a solution, to help with

education, to help with understanding and to

And some of the points that may be

raised, and I think would be very helpful 1 going forward, certainly, are whether -- some 2 3 of this probably is impossible to get at, but the incidence of illegal stops or alleged 4 5 illegal stops have increased. 6 I can certainly understand a link. I appreciate you weren't prescient in your 8 answer, but also asking the Chief how many 9 officers have been -- this I could have maybe 10 followed up with him -- have been trained? What is the training schedule? What will 11 12 change after this unit is set up? 13 I could have asked him more 14 questions about that unit. And let's say 15 you're -- whether your clients prevail in an initial suit or don't, I think that there is 16 17 -- one of the values of our system of justice 18 is that you can keep following up, and you 19 can --20 I'm not sure that I agree that 21 there can be no constitutional resolution of 22 this type enacted, but you pushing one way, I

1	think, can be very valuable, and I would hope
2	that those are advocating that and I'm
3	referring to the other gentleman who share
4	your table, would help her, at least try to
5	implement a policy in a way that is consistent
6	with the Constitution and the Civil Rights as
7	possible.
8	So, I commend you in particular
9	for pursuing that.
10	MS. JOHNSON-FIRTH: Thank you.
11	CHAIRPERSON CHAVEZ: Ed.
12	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Yes. Oh, sorry.
13	MR. HETHMON: A very brief
13	MR. HETHMON: A very brief response. Yes, I think those are very helpful
	-
14	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful
14 15	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful words. I think one of the reasons you sense
14 15 16	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful words. I think one of the reasons you sense perhaps some obstreperousness in our tone is
14 15 16 17	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful words. I think one of the reasons you sense perhaps some obstreperousness in our tone is because we feel so I mean, I've been I
14 15 16 17	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful words. I think one of the reasons you sense perhaps some obstreperousness in our tone is because we feel so I mean, I've been I remember attending one immigration lawyer's
14 15 16 17 18	response. Yes, I think those are very helpful words. I think one of the reasons you sense perhaps some obstreperousness in our tone is because we feel so I mean, I've been I remember attending one immigration lawyer's conference in Washington, D.C. as a young

association announced, you know, "Be very careful what you say in the room. We have one of "them" sitting over there."

that's the sort of bias and animus that we work with professional year-in and year-out.

And I will be happy -- that's why I was the only person to go down to the Human Rights

Commission on August 11th, because, you know, when we actually sat down, we were able to have a very helpful dialogue.

And that's the kind of tone --

And we suggested issues that, when their Human Rights Commission encounters these kind of issues, the things they need to think about in advance so that these kind of things can be resolved in the way that you're mentioning, sir.

CO-CHAIR COOKE: And our objective is to foster dialogue as well, and we often do, always do that. And our objective is foster a dialogue as well, but in the tradition that I spent eight and a half years

say, the people no are already here, whether

legal or illegal in order to achieve long-

21

		Page	212
1	term reasonable objectives that you both		
2	regard as important?		
3	That is to say, do we have to		
4	continue this possibly possibility of		
5	aggressively identifying and deporting people,		
6	even given the possibility of the present		
7	danger that we all have to admit that out of		
8	every one that we actually find we're going to		
9	offend ten legal citizens and what not?		
10	Is it actually critical to attack		
11	the population that exists here now to achieve		
12	reasonable long-term and appropriate kinds of		
13	immigration policies?		
14	MR. HETHMON: My personal view in		
15	this		
16	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Yes, that's what		
17	I want.		
18	MR. HETHMON: is that this is a		
19	two-part question, and the answer to the one		
20	dealing with identification is, yes. The one		
21	dealing with removal of that entire population		
22	is is no.		

would be if a person is a citizen.

1	As the world becomes more crowded,
2	as the world becomes more interconnected, this
3	sort of imperative for the rule of law really
4	remains there.
5	But the second question, which was
6	sort of it runs into the, you know, the
7	removal, kind of amnesty issue. This is
8	this, I think, is really is more a
9	political question, rather than a legal
10	question. And it can't really be answered
11	until you have, you know, an articulate and
12	firm national policy on this issue.
13	CO-CHAIR COOKE: So FAIR is not
14	taking any political position on that issue?
15	MR. HETHMON: I'll let Dan Dan
16	is the person who speaks on politics, so
17	MR. STEIN: Chairman Cooke, I just
18	I'm not quite sure I understand exactly
19	your question. The term "attack"
20	CO-CHAIR COOKE: Well, perhaps
21	that's not the best word, but to aggressively
22	pursue and remove individuals who are

enforcement strategy, employer sanctions.

Not only did that not happen, but
by the Bush Administration, interior
enforcement and employer sanctions virtually
ceased as
CO-CHAIR COOKE: I've heard that
complaint continued. I've heard that
complaint.
MR. STEIN: So, the proposals that
were up before the Senate appeared, to our
side, to be bad faith, that we had once we
played this game one time too many times, and
we weren't going to go down that road again.
People want to see real
enforcement. Now, in the movie "1775" in the
play, John Adams exasperatedly says to the
Constitution Convention, "You know, we're
going to have a resolution, you know, we have
to offend somebody, damn it."
You can't enforce immigration law
without inconveniencing some people, and
generally, hopefully, those people are only
those people who have broken our immigration

laws.

And when a person breaks the

immigration law, they not only break that law,

but generally over time they fail to file

taxes, these fraudulent documents, they have

a whole range of felonies and other things

associated with it.

The employers are guilty of a lot of criminal behavior --

CO-CHAIR COOKE: I don't mean to interrupt you, but are those the only people that get inconvenienced? I apologize for interrupting.

MR. STEIN: Well, what I'm saying,
I mean, what we look for in the way of common
dialogue, sir, are responsible approaches to
the long-term strategy which would be, say,
all right, if you're going to let people stay
here who jumped the que in front of millions
of people who have waited in line, and you
want to reassert the idea that what ties us
together is such a diverse society is respect

1 somewhere along the way that immigration was important for future party-building. 2 3 Republican people, mostly -- frankly Bush people decided that immigration was important 4 to raise political money. And the old Father Hesburgh 6 Commission, Barbara Jordan chaired a wonderful commission in 1995. These commissions which 9 took an enlarged view of the national interest 10 on which proposals, the original Simpson-Mazzoli bill is based and then in 1995 the 11 12 Smith-Simpson bill was based, all those great 13 recommendations were torpedoed by a coalition 14 of business and, you know, left of center, 15 whatever you want to call them, immigration 16 advocates, to essentially prevent them from 17 passing. We don't -- we shouldn't be in 18 19 this situation as a country today. 20 CO-CHAIR COOKE: I quite agree 21 that the testimony that we heard from Ms. 22 Firth and Reverend Carter and Mr. Byler

suggests social impact that will be derived
from our current course of action if we pursue
it.

And if we continue to, for lack of a better word, focus on existing individuals currently in this country that could very well not only create extraordinary conflict in the community, but also undermine long-term, the Constitution that we -- some aspects of the Constitution I think are absolutely critical.

MR. STEIN: But if you're saying, respectfully, if you tell people that there is no alternative, that the law -- rule of law simply cannot prevail in border regulation and immigration regulation, you're saying that as a nation we can't control our destiny.

CO-CHAIR COOKE: No. I'm saying that the problem from my perspective is, at least from what I've heard, is that it's not so much the absence of the rule of law, but the failure to enforce existing laws.

I was in Congress and responsible

for enactment of the '86 Immigration Act, so

I quite agree with you that it was very,

extraordinarily ambitions. It took three

times for the Congress to pass it, as you'll

recall.

We were very hopeful that these things would have occurred, but the fact of the matter is that they haven't been enforced for various reasons by both parties.

If we were to enforce those laws prospectively and perhaps even implement some others along the lines that you suggested, do you think it's still necessary for us to focus on the kinds of things the Prince William County Commission has enacted in its legislation that has such a direct impact on individuals and on people, some of whom are illegal and some of whom are not illegal?

MR. STEIN: Well, I'd like to try it and see how it works before we decide it's not a workable thing but, as I say, the

Federal-State partnership is absolutely

have more actual evidence of the person whose

22

				_
A	ACLU 184:11	adults 84:7	agree 28:6 154:8	
abandoned 68:22	act 14:19 31:6,18,20	advance 162:13	208:20 219:20	2
abide 67:13 179:9	38:7 80:17 166:6	210:15	221:2	a
179:12	171:5 172:5,6	adversely 6:5	agreed 12:3 165:10	2
ability 90:15 124:2	215:10 221:1	advice 126:3	agreement 30:21	a
124:4 153:10	acting 185:22	Advisory 1:4,12,15	agreements 28:17	a
184:17	action 152:9 163:21	1:17,18,20,22 4:12	31:5	1
able 8:2 61:14 63:16	169:6 177:9 220:2	4:16 6:16 66:8	ahead 10:6 72:4	
63:22 112:6,16	actions 103:12	advocacy 8:11	142:13	
130:12 175:4	111:20 156:7	140:19	aid 81:21	
193:9,17 202:19	180:22 213:5	advocate 155:2,7	aimed 52:4	1
202:22 210:10	activities 75:11	161:12	airports 56:11	1
abroad 31:22	171:22	advocated 190:14	akin 26:12	
absence 44:9 133:9	activity 74:9 79:17	advocates 35:11	Alexandria 158:1	
199:20,21,22	93:1,2 153:6	158:5 166:19	Alice 103:16 105:10	
220:20	actual 177:20	189:9 194:13	alien 7:9 76:7 95:4	
absolutely 175:14	222:22	199:16 219:16	99:10,22 109:9	ı
180:19 211:15	Adams 216:15	advocating 42:19	150:15 164:14	l
215:2 220:10	add 88:3 118:12	209:2	171:1 182:15	١
221:22	148:7	Affairs 11:9	185:3 213:8	
abstract 191:9	added 171:12	affect 21:14 116:21	alienage 171:1	
abundance 148:5	184:13 205:6,17	116:21	213:13	
abuse 84:2 169:10	adding 75:3 148:12	affiliate 144:4	alienist 169:9	
abuses 155:18,20	addition 87:17 89:1	affiliated 164:2	aliens 31:19 37:3	٤
accent 53:8 123:7	89:8	affiliating 101:6	58:7,20 66:10	ľ
123:16 201:6	additional 35:18	affirmative 199:16	71:22 92:22 94:8,9	
203:13	address 66:20 75:15	affirming 153:3	99:13 100:4,13	2
accept 180:18	76:10,14,18 78:10	afforded 161:20	101:18 108:11,15] ا
accepted 194:21	97:22 105:14	afoul 200:18	108:21 110:4,5	١
access 28:3 37:4,4	109:1 121:1	afraid 142:18	127:7 128:9 135:8	[
38:19,21 39:17	administration 1:7	144:15 145:5,12	138:7 175:20	ľ
40:3,5,15 160:20	30:3 216:2	161:10 195:14	184:15	
accolades 10:9	administrations	African 47:16	alike 76:13	
accomplished 71:17	29:20	aged 54:15	allegations 180:15	
account 20:1 54:20	Administrator	ageist 73:1	allege 176:14	۱,
218:5	124:17 128:13	agencies 49:8	alleged 102:2	Ι,
accountable 100:14	admire 144:18	agency 5:12,13,13	175:17 177:3	۱,
accounts 126:11	admit 51:21 110:21	43:13 79:18	208:4	[
accurate 186:21	111:4 212:7	agenda 66:11 106:7	alleges 180:16	
accustomed 144:13	admitted 48:3,5,12	143:3 162:17	allegiance 143:8	
195:16	admittedly 134:12	166:20 195:20	alleging 178:21	۱,
achieve 211:22	adopted 26:7 27:12	aggressively 212:5	allies 222:5	۱.
212:11	77:7 78:17 126:12	214:21	allotting 9:16	Ĺ
achievement 215:3	193:2	ago 13:9 46:14	allow 9:22 28:18	
achieving 211:16	adult 14:6 21:7 47:3	94:11 128:22	42:16 84:5 102:4	
acknowledge	54:14 63:20 83:20	155:15 159:2,20	156:13	۱,
195:19	84:2 129:8 133:1	174:8 180:6	allowed 124:6,6	
	135:7 136:15	204:14	allowing 28:21 29:1	۱ ا
	1	I	1	1

52:12 83:22 allows 34:15 all-time 14:13 15:2 alternative 220:13 altogether 57:11 ambitions 221:3 Amendment 52:16 55:22 56:18 60:10 61:4,15,16 62:2 80:11,13 203:6 **America** 7:1 67:9 **American** 7:16 8:5 10:12 11:15 48:10 67:7 68:11 69:19 70:2 72:4 115:14 116:9 141:21 162:4,10 167:4,9 168:18 169:11,13 170:4 218:7 Americans 66:17 68:19 69:3,13 70:6 70:13 71:20 America's 85:21 amnesty 112:4,15 112:21 188:22 214:7 215:18 amount 110:11 ample 147:2 analyses 131:2,6 analysis 9:20 24:19 26:4 29:14 35:10 35:19 37:16 39:3,6 39:13 40:11 43:2 51:1 202:16 analyzing 36:20 45:9 anchor 193:3 194:3 ancillary 32:15 33:17,17,19 129:11 and/or 6:8 180:14 anecdotal 108:1 133:13,15 181:15 181:19 186:22 193:8,10 196:15 anecdotally 127:4 193:13 anesthesiologists

89:6	121:11 124:18	Arizona 15:12	172.12 220.0	40.0 41.17 44.11
Angeles 195:10	appearance 183:14	73:20	172:13 220:9	40:9 41:17 44:11
angry 143:20	202:10		assault 54:14	76:20 77:10 93:4
145:11		arrange 144:2	assert 213:6	93:11 97:10 121:7
animus 193:14	appeared 216:9 appellate 204:5	arrangement 179:19 180:3	asserting 179:4	authority 27:2
210:5	. ^^		assess 5:14 26:5	29:17 30:1,4 31:10
Annabel 143:7	applicable 170:19	arrest 32:21,22 33:4	assessing 24:21	32:4,9,15 35:20
announced 210:1	application 67:20	33:19 35:2 36:4	assessment 124:12	45:8 77:13 80:16
annual 167:14	applied 37:19,20 38:1 53:12 59:20	42:5 44:13	assimilate 67:15	96:12 179:20
191:1		arrested 36:6	assist 8:14 189:14	180:9
	applies 62:11	121:12	assisting 165:16	authorize 44:8
anonymity 213:5 answer 40:17	apply 37:17 54:11	arrestees 119:4,7	associated 74:18	authorized 33:13
	59:7 69:8	arrests 35:3,4	93:18,19 151:20	43:11
106:20 117:4	applying 52:18,19	article 105:12 202:2	171:13 217:7	automatically 34:22
135:3 137:14	53:18	articulable 119:22	associating 211:2	35:1
147:2 173:7 176:7	appointed 63:4	articulate 202:22	association 34:10	availability 20:15
178:5 183:17	appreciate 103:3	214:11	210:1	available 11:19 38:8
188:13 190:20	162:8 207:16	articulated 199:22	assume 42:10	193:21 223:11
207:13 208:8	208:7	200:5	assumption 40:2	average 19:12
211:11 212:19	approach 98:1 99:9	articulating 126:8	206:12 215:15	averaging 18:8
213:21	100:6 101:1 130:1	ascertain 157:1	assumptions 149:6	avoiding 163:19
answered 174:8 181:2 214:10	approached 71:11	159:13	149:15 150:2	award 11:17
	approaches 217:16	Ashcroft 29:15	asylum 157:13	aware 40:13
answering 182:19	approaching 15:3,7	Asia 48:4,8	as-applied 53:3	a.m 1:8 4:2 62:22
anticipate 127:12	appropriate 102:8	Asian 14:21 47:13	atmosphere 205:7	В
183:5	102:11 175:14	47:16	attached 129:10	
anticipated 4:9	177:14 212:12	aside 11:14 30:11	attack 211:19,20	B1:21 133:8
183:2 186:2	approve 183:3	asked 21:20 36:6	212:10 214:19	babies 193:3 194:4
anti-illegal 7:9	approximately	39:13 54:2 71:12	attacked 144:11	baby 115:14 116:8
198:18	108:19 159:1,15	71:12 73:2 78:10	attempt 62:7 131:12	back 13:1 67:22
anti-immigrant	Arab 47:15 56:12	78:20 80:20 81:8	attending 63:12	68:3 78:18 81:15
	Arab-looking 56:10	88:13 91:13 94:21	209:18	84:19 97:21 129:1
anxiety 152:2	area 13:11 15:10,14	128:22 130:4	attention 94:12,12	129:5 137:5
206:14	15:14,14 16:5 26:8	134:3 148:14	101:16	157:22 215:7,8
anybody 115:13 126:22	27:21 28:10 32:10	155:8 157:5,16	attitude 11:20	backbone 85:21
	32:13 36:22 80:2	159:6,8,13 160:7,9	148:16	backdrop 80:20
anymore 165:16	82:17 94:16 97:5	166:11 177:7	attorney 29:15,18	background 9:18
anyway 22:4 66:2	100:16 147:21	182:12,21 191:22	30:7 56:19 80:7	bad 41:14 112:1,13
123:6 135:5 188:13	areas 16:6,7,16,17	201:4 208:13	157:19	184:9 216:10
	17:21 20:14 22:14	asking 53:6 59:15	attorneys 126:4	badly 41:10 balances 70:10
apart 194:2	23:18 27:7,16 28:1	59:16 60:8 106:19	Attorney's 126:5	
apologize 211:11 217:12	28:7,11 30:13	109:16 119:22	attract 50:17	ball 129:14
	31:15 32:3,6 38:12	120:4 133:4 165:5	August 127:14	ban 40:14 58:19 183:22
apparent 160:4	43:19 46:7 134:13	166:15 179:20	128:15 170:12	
apparently 156:21 203:21	189:9	180:10 206:20	181:11 210:9	banning 39:11
	Argentina 69:5	208:8	auspices 115:3,22	Barbara 2:2 9:2,5 219:7 223:6
appeal 60:12	arguing 178:22	asks 120:15	Austin 10:19	barred 37:13
Appeals 60:13,15 appear 8:4 66:6	argument 166:6	aspects 31:11,16	author 181:7	barring 39:16
appear 6.4 00:0	205:2	65:7 149:18	authorities 29:4	Latting 39.10

based 132:18	58:11,14 69:8	block 157:4,9	163:2 164:4	202:3
172:21,22 183:10	78:21 79:3,5,15	blood 67:2	broad 52:17 61:2	calls 144:22 178:7
183:13 213:2	166:12 173:18	Bloomberg 61:7,13	112:4 149:15	Cameroonian
219:11,12	183:12	blow 197:21	broader 61:22	157:13
basic 28:15 165:5	benefit-by-benefit	board 1:6 6:6,10	broadly 50:8 59:10	campaign 66:11,14
basically 18:5,13	39:3	49:4 64:14,19	broken 192:18	camps 205:10
26:4 30:18 34:19	Benjamin 71:10	75:14 78:12,17,19	205:22 216:22	Canada 70:3
58:1 60:15 96:15	bent 158:3	81:16,16 84:14,21	broker 207:1	candidate 152:8
96:17 115:17	best 134:21 214:21	94:20 95:7,8 96:7	brought 60:3 75:22	candidates 68:6,10
121:15 169:14	better 50:10 67:8	97:17,18,22 100:6	77:5 94:12 104:12	capability 201:9
174:11 194:1	74:6 130:22 135:4	103:1,12,22 104:4	105:9 174:10	capable 126:4
basing 213:4	162:17 163:2,3	108:2,5 118:13	177:8	200:13
basis 33:5 37:14	203:13 220:5	119:18 125:6	Bruce 198:16	capacities 6:18
53:7 61:15 105:6	beyond 33:12 133:1	128:15,22 129:6	bucks 39:20	capture 101:11
128:1 133:13,15	139:2 154:5	129:15 130:5	build 48:6 70:18,19	car 157:17 159:14
140:7 218:11	160:12 177:12	140:15 144:20	building 1:7 153:3	160:6 199:3
Basta 169:14	bias 210:5	163:22 193:1	builds 16:3	card 53:19 85:17
beard 66:4 72:18	big 21:11 22:13	206:10	build-up 155:11	care 65:8 79:14
beautiful 118:15	34:12 164:17	Board's 83:19 104:8	built 206:12	84:1 85:22,22 87:7
148:6	166:17	body 125:3	burden 87:18	87:9,11,12,14 88:1
began 15:17,19	bigger 23:17	bond 76:3	Bureau 13:14	88:5,17 89:3,19,20
74:17 80:6 140:6	bill 39:11 151:11	book 172:7,12	Bush 216:2 219:3	89:22 113:13,14
beginning 24:16	215:16 219:11,12	books 173:21	business 11:16	114:2,6,19 115:2
72:15 125:4	billion 168:17	border 73:22,22	68:21 166:21	115:10,13,21
207:13	bills 68:17	220:14	219:14	116:5 190:22
behave 35:16	bio 64:16,17	borders 70:1 161:19	businesses 69:11	careful 45:9 99:5
behavior 33:17	bios 141:1	born 7:11 55:13,15	166:17 175:18	210:2
217:9	bipartisanship	72:4 93:15 197:3	button 73:5	carefully 98:4,11
believe 7:17 8:6	218:21	bother 58:9	buzzer 142:5	100:21
44:21 66:10 68:5	birth 46:4 152:6	bottom 166:21	Byler 2:17 3:15	Carolina 16:21
72:3 84:21 90:19	203:14	172:18 186:7	139:22 141:2,5,10	carried 199:19
91:5 96:19 114:4	births 87:4,6 88:11	207:15	142:7 147:4,8	carry 98:9
122:6 127:14	bit 4:8 9:21 12:10	boundaries 150:20	192:22 193:4,18	carrying 94:15
146:20 149:1	12:14 13:7 17:6,11	break 62:17,19	196:21 219:22	203:13 213:18,19
151:14 162:13	20:8 21:19 22:4	139:18 217:3	byproduct 12:17	Cars 198:13,14
165:22 188:15,16	25:1 56:17 92:5	breakdown 142:17		Carter 2:18 3:16
200:16 201:11	103:15 105:12	breaking 143:9	C	139:22 141:3,15
believes 29:16	113:6 122:18	169:1	C 1:18	141:16 147:10,11
163:12	123:8 147:12	breaks 217:2	California 13:2,3	154:17 199:14
believing 56:11	172:2,17 178:20	breech 213:10	15:11,20 46:13	204:6 211:3
Bench 187:18	192:20 203:12,13	breeder 185:3	188:12	219:22
benefit 40:11 62:11	205:16 222:11	Brethren 141:17	call 25:20 31:4 90:8	case 60:3,10 75:21
83:8,12 90:21	bits 166:4	147:15 150:4	139:21 154:14	121:20 132:3
145:7 192:11	Black 13:18 198:16	brief 45:21 209:13	207:2 219:15	174:9,12,21 175:4
218:9	blasts 144:22	BRIEFING 1:4	called 24:19 29:10	183:12 192:19
benefits 27:12 28:4	blessed 148:5	briefly 50:1	82:17 90:21 142:9	202:9
36:17 37:2,8 39:12	blessings 153:14	bright 202:18 203:5	144:6,7 192:5	cases 84:14 88:10
52:10,11,19 58:7	blind 194:20	bring 91:6 139:18	198:6,22 199:1	158:7 174:9 177:8
	l		1	1 200.7 17 17 7.00

