

**Statement of**  
**David Wolfe Leopold**  
**On behalf of the**  
**American Immigration Lawyers Association**  
**Before The**  
**Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship, Refugees, Border Security, and**  
**International Law**  
**Committee on the Judiciary**  
**United States House of Representatives**  
**Hearing on the Arrest, Prosecution, and Conviction of Undocumented**  
**Workers in Postville, Iowa from May 12 to 22, 2008**  
**July 24, 2008**  
**11:00 a.m.**  
**1310 Longworth House Office Building**

Chairwoman Lofgren, Ranking Member King, and distinguished Members of the Committee, I am David Wolfe Leopold, National Vice-President of the American Immigration Lawyers Association (AILA). I am honored to appear before you today concerning the arrest, prosecution, and conviction of nearly 300 undocumented workers in Postville, Iowa from May 12 to 22, 2008.

AILA is the immigration bar association of more than 11,000 lawyers who practice and teach immigration law. Founded in 1946, the association is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization and is affiliated with the American Bar Association (ABA). AILA members represent tens of thousands of families who have applied for permanent residence for their spouses, children, and other close relatives to legally enter and reside lawfully in the United States.; U.S. businesses, universities, colleges, and industries that sponsor highly skilled foreign professionals, students or visitors seeking to enter the U.S. on a temporary basis, or having proved the unavailability of U.S. workers when required, on a permanent basis; applicants for naturalization; and asylum seekers, often on a pro bono basis. AILA attorneys have been deeply involved in providing legal assistance in the aftermath of large-scale immigration enforcement operations.

Based in Cleveland, Ohio my law practice is devoted to the representation of individuals, corporations, health care institutions, law firms, religious organizations, and other entities across the nation and throughout the world. For nearly 10 years, I have served as a Criminal Justice Act (CJA) Plan defense attorney for the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, representing criminal defendants in federal criminal matters upon court appointment. At the request of the Federal Public Defender I have either taken criminal appointments and/or offered counsel to public defenders in immigration related criminal matters. I am a frequent speaker on the immigration consequences of criminal convictions at federal, state, and local bar continuing legal education seminars. In addition to my practice, I direct the immigration law curriculum and teach immigration law at the Case Western Reserve University School of Law and serve as an adjunct professor of immigration law at the Cleveland-Marshall School of Law, Cleveland State University.

## **I. INTRODUCTION.**

On May 12, 2008, the Agriprocessors meat packing facility in Postville, Iowa was raided by federal immigration agents. Before the raid, Agriprocessors had been accused of serious violations of labor, food safety, environmental and other labor laws. The government's own search warrant listed multiple violations of immigration, labor, and criminal laws committed by the company's supervisors and associates. It was soon learned that many of the nearly 400 undocumented workers arrested in the raid had been subjected to horrifying conditions, but had been powerless to speak out because they had no legal immigration status.

As a result of the raid, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) arrested 389 Agriprocessors workers. Of these, 306 were turned over to the U.S. Attorney's office to face criminal charges for working with false papers including Social Security Fraud under 42 U.S.C. § 408(a)(7)(B) and Identity Theft under 18 U.S.C. § 1028A(a)(1). Only 60 were released from detention, and the rest were herded into the National Cattle Congress (NCC) fairgrounds, a facility normally used to show livestock, that served as a temporary detention facility and makeshift courthouse in the aftermath of the raid.

AILA members and others in Postville reported that those arrested were denied access to immigration counsel for lengthy periods of time during "processing" and questioning; inadequate provisions were made to assure that each individual charged was afforded meaningful access to counsel familiar with both criminal and immigration law; defense counsel were forced to recommend acceptance of a uniform plea agreement in seven (7) days without sufficient time to assess the case facts and forms of relief under the immigration law or expose their clients to significant jail time; and, mass hearings were conducted at which CJA defense counsel were called upon to represent 10 defendants at a time in a single, brief, proceeding, with some called on to do so on multiple occasions for multiple groups of defendants.

Most striking was the May 12, 2008 press release from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa announcing the temporary assignment of federal judges and court personnel to Waterloo, Iowa "in response to the ... prosecution of numerous illegal aliens..." The press release was issued by the court before any of those arrested and charged had been found to be in the country illegally.