	<u> </u>			I
177:11	96:10 103:3 105:8	196:18 199:8	53:14 54:3 56:15	119:8,17 120:4,8
cash 94:15	105:19 106:2,6,10	201:22 203:11,20	57:10,16 62:3,12	122:1,4,15 123:19
categories 80:1	106:14,21 107:7	207:6 209:11	63:1 64:12 65:19	124:9 128:13,17
135:13 168:11	107:12 108:3	222:16	66:3 71:13 72:11	135:2,17,19 136:2
categorized 81:17	109:7,13,17,22	chairs 118:14	72:14,22 78:2 85:8	136:11,21 137:9
82:17	110:7 111:21	169:16	91:2,10,17,20	137:14,21 138:6
category 83:17	112:11,20 113:2	Chairwoman 204:7	102:14,17 105:17	138:17,21 139:3
caught 40:6	117:3 118:5 131:8	challenge 70:16	105:21 106:4,8,12	139:16 197:15
cause 96:19 117:17	132:10,14 133:17	152:15 175:8	106:18 107:4,9,12	201:4 204:13
119:19,21 121:3	133:21 134:2,7,11	challenges 86:12	107:22 109:11,15	207:12 208:8
122:18 123:17	134:16,20 139:14	challenging 164:8	109:20 110:2,9	chiefs 34:7,10,11,12
198:19 200:20	167:13 190:19	Chambers 1:6	112:9,18 113:3	35:12 36:13 45:4
201:1	192:2 214:17	chance 168:1	117:8,12 122:16	97:13
caused 36:12 74:21	Chairperson 1:8,11	change 15:18 17:11	123:11,15,20	child 187:9 194:7
causes 89:17	4:3 23:3 24:12	22:16 72:12 98:3	124:15 127:19	childhood 103:15
causing 49:5 104:2	25:5 40:18 41:4,12	99:7 111:14,16,19	130:3,11,14,17,20	children 19:20 24:9
caution 73:5	45:17 48:21 51:17	111:20 113:6	134:22 135:18	24:10 67:8 68:18
ceased 216:4	53:14 54:3 56:15	143:1 208:12	136:1,10,20 137:1	83:2 161:9 188:3
cell 41:6	57:10,16 62:3,12	215:21	137:11,15 138:5	193:2 194:5 197:2
census 13:14 164:21	63:1 64:12 65:19	changed 14:19	138:14,18,22	197:8 198:11
188:20	66:3 71:13 72:11	218:18	139:9,17 141:12	Chimera 202:3
center 7:20 10:7	72:14,22 78:2 85:8	changes 12:7 23:19	146:22 147:5,9	China 69:5
44:18 63:21 84:2	91:1,2,10,17,20	changing 12:14	154:16 161:15	Chishti 2:7 3:6
129:8 133:2 135:2	102:14,17 105:17	94:1	162:3 167:16,19	10:22 11:6 24:14
135:7 136:15	105:21 106:4,8,12	characteristics	168:2,6,10 169:15	25:3,7 41:11,12
197:10 219:14	106:18 107:4,9,22	13:22 204:1	171:9,15 174:15	42:21 44:9,17
centers 34:13	109:11,15,20	characterize 146:8	176:4,8 180:12	51:18 53:2,22
century 74:3	110:2,9 112:9,18	characterized 59:10	181:4,17 182:17	54:10,21 55:11
certain 28:3 62:6	113:3 117:8,12	204:11 205:1	183:9 185:21	56:5 57:5,12,20
79:9 121:16,18	122:16 123:20	charge 95:15 96:19	186:13 189:16	58:21 62:5,10
143:3 166:4,5	124:15 127:19	138:11 139:7	191:5,11,16 192:5	Chishti's 183:19
206:6	130:3,11,14,17,20	159:2	192:8 193:4	184:5
certainly 14:1 24:4	134:22 135:18	charged 128:14	196:18 199:8	choose 52:21
65:16 70:15 90:4	136:1,10,20 137:1	159:16	201:3,22 203:11	chosen 148:1
94:6 118:7 188:15	137:11,15 138:5	charges 86:22	203:20 207:6	chunk 21:11
188:15 203:5	138:14,18,22	121:17 135:20,21	209:11 222:16	church 141:17
208:2,6	139:9,17 141:12	136:8,17 160:19	cheated 218:9	144:9 147:14,17
certificate 203:14	146:22 147:5,9	174:6 185:8	check 120:17	147:22 149:22
cetera 81:21 104:13	154:16 161:15	Charlie 2:13 3:12	checked 76:2 105:2	150:4
chain-sawed 197:22	162:3 167:16,19	65:10 91:4	132:2 141:6	churches 175:19
Chair 25:8 102:19	168:2,6,10 169:15	chart 49:19 73:3	checking 165:6	Circuit 60:1,12,14
105:9 162:7	171:9,15 174:15	91:7 104:20	checks 42:6 70:9	60:19 61:21
chaired 219:7	176:4,8 180:12	charts 49:14	Chicago 15:14	circumscribed
Chairlady 85:12	181:4,17 182:17	chattering 68:20	chicken 145:21	26:21 27:2
Chairman 4:18	183:9 185:21	Chavez 1:8,11 4:3	chief 65:10 73:9	circumstance
8:20 64:14,18 66:1	186:13 189:16	4:17 23:3 24:12	91:5,8,13,18,21	163:15 202:16
66:6 72:13,20	191:5,11,16 192:5	25:5 40:18 41:4,12	92:12 97:19	circumstances
73:11,11 91:21	192:8 193:4	45:17 48:21 51:17	102:16 118:18	103:7 121:19
	1	1	1	1

122:2,5 124:12	classification 57:7	color 146:15 158:13	170:21	compact 42:13,14
202:12	classified 50:21	183:11	commit 55:19 56:3	42:18 43:15 44:7
cited 41:17 174:1	51:2	Colorado 15:12	112:2,5 138:2	compared 25:13
cities 29:10 34:11	clause 80:11,13	39:10	committed 8:5 32:2	28:11
59:9,11 60:8 148:4	clear 26:20 30:11	Columbia 11:8	75:9 94:7 135:12	compelling 34:18
citizen 115:14 116:9	32:18 45:4 53:4	combined 213:5	148:11	compete 166:16
145:1 159:22	59:5 69:17 106:7	come 30:9 34:13	committee 1:4,8,12	complaint 179:5
185:16 213:16,22	106:15 120:20	40:7,8 43:7 50:12	1:15,17,18,20,22	182:15 185:13
citizens 19:21 72:4	138:1 149:4	50:13,14,14 67:21	4:12,16,18,20 6:16	216:6,7
83:3 86:2 113:16	191:19	71:3,3 79:10 84:19	9:11 10:1 40:21	complaints 93:16
117:22 118:12	clearer 56:17	86:1 115:11	51:19 66:8 73:12	182:4 184:2
119:5 148:21	clearly 34:1 53:5,9	117:13 119:5	78:9 85:12 91:22	completely 143:5
158:10 161:22	55:7 56:13 57:6	129:1 160:5	223:3	194:20 207:12
169:11 170:7	61:21 129:15	164:15 170:15	common 68:22	complex 1:7 92:3
171:3 173:1,14	131:21	174:2 191:22	148:7 153:3,12	149:2,16,17
201:17 212:9	Clergy 175:20	196:5 215:20	215:11 217:15	complexity 80:9
213:11	client 82:20 133:7,8	comes 35:19 43:13	Commonwealth	205:18
citizenship 80:10	157:13	53:11 125:9 142:6	86:14	compliance 176:1
123:18 172:20	clients 156:3 207:19	175:5 184:3	communicate 97:1	complicated 151:9
189:3	208:15	comfortable 127:10	communities 6:22	172:4
city 60:22 61:6 62:1	climate 149:12	127:11	73:20 76:15	complication 194:6
97:13	152:7 193:19	coming 12:16 23:12	151:16 161:3	206:1
civil 1:1 4:13 5:10	194:21	68:5,5 73:14 86:9	215:13,13	complications
5:15,18,19 6:3	clinical 83:3	92:19 102:10	community 8:11	195:20 198:7
8:15 11:5 30:14,16	cloned 184:7	182:6 196:9	73:15,17 74:2,9	comply 62:7
30:19 31:3 45:10	close 13:14 93:3	commend 209:8	75:13,17 74.2,9	comply 62.7 component 100:5
45:12 52:5,16	closely 83:4 162:21	comment 94:22	81:13 82:7,22 83:9	100:22
77:20 103:11	coalition 175:19	159:10 180:14	83:16 84:6,18	composition 19:15
124:3 142:9	219:13	181:3 207:9	85:20 89:12 90:21	composition 19.13
150:14 155:18,20	code 85:19 168:21	commented 97:17	99:14,18,20	151:10 172:8
156:1 163:17	codes 152:15	comments 78:20	106:16 107:1,14	222:1
167:4 172:5	Cohen 1:14 9:8 54:4	85:6 125:1 175:13	107:15,18,20	comprised 63:2
176:15 177:7,9	54:5,11 55:9,16	181:14	112:8,14 140:19	concept 173:2,3
179:11 185:13	113:4,5 116:10,13	commercial 84:13	142:20 143:4	concern 6:21 40:12
190:5 209:6 222:8	117:7 175:1 176:9	commission 1:1	144:17 146:4	51:19 52:2 145:16
223:1	176:10 178:20	4:13 5:10,17 66:7	147:22 148:12	189:20 190:8,13
claim 41:18	199:11,12 204:9	77:20 132:9	149:3,9,12,18	191:20 193:18
claimed 105:13	coherent 26:15	170:12 172:16	152:21 153:3,9	205:4 206:14,18
claims 185:8 213:7	colleagues 13:10	181:11 182:1,7	156:8 158:6	207:3 222:6
clarification 174:16	50:20,21 102:20	210:9,13 219:7,8	159:21 165:2	concerned 35:15
191:17	collect 187:12	221:15	169:2 187:9 193:8	66:18 100:17
clarify 114:16	collected 185:11	commissioned	194:1,18,22	103:5 168:20
116:10 123:22	188:19	132:9	196:17 197:10,15	180:7,9
138:13 169:20	collecting 188:17	Commissioners	198:2 205:7,12,13	concerning 93:17
171:3	collection 187:3	192:12	205:14 206:4,18	94:22 149:16
class 68:20 124:3	college 11:7 75:18	commissions	207:4,19 220:8	concerns 109:2
196:2	Collision 172:9	125:15 219:8	community's 145:8	145:13,17 149:10
classes 161:8	Colonel 63:18	Commission's	commute 4:7	211:5
	- 3.0		************************************	1 211.5

completed 20.2		215:10 220:16	117.0 120.01	40.50.15.00.50.0
concluded 30:3	considerations	215:10 220:16	117:2 138:21	49:7,9,17,22 50:3
66:13 71:15	52:17 184:1	controlled 164:10	180:19 211:8	50:6 58:15 64:14
223:12	186:10	controlling 52:4	corresponding	64:19 65:5,11
concluding 167:12	considered 33:3	162:18	215:21 218:3	66:15 73:14 74:1,4
conclusion 51:14	82:10 167:11	controversiality	cost 40:11 82:14	74:11,17 75:10,15
151:5	175:10 202:15	186:8	88:18 89:5 90:17	75:20,22 76:5,8
condition 49:10	consistent 26:15	controversy 32:17	113:21 115:16	78:5,5,11,14,18
213:17	28:22 79:11	convened 1:6	129:2,10	79:19 80:6,21
conditions 146:1	162:16 209:5	convenience 158:20	costing 132:17	83:12 85:14,17
202:15	consistently 22:7	Convention 216:16	costly 87:15	86:4 88:4 90:5
conduct 36:3 69:10	65:6	conversation	costs 39:7 89:9	92:2 93:14 94:16
conducting 132:7	consists 19:7	149:11 205:17	113:15,16 116:15	95:5 103:22 104:3
conference 209:19	conspiracy 184:14	207:1	117:4,13,18,21	105:1 109:7 111:9
confident 129:5	constitute 19:18	convicted 99:19	118:4 131:12	113:1,18 114:5
confidentiality	constitutes 137:13	convinced 175:16	council 70:12	115:3 116:16,19
60:21 61:3,11,17	179:1	Cooke 1:13 8:21,21	counsel 160:21	117:6 118:13
61:22	constitution 38:4	45:20 46:15 47:7	count 129:9 164:22	124:17 126:4,4,12
confines 32:11	56:18 70:8 80:12	47:10 48:13,18	counter 72:1	126:19 127:6,8
conflict 220:7	80:14 156:11	62:4,5 130:18,21	counties 35:6	128:9,12,13 129:1
confrontation 199:6	158:16 161:18,21	131:8 132:6,13,16	countries 86:2	131:11,14 134:3
confrontations	179:10 187:8	133:11,19 134:1,5	218:4	138:3 140:12,15
198:9	200:19 209:6	134:10,15,18	country 14:12 15:4	142:18 147:13,17
confused 72:14,16	216:16 220:9,10	207:8 209:12	16:2 28:16 31:21	147:19 148:4,15
123:12 178:21	constitutional 30:10	210:18 211:10	34:7,13 35:12	148:21 150:10
confuses 205:19	56:14,20 208:21	212:16 214:13,17	36:13 39:7 52:11	151:17 155:10,18
confusing 150:19	213:6	214:20 216:5	52:14 53:1 57:22	156:2,20 157:14
confusion 30:11	constitutionally	217:10 218:10	59:22 68:13 69:6	158:21 160:3,13
congregants 206:7	163:13	219:20 220:17	69:20 71:1,7 93:9	163:22 170:11
congregation	construction 83:10	222:4	99:16 109:10	178:1,4,10 179:22
204:14,15	construed 79:13	cooperate 77:9	137:7 158:15	199:17 200:5,21
Congress 5:22 27:2	consultants 132:20	cooperated 76:19	161:18 163:6,16	204:12,12,13
30:11,17 31:14	contact 44:5 119:5	cooperative 77:1	163:18 164:11	206:20 221:15
32:7 43:10 110:17	CONTENTS 3:1	93:5 101:21	166:1,9 170:6	223:9,9
112:3,14 220:22	contested 28:12	cop 157:5 202:4	172:5 175:11	county's 18:21 19:6
221:4	context 12:6 33:13	cops 29:2,8,22	183:1 188:9 189:4	19:19 20:2 27:19
congressional 31:13	43:8 60:4 159:12	30:19 31:10,16	192:15 211:18	148:16
68:7 70:11	171:20 173:11	32:4 43:17	213:18 215:1	County-funded
connection 177:2	175:15 202:7	core 15:10,18 16:14	219:19 220:6	114:14
179:3	continue 24:1 90:13	46:12	222:3	couple 48:22 76:4
Consequently 150:3	166:12 168:16	Corey 2:10 3:10	country's 155:20	126:11 129:11
conservative 126:7	169:5 211:18	64:15,15 73:1,10	county 1:7 4:21,22	155:17 176:11
consider 69:2,2	212:4 220:4	74:14	5:5 6:4,6,9 7:2	180:5 193:5
105:4 170:5	continued 189:10	corn 145:21	8:14 12:5,10 18:2	course 85:6 89:9
172:12 199:19	216:6	Cornell 11:8	18:7 19:3,14 20:17	97:4 102:1 110:15
consideration 104:9	continues 149:14	cornered 68:20	21:13 22:20 23:21	119:20 131:15
110:17 152:20	continuing 114:10	corners 27:15	25:17,19 28:1 29:1	140:21 172:9
183:22 184:8	178:11	Corporate 76:12	32:14 35:16,17	175:6,12 190:5
202:12,21,21	control 163:3	correct 45:22 64:11	37:11 44:4 49:3,4	193:15 220:2
	1		1	