## **II. THE EXPEDITED PROCESS USED TO CONVICT THE WORKERS COMPROMISED THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE COURT AND DEPRIVED THE DEFENDANTS OF DUE PROCESS.**

A prosecutor's professional, moral, and ethical duty is to do justice, not merely to convict. This cardinal principal was ignored by the government in its zeal to criminalize undocumented workers. In essence, the expedited justice or "Fast Tracking" system concocted by the government, with the willing assistance of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Iowa, was a conviction/deportation assembly line which could not be burdened with protecting the fundamental rights of the defendants, mostly poor uneducated Guatemalan farmers who came to the U.S. to feed their families. As vividly described by Professor Erik Camayd-Freixas in his essay *Interpreting after the Largest ICE Raid in U.S. History: A Personal Account*, the workers were shackled in groups of 10, assembled and, like the livestock prepared for slaughter at Agriprocessors, they were efficiently packaged, convicted, and ordered deported. Shockingly, many of the workers appear not to have understood they were pleading to Social Security Fraud but

thought they were pleading guilty to having worked in the U.S. without proper documentation—a civil violation. Indeed, first hand accounts and press reports raise serious questions as to whether many of the defendants were even guilty of Social Security Fraud, as charged. As Dr. Camayd-Freixas recounted in his essay,

“[M]ost of the clients we interviewed did not even know what a Social Security number was or what purpose it served. This worker simply had the papers filled out for him at the plant, since he could not read or write Spanish, let alone English.”<sup>1</sup>

Why did the “Fast-Tracking” system work so well? First, the government charged the Defendants with Social Security Fraud and Aggravated Identity Theft. The Aggravated Identity Theft charge provided the necessary leverage to force a plea to Social Security Fraud because Aggravated Identity Theft carries a two (2) year mandatory minimum sentence. The government offered a uniform plea agreement which dismissed the Aggravated Identity Theft charge in exchange for a plea to Social Security Fraud, a five (5) month sentence, and a stipulated order of removal under the 8 U.S.C. § 1228(c), the Judicial Removal provision of the Immigration and Nationality Act. To increase the pressure on the Defendants and their court appointed CJA counsel, the government imposed a seven (7) day limit on the plea bargain offer. To make matters even more chaotic, the Defendants were provided counsel at a ratio of 17/1 and the Court did nothing to ensure that the Defendants were afforded meaningful advice regarding their immigration status or the immigration consequences of their pleas.

Stated simply, the “Fast-Tracking” system depended on threatening the workers with a two (2) year prison sentence, their inability to receive adequate attention from counsel, and their ignorance of the charges leveled against them. The government made the undocumented workers an offer they couldn’t refuse. Faced with the choice of 5 months in prison and deportation, or 6 months in prison waiting for a trial which could lead to 2 years in prison and deportation, what choice did the workers really have? Needless to say the scheme left little room for the fundamental protections offered by the Constitution. The spectacle was a national disgrace.

---

<sup>1</sup> 42 U.S.C. § 408(a)(B)(7) (A) requires that the Defendant use a social security number “willfully, knowingly, and with intent to deceive”.

**III. THE “FAST-TRACKING” SYSTEM, WHICH INCLUDED A PLEA AGREEMENT THAT REQUIRED THE DEFENDANTS TO STIPULATE TO JUDICIAL ORDERS OF DEPORTATION, IMPROPERLY DEPRIVED THE WORKERS OF AN OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY CONSIDER THE IMMIGRATION CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR PLEAS.**

By all credible accounts, the CJA defense counsel, who did a valiant job defending the workers under the extremely difficult circumstances created by the government and the court, barely had an adequate opportunity for meaningful discussion with their clients about the criminal charges leveled against them, let alone the immigration consequences of accepting the plea agreement. Dr. Camayd-Freixas' essay raises serious questions about whether the pleas taken from the workers at the NCC were given knowingly as required by law, not only because the defendants had limited access to CJA counsel, but because they had little or no access to advice regarding the immigration consequences of their acceptance of the uniform plea agreement. As recounted by Dr. Camayd-Freixas,

I remember reading that immigration lawyers were alarmed that the detainees were being rushed into a plea without adequate consultation on the immigration consequences. Even the defense attorneys had limited opportunity to meet with clients: in jail there were limited visiting hours and days; at the compound there was little time before and after the hearings, and little privacy due to the constant presence of agents. There were 17 cases for each attorney, and the Plea offer was only good for 7 days. In addition, criminal attorneys are not familiar with the immigration work and vice versa, but had to make do (sic) since immigration lawyers are not court appointed, and these clients could not afford to pay.