110000	101 10 10 101			
court 1:8 30:8,9	101:19 104:21	currently 119:3	223:6	dedicated 67:4
60:11,12,14,20	107:19 110:5	220:6	dead 72:19	deep 147:22
80:14 121:21	111:18 135:13,15	custody 77:5	deal 66:20 73:16	deeper 154:6
122:7 134:8 155:3	135:15,22 159:12	custom 152:18	95:3,4 124:19	deepest 206:18
175:16 187:17,20	178:16	customer 81:10,11	151:13 173:5	defend 35:7 61:14
203:8	crimes 7:4,7 22:3	133:7,8	182:9,11 194:6	61:15
courts 27:5 59:22	43:16 56:4 94:7,8	Customs 76:22	203:19	defense 58:11
202:19 203:1,7	99:19 112:2,5	108:9	dealing 56:19,22	153:12
204:5	132:3 135:12	cut 58:14 142:6	99:5 118:1 151:19	defer 40:21 128:12
covered 43:17 116:9	178:13	cycle 122:11 185:7	212:20,21	171:16
171:4	criminal 30:15 31:7		deals 158:17 203:8	define 200:21
Covington's 132:11	31:11 33:20 44:2	<u>D</u>	dealt 93:8	definitely 193:20
Co-Chair 1:13	44:12,19 45:2,11	D 1:13	Deane 2:13 3:12	201:7
45:20 46:15 47:7	45:13 79:17 92:18	damn 216:18	65:10 73:9 91:5,8	definition 59:11
47:10 48:13,18	92:22 93:1,2 95:15	Dan 2:22 3:19 140:1	91:13,18,21	degree 5:15
62:5 130:18,21	96:5 99:10,13,21	141:4,20 162:3,9	102:16 118:18	degrees 10:17 163:1
132:6,13,16	100:4,13 101:18	168:3,6 180:14	119:8,17 120:4,8	Delhi 11:7,7
133:11,19 134:1,5	121:17 129:7,11	189:17 214:15,15	122:1,4,15 123:19	deliberative 142:17
134:10,15,18	130:15 133:2	danger 36:10 212:7	124:9 128:17	deliver 115:12
209:12 210:18	137:18 150:14	daresay 126:5	135:17,19 136:2	116:8
211:10 212:16	153:6 160:19	dark 17:17 123:15	136:11,21 137:9	delivered 84:17
214:13,20 216:5	217:9	201:5	137:14,21 138:6	deliveries 88:22
217:10 218:10	criteria 57:14 124:5	darker 123:8	138:17,21 139:3	delivery 65:8 79:8
219:20 220:17	criterion 124:2	203:12	139:16 201:4	81:2,11,12 87:22
222:4	critical 211:15	data 13:13 19:2	204:13	89:10 115:17
craft 98:4 201:12	212:10 215:3	21:22,22,22 22:19	debate 6:14,21	132:19
crafted 200:18	220:10	24:7 101:10,10	29:13 41:21 70:15	demand 68:1
201:19	cross 200:9,12	104:18 114:15	103:6 143:6 144:3	demands 88:12
Craig 2:10 3:10	crossed 199:16	128:6,19 129:4	149:7,14 169:7	democracy 70:7
72:17 78:4	cross-designated	131:1 133:6,9,14	193:16 200:15	145:4 173:4
create 111:1 211:19	99:22	133:16 140:9	debilitating 87:15	democratic 29:19
220:7	cross-designation	166:4,4 185:11	150:20	143:8 213:1
created 72:1 205:6	96:13	186:19,21 187:3	decades 12:17	218:22,22
creates 195:19	cross-trained	187:12 188:18,18	186:18	Democrats 76:12
creating 36:10	136:16	database 44:5,19	December 1:5 94:21	demographers
99:10 149:12	crowd 71:12	45:6 130:12	decent 148:11	10:14 104:13
207:5	crowded 146:1	183:19	decide 43:18 128:6	demographic 9:19
credential 189:12	214:1	date 85:2 125:7	221:20	10:13 23:19 49:15
credentials 190:1	cuffed 159:14	168:1	decided 75:15	93:13 107:6 128:6
credible 150:6	culminated 155:16	datum 166:5	110:18 198:2	demographics
credit 174:5	cultural 70:22	daughter 147:16	218:22 219:4	10:12 11:15 118:6
crime 13:7 22:1,2,6	curious 47:7 49:13	Davis 2:2 223:6	decision 84:21	140:8
32:2,21,22 33:8,10	109:21 110:3	day 27:14 68:4,17	decisions 39:9	demography 25:11
33:14,22 42:22	125:1 150:22	98:15 118:7 140:6	declare 66:22	demonstrated 27:1
43:9 44:18 49:20	current 81:2 148:16	147:6	decline 128:6	denial 183:12
55:18,19 56:2 61:9	149:20 152:15,22	daylight 198:10	decorum 206:6	denied 174:14
75:9 76:1 79:16	168:16 204:16	days 180:5 198:3	decreased 185:19	deny 52:10 53:15
91:15 93:17 94:6	220:2	de 2:2 9:2 179:21	decreasing 14:15,18	denying 67:3 134:8
Bart (Marines Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Ann	I	l	l 8 , - 0	1 -0 -8 -1 -1 -10

196:1 160:18 178:9,14 189:8 197:12 discussing 116:20 doing 19:5 50:10 department 5:5 178:15 200:14 204:1 discussion 149:1 63:14 101:9 84:8 88:4,6 92:2 detainer 138:8 215:12 124:18 153:20 154:1 172:17 94:4,22 95:2,6 detainers 42:15 difficult 4:8 83:10 173:6 175:15 157:6 173:19 96:12,21 98:17 136:11,13 128:2 131:17,19 181:10 204:21 domain 26:12 102:6 114:7 115:4 detaining 101:13 133:18 134:12 206:3,8,9,11 domestic 66:11 115:5.9 116:1.2 161:1 152:12 disguised 173:10 153:11 162:17 150:9 185:10 detectives 99:11,12 dignity 153:5,19 dismissed 160:20 dominance 145:1 187:6 200:1 **detention** 33:12,20 154:9 163:8 174:9 dominate 66:10 departments 39:14 42:2,18 63:20 84:2 **Dillon 80:15** disorderly 36:3 dominated 144:4 185:18 95:14,16,20,21 diminished 165:10 137:4 door 67:22 **depend** 53:22 129:8 133:1 135:2 200:4 disorganized doors 67:1 86:1 deport 77:10 99:17 135:7 136:15 direct 84:15 221:16 140:22 doubled 18:22 19:1 188:3 determinate 48:10 directed 21:21 disseminated 22:20.21 deportation 32:1 determine 38:18 78:18 85:4 125:6 194:13 doubles 18:10 96:4 121:11 104:19 124:13 128:22 **dissent** 70:15 doubling 19:10 122:10 174:13 133:7 direction 78:12 79:9 distance 4:6 doubt 55:2 deported 138:10 determined 49:5 95:9 125:8 distillation 70:21 downward 22:4 deporting 212:5 96:22 104:1 135:8 directions 196:9 distinction 45:15 **Dr** 10:17,21 11:12 depressing 69:16 determines 120:16 54:17 213:11,14 directly 83:15 164:3 23:5 45:21 46:6,18 derived 220:1 determining 104:5 director 11:1 distinctly 187:19 47:9,18 48:15,20 describe 193:13 detour 71:5 disabled 83:21 84:3 distinguish 200:6 49:1 50:7 114:13 described 145:17 devastating 71:5 disadvantaged distinguished 64:3 147:11 204:6 186:1 develop 84:15 65:17 140:20 Draconian 185:17 deserving 194:22 162:21 disagree 30:5 110:8 **District** 60:11,11 draft 184:18 design 101:8 developed 143:13 118:18 64:6,7,22 174:7 drafter 173:12 designed 84:5 98:12 developing 93:3 disagreed 60:15 disturbance 178:17 drafting 182:22 128:18 198:17 186:9 disappear 190:17 diverse 74:1,2,3 183:4 designing 98:14 development 80:2 disapprove 180:21 217:22 draining 35:5 desire 69:11 166:8 devolution 25:20 185:22 diversification dramatic 14:10 167:1 27:18 disbursal 46:11 12:20 22:16 despite 8:4 34:2 de-humanizes discern 146:12 diversity 13:6 74:4 dramatically 143:1 69:18 182:7 194:5 169:10 divide 151:2 drawn 20:14 50:19 destinations 16:1 dialogue 78:1 discourage 79:16 divided 151:16 draws 16:4 **destiny** 220:16 170:16 171:8,11 discourse 194:15 205:8,9 dream 8:5 67:7 destroyed 156:7 178:12 210:11,19 discovery 163:19 dividing 149:12 dress 55:6 197:21 210:21 215:12 207:20 division 115:4 152:7 drinking 93:22 detail 41:19 99:3 217:16 218:11,15 discretion 79:6,7 205:7 drive 197:7 198:13 158:12 172:2 218:18 80:16 82:5 doctrine 53:3 driven 12:22 17:22 details 71:21 101:16 dialysis 38:18,19,21 discrimination 6:12 document 193:17 22:12 46:8 114:8 200:2 diamond 10:14 7:18 8:1 61:9 documentary 193:7 driver 159:4,5,6 detain 6:8 29:3 dictated 26:16 167:6 172:1,20,22 documentation driver's 69:7 120:12 32:20 33:7,9 42:8 difference 109:14 172:22 160:8 195:1,5 120:13 160:9 43:4.18 44:22 45:3 135:14 213:21 discuss 75:6 81:8 documented 116:6 184:22 185:4 45:8 96:18 101:13 differences 149:18 153:18 documents 159:11 189:2 detainable 178:16 different 43:2 57:6 discussed 96:9 185:3 217:5 driveways 94:2 detained 43:10 79:22 119:6 149:7 172:1 173:9 Doe 80:15 driving 13:21 46:2 119:9 137:19 152:11 180:3 181:22 dog 170:13 46:4 122:20 136:3

	-	-	-	
157:4,13,22	161:2 165:13	89:20 90:2,8,11	enforcement's 92:8	essential 173:3
drop 22:8	177:2,4,20 183:2,3	107:16 115:11	enforcing 152:15,22	211:16 222:1
dropping 22:7	183:7,9	emerges 70:20	engage 34:22 35:1	essentially 77:6
drove 4:5	effective 95:16	emerging 23:21,22	169:8 170:16	165:9 187:20
drugs 157:17	101:5 153:2 194:4	emotional 164:8	218:15	199:10 213:10
drunk 136:2,3	effectively 95:10	emphasis 110:11	engaging 149:10	218:8 219:16
137:3	100:4	empirical 104:16,18	152:17	establish 96:11
due 80:10 147:21	effects 73:17 74:10	140:9	English 55:10,12	101:10 153:11
160:22 163:7,14	155:15 160:14	employee 192:16	120:14 123:5	established 119:18
duration 42:3	effort 186:17	employees 83:13	enjoy 71:6	147:18 189:13
duty 8:15	efforts 69:18 81:4	employer 215:22	enlarged 162:14	estimate 86:8 89:14
D.Č 10:8 13:11	144:19 215:11	216:3	219:9	estimated 108:12
209:19	egregious 156:4	employers 217:8	enlightened 222:11	estimates 18:16
	eight 98:16 168:17	employment 12:22	enormous 87:20	21:6
E	210:22	27:8,14 105:4	enormously 5:1	et 81:21 104:13
earlier 57:21 63:12	Eighties 165:8	enable 165:1	enrolled 188:4	ethically 130:1
75:21 95:11 96:9	Eighty 80:1	enables 164:12	ensure 153:11	ethnic 6:11 13:6
101:12 103:21	eight-hour 122:14	enact 164:1	enter 151:3	ethnicity-based
131:10 134:4	either 42:16 44:7	enacted 6:9 208:22	entered 67:5 179:18	54:22
176:19 192:14	63:3 64:1 84:12	221:15	entire 79:20 113:11	European 14:18
early 13:2 124:22	111:17 120:17	enacting 52:3 166:1	169:3 212:21	evaluation 101:1
125:5 173:15	125:3,9 138:19	enactment 221:1	entities 97:13	128:17
215:9	142:21 156:22	encountered 148:10	entitled 53:17,20	eventually 215:19
earnings 50:5	187:15 205:2,9	encounters 210:13	163:13	everybody 20:18
ears 146:12,15	El 120:13	encourage 6:11	environment	62:9 187:8 203:18
ease 48:13	elapsed 9:15	222:20	127:11	everybody's 141:1
easily 189:3	elderly 83:21 84:1,3	encouraged 49:8	epithet 197:8	evidence 50:18
Eastern 1:1 174:7	elected 63:3 64:7,18	encouraging 195:22	equal 38:3 46:10	104:16 108:1
easy 43:22 183:17	64:21 65:2 66:19	ended 95:17 198:16	47:6 53:10 54:9	125:4 126:22
economic 49:6,17	72:5	endorsed 100:7	80:12 153:4	127:7,21,22 128:1
50:1 104:2 111:3	election 64:20 65:2	ends 85:6	201:14	140:10 160:11
150:16 151:19	66:12 68:6 152:1	enforce 28:19 29:17	equally 29:6 54:15	171:7 175:5
economically 50:10	198:3 205:6	30:1,19 31:11,16	194:8	181:15,19 187:1
economists 105:3	element 128:11	32:5 58:13,19	equation 167:11	187:22 193:9
economy 51:15	elicit 130:6	216:19 220:21	equivocation 66:16	222:22
111:15	eligibility 82:13	221:10	era 67:12	evidenced 151:22
Ed 8:21 45:19 62:4	eligible 112:10	enforced 156:9	Eric 2:17 3:15	evolved 27:3,21
207:7 209:11	114:17,18,22	221:8	139:22 141:2,5	70:14 202:8
edicts 69:22	115:15,20	enforcement 5:13	142:2	evolving 65:8
editorial 206:5	eliminating 70:1	5:15,18 25:22	Eritrea 156:16	exacerbated 7:1
EDMUND 1:13	elites 68:21	27:10 28:2,8,13	err 126:6	exact 129:13 181:11
educate 204:16	elucidate 8:3 107:5	29:8 30:14,16 31:2	erring 126:6	exactly 14:9 29:20
educated 11:6	email 144:21	76:22 77:15 79:17	ESL 161:8	53:2 67:9 214:18
education 20:11	embarrassment	84:9 92:7,9,10	especially 30:6	exaggeration 69:2
37:7 100:7 200:1 206:22	192:18	108:9 152:18	42:21 67:12	examined 78:13,14
educational 134:9	emergencies 89:21	183:13 202:4	102:22 105:13	79:19
effect 6:11 126:21	emergency 63:21	215:22 216:3,14	155:16 207:16	example 49:20
120:21	79:14 89:11,11,14	222:3	essence 16:16	52:12 53:16 54:13
Edited the State of the State of State	-	-	•	•

57:2 58:15 62:7	132:21	192:16 204:13	185:15 195:3	felonies 217:6
82:2 83:1 87:22	explain 18:18 73:15	218:5 221:7	fascinated 181:15	felony 31:21 138:7
104:10,21 118:1	exploitation 167:1,3	factor 122:8 124:11	fascinating 141:7	felt 129:5 144:15,21
120:5,13 122:11	167:4	179:21 191:1	fastest 86:4	155:15
128:5 133:22	express 189:20	201:10	Father 219:6	females 54:16
184:11,20 187:4	expressed 193:15	factors 50:5	fathers 71:8	Fernandez 198:6
202:14	211:5	facts 5:14,19 6:3	fault 146:10	fertility 12:16
exasperatedly	expressing 215:6	105:6 119:15	favor 162:15 167:6	festivals 142:16
216:15	expressly 161:22	166:5	FBI 7:3	field 25:14
exceed 42:2,18	extended 77:12	fact-finding 104:8	fear 174:12,13,14	figure 72:17 105:5
excellent 177:20	extension 33:17	104:11	fears 149:15	137:12 138:15
exception 190:21	extent 6:3 114:5	fail 217:4	February 77:17	figures 104:22
exceptions 213:15	126:6,18 174:3	failed 76:11,13	131:11	135:6 168:3,7
excluded 39:5	184:5	121:10 146:11	federal 5:12,19	file 217:4
exclusive 26:11	extra 41:13 184:13	188:22 197:21	21:10 25:21 26:12	film 142:14,15,15
exclusively 88:17	extraordinarily	200:21	26:16 28:17 29:3	143:22 195:11
170:6	82:8 221:3	failing 49:9 58:13	30:13,21 31:1,16	filmmaker 141:5
excuse 171:9 188:21	extraordinary	failure 82:19 151:9	40:9 42:13 43:3,7	142:11
executing 39:15	25:15 34:9 186:7	220:21	43:13 44:5 58:6,12	final 47:10 62:3
Executive 4:21 78:5	220:7	fair 49:16 52:14	58:18 59:3,7,14,19	122:13 161:17
97:12 101:7 134:4	extrapolate 129:18	98:4 101:14 144:6	60:4,7 61:18 70:11	207:7
exemption 84:11	extremely 198:10	146:7 163:11	76:11,19 77:5,9	finally 9:9
exercise 170:19	extremes 206:16	164:2 167:5	78:22 79:12 81:19	financial 87:17
exercising 79:7	eyes 146:12,14	169:21 188:16	82:1 85:4 92:13	90:16
exist 47:15		190:3,7,7,18,20	102:12 110:15	find 29:4 50:8 51:16
existence 213:9	F	214:13 218:13	112:7,12 114:8	63:5 68:20 86:15
existing 143:10	F 1:16	fairly 9:12 18:3	124:20 125:3,9,13	120:19 140:22
211:20 220:5,21	face 24:1 164:7	22:7	146:10 150:20	141:11,13,14
exists 212:11	faced 156:3	fairness 163:8 190:6	151:9,12 152:16	154:10 195:21
exodus 128:8	facie 174:11,21	218:7	175:21 176:1	212:8 215:13
expand 89:9	facilities 5:2 82:13	FAIR's 190:7,10	179:11,20 184:19	finding 186:20
expect 17:10 66:19	223:10	faith 149:3 184:9	189:8 202:4	fine 43:14 65:12
68:4 69:7 77:15	facility 178:10	204:22 206:17	federalism 27:1	finished 71:8
expectation 100:18	fact 7:22 34:2 45:3	216:10	29:22	Firefighters 63:13
expeditiously	45:7 51:8 52:6,9	fall 114:3 196:3	federally 79:14	firm 170:6 214:12
139:20	53:19 63:7,16	false 121:1 149:19	Federal-State	first 4:10,14,20,20
experience 65:7	66:17 67:3 74:16	familiar 5:11 34:18	189:15 221:22	5:9 8:19 9:16 10:5
139:8 155:9	75:1,19 88:1 97:1	41:16	Federation 141:21	12:16 25:9,16 28:5
experienced 7:22	103:11 105:6	families 7:12 19:16	162:4,10 170:4	29:14 33:18 48:22
17:5 196:8	108:5,11,15,20	19:18 20:4 81:21	feel 7:13 113:10	64:8 66:21 70:7,8
experiences 145:8	110:16 111:7	151:3 167:10	127:10 143:16	71:7 75:3,12 84:19
156:15	112:3 114:11	174:13	146:7 191:13	95:3 102:19
experiencing 50:16	117:20 122:8,9	family 50:14 63:21	197:13 209:17	103:18 105:11
51:13	123:14 124:21	83:5,6 147:15	feeling 70:4 126:17	109:10 127:15
expert 8:12 12:9	130:9 131:9	148:1 160:21	195:9	128:17 136:6
25:18 49:15	133:15 140:7	197:1,1	feelings 104:17	142:7 146:19
142:10	179:17 180:16	far 46:21 136:19	143:19	147:18 157:2
experts 8:10 104:12	182:7 190:22	139:8 152:11	fellow 192:11 223:4	176:13 177:6
	l	l	l	1

180:9 181:3,13,18	208:18	26:5	G	Gerhart 2:10 3:10
182:16 185:1	follows 81:17	France 69:5	gain 167:2	4:22 63:11,12
199:13 207:6	207:10	franchise 144:7	Gainesville 64:5,7	65:21 72:17 78:4,8
Firth 154:19 180:16	follow-up 54:6	Franklin 71:11,19	66:15	113:7,19 114:4
207:17 219:22	117:9	frankly 37:14 61:19		124:17 125:5
fiscal 82:8	food 81:21	76:10 169:13	game 216:11	126:2 128:16
fit 50:3 203:22	footage 193:20	205:4 219:3	gamut 79:20	130:8,13,16 131:7
five 10:14 22:19	foray 25:17	fraudulent 217:5	gang 75:10 92:22	132:6,15,17
27:6,16 28:7 88:20	force 20:6,8,16,17	Freda 2:3 223:7	93:12 96:5 108:10	139:15
99:12 142:3	164:13 166:22	free 90:18	gangs 92:18,19 93:8	getting 15:21 73:6
146:21,21 147:1	204:18	freedom 71:6 80:17	gap 111:3	93:7 182:3 187:20
150:13 161:6	forced 76:15 146:11	198:1	Garcia 109:5	188:18
170:9	160:10	frequently 35:2	gather 5:14,19 6:3	giant 25:11
five-minute 62:19	foreign 26:13,14	FRIDAY 1:5	125:4	gifted 148:6
fix 206:2,2	93:14 202:10,10	friendships 143:13	gathering 177:10	gist 11:22
flag 120:11	foreign-born 23:8	frightening 144:12	186:19	Giuliani 60:3,15
flame 152:6	23:10	198:4	Gaziano 1:16 8:22	give 9:14,20 25:12
flashing 45:5	foremost 75:12	front 189:22 217:19	41:2,9 43:21 44:16	38:20 45:7 59:19
fled 93:9	forget 9:4 71:4	fruit 145:22	45:16 118:11	
flee 36:1,8	forgot 41:6	fruition 30:9	119:12 120:2,7	69:20 81:1,3 95:12
fleet 83:13	formal 127:15	frustrating 88:2	121:20 122:3,12	119:15 120:3
flows 48:1,5	format 106:22	fueled 12:12	207:9 211:4	128:19 143:17
fluency 55:9	formed 211:12		gears 113:6	168:1 184:20
fluid 59:12	former 13:9 50:20	fuels 152:5	gem 25:11	given 27:19 29:21
fly 185:5		fugitives 93:9	gender 57:2	30:6 36:11 69:7
focus 12:7 99:12	forming 70:2 152:21	fulfill 90:13	general 29:15 31:9	83:19 111:10
1		fulfilled 67:20	80:3 102:12	114:1 121:13
100:4,13,21 101:18 149:15	forth 68:3 143:6	fulfilling 166:7	129:18 137:5	159:3 160:20
	fortify 198:5	full 98:15 105:4	148:13 150:2	163:15 186:8
178:1 190:5 191:18 220:5	Forty-seven 89:3	122:11 145:7	153:13 196:16	212:6
	Forum 97:12 101:7	164:11	207:2	gives 121:1 152:6
221:13	170:4	fully 79:11	generalizations	197:3
focused 27:20 47:12	forward 62:14	function 32:16,20	56:7	give-away 72:19
94:11	70:18 72:10 78:1	81:10	generalized 60:21	giving 78:9 113:1
focuses 11:3	79:11 85:7 95:7	functional 80:2	generally 50:9	118:15
focusing 11:20	125:17 139:21	fundamental	51:15 54:12 68:10	glad 36:17 63:13
47:17 103:4 158:8	182:5 208:2	111:21 154:6	126:16 133:3	73:12 105:9
fog 4:6 122:21	foster 210:19,21	163:8 213:11,20	216:21 217:4	global 165:13
folks 79:4 84:12,17	211:18	218:7	Generals 29:18 30:7	go 10:5 25:6 38:11
129:8,19 205:14	found 7:21 15:9	fundamentally	generation 14:3,11	50:9 51:15 68:3,17
205:20 222:10	51:7 131:17 148:3	205:21	generations 7:13	72:21 78:7 84:16
follow 48:22 56:16	218:17	funds 58:6	generosity 50:22	95:7 119:8,9 133:1
99:9 101:3 122:17	founding 71:8	further 45:9 119:20	generous 51:2,8,9	157:10 159:1
127:20 130:4	four 12:17 18:8,20	151:8 156:14	51:11 148:10	172:16 173:22
134:22 138:8	19:8 79:22 167:16	205:18	gentleman 209:3	184:14 192:2
180:13 189:16	167:19	future 119:3 153:1	geographic 12:20	193:7 207:7 210:8
followed 67:19	Fourth 203:6	218:3 219:2	Georgetown 161:4	215:7 216:12
157:15 208:10	frame 36:20	fuzzy 59:12	Georgia 16:22 17:1	goals 215:4
following 10:21	framework 24:20			goes 118:17 158:11
	•			1

182:5	131:14 150:10	grown 18:4 86:7,9	183:6 186:4	186:22 207:21
going 4:3 8:9 9:12	151:10,12 156:2,6	198:11	198:12 199:1	hearings 5:20 9:4
9:13,17,20 10:2	170:15 171:13	growth 12:6,12,15	204:17	heart-breaking
12:8,19 16:1,6,7	184:19 189:8	13:6 14:1,2,11	happens 138:15	88:1
19:7 21:18 23:20	204:12 206:20	17:5,8,20 18:5,8	182:2 204:20	heavily 126:3
37:17,18,20,21,22	223:10	46:2,5,9,10,16	206:10	heavy 201:5
40:21 43:22 49:21	governments 58:6	48:18 50:16 51:10	happy 106:5 173:7	Hector 75:20
58:11,14 62:16	58:18 156:5	51:13 86:10	174:4 176:6 210:7	heightened 125:22
63:15,22 83:7	government's	165:15 188:8	222:15	heightening 206:14
89:14 98:15,20,21	146:10 152:16	191:1	harassment 185:15	held 95:13,15 135:7
99:2,8 100:2,10,10	governs 80:17	guarantees 38:3	harboring 31:18	135:9 136:8 137:7
100:12,13,16	graduation 63:13	guess 62:17 65:14	hard 8:7 21:18	137:17 139:2
102:18 112:18,20	Graham 172:9	66:3 137:11	41:15 47:20 48:11	145:2
113:3,5 121:4,4	Graham's 172:12	186:16,17	133:6,9,14,16	help 73:15 101:10
126:1 128:1,2	granting 112:15	Guevera 109:4	harder 44:2	144:7 145:12
135:4 138:3	graphic 91:16	guide 81:2	hardship 49:6,17	198:17 199:2
139:18,18 140:16	great 69:4 73:8	guided 80:8	50:2 104:2	204:16 206:21,22
142:1,2,15 143:1,6	77:21 86:11 88:12	guidelines 83:20	hard-working 67:4	207:1 209:4 223:7
143:21 147:2,6,7	116:15 117:4	guilty 217:8	87:21	helpful 5:1,7 73:7
164:10 175:3	123:6 124:18	guys 112:1,13	harming 201:16	208:1 209:14
179:6,15 180:17	147:21 158:12	171:12	harsh 206:6	210:11 222:19
182:3,10 187:13	173:5 207:18		hate 7:4,7 28:5	223:3
188:3 199:8 208:2	219:12	H	196:14,20	helpless 144:16
211:7 212:8	greatly 213:17	half 13:15 18:21	Hawaii 196:8	Heraldo 109:5
215:17,20 216:12	greed 167:1	40:19 105:2 111:2	hazard 171:12	heritage 70:7
216:17 217:18	Greene 2:3 223:7	161:8 190:16	Hazleton 184:10	Hesburgh 219:6
218:5 222:7,16	Greg 4:22	210:22	heads 103:17,18	Hethmon 2:19 3:20
Goldsmith 209:22	Greve 1:18 9:9	half-Chinese 196:7	health 65:8 82:2,19	139:22 141:3,17
good 24:14 34:15	123:21	Hall 71: 9	85:21 88:3,6,9	169:15,22 170:1
112:17 123:5	grew 18:13 196:7,8	hand 123:9 145:5	90:14 114:6 115:4	171:10,18 174:19
153:4 154:21	gross 56:7 86:21	206:3	115:5,9 116:1,2	175:3 176:6
169:22 177:5	87:2	handed 196:19	118:9 145:22	180:14,22 181:6,9
181:9,15 183:19	ground 124:19	handle 88:10 97:15	healthy 18:9 55:18	181:21 183:7,16
184:20 187:4	grounds 53:10	177:6	55:22	186:6 201:22
195:22 207:2	61:10 201:15	hands 40:8	heaps 169:10	202:1 203:16
223:8	group 17:3,15 46:17	hands-down 39:18	hear 125:14 140:18	204:3 209:13
goods 68:1	46:20 88:10,16,16	hand-out 16:11	153:7 181:6	211:8,9 212:14,18
gotten 15:22 60:17	141:20 154:20	90:20	heard 63:18 97:11	214:15
got-you 192:2	164:3 178:3	hand-wringing	107:17 110:4	high 14:13 15:2,3
government 6:7	195:17 207:18	185:9	127:4 140:13	20:18 57:3 67:13
21:10,12 26:12	grouped 79:22	happen 65:9 186:2	149:21 151:17	82:9 113:15,21
28:17 30:21 31:1	groups 8:12 47:14	216:1 222:9	169:17 180:15	higher 20:8,19
42:13 43:3,7 58:9	56:8 99:3 140:19	happened 155:10	193:8 216:5,6	151:14
58:12 59:3,8,14,14	194:18	185:7 192:3,8	219:21 220:19	highest 57:7,13
59:16,19 60:4,8	growing 14:22	happening 18:19	hearing 8:1,10	59:22 115:13
61:18 69:21 76:11	18:14 22:14 23:9	144:17 156:14	45:22 106:9	150:9
78:14 80:3 84:11	86:5 90:3 111:6	160:16 178:7,19	118:15 121:11	highly 26:21
85:5 125:10	145:21	179:14 180:8	122:10 154:4	high-risk 94:18
		•	•	

Hill 211:1 hinted 61:21 hire 88:16 166:22 hired 88:15 Hispanic 7:20 10:7 12:15 16:13,18 17:21 18:12 22:20 23:1 46:1,2,5,10 46:18,21 47:1,3,12 47:17 55:4 128:7 **Hispanics** 7:4,7,10 7:17,19,21 8:4 17:10 22:11 Hispanic-sounding 55:3 historic 16:14 46:7 historical 172:4 historically 15:10 15:15 26:10 74:2 history 31:13 70:16 71:21 92:5 206:1 hit 136:3,4 hold 5:20 6:18 43:13 45:13,14 100:14 holding 164:14 holds 10:17 home 7:14 38:17 147:20 148:17,19 154:15 157:22 192:14 207:2,4 homeless 84:3 homes 83:22 84:6 143:15 honest 148:20 honestly 178:5 200:16 201:11 honor 154:22 hope 8:12 140:18 148:17,20 153:22 154:4,7,12 162:1 169:6 209:1 hopeful 221:6 hopefully 216:21 **Hopkins** 10:18 hospital 65:5 85:15 85:15 86:22 87:5 90:10,13 107:16

114:14 116:8 hospitals 75:5 85:14 85:16,18,20 87:19 90:9 107:16 111:17 117:5 131:15 150:18 hostility 149:13 152:6 hour 40:20 hours 77:4 98:16 159:16 207:14 house 52:19 69:19 70:12 households 20:1 houses 161:3,6 housing 27:9 75:7 93:22 107:21 152:15 168:21 169:2 Hugh 172:9 human 66:7 70:21 80:5 141:20 153:5 154:6.20 155:1.6 170:11 172:16 181:10 182:1,15 194:8 210:8,13 humanly 186:11 hundred 162:19 167:16,19,21 hurt 143:19 hypothetical 56:6

I ICE 96:5 100:11 136:14,16 138:20 139:4,7 160:18 161:1 164:15 179:21 ICP 97:11 idea 166:3 185:16 204:4 217:21 ideas 120:3 identification 84:7 84:10 159:11 160:8 212:20 identified 28:7 74:13,14,15,16

180:18 181:22

identify 78:21 80:22 99:17 164:14 identifying 212:5 identity 68:13 149:19 idly 169:4 ill 89:19 illegal 6:8,22 31:19 46:1,3,22 48:14 49:5,7 52:4 66:9,9 71:22 73:16 74:9 74:10,12,18,20 75:10 76:7 77:2 78:15 80:10 82:21 92:22 94:8,9,14 95:4 96:3 104:1 105:15 108:7,11 108:15,20 109:8 109:19 110:3,5,12 112:6 116:17 126:15 127:7 128:9 129:3,20 131:12 133:8 135:8 138:7 140:11 150:12,15 150:17 151:8 152:3,9 153:18 159:10 161:20 162:18 163:4 164:9,14 166:10 166:18,22 167:7 168:21 175:20 182:14 184:14 185:2 188:10 189:11 190:4,6,8 193:16 194:11,11 194:16 200:6 208:4,5 211:22 221:18,18 illegality 111:13 illegally 52:10 75:2 79:5 84:18 96:20 111:9 112:2 137:7 151:4 163:12,17

80:7 81:18,22 82:4

96:3 107:14,15,18

107:20 129:20

192:15 illustrate 156:13 imagine 38:16 69:3 imagined 155:19 immediately 115:14 170:18 196:11 198:19 immigrant 11:5 14:14,16,20 17:18 20:7 23:15 35:11 47:14,21 54:8 74:7 126:14,15,16 143:4 146:4 150:16 158:6 159:21 170:22 178:3 immigrants 6:8 14:5,7,8,12 15:1,6 15:21,22 16:7,9,10 17:16 19:5,7,17,17 19:20 20:7,19,21 21:4,6,14 22:11,14 23:11 24:9 46:20 46:21,22 47:4 48:7 50:9,11,13,17,19 51:3,5,6,7,15,21 74:21 75:10 77:2 92:22 93:20 110:20,22 116:17 129:3,21 140:10 140:11 156:4 161:1,19 200:7 immigrate 67:16 198:18 immigration 1:2.13 4:15 6:15,19,21,22 8:19 11:3,4,21 12:13,18 13:20 14:19 15:20 17:22 18:1 22:12 24:2,22 25:22 26:8,11,20 27:11 28:2,14,19 29:2,9,17 30:1,13 30:14,15,16,17,20 31:3,6,8,11,17,18 31:20 32:5 33:1,11 33:18 35:22 36:7

42:7 45:11 46:1,1

180:10

46:9 47:12,13 48:14 49:5,7,9 50:8 51:20,22 52:4 54:13 60:5 61:2,8 66:9 67:2 73:17 74:5,10,12,19 76:1 76:22 78:16 86:16 86:17 92:6,11,15 93:4,8,10 95:21 97:2 100:15 101:20,22 103:8 104:2 105:15 108:7,8 110:12,14 112:7,12 117:15 119:3,10 121:7 128:3 131:13 132:1 133:4 135:10 137:20 141:18,19,22 146:3 149:7,10,16 149:20,22 150:5 150:11,17,22 151:8,11,21 152:3 152:10,17 153:18 154:5,19 155:1,6 158:5 159:18 160:7 161:12,14 162:5,11,12,15,18 163:4,9 164:9 165:17 166:10,18 167:14 168:21 169:18 170:1,4,22 171:21 172:6,19 173:10 175:22 176:2 182:6 187:11,14 188:9 188:11 189:11 190:4,4,6,8,9,12 191:2 193:16 202:5,8 205:16 209:18 211:17 212:13 215:2.10 216:19,22 217:3 218:3 219:1,4,15 220:15 221:1 222:2 immigration-based

165:2 167:8

immigration-rela	includes 7:2	93:19	institution 114:15	interstate 42:14
170:8	including 7:11	inform 29:3 72:5	instructional 78:20	intervention 84:4
impact 13:21 14:1	41:20 168:11	information 8:13	instructive 193:22	175:22
24:5 38:14 78:15	170:14 183:21	44:18 59:2,18 60:9	instrumental 103:1	interview 120:18
82:6 90:16 101:5	incomes 20:12 21:2	60:16,22 63:5	insults 70:4	interviewed 144:15
104:14,15,17	inconvenienced	80:17,18 81:1,3	insurance 86:3	intimidated 144:21
111:15,16 113:21	217:12	129:2 130:6	145:22	intolerant 148:22
127:16,17 140:10	inconveniencing	133:10 143:10	integral 188:19	introduce 4:19 8:18
150:17 220:1	216:20	150:7 187:14	integrated 189:4	10:4 64:3,5
221:16	incorporated	188:18 192:21	integration 11:5	introduced 24:15
impacted 101:4	152:18	193:11 222:19	intend 76:18	introduction 3:3
impacts 13:5 22:13	increase 46:4	informative 62:14	intensive 87:12 89:3	11:14 147:12
81:9 82:8,22 107:1	117:21 136:4	informed 172:13	intensive 67.12 69.5	inundated 88:7
imperative 214:3	increased 88:12	informing 157:18	intention 52:9	investigated 94:7
implement 96:15	110:19 208:5	infrastructure	intentionally 97:9	investigation
209:5 221:11	increasing 21:17	169:3	186:18	124:20
implementation	90:6,11 93:16	inherent 29:17 30:1	interaction 172:4	invitation 204:15,15
27:22 131:2	incur 118:4	30:4	interconnected	invited 143:14
implemented 52:8	indecent 148:22	initial 208:16	214:2	150:6
63:8 113:11	Independence 71:9	initially 46:14 163:6	interest 70:1 103:9	inviting 11:13 25:9
implementing	independent 5:12	initiate 77:8	103:10 126:1	85:13
39:20 140:17	Indian 47:16	initiated 176:14	162:15 167:9	involve 121:8
implications 103:11	Indians 47:16	initiative 183:1	170:6,7 171:19	involved 17:6 93:7
implying 148:15	indicate 121:10	initiatives 52:3,8	219:9	93:21 114:5 140:8
important 29:7 33:4	indicates 85:17	181:7 183:18	interested 69:21	140:9,14 143:16
34:3 35:14 36:20	203:8	186:4	171:11	165:11 175:12
37:8 39:8,11 40:12	indication 9:15	injuries 175:17	interesting 12:13	196:13 209:20
66:21 92:4 98:8,10	indicia 54:8,18,22	injury 174:21	21:21 41:22	involves 174:20
99:4 100:8 197:14	55:8 202:11	inmates 108:20	181:20 201:20	involves 174.20
212:2 219:2,4	indicias 57:13	inquire 29:2 44:4	interestingly 17:14	IRAIRA 59:6
importantly 151:1	indigent 88:17	54:14,15 55:22	interfere 29:8	irrespective 79:1
impose 96:14	individual 27:4	96:21 104:13	interior 215:21	82:20
imposed 116:16	52:18 83:15 96:20	118:20,21 119:2,7	216:2	issue 28:13 30:8
117:4	98:16 120:8 121:7	119:14	Internal 85:19	34:14 36:17 40:1
imposition 222:8	121:9,10,12 122:7	inquiries 52:17 54:9	international 11:9	60:18 68:4 69:15
impossible 208:3	124:14 222:8	125:21	34:10 42:13	69:16 71:22 76:10
imprimatur 84:10	individuals 67:5	INS 42:7,8 44:4	120:12 165:15	92:3,21 93:12,19
improper 186:10	69:7,12 81:14	188:2,2	internet 144:11	94:13 95:3,5 97:10
INA 43:1	93:15 95:13 127:5	insisted 184:4	interpretation 27:4	99:6 100:18 102:1
inaccurate 149:5	214:22 220:5	instance 116:18	interpreted 27:5	102:10 107:15,15
inception 155:16	221:17	144:9 158:17	188:5	108:6 124:10
incidence 208:4	infants 82:3	instant 165:20	interrupt 182:18	143:14 144:10
incident 159:15	inferring 133:12	instinct 71:22	199:9 217:11	149:16 150:5
incidents 7:6 177:12	inflate 137:16	Institute 13:10	interrupted 160:1	151:7,13 154:7
193:17	influence 184:17	24:18 26:3 50:21	interrupting 217:13	162:22 164:5
include 81:20 82:11	185:17	141:18 169:19	interruption 57:9	165:19 168:14
included 79:9,21	influential 10:16	170:2	intersect 124:22	169:12 172:14
80:9 83:20 184:10	influx 92:18 93:14	Institute's 11:1	intersection 11:4	173:16 176:21
	I	I	l	