Local AILA attorneys reported that they had difficulty accessing clients who were apprehended during the raid even when the attorneys had an attorney-client agreement in hand. Several attorneys reported driving many hours to the raids site only to be turned away.

Reports of the appalling situation at the Cattle Congress quickly reached AILA. Kathleen Campbell Walker, AILA President and Jeanne Butterfield, AILA Executive Director responded by sending a letter to Linda R. Reade, Chief Judge of the Northern District of Iowa expressing AILA's alarm about the workers' lack of access to immigration counsel:

We understand that hundreds of people arrested pursuant to this enforcement action were denied access to immigration counsel all day Monday until Tuesday. In addition during “processing” and questioning, criminal charges were brought against scores of those arrested, but inadequate provisions were made to ensure that each individual charged

is afforded meaningful access to counsel familiar with both criminal and immigration laws; and that the mass hearings have been held in which one court-provided defense counsel was called upon to represent as many as 10 defendants at a time in a single proceeding.

A criminal conviction, even a conviction for a minor offense, can have a devastating impact on an immigrant's right to stay in the U.S. with his or her family or to return to the U.S. after a trip abroad. Effective assistance of counsel to an immigrant in a criminal matter, including advice as to whether or not to accept the terms of a plea agreement, necessarily includes a thorough analysis of whether or not the defendant has a claim to U.S. citizenship, and, if not, the immigration consequences of a plea and/or conviction at trial and the availability of relief from removal. As explained in AILA's letter to Judge Reade,

Immigration law is extremely complex. For example, people born outside the U.S. may be U.S. citizens, derivatively through parents or grandparents and not even realize it. In addition, they may be eligible for various forms of relief from removal, including potential asylum relief in some cases. It is not possible for a credible review of these potential issues to be even cursorily addressed in the time frame being forced upon these individuals and their over-burdened counsel. Stated simply, to impose Judicial Removal and obligate the federal defense bar in Iowa, within seven (7) days, to fully evaluate any legal or factual arguments against the arrests themselves, and to identify and evaluate any possible challenge to removal or relief from removal for scores of new clients, works a travesty of justice.

AILA requested that specific immediate steps be taken to guarantee full constitutional protections to the accused workers, including:

1. Assuring that prosecutorial discretion is applied to all cases to all cases to determine if criminal prosecutions are merited.
2. Assuring that, under the circumstances of this case, where nearly 400 individuals have been charged criminally under the immigration laws, CJA attorneys with immigration expertise—even from outside the Northern District of Iowa—are appointed to represent individual defendants.
3. Providing at least thirty days for defense counsel to associate with immigration bar support for the review of potential relief from removal for those charged.
4. Assuring that all detainees remain in the current state where arrested until their cases are adjudicated and be provided with the opportunity to seek release on bond and a fair and full bond determination.
5. Assuring that all detainees be individually interviewed by counsel to preserve attorney-client privilege and confidentiality.

6. Assuring that any defendant who, after full consideration with a competent immigration attorney, is found to have a reasonable basis for seeking relief from deportation under our laws be provided with a full and fair immigration court hearing to determine the eligibility for such statutory and discretionary relief.

Unfortunately, Judge Reade never directly responded to AILA's plea and no meaningful steps were taken to ensure the workers' full constitutional protections.<sup>2</sup>

#### **IV. THE USE OF THE STIPULATED JUDICIAL ORDERS OF DEPORTATION WAS IMPROPER AND LIKELY DEPRIVED MANY WORKERS OF AVAILABLE DEFENSES, RELIEF, AND PROTECTION AVAILABLE TO THEM UNDER THE IMMIGRATION LAW.**

As a non-negotiable term of the uniform plea agreement, the government required the workers to agree to stipulated judicial orders of deportation pursuant to 8 U.S.C. § 1228(c)(5). From the outset AILA raised serious concerns with Judge Reade about the use of Judicial Removal in the NCC proceedings and the unreasonably short time frame given to the defendants to consider the uniform plea agreement which provided that they waive all their rights under the immigration law.