177:22 186:9	51:16 111:2	keeping 73:13	196:12,13 197:7,9	lastly 154:12
191:18 204:10	John 2:9 3:9 64:6	key 16:12	199:3 200:2,20	late 51:1 63:15
205:19 209:20	65:14 74:13	kids 21:15	201:1,2,5 203:3,4	latest 13:13 18:16
214:7,12,14 215:8	106:16 216:15	kind 11:14 59:12	203:6,17,18 210:1	Latin 48:10 145:20
218:20	Johns 10:18	70:2 94:3 99:8	210:9 211:11	Latino 11:20 13:18
issued 30:3	Johnson 153:20	104:11 118:4	214:6,11 216:16	14:6,21 16:22
issues 6:19 38:9	199:13	119:15 122:10	216:17 218:6,17	18:22 22:14 23:11
39:7 40:10 54:12	Johnson-Firth 2:21	131:5 145:9 166:6	219:14 222:6,7	23:16 92:19
56:22 61:1,2,3	3:18 140:1 141:3	174:3 175:11	knowing 59:4	158:18 159:2,21
66:10 80:7 93:17	141:19 154:18,21	182:11 185:17	153:21 204:17	175:19 195:7,13
93:18,21 94:4	155:5 161:17	189:4 196:5 197:9	knowledge 25:14	196:5,7 197:15
97:14,15,16,18	176:12 177:5	202:11 207:1	155:9	Latinos 12:6 13:3
101:11 103:4	179:5 200:11	210:4,14,15 214:7	known 40:4 94:18	13:12 14:5,8 15:9
107:20 114:14	209:10 222:21	kinds 20:12 94:2	189:18 190:2	15:16 19:4 178:2
130:15 131:3	join 63:16 147:14	100:12 145:19	knows 35:21	laughed 69:13
140:8 150:11	joined 10:7 65:21	185:8 194:12		laughter 69:14
160:13 161:14	147:17	212:12 221:14	L	law 11:2,4,8 27:11
164:8 172:18	joining 9:11 91:4	knew 108:12 129:9	La 2:2 9:2 223:6	27:21 28:2,8,10,14
173:9 182:6	206:19	131:18 132:3	label 169:10	28:20 29:9,17 30:1
186:10 201:14	Jordan 219:7	134:16 207:13	labor 11:4 20:6,8,16	30:18,20 31:11,17
210:12,14 222:12	Journal-Messinger	know 4:6 11:17	20:17 87:21	32:3,5,19 34:15
Ivy 2:2 223:6	152:14	12:3 26:10 35:17	150:16 166:16	36:20 37:15 43:21
	Jr 1:13,21 9:1	36:5,19 37:6,14	167:5 192:4,9	45:11 52:16 53:13
J	Juan 109:4	39:10 40:4 48:16	laborers 27:14	56:20 58:4,13,18
J2:12 3:11	judge 175:13 213:4	50:4 51:14 52:15	lack 87:22 166:4	61:6,20 67:14,19
jail 75:22 95:7,10	judicial 175:22	58:10,21 59:2,8	220:4	70:14,14,18 71:4
95:13 97:8 108:14	judicious 151:14	60:16 61:19,20	lacks 206:5	78:22 79:12,17
108:20 119:9	July 77:11 78:18	62:6 71:20,21	Lacy 1:21 8:22	81:19 82:2 84:9
129:20 138:12,13	96:7 164:1	72:18 75:8 81:6	lag 68:10	92:8,9 100:15
jails 75:8 77:3,5,9	jump 218:8	87:13 99:4 100:18	lagging 139:5,6	101:15 102:12
132:1,5 150:18	jumped 217:19	102:2 104:4,15	lament 153:8	110:19 112:7,12
160:17	jurisdiction 197:12	108:8,11 114:3	land 63:19 148:6	114:9 138:3
James 1:6	jurisdictions 33:2	116:17 119:4	156:12 179:10	141:18,20 149:20
January 77:17	57:22 127:9,9	120:10 123:13	landlords 52:13	150:1,21 153:1,2
98:19 131:10	150:21 152:17	124:22 128:3	landscape 70:22	154:8,20 156:15
156:9 177:20	jurisprudence	137:3 142:14,22	language 69:9 124:1	157:4,8,12 169:1
179:8	26:18,22 203:7	143:2,2,13,17	124:4,10 201:9	169:19 170:1,6
Japan 69:6	justice 129:7,11	145:20 154:2	202:10	171:21 172:19,19
JD 65:5	130:15 133:2	159:20 164:19	large 15:13 17:15	172:21 175:22
Jean 209:22	153:11 159:17	165:1 166:5,7,9,19	48:3 55:11 62:18	176:2 179:7,8,9,13
Jeff 2:18 3:16 11:10	208:17	173:10 177:12	81:13 87:11 161:3	183:12 201:13
139:22 141:3,15		178:17 179:3,16	largely 14:21 17:4	202:5,8,9 205:16
141:16	<u>K</u>	180:5 182:3,10,11	17:18,22 20:14	205:21 213:2,6
Jeffrey 2:6 3:5 10:6	Katrina 17:13	182:12,14 184:12	46:8 47:12 129:6	214:3 216:19
Jersey 75:18	keep 23:20 30:10	184:16 185:17	176:22	217:3,3 218:1
job 50:16 51:13	43:6 71:19 72:7	187:21 191:15	larger 20:2 82:22	220:13,13,20
83:5 88:5 164:4	86:17,18 118:14	192:11 194:3,9,11	largest 46:20,22	lawful 39:5 98:4
jobs 20:11,15 50:15	148:18 208:18	194:12 195:3,4	162:11	156:16 158:9,19
i e			1	1

159:17 160:1	26:4 29:14 30:2,5	124:19,19 125:3	literally 7:13	long 10:9 43:6
173:17 184:21	37:1,16 39:1 41:17	150:10 152:19	litigate 165:4	101:13 147:6
201:17 202:14	44:10 46:19,21	184:19 189:14	litigated 58:22 59:1	172:4 175:20
lawfully 96:18	47:4,21 48:7 52:20	200:20	164:20	177:22 181:10
120:21	53:5,9 58:3 67:2	levels 15:3 20:10	little 4:7 9:14,21	202:17,20 211:22
lawfully-stated	67:21 74:5,7 80:8	66:19 162:16	13:4,7 21:12,18	215:7
156:21	80:10 81:5 82:5,7	liberal 76:12	50:18 56:16 62:17	longer 15:21 112:5
lawlessness 49:6,18	82:21 83:6 97:15	liberties 11:5	87:8 92:5 103:15	112:6 151:12
104:3,19	104:12 109:12,18	liberty 141:8 153:14	104:8 105:12	158:11 177:15
lawmakers 39:8	110:11,14,20,21	libraries 82:12	114:17 122:18	198:8
40:2	111:10,14 112:10	library 53:16,18	123:8,12 142:4	long-term 212:12
laws 5:19 26:22	117:19 126:3,9	license 120:12,14	158:3 173:20,21	215:3,4 217:17
32:10 37:18 80:19	140:8 146:12	123:9,9,10 158:3	203:12,12 205:16	220:8
81:2 86:13 92:11	150:8,12 158:8	159:7,8 160:9	222:11	look 5:17 13:7 27:6
92:15 124:21	161:20 165:5	184:22 185:5	live 69:10	31:12 34:19 47:3
156:12 179:11	167:13,14,20	licensed 69:8 189:2	lived 7:12	50:7 53:8 55:4
192:17 213:9,9	168:12 171:4	life 37:9 38:9,14,18	lives 69:10 109:4.17	61:5 62:14 72:9
217:1 220:21	179:1,2 187:15	67:1 93:17 94:3	151:2 187:8	77:22 80:21 85:7
221:10	188:14,15 191:15	109:1,2 143:1	living 55:13 146:1	101:10 104:22
lawsuit 177:7,16	194:10 197:1,2	147:15 148:8	169:1 195:16	107:1 108:5 128:5
lawsuits 35:8	199:21 200:8	lifelong 87:14	Lloyd 1:14 9:8	137:17 140:9
lawyer 10:22 155:2	211:22 212:9	lifetime 113:16	113:4	156:14 172:11
155:6 157:8	214:9	light 9:14 123:1	Lloyd's 207:11	195:14 201:21
200:12 209:20	legality 24:21 26:6	142:4,5 203:18	load 90:11	205:20 217:15
lawyers 28:5 61:12	legally 34:3 52:14	likelihood 54:18	lobby 166:21	222:9
156:22 177:10,17	52:22 53:17,20	limited 32:8 35:6	local 13:5 22:13	looked 51:4 157:9
lawyer's 209:18	67:6,17 117:21	43:8 76:17	24:21 28:18,19	looking 12:11 13:10
lay 106:22	151:4 194:9	limits 9:13 24:20	29:1,16,22 30:19	25:19 49:13
layer 184:13	legally-separate	37:5,6,7 80:16	31:10,15 32:4,19	103:13 104:20
layers 205:17	170:2	191:2	33:7,10 42:5,6	124:7 125:16
lead 16:22	legislation 5:22	Linda 1:8,11 4:17	43:17 52:3 58:5,9	looks 5:18 14:4
leader 144:10	110:16 111:7	123:10,14 153:20	58:18 68:8 69:9	19:16 23:8 61:8
leaders 8:11 206:19	126:13,20 188:22	line 166:21 172:18	70:12 78:21 80:16	Lopez 109:5
leadership 164:6	221:16	186:7 202:18	88:9 92:8,9 96:18	Los 195:10
leading 113:10	legitimacy 179:17	203:5 215:19	124:21 126:8,8	losing 153:10
leads 113:15	length 160:6	217:20 218:8	138:13 144:4,6	lost 60:10
learn 69:9	lessened 200:3	lines 218:12 221:12	149:8 150:21	lot 4:6 7:18 9:18
learned 150:13,19	lesser 76:1 156:5	link 208:6	152:13,17,18	13:3 17:21 18:5,19
151:1,6 158:6	letter 206:20	Lisa 2:21 3:18	154:10 162:21	18:19 21:5 23:13
learning 176:21	letting 81:6 118:14	139:22 141:3,18	164:3 183:18	24:6,8 31:8 36:12
leave 172:14	218:8	154:18	194:13 202:4	40:2 48:7,16 58:22
led 71:5	let's 42:4,10 44:3	list 83:17 113:19	localities 25:21 26:7	59:1 94:3,11 99:1
Lee 198:17	55:17 69:17	114:12 135:20	26:14,19 27:8,10	119:6 142:19
left 8:20 64:4,4	105:18,21 122:22	136:22 140:21	27:11,13 28:14	144:20 158:4
126:18 127:8	123:2,4,6 180:17	145:15 175:20	29:7 35:7 36:21	159:20 186:21,21
128:4 166:20	208:14	180:15	134:8	187:22 188:9,10
199:5 219:14	level 26:16 57:3	listened 201:3	locality 76:9 79:6	193:21 196:13
legal 9:20 19:21	68:7,7,8 70:11,11	lists 61:7	loitering 178:15	199:6 202:2 203:3
	l ' '	A CONTROL OF CONTROL OF THE CONTROL		

	****		•	
215:11 217:8	152:14 155:7	116:9	mentions 170:22	195:15 199:16
lots 27:15	156:20 157:5	medical 79:14	merely 121:6	200:10,12
loud 94:2	158:1 159:4 164:3	Medicare 115:1	merits 79:7	mine 41:15 50:20
Louisa 1:18 9:9	197:11 198:21	meet 38:22 52:15	mess 199:3	195:11
Louisiana 17:11	199:1	meeting 4:13	message 201:3	minimized 186:11
love 153:17	mandate 38:7 182:9	128:15 223:12	met 172:15 173:14	ministry 148:9
low 20:10,12 105:3	191:14	meetings 5:2	method 140:5	minor 121:17
lower-level 135:21	manner 79:11,12	member 1:14,16,18	methodically 98:2	138:11
low-income 118:1	Manual 109:4	1:19,21 41:2,9	Metropolitan 13:11	minus 129:12
lucky 115:8	map 70:15	43:21 44:16 45:16	15:13	minute 36:16 116:7
	market 161:7	54:5,11 55:9,16	Mexicans 46:13	minutes 9:16 10:11
M	166:16 167:5	57:19 113:5	105:16	25:13 142:3
machine-readable	married 147:16	116:10,13 117:7	Mexican-American	146:21 147:1
189:1	matched 153:4	118:11 119:12	197:1	159:1 170:10
mad 174:3	matter 106:13	120:2,7 121:20	Mexico 15:12 48:9	197:7 201:8
Madam 25:8 66:6	110:15,15 191:15	122:3,12 123:21	48:16 70:3	mischaracterizati
71:18 73:11 85:11	221:8	124:16 125:21	MHA 65:5	149:5
91:1,21 105:9	matters 5:21 26:20	126:10 127:18	Miami 15:14	misdemeanor
109:7 162:6	170:8 207:20	154:19 175:1	mic 155:3	121:17 138:6
167:13 171:19	maximize 167:2	176:10 178:20	Michael 2:12 3:11	mispronounce
190:19 192:2	Mayor 60:3 61:7,13	186:15 192:22	65:3	41:10
204:6	Mazzoli 219:11	199:12 207:9	microphone 41:5	Mississippi 50:4
madness 140:6	ma'am 91:8 102:16	members 4:19 6:15	65:18	mistake 122:22
Magazine 10:13	McCoart 1:6	8:18 9:10 10:1,4	middle 68:1 143:5	MIT 10:20
mail 196:20	mean 27:22 28:5	40:21 73:12 85:12	205:6 206:15	mitigated 200:3
main 190:7	47:13,15 48:2	91:22 96:6 102:22	middle-class 167:10	mix 83:14
maintain 162:1	131:20 133:14	108:10 118:14	Midwest 17:4	mixed 66:2 201:2
182:15	164:18 185:8	140:18 142:19	migrants 16:6 19:22	mixed-race 196:4
maintained 15:4	188:5,7 189:6	144:20 145:12	migration 11:1 16:3	model 83:3
major 23:19 27:7	191:14 197:17	149:22 160:21	24:18 26:2 47:21	modern 185:7
27:16 30:17 34:11	209:17 215:7	162:20 169:20	51:10 165:14	Molina 75:20
48:10 97:13	217:10,15	223:5	migratory 46:17	moment 4:18 63:17
majority 19:20	meanest 175:10	memo 41:21	Mike 2:19 3:20	123:4 179:22
46:19 74:22	meaning 23:11	memorandas 30:20	139:22 141:3,17	moments 75:6
222:10	190:16	men 20:7,9 68:16	169:15,16,18	momentum 16:4
making 39:9,21	meaningful 222:2	198:11	170:1 180:13	48:6
124:11 157:20	means 11:17 67:14	mental 82:19	211:8	money 39:14,16
174:20 205:11,12	87:1,6 142:10	mentality 152:5	million 13:14 16:15	219:5
223:10	195:7	mention 11:21	16:15 39:20 87:2,2	month 195:12
males 54:15 55:19	measure 104:9	24:17 97:11	88:21 89:2 90:19	months 34:9 72:3
56:1	measures 6:5,9	mentioned 42:22	111:1,2 129:13	97:7,9 98:14
man 158:18 159:2	24:22 26:7 27:20	57:21 91:15 95:11	167:15 168:15,15	126:11 130:10
159:16	189:13	96:10 97:4 103:21	190:16 191:12	155:15 156:19
managing 154:19	media 7:16 68:21	124:1 171:2	215:18	moral 154:7 171:12
Manassas 63:20	94:12	184:12 186:16	millions 67:15	morning 4:7 72:9
141:16 144:8	Medicaid 58:14	189:17 194:3	217:19	104:11 122:21
145:12 147:14	86:19 87:1,3 89:5	mentioning 101:12	mind 18:17 65:15	154:21 155:8
148:4,5 150:4	114:18 115:15,20	210:17	104:14 148:19	169:22 170:14
		1	<u> </u>	I

186:1 110:15 144:5,5 15:13 16:1,6,7,7,8 November 64:20 195:5 mother 87:7 115:2 162:12,14,16 16:10,16,17 17:11 65:1 157:12 obviously 44:10 198:22 175:19 183:11,14 17:15 36:11 39:15 158:18 89:17 112:15 mother's 115:16 184:1 214:12 39:20 51:5,10 60:2 number 13:13 125:15 186:19 motivating 105:7 219:9 61:6 75:18 96:1,15 14:12 39:12 47:14 193:9 motivators 167:2 nationality 31:6 97:5 98:18 111:2 48:4 55:12 61:1,2 **OB's 88:17** motor 185:10.18 201:15 177:1 178:22 63:9 87:11 88:11 occasionally 5:20 MOU 42:11 nationally 24:10 190:11 92:19 93:16 94:7,8 Occoquan 64:21 move 18:3 70:17 173:22 newborns 87:11 110:20 111:4,8 occur 178:11 222:7 73:3 147:7,21 Nations 69:22 news 150:1 151:18 113:12 116:3 occurred 157:11 moved 13:3 127:7 nationwide 7:5 newspaper 109:8 126:10 127:4 221:7 147:12 46:17 newspapers 104:7 129:13 137:16 October 215:17 movement 15:18,19 nation's 162:11 nexus 177:18 178:6 149:22 odd 60:6 46:7 native 21:15 nice 191:10 numbers 12:11 oddly 60:2 moves 154:4 natives 20:20 24:11 **NICU 89:4** 14:18 15:13 16:12 offend 212:9 216:18 movie 216:14 native-born 20:9 night 68:1 157:21 16:16,20 17:6,15 offense 42:6 150:15 moving 46:13 51:6 118:2 198:12 18:18,18 23:20 178:17 51:8 naturalized 72:5 nine 16:15 46:22 48:3 69:4 offenses 137:18 multiplier 164:13 naturally 168:22 Nineties 13:2 15:17 88:7 95:12 127:13 offer 66:8 municipalities 188:7 51:1 165:8 127:16 offered 79:22 noise 93:22 149:9 nature 186:9 numerically 22:2 offers 78:14 86:11 municipality NCIC 44:14,17,19 nominated 192:4.9 numerous 158:12 office 1:1 11:2 151:19 45:1.6 noncitizens 173:1 nurses 87:22 77:14 126:5 157:4 murder 75:18 76:6 near 41:19 nonrefugee 48:7 officer 36:4 92:12 0 murdered 76:4 Nearly 87:5 non-citizens 213:12 98:17 120:10,15 obey 86:13 142:4 109:8 necessary 221:13 non-for-profit 121:4 122:5,14 object 168:9 189:12 music 145:21 need 83:4 91:9 97:2 90:12 157:9,14,18 159:6 objective 210:18,20 **Muzaffar 2:7 3:6** 99:4 101:11,15 normal 32:16,20 159:8,13 160:5 objectives 211:17 10:22 24:14 125:14 131:16 33:3 135:22 202:17,22 212:1 150:16 156:14 normally 33:12,21 officers 65:13 98:6 N obligation 58:17 162:16 167:10 105:4 137:4 98:11,15 100:3 name 4:17 41:10 90:14 213:17 210:14 North 16:21 70:2 102:8 119:5,16,19 80:22 85:17 obligations 67:21 needed 96:14 163:3 Northern 108:10 123:2 156:20,21 123:14 162:9 obliged 43:6 needs 76:9 111:4 148:2 179:21 185:22 192:12,19 209:22 obscuring 91:11 needy 81:21 note 38:5 59:22 199:20 200:2,22 names 41:14 55:3 observation 128:21 neighborhoods 75:7 85:1 132:22 208:9 name-calling 169:8 107:21 144:3 noted 125:22 134:4 offices 157:9 narrow 31:14 92:2 observed 213:10 neighbors 153:17 notes 90:3 official 22:1 42:5 92:7 observing 211:1 neonatal 87:12 89:3 nother 178:12 officially 4:14 narrowly 32:11 obstetrical 88:10,21 113:15 notice 40:8 74:17 155:14 201:13 obstetrician 87:8 neophyte 176:20 noticeable 178:3 officials 8:11 44:6 nation 67:2,11 nervous 123:13,16 notifies 42:7 obstetricians 63:3,3,4 66:19 68:15 162:20 114:20 201:6 notifying 121:6 72:6 156:2,3 220:16 obstreperousness net 190:11 noting 11:15 199:20 national 6:12 12:5 209:16 never 155:19 notion 55:17 Oh 133:19 137:9 19:12,15 29:13 obstruction 159:16 164:10 notions 218:7 209:12 44:18 57:1 67:12 nevertheless 166:3 obtained 44:8 not-for-profit 85:16 oils 94:1 90:3 100:20 **obvious** 146:18 new 7:15 11:2 15:12 117:5 okay 45:16 54:3

				rage 242
110.12 122.1 12	122.14 15	noid 21.0 00.21	nowtnew 156-15	20.1 2 4 21.9 21
119:12 122:1,12 123:20 134:18	133:14,15 opposite 29:21	paid 21:8 88:21 89:1	partner 156:15 157:12	29:1,3,4 31:8,21
135:18 136:10,20				35:3,16 40:3,4,13
138:22 142:7	opposition 24:2	panel 2:5,8,15 3:4,8 3:14 10:5 62:19	partnership 164:12	41:6 44:21 52:10
	optimum 191:10		189:15 221:22	52:13,21 53:6 55:4
147:4,8 181:21	options 126:8,9	63:2,10 118:19	Party 218:22	55:5,12,13,13,18
183:16 187:7	orchestrated 166:8	124:1 139:19	party-building	56:3,10 57:14
196:14,15 197:6 197:22 204:8	order 52:15 95:16	172:2 173:8	219:2	59:16 63:10 66:1
	153:10 211:22	176:19 222:18	pass 56:13 98:7	67:16,18 69:18,19
Oklahoma 175:9 OLC 41:20	orders 95:14,20,21 102:12	panelists 9:17 64:3	110:18,19 112:16	84:5 94:13 99:3,15
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		102:18 140:21	221:4	100:14 101:13,14
old 14:17 38:16	ordinance 173:12	222:18	passage 63:6 103:2	108:14 111:4
96:4 157:5 219:6	173:13 174:7	paper 152:13 206:5	130:7 155:12	112:1,4 117:14
omnibus 39:11	184:11,17 192:1	206:8	156:7 177:19	118:8 126:18
once 15:18 48:5	ordinances 28:9	papers 213:19,19	passed 13:17,18	128:3 136:6 137:2
95:16 99:16	62:1	paragraph 153:15	39:11 96:8 110:18	137:17 138:2,16
115:11 129:7 138:9 153:20	ordinary 185:16	paralipsis 192:6	111:8 112:4	139:1,5 142:18
	organization 144:5	parents 161:13	155:14 173:21	143:5,20 144:12
178:8 199:12	144:6,19 162:12	187:13 197:2	179:7,13 188:22	144:14 145:5,10
216:10	163:1 170:3 182:8	park 129:14 148:5	215:10,16	145:11,18 146:7
ones 146:19 185:1	organizations	parked 198:14	Passel 2:6 3:5 10:6	148:6,11 151:2
189:11 191:8	162:22 164:20	199:3	10:17,21 11:10,12	153:19 154:9
one's 41:7	165:4 169:7	parking 27:15 94:1	23:5 45:21 46:6,18	158:13 160:10,18
one-seventh 15:5	organizers 158:5	199:6	47:9,18 48:15,20	164:22 165:1
one-third 108:9	origin 6:12 56:12	parks 82:12	49:1 50:7	166:13,15 168:17
onset 51:20	57:1 183:11,14	parlance 29:11	passenger 159:5	168:18,20,22
open 82:12	184:1	part 23:21 83:14	passing 11:22	169:13 175:11
opening 131:4	original 219:10	99:7 122:13 149:2	140:14 219:17	178:14 179:12
operate 29:14	outset 76:21	166:17 188:19	passion 152:22	180:2,10 183:10
164:13	outside 16:14 46:11	194:15,21 204:10	passport 203:14	190:16 192:10
operating 89:8,10	132:8,20,20,21	205:12,13 206:21	path 71:5	194:18 195:17,22
opinion 30:2 44:10	outspoken 34:8	215:1	patients 86:16,18	197:21 198:13
44:11,12 49:16	overall 46:9,10,16	partially 152:1	86:20 88:11 89:4	199:3 200:7
50:19 60:20 150:2	86:21 124:12	participants 222:17	89:13,15 115:7	201:17 203:4
211:13	151:5	participate 142:19	116:3	204:22 205:9
opinionmakers	overcome 146:5	145:6	patterns 15:20	211:21 212:5
72:6	overcrowded 75:7	participation 20:6,8	17:12 51:5,6,10	215:18 216:13,20
opinions 30:6	93:22 169:1	20:16,17 111:17	pause 36:14	216:21,22 217:11
opponent 204:11	overcrowding	particular 70:9 91:7	pay 20:21,22 21:4	217:18,20 218:8
opponents 166:17	107:21	114:2 116:18	24:5 68:17 76:16	218:16 219:3,4
199:17 205:3	overwhelmed 115:7	118:17 146:4	87:1 90:15 101:16	220:12 221:17
opportunities 12:22	116:3	173:11 209:8	115:21 166:12	222:9 223:8
86:11 147:20	ownership 80:19	particularly 13:5	payments 13:11	people's 104:17
opportunity 66:6	owning 145:21	60:6 92:7 103:3	payroll 83:13	143:15,19
67:8 72:9 78:10	Oxford 172:10	118:13 126:14	penalize 6:8	perceived 93:18
123:22 147:2	P	206:4 222:19,21	penalty 44:3	percent 7:5,8,16,21
162:9		parties 6:13 94:2	pending 121:21	8:6 13:15 15:16
oppose 70:5	package 90:21	171:11 218:19	Pentagon 185:5	16:8,9 18:9,14,21
opposed 46:3	PAGE 3:2	221:9	people 16:4 18:7	19:3,8,9,9,11,13
La Maria September			•	1

			1	
21:7,9 22:19 86:7	112:22 113:1	107:10 139:21	policy 6:15 11:1,3	190:13,15,22
86:9,21 87:5 89:4	125:13 220:18	140:4 155:4	24:18 26:2,13,14	191:10,20 195:8
89:16 105:2	pertaining 149:19	161:16	26:15 34:2,16 35:9	211:20 212:11,21
108:19 161:9	150:11	pleased 91:22	35:15 36:15 40:12	213:3
195:7	Pew 7:20 10:7	plus 80:22 129:12	44:4 51:21 52:1	populations 22:15
percentage 15:1	pewhispanic.org	Plyer 80:15 187:18	60:21 83:19 96:15	portion 75:9 132:4
17:5 108:14 128:7	11:19	pocket 115:22	98:3,4,6,7,10,18	135:9 137:12
137:13	phase 99:8	point 18:6 19:3	98:20 101:18	pose 99:17
percentages 129:19	Philadelphia 71:10	22:22 23:7 37:10	102:3 103:8	position 60:5
perception 31:9	philosophical 70:21	56:1 70:13 83:11	110:14 113:11	190:10 195:22
47:8 206:12	philosophy 98:9	84:20 112:11	116:19 118:22	214:14
perceptions 149:19	phone 144:22	117:10 121:3	177:1,3,4 178:22	possibility 211:19
perfect 203:5	phones 41:6	125:11,22 129:16	190:4,9 191:15	212:4,6
perfectly 55:13	photographs	145:9 161:17	199:17,22 200:3,5	possible 77:16
146:18	198:15,20	163:5 167:13	209:5 211:17	119:1 153:18
period 7:8 9:22	physicians 89:19	172:14 174:16	214:12 215:2,13	186:12 200:17
19:10 22:3,17	90:7	179:19 180:2	policy's 102:5	201:12 203:9
permanent 156:16	Ph.D 10:18	186:5 191:16	political 70:10	207:14 209:7
158:9,19 160:1	pick 42:9 44:6	211:4	152:1 166:20	possibly 10:2 42:17
167:20 168:12	picked 77:4	points 113:13	196:13 214:9,14	44:7 212:4
171:4 201:18	picking 77:2 139:4	128:16,19 170:18	219:5	post 143:11
permissible 202:11	piecemeal 98:21	173:6 207:22	politician 74:15	posting 142:13,15
permit 24:7 179:2	pin 122:17	polarization 153:8	politics 68:21 154:5	post-produce
perpetrators 110:6	place 56:2 71:7 75:3	police 28:18,19	214:16	195:11
111:18	81:5,7 82:14 95:8	29:16 32:15,16,19	poll 7:15,18,19	potential 82:7
person 9:3 33:1,5,7	95:9 98:20,21	32:20 34:4,7,10,11	pony 170:13	potentially 131:11
33:9 38:17,21,22	101:3 102:5 103:7	34:12 35:10,12,17	poor 169:11	Potomac 85:15
42:8 43:6,9,14,18	109:10 129:4	35:20,21 36:3,11	popular 26:6 29:10	87:19
44:13,20,22 45:3,8	141:10,14 154:14	36:13,18 43:5 45:4		poured 169:11
45:13,15 54:19	179:12 180:10	65:11 77:13 91:5	Popularly 31:5	poverty 146:5
96:22 114:17	196:22 207:2	92:2,11,12 94:4,21	population 12:15,20	power 35:10,18
115:18 120:11,11	placed 95:20,22	95:2,6 96:9,12,17	13:5,16,16,18,18	165:21 196:13
120:14,16,20	110:10 136:12,14	96:20 97:12,19	13:22 14:7,14,17	powerful 167:2
121:1,1 122:9	places 50:9,10,15	98:17 101:7 102:6	14:20 15:2,6 16:14	powers 36:11 76:17
163:16 170:13	65:20 72:12 87:18	119:4,16 150:9	16:18 17:1,18,21	practice 33:3
194:11,17 195:14	141:13	156:10,20,20	18:10,12,21 19:7	183:21
196:4,6 210:8	Plaintiff 174:17	157:14 158:1,13	19:19 20:2 21:1,8	practicing 155:7
213:15,22 214:16	plaintiffs 175:18	158:21 159:3,9	21:17 22:6 23:8,10	preceded 130:9
217:2 222:22	plane 185:5	160:16 178:8	23:15 46:3,5,16,19	precisely 167:7
personal 112:22	plans 119:4	179:18 180:4	47:3,5,14 48:19	preconditions 49:11
118:12 192:20	plate 158:3	185:22 197:12,15	56:8 86:10,11	preface 12:8 181:13
212:14	play 26:19 216:15	198:21 199:1,5,20	111:5 118:2	prejudice 149:13
persons 53:16 111:8	played 184:21	200:22 203:19	126:14,15,16	194:20 195:1,18
135:12 137:8	216:11	204:13	128:7 129:18	196:1,4,9,10
140:13 163:9,12	players 165:16	policies 58:1 101:2	132:4 137:6	prenatal 87:9,10,13
person's 195:5	playing 39:8 145:20	124:21 165:11	145:18 146:8	88:1 113:13,14
perspective 77:1	please 41:7 42:8	211:18 212:13	165:15 168:14,19	114:2,5,19 115:2
80:8 92:3 96:9	69:2 78:7 91:20	policing 92:6	188:8 189:17	115:10,21 116:5
Burnan Carlos San Carl	-	•	1	1

prerogative 102:19 primarily 63:2 probable 96:19 159:7 160:10 proportion 19:6 prescient 208:7 81:19 84:9 202:8 119:19.21 121:3 production 142:13 proportionate prescribed 38:13 primary 89:19.20 122:18 123:17 profession 150:9 20:22 21:3 presence 77:22 89:22 108:22 200:20 201:1 professional 6:17 proposals 216:8 111:11 116:16 142:12 166:21 probably 37:21 210:6 219:10 173:17 184:22 188:8 202:20,21 43:14 57:16 61:3 professionals 87:21 proposed 97:21 200:4 Prince 4:21 5:4 6:4 61:14 102:5 127:5 prospectively present 1:10 2:1 7:2 12:5,9 18:2,4 113:15 121:8 professor 9:8 43:22 221:11 11:11 24:6 37:14 23:21 25:17 27:19 127:13 135:3 172:8,11 176:9 prosperity 71:6 60:5 154:22 167:8 28:22 32:14 35:16 188:10 192:10 183:18 184:5 protect 8:15 61:17 212:6 213:18 49:3,4,17,21 58:15 208:3 199:11 204:9 179:12 197:13 223:2 63:19 64:18 65:4 problem 38:2 73:16 Professors 173:20 protected 43:1 55:8 presentation 91:14 65:11 66:14 73:14 73:18 74:12 75:8 professor's 118:6 61:4 62:2 124:3 127:15 158:10 74:1,4,11,16 75:19 75:16 76:14.18 profile 9:19 201:8 158:15 163:14 presented 108:2 75:21 76:4,8 78:5 90:3,4 100:20 profiling 34:22 35:2 protection 38:3 presenting 9:18 85:15,20 86:22 107:19 108:6 102:3,4,7 124:7 53:6,9,11 54:9 128:14 115:6 131:18,20 87:5,19 88:4,8 160:13 177:21 80:12 101:19,20 presently 215:1 90:4,12 92:1 131:22 134:12,17 178:13 180:8,17 184:13,18 201:14 presents 86:12 103:22 105:1 151:6 153:21 197:4 202:7 protects 161:18 120:12 109:6 111:8 164:18 173:22 program 77:8 80:22 proud 68:19 163:6 president 6:1 65:4 113:17 126:12 220:18 84:2,12 95:1 96:2 164:6 184:7 141:21 162:4,10 problematic 43:20 127:8 131:13,13 97:8 100:1.9 101:8 provide 8:14 58:7 192:19 209:22 138:3 140:11,15 56:9 200:1 215:18 78:22 79:4,20 presidential 68:7 142:18 147:13,16 problems 74:18,21 programs 78:13 82:20 83:2 85:22 presiding 1:9 147:19 148:3,15 75:1,4 87:14 89:18 80:22 84:4 90:14 98:15 press 126:11,22 151:17 155:10 105:15 111:10 prohibited 82:15 107:10 135:19 180:5 156:19 157:14 113:14 118:10 124:2 136:21 151:10 pressures 151:20 158:21 160:3,13 154:11 prohibiting 79:13 152:10 153:12 165:14 163:22 168:20 procedural 163:7 124:8 176:16 187:13 presumably 58:8 170:11 177:22 163:14 prohibits 134:8 provided 49:14 114:19 178:9 179:21 procedure 185:14 prolong 33:11,21 80:18 82:3 84:7,10 presume 24:22 187:6 192:1 procedures 39:21 promised 152:8 90:18 100:2 114:6 180:20 221:14 223:9 84:15,20 189:2 **promote** 153:13 provides 184:19 presumption principal 63:6 proceed 84:22 166:18 providing 5:2,6 180:21 161:10 91:19 prompt 139:4 49:10 88:19 129:2 pretend 123:4,7 prior 29:19 30:6 proceeded 159:10 promptly 136:18 provision 58:19 pretext 171:22 64:20 88:8 93:7 proceedings 148:18 59:2 62:8 114:10 pronouncing 41:14 pretty 17:16 20:18 104:8 130:7 131:2 process 25:20 67:15 41:15 provisions 38:6 105:3 114:7 priorities 162:14 70:21 72:1 77:7 proof 53:19 123:18 39:15 59:6 61:22 prevail 208:15 priority 67:13 80:11 101:2 128:8 provoked 185:6 220:14 prison 138:8,9 120:18 125:1,6 **proper** 103:8 **proximity** 48:9,15 prevent 59:3 165:4 180:1 142:17 143:9 175:17 **public** 8:10 27:12 183:5 186:3,18 prisoners 77:10 160:22 163:7,14 properly 164:10 28:3 34:2,4,15 187:5 219:16 Privacy 171:5 165:17 183:5 properties 84:13 35:9,15 36:10,17 previous 91:14 private 6:12,17 204:19 property 22:3 80:19 37:2,7,8 38:8 118:19,19 124:1 88:16 90:7 114:20 processed 184:2 135:14 161:11 39:12 40:12 49:8 price 76:16 privileged 25:10 processes 129:12 prophesy 166:7 49:10 53:15 63:3 prima 174:11,21 proactive 154:10 **produce** 123:17 proponents 205:2 68:11 75:16 80:3

94:1 100:7 101:2	que 217:19	157:15 172:2,17	reach 149:20	reasons 34:2,4
136:2 149:11	Queen 103:16	187:19 205:4	202:19	76:13 145:20
150:2 154:1 164:4	question 6:20 41:3	214:18 219:20	reaching 97:10	156:22 168:19
166:19 170:5	41:20 42:1 45:18	221:2	reaction 18:20	209:15 221:9
173:18 178:17	45:21 47:11 51:18	quo 218:1	181:20	reassert 217:21
187:10,22 192:13	52:7 57:20 62:4	quotas 150:22	read 10:10 90:22	recall 57:4 103:17
195:14 199:19	106:19 110:10	quote 157:20 193:2	105:22 106:3	132:14 141:9
publicly 129:6	113:4,6 118:17	quote 137.20 173.2	187:18	221:5
191:3	124:16 127:3	R	reading 104:6 206:7	recap 170:9
published 172:9	128:12 130:4,19	R 1:14	ready 152:10	receive 115:9
Puerto 55:14,14	134:2 135:3 136:7	race 53:7 56:22	Reagan 215:16	received 93:16
pull 104:18 193:10	139:6 150:1	57:6,13 183:15	real 23:9 109:1	196:20
pulled 123:3 156:18	164:21 177:6,6,21	191:19 201:15	122:20 190:13	recess 62:21
157:2,15,20 158:1	178:6 179:17	race-based 54:22	216:13 222:5	recession 13:2
158:18	182:20,21 186:15	57:14	reality 118:7 152:11	recipient 79:2
pull-over's 158:12	188:13 190:3	racial 6:11 7:1	really 9:5 12:9,21	Reciprocity 192:7
purpose 5:14 6:2	199:11 204:8	34:22 35:2 102:3,4	16:22 18:12 22:16	recognize 167:3
63:4 111:22	207:7,10 211:2,7	102:7 124:7,10	23:12 24:7 25:9,16	187:7
pursuant 78:12,22	212:19 214:5,9,10	149:18 160:12	34:20 36:14 37:17	recognized 26:18
80:11 82:1	214:19 222:13	171:22 177:21	38:11 39:2 46:12	recognizing 68:11
pursue 214:22	questioned 158:22	178:12 180:8,17	48:10 55:1 56:6	recommendations
220:2	questioning 33:18	183:22 193:14	58:3,10 83:14 84:4	5:21 79:10 219:13
pursuing 209:9	211:2	197:4,8	90:9 92:14 101:4	recommended 82:9
push 143:3	questions 3:7,13,22	racially-neutral	111:12 114:13	95:6 172:7
pushing 166:22	9:22 40:17,20,22	37:21	125:11,14 135:1	record 105:22 106:3
208:22	48:22 55:3,5,6	racially-suspect	142:8 143:8,22	120:17 197:16
put 9:6 12:5 17:19	57:18 72:10 82:7	38:1	144:11,11 145:3	records 121:9 165:6
21:22 22:5 73:8	85:7 102:20	racism 173:10	146:21,22 164:17	recovery 17:12
82:14 90:20 91:16	120:16 133:4	174:6	172:12,18,19	red 103:16 123:1
95:7,9,19 98:20,21	139:10 147:3	radar 120:10	173:2 182:4,18	142:5 203:18
99:1 101:2 140:7	160:6 165:5 173:7	raise 68:18 219:5	184:14 185:20	redo 198:4,5
178:9 184:16	176:7,11,12	raised 131:4 208:1	194:18 195:6	reduced 90:18
197:3	180:11 182:11,14	raises 207:1	200:21 201:1	reelection 66:14,15
puts 13:14	186:14 190:21	raising 121:2	207:15 211:12,13	refer 13:8
putting 223:7	193:5 207:11	rallied 196:12	214:3,8,10	referencing 204:7
P-R-O-C-E-E-D	208:14	range 6:18 81:18	realtor 161:5	referred 58:5
4:1	quick 57:17,19	129:14 135:20	reason 33:6 42:4,5	128:18 131:7
p.m 223:13	128:16 130:18	217:6	47:11 75:12,13	referring 202:13
	206:2	rapid 12:6,12 17:5,8	76:9 108:22 122:6	209:3
Q	quickly 18:3 51:17	46:4 51:9	132:22 142:12	refers 31:18
quality 85:22 93:17	53:15 101:17	rapidly 14:22	158:2 160:4 189:6	refile 175:4
94:3 109:2 115:13	160:12 204:22	rapidly-growing	189:10	refine 117:3
quantifiable 127:13	quite 15:7,21 17:7	22:6	reasonable 98:5	reflect 20:11
127:22	18:9 20:18,22 21:2	rate 17:8 18:8 20:7	119:21 169:6	reform 30:18 38:7
quantify 109:3	28:10 32:8,18 34:9	20:9 22:6 91:15	189:12 195:21	141:18,22 151:11
131:12,17,19,22	34:13,18,18 35:13	rates 20:19 49:20	211:16 212:1,12	162:5,11,12
133:21 134:13,14	37:1 41:21 53:4,12	167:14	reasonably 30:12	169:19 170:1
quarter 22:22 23:14	59:5 62:18 113:8	rationale 150:22	reasoning 34:17	215:10
	-	•	•	•