Indeed, it appears the stipulated judicial orders of deportation may have been improperly used against many of the defendants in the Agriprocessors cases. By its terms, stipulated judicial orders of deportation are limited to removal orders against aliens who are "deportable" from the United States because of a criminal conviction. See 8 U.S.C. § 1228(c)(5)(requiring that the alien agreeing to the stipulated order be found to be deportable). Congress has required, as an essential element of all deportation grounds based on criminal convictions, that the alien have been lawfully admitted to the United States. See 8 U.S.C. § 1227(a)(2)(A). Yet in the Agriprocessors cases, the uniform plea agreement, which included in paragraph 7 a stipulation to a judicial order of deportation, alleged that the "Defendant entered the United States illegally without admission or parole and is unlawfully present in the United States." This is a material contradiction in the uniform plea agreement because if the Defendant had entered the U.S. without inspection, as alleged, and then became removable due

---

<sup>2</sup> However, Judge Reade answered AILA indirectly during an interview with a reporter, to whom she said, "The immigration lawyers...do not understand the federal criminal process as it relates to immigration charges". See, *270 Illegal Immigrants Sent To Prison In Federal Push*, New York Times (May 24, 2008). AILA President Kathleen Campbell Walker respectfully replied by stating "It is precisely because immigration lawyers understand the complexity of the interplay between immigration law and criminal charges that we have recoiled so forcefully at this new approach."

to a criminal conviction, he or she would be treated as an applicant for admission and charged with the grounds of inadmissibility, not deportability.

Therefore, it appears stipulated judicial orders of deportation may not have even been legally available to the U.S. Attorney in the Agriprocessors cases. This mistake of law, at a minimum, would appear to render the stipulated judicial orders of deportation provision of the plea agreement void *ab initio*. Clearly, the use of stipulated orders in the Agriprocessor cases in and of itself underscores the need for the appointment of counsel familiar with both immigration and criminal matters. Even the most skilled CJA attorney could not have been expected to catch this serious contradiction in the plea agreement absent an intimate understanding of the immigration law.

Clearly, the use of stipulated judicial orders of deportation against the workers in Postville was unconscionable. It was unreasonable to impose a seven (7) day deadline for consideration of the terms of the plea agreement and to fail to provide the defendants any meaningful ability to fully analyze whether its use was lawful. The workers were essentially coerced into giving up procedural and substantive rights under the immigration law, including the right to a full hearing before an immigration judge which would have required the government to meet its statutory burden and afforded the defendants an opportunity to apply for relief from deportation.

**a. The Use Of the Stipulated Judicial Orders of Deportation Likely Led To The Waiver Of Critical Forms of Relief From Deportation For Many Defendants.**

The fact that a noncitizen may be in the U.S. unlawfully does not necessarily mean the law requires his or her removal. Under the intricate labyrinth that is immigration law an alien who is legally deportable from the U.S., may nevertheless be eligible for full relief from deportation. Congress has provided for relief from deportation, and the right to stay in the U.S., in many situations. Among the available forms of relief are Adjustment of Status—the mechanism by which an alien may be granted lawful permanent residency (green card status) based on family or employment ties; Cancellation of Removal for Nonpermanent Residents—the mechanism by which an alien who has been present in the U.S. for 10 years or more may granted lawful permanent residency, in the discretion of an immigration judge, due to exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident spouse, parent or child; and Asylum—the mechanism by which an alien is protected through the provision of sanctuary in United States due to past persecution or a well founded fear of future persecution on account of race, religion, nationality, political opinion or membership in a particular social group.



The following is a summary some of the forms of relief from deportation that may have been available to the workers had they been afforded all the protections available to them under the law.