refugee 48:1 170:17 10:15 131:5 132:11 restriction 85:5 refugees 48:3,8 relief 84:3 representatives 133:13 140:14,17 114:12 refuse 69:9 relieved 88:13 150:8 170:15 155:11,13 156:6,9 restrictions 27:12 refused 76:14 religious 184:1 represented 15:15 160:15 164:1 27:13 28:3 33:16 regard 153:4 reluctance 90:7 21:7 165:20 177:19 36:22 59:13,15 176:15 212:2 rely 126:2 representing 54:18 179:16 182:5 187:3 regarding 131:3 remain 83:22 84:5 represents 169:18 200:18 204:17 rests 32:17 155:10 99:20 148:15 republic 71:18 72:2 205:5 208:21 result 76:15 87:14 regardless 90:15 163:18 166:13 72:7 216:17 108:4 168:22 101:19,21 117:19 remaining 175:18 Republican 29:19 resolutions 165:12 196:16 197:4 163:9 187:10 remains 214:4 219:3 166:2 results 26:15 127:16 region 1:1 92:20 remarks 66:9 73:1 Republicans 76:12 resolved 30:8 222:6 Regional 63:20 131:4 211:3 request 43:3,12 136:18 210:16 return 215:17 registered 120:22 remedy 175:17 187:13 resources 35:6 REV 147:11 204:6 registration 157:10 176:15,17 require 42:17 44:8 70:20 118:9 148:6 Revenue 85:19 213:8 remember 185:2 87:11 119:19 150:6 revenues 87:2 regular 200:7 187:19,19 209:18 required 96:10 respect 31:7 33:16 reverend 141:15 regulate 163:3 215:8 121:5 35:15 36:22 37:6,8 147:9 154:17 regulating 165:17 remind 107:2 requirement 56:21 37:11 38:2 42:22 199:14 211:3 regulation 27:7.9 reminded 103:15 requirements 61:17 43:16 56:8 59:7,13 219:22 165:19 220:14,15 reminds 105:11 requires 96:17 61:1 78:15 98:11 reversed 14:20 regulations 170:21 removal 212:21 121:15 106:10 143:15 review 26:9 171:2,3 214:7 Research 97:12 153:5 191:22 reviewed 60:1 regulatory 81:10 remove 111:22 101:7 211:17 217:22 revisited 155:21 reimbursed 115:16 112:1,7,13 145:19 reserved 161:22 222:8 re-elected 64:8 rejection 152:16 214:22 reset 195:15 respectfully 220:12 re-emphasize 102:9 relate 37:9 removed 112:14 reside 53:20 respecting 153:19 re-enter 31:21 related 36:10 47:19 rendering 79:13 residence 158:14 respects 163:8 re-entry 32:1 42:10 56:22 88:18 92:18 renovate 84:12 resident 75:19 76:5 respond 97:20 rhetoric 7:9 152:1,4 93:1,8 96:5 rent 52:13.19 79:1 117:22 132:15 204:8 **Ricans** 55:14 relates 81:12 92:6 repeated 194:14 156:17 158:19 responded 94:5 rich 70:6 relating 150:21 repeatedly 191:4 160:1 165:2 149:9 Richard 1:19 9:9 relation 55:17 replicated 73:19 residential 84:13 response 97:21 Rico 55:14 Relations 170:11 replied 71:19 **residents** 6:4 8:16 125:2 209:14 ride 159:3 relationship 163:1 148:17 157:7 52:5 74:16 109:7 responsibility 88:14 rider 159:8 169:20 reply 168:1 111:14 113:17 92:14 97:5 ridiculous 70:2 relative 79:6 133:4 report 11:18 81:15 158:9 164:14 responsible 74:22 right 9:7 16:12 36:4 relatively 14:17,22 128:14 178:18 167:20 168:12 132:7 151:13 42:19 44:21 45:3 20:4,10,12 203:1 reported 7:3 126:21 171:4 152:2 217:16 45:14 64:5.10 relatives 215:19 152:14 177:12 residing 163:12 220:22 67:18 91:17 release 24:18 26:3 REPORTER 155:3 resolution 27:19 rest 75:14 105:14,20 117:7,9 180:5 reporting 79:16 37:12 38:20 49:2 restate 183:8 123:1 130:13,16 released 7:15,20 129:5,6 49:12 63:7 77:6,8 restrict 82:6 125:7 131:9 132:13 11:18 76:3 121:18 reports 150:1 77:12,16 78:17 restricted 81:19 138:5 149:4 138:19 159:17 155:17 96:8 97:19 103:14 82:1,18 83:19 85:2 153:21.22 154:2.3 releases 138:10 represent 21:1,16 108:19 109:1 113:20,22 157:21 163:17 releasing 12:4 64:21 92:1 111:22 112:17 restricting 79:8 166:13 172:14 relevant 32:14 53:4 representative 127:17 130:7,9 81:9 84:16 85:3 174:18 177:11

180:22 181:4 roughly 46:9 47:5 220:17 seconds 168:9 sensitive 196:3 185:2 187:4,5,9,15 89:13,16 says 31:20 38:20 secret 184:14 sent 31:22 161:9 189:22 194:19 rounding 89:2 42:8 49:3 59:2 Secretary 192:4,9 sentence 95:17 217:18 round-up's 100:11 65:7 123:10 section 31:4.6.19 99:16 103:18 rights 1:1 4:13 5:10 rule 67:13 70:18 184:11 213:14 32:12 206:5 105:11 136:17 71:4 80:15 153:2 5:15,18,19 6:4 216:15 secure 153:13 137:3 138:4.16 8:15 27:4 52:5,16 154:8 202:19 scary 198:11,12 security 67:12 sentenced 95:18 66:7 77:20 103:11 203:5 205:21 scenario 69:3 see 15:19 16:20 sentences 77:3,11 124:3 141:20 213:2 214:3 218:1 schedule 142:14 17:20 18:4 19:14 137:19 142:10 154:9.20 220:13.20 208:11 22:15 23:12 24:3 separate 24:8 57:7 155:2.6.18.20 rules 98:3 scholars 30:5 29:12 38:13 39:14 separating 191:9 156:1 158:7 rulings 80:14 school 11:2,8,9 40:16,22 41:9 45:5 September 71:10 159:20 161:12,20 run 13:22 136:3,4 22:18 133:22 45:7,10 73:4 89:14 98:13 157:3 167:4 172:5.16 151:15 203:18 161:10.10.11 91:11 100:19 sergeant 99:11 177:7 178:10 rung 41:7 187:6,10 188:4 108:6 118:7 series 21:22 22:1 179:11 181:10 running 120:17 schools 13:7 21:14 120:19 134:18 78:19 80:7 182:1,15 185:13 199:10 200:18 21:17 22:15 23:1 140:5 144:1 serious 82:21 99:13 190:5 201:16 runs 120:9 214:6 24:6 150:17 188:1 151:15 154:5 99:19 106:13 209:6 210:8,13 rush 122:20 Schwartz 2:12 3:11 173:20 195:6,18 132:2 222:9 223:1 65:3 75:6 85:10,11 198:10 215:4 serve 138:4.12 S ripe 149:13 107:17 113:7,12 216:13 218:21 served 70:22 77:3 S 2:6,10 3:5,10 ripped 194:1 114:16 116:12 221:20 77:11 99:16 safe 28:9 ripples 169:2 117:2,11 118:3 seeing 12:21 14:2 136:17 138:16 safety 37:9 38:10,15 rise 119:15 Schwartz's 113:9 16:5 89:12 92:21 service 9:6 51:3 75:16 80:4 risen 7:8 114:13 125:17 195:13 79:8 81:2,11,11 sale 161:4 rising 152:2 scientist 10:15 seek 27:14 32:1 82:20 83:14 114:2 Salvadorian 120:13 risked 151:2 174:4 86:15 154:8 132:18 207:18 Samp 1:19 9:9 risks 186:11 scope 165:21 seeking 149:3 services 5:6 6:7 57:19 126:10 road 70:15 83:9 scream 197:8 seen 14:10 22:12 37:11,12 38:8 39:6 127:3.18 186:15 157:22 216:12 screaming 198:11 26:11 27:17 32:10 40:3,5 49:10 50:20 sanctions 215:22 roadblocks 100:11 screened 39:22 37:18 92:18 93:12 52:12 53:16 58:19 216:3 100:11 119:10 93:13,15 126:10 65:12 68:2 78:13 sanctuary 29:10 roads 83:11 screening 124:5 126:22 136:3 79:20,21 80:5 81:9 58:1 59:11 127:9 robbed 94:13 144:2 193:14 197:18 81:13,17,18,22 165:12 role 25:21 26:19 scrutiny 56:21 57:3 selected 10:13 82:2.4.11.16.17.19 sat 209:21 210:10 31:2 39:8 92:8,10 183:13 204:2 selectively 53:7 83:2,8,12,13,18,20 satisfied 207:12 92:16 188:17 se 22:11 52:1 190:9 self 86:22 166:6 83:21 84:1,7,16 roles 165:9 Saudi's 185:4 searched 159:14 self-pay 86:19 87:3 85:2,3 88:18,19 Save 144:7 145:12 Ronald 215:16 seats 73:13 140:4 89:4 89:6 90:14,17 saved 39:16,19 room 87:22 89:10 second 14:2 28:21 seminar 159:19 113:20,21 114:7 saw 118:6 142:16 89:11,11,15,20 32:13 38:5 60:1,12 seminars 159:20 114:11 125:7 143:9 196:10 90:2,8 115:12 60:14,19 61:21 Senate 216:9 129:3 134:9 118:16 192:11 saying 8:6 12:9 99:7 100:5 128:21 send 187:9 166:12 174:14 34:19 54:7 72:16 206:10 210:2 157:11 172:15 sense 68:22 82:13 serving 81:12 137:3 116:14,19 137:22 rooms 89:10 90:11 176:18 200:19 113:8 125:22 148:12 187:7 197:16 107:17 214:5 174:12 194:7 sessions 145:1 203:15,16,17 roots 13:1 147:22 secondly 96:14 199:18 205:22 set 62:18 181:22 217:14 220:11,15 Rosario 109:4 190:10 209:15 185:14 208:12

setting 5:1 9:3 215:12 **skinned** 203:12 203:9 210:5 214:3 St 11:6 162:15 189:14 sign 30:20 146:2.3 skip 14:4 214:6 222:11 stable 111:5 168:19 191:1 197:3,6,14,20 sky-rocketed soul 68:13 stacked 30:7 settled 28:10 53:13 198:5 166:11 sounds 181:14 staff 2:1 4:22 9:2 settlement 17:12 signed 28:17 42:12 sky-rocketing 218:10 62:16 73:2 78:11 46:7 51:5 61:7 215:16 165:14 **source** 188:8 78:19 79:10.19 **set-off** 218:3 significance 148:7 slide's 13:12 **South** 161:4 80:21 97:6.20 seven 180:1 significant 14:6,7 slightly 20:19 22:2 Southeast 17:4 48:4 127:5 129:1 Seventies 165:7 16:20 75:9 93:14 136:15 147:14 44:1 48:8 severe 90:16 132:4 136:4 smack 156:5 southern 60:11 223:6 similar 166:1 174:9 sexual 61:9 small 99:2,11,21 73:22 stake 68:11 142:21 shaken 157:7 175:7,8 182:7 smaller 17:6 23:15 Southwest 46:11 stamps 81:21 **share** 14:6,8 16:6 Similarly 7:19 108:16 Southwestern 15:11 stance 222:11 20:2,22 21:3,4,17 simple 34:18 151:6 Smith-Simpson sovereign 67:11 stand 37:15,22 23:10,17 60:8,22 152:4 176:1 219:12 68:15 169:4 197:6 67:6 125:12,20 simplify 213:16 snapshot 108:17 sovereignty 173:3 204:22 145:10 150:6 simply 52:21 54:14 sneaking 67:22 **Spain** 69:5 standard 122:19 155:8 177:15 55:22 58:8 68:12 social 10:15 50:19 **Spanish** 123:16 201:1 202:6,7 209:3 102:13 106:17 51:2 193:19 220:1 145:20 203:2,10,21 **sharp** 157:20 131:19 133:3 society 87:16 213:2 speak 55:12,15 standards 57:6 sheriff's 5:5 77:14 134:3 137:18 217:22 114:13 120:14 67:14 161:1 84:8 200:1 139:1 148:17 socioeconomic 125:16 131:16 199:21 shift 23:9 36:16 163:18 170:9 117:15,18 142:22 144:10 standing 174:17,20 shifted 23:12 178:2 172:3 174:16 sociological 151:20 146:16 161:11 174:20 194:17 **shifting** 203:10 220:14 sold 185:3 speaking 145:20 start 10:6 64:4 shifts 15:19 93:13 Simpson 219:10 solely 183:13 171:19 98:19 182:3 Shocked 157:7 single 18:18 52:18 solicitation 28:9 speaks 145:4 214:16 203:13 **shooting** 142:14 185:13 solution 206:21 specific 30:12 31:14 started 13:1 15:19 **shop** 174:2 sir 122:15 210:17 solutions 151:7 32:8 33:15 37:11 48:6 92:21 93:2.3 shop's 173:19 217:16 152:4,10 154:10 81:13 125:7,20 97:8 142:13 short 13:21 22:16 sit 25:10 215:14 183:11,22 203:2 143:11 168:13 62:21 182:19 sitting 38:17 64:12 solve 100:19 specifically 30:22 191:7 **shortly** 11:16 210:3 somebody 47:19 38:12 43:11 94:17 state 1:2,11,14,16 **shot** 19:14 situation 40:7 42:4 75:2 109:9 197:7 128:11 132:1 1:18,19,21 4:12,16 show 16:2 21:16 87:18 118:21 216:18 133:2 140:11 6:16 8:15 21:11 45:1 53:19 122:6,7 164:17 201:12 somewhat 65:17 187:2 24:21 25:21 28:18 122:9 135:22 219:19 111:3 202:2 204:1 specifics 128:19 28:19 29:16,22 170:13 184:9 situations 119:13 soon 77:16 136:17 spectrum 66:17 30:18 31:16 32:4 showed 49:20 164:7 six 19:2 22:9 99:11 sorry 64:16 80:4 speculate 21:19 32:10 33:7,10 51:7 showing 39:7 69:4 130:10 150:3 130:22 135:1 speech 196:14 198:1 52:3,5 58:16 61:18 shows 22:8 44:19 167:22 143:17 146:18,20 **spending** 205:15 66:16 78:22 82:1 shutting 67:1 **Sixties 47:22** 209:12 211:10 **spent** 12:10 39:15 85:4 96:18 114:8 sick 70:4 six-year 19:10 sort 19:14 30:10 39:19 97:6,7 115:5 121:14 side 44:11 126:7 size 14:15 32:6 48:6 59:10,17 195:10 210:22 124:20 125:3.9.13 157:6 166:20 skill 124:10 73:8 83:6.10 spiritual 70:20 125:15 150:20 184:10 205:1 skin 123:8,15 142:16 144:7 **split** 174:13 218:19 156:2 165:21 216:10 218:16 146:15 183:10 179:1,20 186:22 spoken 30:12 173:18 183:18 sides 143:13 149:7 201:5 194:12 199:15 150:10 189:14,22

stated 158:2 191:3	146.2 150.10	(4.11 12 12 (5.14	CITECOMMICCI	66.5.16:51.16
	146:3 159:18	64:11,13,13 65:14	SUBCOMMISSI	66:5,16 71:16
statement 42:2	160:7,11 163:10	65:16 66:5 71:14	3:7,13,22	127:2 128:10
105:10 205:11,13	163:20 165:6	71:16 74:13 75:14	subcommittee 1:2,6	supervisors 6:6,10
statements 102:21	187:11,14 188:6	103:6 106:16	1:13 4:15 8:19,21	49:4 64:15,19
states 5:16 7:12 8:8	195:2 200:8	108:4 110:12	62:4 223:5	75:15 94:21 95:8
15:11 16:18,21	201:18 218:1	127:2,20 128:10	subject 66:18 69:17	96:8 97:22 103:1
17:3,7,9,15,17,17	statute 175:9	Stirrup's 77:12	96:3 106:9 150:7	104:1 119:18
26:7,13,18 27:8,10	182:16	stop 40:16 120:3	177:16 181:11	130:5,5 145:14
27:11,13 28:14	statutes 170:21	157:11 202:13	195:8	163:22 193:1
29:7 36:21 42:12	173:18 174:1	stopped 120:9	submission 196:19	support 26:3 83:15
47:20,20 50:22	184:3	121:16 158:21	submitted 26:8	112:21 131:5
51:1,9,9,11,12	statutory 182:8	159:4 160:2	158:11	163:21 189:10
52:20 53:18,21	stay 148:1 149:4	stopping 67:1	subsidies 90:8	supporting 170:3
67:5,16 69:15	217:18	stops 208:4,5	subsidizing 89:5	supports 163:11
73:20,21 74:7 86:6	Stein 2:22 3:19	store 158:20	substance 84:1	supposed 198:8
86:14 90:6 110:21	140:1 141:4,20	straight 40:10	succeed 8:7	supreme 80:14
110:22 113:17	162:3,6,9 167:18	straightforward	succeeded 163:19	121:21 134:7
151:3 159:22	167:22 168:4,8,13	151:7	successful 65:6	179:9 203:8
164:12 165:1,5,9	180:14 181:1,2	strain 187:22	66:13	sure 25:18 39:21
165:10,15,22	186:16 187:17	strategy 189:5	suddenly 68:19	41:4 58:22 72:13
166:14 188:5,16	190:19 191:8,13	215:22 217:17	Sudley 157:22	96:16 99:14 101:3
189:7 190:12,15	191:21 192:7	stream 132:19	sued 35:4,5 60:7	116:12 117:11
201:17 204:5	211:8 214:17	street 27:14 36:3	suffer 145:6,7	120:7 128:10
213:16	215:7 216:8	124:19 195:6,13	suffice 97:6	132:16 134:1,10
state-Federal	217:14 218:14	198:14 199:7	suggest 133:10	145:14 147:1
164:11	220:11 221:19	streets 77:13 107:19	172:10 218:12	174:21 186:9
state-mandated	222:15	strengthen 154:14	suggested 83:7	198:19 200:11
79:15	step 95:4 119:20	strict 9:12 10:2	100:6 203:22	207:10 208:20
state-to 51:6	Stephen's 11:7	56:21	210:12 221:12	214:18
stating 191:7	steps 186:8	strong 51:16 102:3	suggesting 126:13	surprised 142:9
statistically 130:1	stereotyped 148:22	strongly 163:21	204:3 207:17	surrounding 23:18
statistics 9:19 22:1	sterile 206:9	178:2	suggests 7:16 83:4	152:3
86:17,19 185:12	Stewart 2:10 3:10	structure 29:21	104:21 119:16	survey 11:20
stats 135:16,22	64:15,15 65:1 66:1	struggles 155:21	220:1	survive 68:14
stature 156:5	72:11,13,20 73:10	struggling 146:5	suit 208:16	suspect 55:1,7,20
status 29:2,5 33:1	73:11 74:14 103:4	student 188:8	suits 176:15	56:13 57:15 61:12
35:22 36:7 40:7	105:8,19 106:2,6,8	students 22:19,22	summarize 101:17	75:20
42:7 49:9 52:20	106:10,14,19,21	75:19	115:18 186:5	suspects 75:17
54:1,8 56:3 79:1	107:7,12 108:3	studied 41:18 97:14	summary 90:20	suspicion 33:5
80:10 81:5 82:21	109:13,17,22	studies 5:20 107:6	summer 75:21	119:22 121:2
86:16,18 94:14	110:7 111:21	131:1,6 132:8,8	147:13 149:21	suspicious 120:15
100:15 101:20,22	112:11,20 117:3	study 13:8 24:18	summons 121:13,14	sweeping 201:14
109:12 111:10	118:5 130:19	27:6 172:8	121:18	switch 65:20 169:16
117:14,15,16,19	131:8 132:10,14	studying 97:9 150:5	sun 198:9	sympathy 194:7
117:19 119:3,11	133:17,21 134:2,7	205:15	superb 88:5	system 65:8 67:14
124:13 128:3	134:11,16,20	stuff 34:20 36:18	supervised 31:1	70:10 75:22 81:7
132:2 133:5	139:14	61:10 173:18	supervisor 64:6,11	85:22 88:9 96:4
135:10 137:20	Stirrup 2:9 3:9 64:6	185:9	64:13,22 65:16	129:7 133:3,22
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	100.7	07.13,22 03.10	149.1 133.3,44

				Page 250
138:9,9 208:17	170:3	testify 72:9	198:14 199:18	222:14
218:9	taxes 20:21 21:5,9,9	testifying 171:16,18	200:12 210:14,15	thoughtful 148:11
systematic 167:6	24:5 217:5	196:6	217:6 221:7,14	thousand 162:20
systems 51:3 82:13	taxpayers 166:11	testimony 11:11	think 10:5 24:2 25:5	167:17,20,21
	169:4	110:4 113:9	25:14 26:10 27:18	thousands 183:17
T	technical 172:17	116:14 139:12	29:15 30:4 31:9	threat 99:18
T 2:9,13 3:9,12	173:6	145:14 158:11	32:7,9,18 33:2,16	three 2:15 3:14
table 3:1 209:4,21	Telephone 57:9	170:10 171:6	34:1,6,6,8 35:9,11	16:15 28:15 29:12
tailored 201:13	television 104:6	176:14 177:15	35:12,13,14 36:12	29:18 30:6 32:6
take 10:10 13:6	tell 29:7 58:2 60:17	179:6 207:17	36:19 37:1,2,16	75:18 109:6
19:22 42:3 62:17	60:18 73:5 107:5,8	219:21	38:2,5 40:4,10,12	152:17 156:19
62:19 90:7 95:1	107:13 146:14,16	Testing 24:20	40:20 42:21 43:2,2	170:18 194:18
102:18 108:5	165:11 168:18	Texas 10:19 15:11	43:5,14,19 44:12	221:3
119:20 130:2	198:22 220:12	73:20	44:14,20 45:3,15	three-phased 98:1
139:18 140:4	telling 59:7,13	thank 4:10,20 5:4,7	47:8 53:10,11,12	101:1
152:9,20 164:15	temporary 81:20	9:5 11:12,13 24:12	54:10,21 55:1,6,20	three-quarters
169:5 174:5	ten 7:5 16:8 17:1	25:3 40:18 45:16	56:5,6,8,9,12,17	23:16
201:20 222:10	18:14 22:8 86:6	62:13 63:1 65:12	57:13,21 61:13,16	threshold 119:17
taken 6:6 54:19	102:5 161:6 168:8	65:22 66:5 72:8	63:9 66:21 68:9	thrown 175:9
62:22 103:12	212:9	73:9,9,14 78:1,2,6	69:1 77:17,20	189:21
136:18 138:19	tenable 218:2	78:8 85:8,9,11	87:13 92:4 97:14	thrust 116:13,18
168:8 172:11	tend 50:16	91:1,2 102:14,17	114:8,11 120:1,5	tide 152:2
177:9 186:7	tendencies 29:12	102:21,22 105:8	126:2,5 129:22	ties 217:21
192:14	tends 118:5	127:2,18 130:17	131:10 132:10	time 4:14 9:13,15
takes 87:20 88:17	tenor 206:6	134:19 139:9,11	136:7,8 139:3,4,7	9:21 12:10,16
151:13	tension 151:15	139:14,15,16	142:12 143:7	19:12 22:17 23:3
tale 103:15	tensions 7:1	140:2 147:11	144:20 145:6	51:14 57:17 71:13
talk 9:21 12:1 13:4	ten-year 22:3	154:16 162:2,6	169:7,13 170:17	83:11 92:11 94:20
25:1 27:20 36:17	term 64:8 189:21	176:3,4 207:5	173:2,11 175:14	95:2 108:12,15,17
40:14 63:19 78:11	194:4 212:1	209:10 222:17	181:2 186:6,20	129:16 131:18,22
92:5 93:10 96:16	214:19 222:2	223:4,5	187:3 188:14	132:2 138:12
98:8 143:22 144:1	terms 17:5 27:3,22	thanked 63:12	192:10 194:17	144:18 145:1
154:13 160:2	30:12 42:17 46:10	thanks 25:8 62:15	199:10 200:17,19	157:2 158:2 165:3
192:3 197:19	50:5 73:6 79:7	78:8 118:12 142:8	204:21 206:17	165:13 168:4,5,9
201:3	81:4 107:19	145:13 161:16	208:1,16 209:1,14	170:14 171:1
talked 32:7 144:14	111:16 117:14	223:11	209:15 210:14	182:19 185:18
196:11 200:22	127:16 160:15,16	thick 123:7,15	211:4 214:8	195:10 196:1
talking 44:14 68:12	170:3 172:18	thing 38:5 39:4 40:6	218:17 220:10	198:4 199:10
117:13 140:7	177:18 193:14	62:6 67:19 98:7,8	221:13	200:13 205:15
168:11 175:6	194:12	107:2 110:13	third 19:19 29:6	216:11 217:4
198:1	terrible 122:22	154:2,3 164:19	100:22 196:2	times 17:1 70:16
tangible 149:17	terrorists 56:11	201:20 203:10	thorny 69:16	73:6 89:22 156:19
tape 196:15 197:18	Terry 202:13	218:4 221:21	thought 12:2 52:22	160:3 206:7
197:20	Terry-type 120:2	things 23:6 56:9	60:9 72:15 82:5,6	216:11 221:4
targeted 183:10	test 37:15,22 39:1	81:20 94:3 96:11	82:15 83:18 84:9	tired 70:4
targeting 158:13	56:14 173:17	100:12,20 125:18	99:1 108:15 114:1	today 4:14 6:2 8:9
tasked 140:17	184:22	184:6 186:20	122:13 181:5	9:13,17 12:1 27:18
tax 13:11 84:3,11	testified 184:6	193:6,21 197:17	182:12,13 200:9	29:13,15 37:14
	•	•		

49:14 61:6,13 65:3 119:16 122:14 twelve 97:7 understanding 58:4 unquote 193:2 65:9 66:8 77:22 161:13 208:11 two 2:8 3:8 9:16 116:11 124:9 unsettled 123:13 92:1 95:12,13 tranquility 153:12 10:4 14:8 23:5 163:2 164:5 unwelcome 7:14 103:10,21 110:4 transporting 31:19 27:20 28:7 30:13 176:18 180:4 126:17 139:13 141:2 treat 124:4 31:15 32:3 33:15 185:11 200:14 unwilling 129:17 151:18 155:1,21 39:20 43:12 57:17 206:22 treatment 87:12 133:9 168:15 175:6 116:22 200:6 85:14 94:11 96:11 understood 92:15 **uphold** 154:9 176:21 186:20 tree 145:22 98:14 102:22 undertook 108:18 urban 13:10 34:12 219:19 222:17 tremendous 110:11 105:2 111:2 underway 23:20 50:21 today's 109:7 149:1 128:16 130:5 117:18 undesirable 146:8 **Uropa** 109:4 Todd 1:16 8:22 trend 14:20 23:22 undocumented 149:6 155:14 use 53:16 57:14 207:6 211:4 28:20,21 29:6 156:19 159:15,19 17:18 18:1 21:4 58:6 76:18 89:20 told 156:8 157:19 175:7 159:21 167:20 24:7,9 27:9 33:6 100:3 111:16 180:19 trending 22:4 176:12 183:20 37:1,3,13 38:9 112:6 122:8 tolerance 153:5,6,7 trends 23:22 27:17 193:2 201:8 39:5,12,17,21 40:3 123:21 132:20 toll 87:20 28:15,15,16 205:10 218:19 40:4,15 46:8,13 145:19 146:11 tomorrow 111:13 tried 12:4 73:16 twofold 77:7 47:5 55:6 58:7,20 169:8 222:2 tone 209:16 210:4 186:3 two-hour 170:10 88:6 115:1,8,19 usually 41:14 161:4 tool 112:13 triple 75:17 76:6 two-part 212:19 116:7 178:16 topics 21:20 tripled 16:16,19 two-thirds 24:10 unemployment U.S 1:1 4:12 5:10,17 torpedoed 219:13 trippled 13:16,17 type 87:18 182:6 104:22 11:3 13:15 19:20 total 95:19 124:12 true 19:21 26:17 208:22 24:11 55:13 unfair 166:16 totality 202:16 46:15 unfortunately 68:9 161:22 168:14 U totally 72:15 171:7 trust 156:8 69:14 87:10  $\mathbf{V}$ ugly 70:17 171:20 truth 206:13 149:11 ultimately 164:9 tough 152:9 v 80:15 try 12:2,7 18:3 unidentified 213:3 165:22 vacuum 143:10 toughest 175:10 41:15 63:5 83:5 uninsured 89:16 ultra-virus 171:7 town 69:13 70:12 101:17 120:5 **Union** 70:3 valid 145:13 unable 129:17 validity 133:12 157:5.6 129:1 139:19 unique 70:6 73:18 133:1 150:1 toxic 198:4 140:22 142:3 unit 87:12 99:10,11 toxification 193:19 unanimous 35:13 valuable 109:18 145:10 163:2 99:22 208:12.14 unanimously 34:14 209:1 traced 46:12 165:4 169:12 United 5:16 7:11 unassigned 87:6 value 90:18 109:3 track 101:9,15 183:5 209:4 8:8 15:11 47:19,20 88:10,11 148:7 168:16 221:19 52:20 53:17.21 unauthorized 19:22 values 70:19 208:17 tradition 153:16 trying 20:6 53:15 67:5,16 69:15,22 38:22 vantage 145:9 163:7,11 210:22 95:4 105:5,14 73:19 74:7 86:6,13 underestimated variety 8:10 78:13 106:15,21 107:7 traditional 218:6 90:6 110:20.22 108:13 various 10:1 40:20 traditionally 116:4 107:13 110:1 113:17 151:3 underlying 33:6,14 131:3 181:7 183:1 190:11 124:13 137:12 159:22 166:13 193:7 221:9 33:19,22 43:9 traffic 120:9 121:16 138:15 140:6 190:12,15 201:16 190:13 varying 162:22 train 98:5,11 . 164:4 169:5 204:5 213:16 undermine 220:8 vehicle 120:22 161:14 207:19 **University 10:18,19** understand 54:7 185:18 trained 30:22 34:20 turn 41:5,6,7 57:10 11:2,7 101:8 119:13 132:12 Vehicles 185:10 98:22 102:8 73:4 102:20 172:10 133:19,20 165:18 Velvet 198:16 156:10 180:1 130:20 155:3 unlawful 35:3,4 174:22 177:22 208:10 157:21 venom 155:22 unlawfully 97:1 202:6 208:6 verdict 103:18 training 98:14,16 turned 25:6 36:7 121:8 214:18 215:5 105:11 99:2 102:9,10 143:5 unlimited 31:10

۷,					Page 252
	verification 81:7	4:16 6:5,16 16:20	217:21 219:15	welfare 36:19 38:6	wife 74:6
	189:1	58:16 66:8 73:21	222:1 223:4,5	52:11 69:8 153:13	William 4:21 5:5
	verify 49:9 81:5	78:6 80:15 86:5,14	wanted 91:15	well-being 148:13	
	189:3	90:5 101:8 108:10	106:14 143:3,12	well-formed 200:5	6:4 7:2 12:5,10
	verifying 80:9	121:14 122:3	145:18 191:19	well-founded	18:2,4 23:21 25:17 27:19 28:22 32:14
	versus 81:13 110:11	123:10 148:2	192:20 218:15	206:13	
	133:8 152:5	155:7 173:16,17	Ward 1:21 8:22	went 11:15 16:14	35:17 49:3,4,17,21 58:15 63:20 64:19
	194:10	184:21 185:14,19	124:16 125:21	18:15 21:10,11,12	
	viable 130:1	virtually 216:3	warm 73:13 118:15	60:12 63:6 104:4	65:4,11 66:14
	victimized 94:10,17	virtually 210.3 virtue 52:3 117:18	warm /3.13 118.13 warrant 44:13,20	106:17 122:22	73:14 74:1,4,11,17
	victims 7:6 61:8,9	virulent 7:10 24:1	45:2,5,7,9	165:7 173:5 185:9	75:20,21 76:5,8 78:5 85:15,21
	94:18 101:19	visa 150:14	Washington 10:7	198:9	86:22 87:5,19 88:4
Ì	109:12 110:5	visible 195:4	209:19	weren't 133:3	
	111:18	visits 89:21 90:2	wasn't 207:12,14	144:12 177:14	88:9 90:4,13 92:1 103:22 105:1
	videos 142:13	visits 69.21 96.2	wash (207.12,14) watched 164:20	208:7 216:12	109:6 111:9
	143:11	volume 115:7	165:3 198:15	West 47:15	113:18 126:12
	video-taping 198:6	voluntary 85:16	watching 104:5	we'll 24:2 35:4,5	127:8 131:13,14
	view 29:21 92:7	117:5	way 11:13 16:22	38:2 62:17,19	138:3 140:12,15
	100:2 112:22	volunteer 148:9	27:2 37:21 41:5,20	101:9 106:4	142:18 147:13,17
	143:17 162:14	vote 68:18	52:7 59:5 97:2	127:15 128:20	147:19 148:4,15
	165:20 171:10	voted 108:18	111:14,16 115:17	139:19 142:3	151:17 155:10
	197:4 212:14	voters 64:7,22	115:20 116:22	174:4	156:19 157:14
	213:21 219:9	voting 5:21 165:6	124:6 143:6 146:9	we're 9:20 12:21	158:21 160:3,13
	viewpoint 70:5		146:16 151:14	14:13 15:6,7 16:5	163:22 168:20
	viewpoints 200:14	W	164:22 186:1	58:14 65:8 68:12	170:11 178:1,10
	views 6:18 106:11	wait 150:14	195:16 196:5,11	73:5 89:14 98:14	179:21 187:6
	153:7 211:14	waited 217:20	196:12 197:11	98:21 99:2,8	192:1 221:14
	Viez 2:2 9:2 223:6	waiting 185:18	203:7 205:5	100:10 103:5	223:9
	vigor 155:22	walking 94:16	208:22 209:5	116:20 146:11	willing 25:12
	vigorous 55:19	158:20 195:13	210:16 217:15	164:6 175:6	129:16 175:21
	violate 54:8 100:15	<b>wall</b> 189:7	218:19 219:1	177:10 186:22	wise 118:22
	violated 52:6 167:6	want 4:10,20 5:4,7	ways 38:1 72:20	187:12 205:2	withdrew 192:12,19
	218:6 223:1	8:18 30:19 39:4	119:6 143:18	207:4 212:8	withhold 6:7
	violating 53:5,9	40:6 41:1 44:6	144:12 145:3	216:16	witness 8:2
	violation 29:5 42:11	49:22 52:6 62:12	weapons 157:16	we've 14:10 22:12	witnesses 8:13
	45:10,12,14 54:19	65:11,15,19 67:6,7	website 141:7	60:17 70:9 86:6	101:21 118:19
	55:21 60:9 120:9	69:20 72:7 73:13	173:13 191:6	89:9 92:15,17	171:6
	121:16 160:22	84:22 91:11 101:4	198:17 202:3	93:12,13 97:3	woman 71:11
	175:21 213:6	103:6 104:3,15	week 7:3,15 76:7	98:13 99:1 104:11	192:14
	violations 31:3,8	113:10 118:11	152:13 159:2	104:12 150:19	women 68:16
	138:2 156:1 158:7	122:17 139:11	195:12	173:15 181:18,19	113:14 116:5
	158:8 168:22	140:2 143:19,20	weeks 76:4 121:21	186:7 188:22	117:1 159:21
	178:10	143:22 145:10	150:3 155:17	193:8 204:18	wonderful 147:22
	violent 22:2 54:13	148:14 166:18	159:19 174:8	205:17	164:4 219:7
	55:18 56:2 70:17	169:11 170:9	204:14	whatsoever 70:1	wondering 58:2,17
	135:15	187:12 191:14,17	welcome 4:11 24:14	whereas's 103:14	127:22 187:2
•	Virginia 1:2,8,11,14	191:18 204:11 212:17 216:13	74:3,5,8,10 77:19	white 69:19 70:12	199:15
	1:16,18,19,21 4:12	212.1/210:13	77:22 78:4 140:3	160:9	Wonderland

103:16 105:10	wrongs 176:13	York's 61:6	<b>150</b> 190:15 191:12	64:20 90:1,17
Woodbridge 1:8	177:3 179:2	young 14:22 20:5	154 3:18	2007 1:5 64:9
76:6	199:18,19	55:19,22 209:19	16 21:7	105:12 131:11
word 5:10 61:20	www.9500liberty	YouTube 141:13	<b>162</b> 3:19	157:3,12
169:9 170:22	141:8	You-Tube 193:21	<b>169</b> 3:20	2008 66:11 68:6
171:1 194:10			<b>17</b> 177:11	127:14 156:10
214:21 220:5	X	Z	176 3:22	2010 89:13
wording 7:17 49:2	xenophiliac 169:9	zeal 152:22	1775 216:14	2011 185:2
103:13	190:1		<b>1787</b> 71:10	2012 86:8
words 108:1 111:12	xenophobes 105:16	<u> </u>	18 34:9 86:9	21 108:19
135:11 146:14	xenophobic 148:16	\$1.5 88:21	1870 15:5	<b>2100</b> 168:17
153:16 209:15	149:1 189:21	\$15 90:19	1895 147:18	213 95:12
work 8:7 10:16 11:3		\$3 129:12	1920 15:5	22 19:9
20:6,13 24:5 68:17	<u> </u>	\$400 87:1	<b>1940</b> 213:9	<b>23</b> 6 79:21
71:9 77:21 78:11	yards 94:1	\$500,000 89:7	1960 14:16	<b>25</b> 3:6 10:16 164:19
78:19 79:10 80:6,8	year 13:9 18:9,14	<b>\$560,000</b> 88:20	<b>1965</b> 14:19 172:6	25th 105:12
83:4 125:16	22:19 67:17 77:7	0	1970 14:14,16	26th 157:3 158:19
132:19 148:9	77:18 84:19 87:2,4		<b>1980</b> 13:17 16:19	<b>260</b> 168:14
153:10 154:2	88:20 89:1,13,15	09-609 164:1	17:2 18:6 19:8	2665 87:4
158:4 159:3 161:5	95:22 110:22	1	165:12	<b>27</b> 164:19
162:21,22 210:6	111:2,5 131:10	1st 156:10	1980's 215:9	<b>274</b> 31:17
workable 221:21	149:8 173:15	1.1 89:2	<b>1986</b> 215:9	<b>276</b> 31:20 43:1,10
worked 97:20	190:11	1:13 223:13	<b>1987</b> 188:21	287(g) 31:5 32:12
162:21 185:1	years 10:16 15:4	10th 60:10 61:4,15	<b>1990</b> 16:13 18:20	77:8,12 94:22 95:9
192:17	18:11,13 19:2 22:8	61:16 62:2 78:18	23:13,14	96:11 100:1,1
workers 166:22	22:9 26:1 27:5	10,000 18:15	<b>1992</b> 93:2	179:18 180:3
167:5,7,10	46:14 48:4 56:20	10:36 62:22	<b>1995</b> 147:13 219:8	
working 5:3 9:3	65:6 71:2 72:4	10:45 62:22	219:11	3
20:5 25:7 62:14	77:21 86:6,7 88:20	<b>102</b> 3:13	<b>1996</b> 30:17 36:20	<b>3.2</b> 215:18
95:10 96:5 136:16	92:17,17 93:6	11 3:5	38:7 58:4 59:1	<b>30</b> 56:20 65:6 86:7
162:13 164:18	94:11 102:5 136:5	11th 170:12 181:12		99:3 159:1 206:19
168:13 170:7	147:19 148:3	210:9	2	300 168:15
173:15 177:10,16	161:6 163:20	<b>11.8</b> 19:11	<b>20</b> 16:9 19:3 46:14	357:8
works 115:17	164:19 167:22	<b>12</b> 19:8,13 86:7	86:21 195:7 197:7	350,000 18:7
221:20	183:20 189:19 192:13 202:9	147:18	202:9	
world 25:11 47:15	210:22	12th 157:12	<b>20-year</b> 150:13	4
56:12 69:6,21 70:8	year-in 210:6	120 80:4	200 71:1 80:21	40 7:21 87:5 89:15
71:1 214:1,2	year-out 210:6	126 80:4	2000 18:22 19:9	400,000 110:21
world's 70:7	yell 198:14	13 19:13 21:8	21:8 22:20 23:13	41 3:7
worth 19:2	yellow 142:5	14 1:5 19:13 39:13	89:12	<b>425,000</b> 86:10
wouldn't 44:7 45:2	yeoman's 9:6	14th 52:15 55:21	2001 13:19 88:19	47 13:14
112:6,10,16,17	yesterday 7:20	56:18 80:11,13	173:16	<b>482</b> 95:19
201:8	11:18 24:19,19	141 3:15	2002 30:3	5
wrap 161:16	26:4 173:21 175:8	147 3:16	2003 7:8 65:1	<b>50</b> 15:4 77:21
written 26:22 32:11	184:6 213:4	<b>15</b> 9:16 10:10 13:15	2004 10:12 64:8	50,000 89:13
59:6 202:1	York 11:2 15:13	18:11,13 25:12	2005 10:8 16:13,19	501(c)(3) 85:18
wrong 55:21 102:13	60:2	46:14 192:13	88:8,15	<b>52</b> 80:3
179:1 180:21	30,2		2006 7:5 39:10	02 00.5
		-	•	•

Page 254

	•		Page 25
<b>576</b> 7:5			
6		· ·	
<b>65</b> 3:9			
7			
<b>70,000</b> 18:16			
<b>71,000</b> 89:14			
<b>72</b> 3:10			
74 8:6			
<b>78</b> 3:10			
79 161:3			
8			
8 3:3			
80 87:2			
819 7:6			
84 80:2			
<b>85</b> 3:11 7:16 15:15			
<b>86</b> 221:1			
9			
9:30 1:8 4:2 90 18:22			
91 3:12			
93 22:18			
94 22:18			
<b>9500</b> 141:7			
7500 141./			
		•	