### **i. Asylum and Withholding of Removal.**

Through enactment of the asylum and withholding provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Congress has ensured that those who would face persecution or deprivation of freedom in their home countries are offered shelter in America. The overwhelming majority of the workers arrested in Postville were Guatemalans. The long history of human rights abuses in that country is well documented. Just this year the U.S. Department of State reported that Guatemala remains plagued with serious human rights problems. See, *Country Reports on Human Rights Practices—2007*.<sup>3</sup> The government clearly understood that many of the impoverished workers in Postville may have suffered persecution or have had well founded fear of future persecution or faced a threat to their life or liberty if they were forcibly returned to Guatemala.

Dr. Camayd-Freixas's essay provides an example of how the expedited process could have deprived a worker of the right to apply for asylum. He recounts his first client interview involving a man who he describes as a Guatemalan peasant afraid for his family who spent most of that time weeping at a table, in a corner of the crowded jailhouse visiting room. Incredibly, the man fled Guatemala on foot and walked all the way to the United States. A key word in the description is *afraid*. And while the man might have been referring to fear of economic hardship, thorough analysis of his situation would have included an intricate examination of his fear. Was there a political element to it? Had he or his family suffered persecution in Guatemala? Did he have a fear of future persecution if he returned? If so, did he understand that by signing the plea agreement he was forfeiting any right to protection in the U.S. under the asylum law? Even in the absence of the stipulation for Judicial Removal, did he understand how a conviction for Social Security Fraud might affect his asylum claim? It is important to understand that while a conviction for Social Security Fraud may not have made him ineligible for asylum, it nevertheless might have lead an immigration judge to deny the claim as a matter of discretion.

### **ii. Cancellation of Removal For Non Permanent Residents.**

Among the millions of undocumented noncitizens in the U.S. are many whose families are "mixed". That is, while they are undocumented, their spouse or children are U.S. citizens or legal permanent residents. Congress has provided that a noncitizen who has been physically present in the U.S. for a minimum of

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2007/100641.htm>

10 years may apply to an immigration judge to cancel his removal from the U.S. and grant him legal permanent residence if he can demonstrate to the court that he is a person of good moral character and his deportation will result in exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to his U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident children. See, 8 U.S.C. § 1229b(b).

Dr. Camayd-Freixas, in his essay, recounted the compelling story of a man from Mexico who had worked for 10 years at Agriprocessors before he was arrested in May. He was the father of two U.S. citizen daughters, a two (2) year old and a newborn. He faced a choice between asserting his constitutional rights and making the government prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt or waiving those rights and taking the plea agreement. Unfortunately for him, holding the government to its constitutional burden of proof would have required that he spend six (6) months in prison waiting for a trial. In the alternative he could sign the plea agreement which, while it left him a convicted felon, led to his release from prison, and deportation, in 5 months.

On the facts, this man was clearly eligible to apply for cancellation of removal and legal permanent resident status because he was the father of two (2) U.S. citizen daughters for whom he was the sole support. However, the plea agreement deprived him of any opportunity to apply for relief and remain in the U.S. with his family. Further, even without the stipulation to judicial removal, his plea to Social Security Fraud prevents him from showing the requisite good moral character necessary to establish eligibility for cancellation of removal. While it can be argued that the "good moral character" requirement was put into the law to prevent undesirables from benefiting by becoming citizens, who can dispute the good moral character of a man that engages in dangerous backbreaking labor to support two young children. Clearly, given what was at stake for him, this man should have been afforded an adequate opportunity to consider the ramifications of a guilty plea and should not have been required to stipulate to his removal.

### **iii. Adjustment of Status.**

Any worker who was the spouse of a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident or who had U.S. citizen son or daughter over the age of 21, may have been eligible to apply for lawful permanent residence based on their close relative. The immigration law generally provides that close relatives may sponsor their next of kin for green cards. Workers who had been advised of their eligibility for lawful permanent residency based on a close family tie to a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident would have understood that by signing the uniform plea agreement and waiving their right to contest removal, they were also giving up any hope they had of becoming lawful permanent residents.

Considering again the worker from Mexico with two (2) young U.S. citizen daughters described by Dr. Camayd-Freixas' in his essay, he may have been entitled to adjust his status under 8 U.S.C. § 1225. If he were married to a U.S. citizen or lawful permanent resident, she could have filed an immigrant petition on his behalf which would have allowed him to apply for his green card based on his *bona fide* marriage. His rights and options were undoubtedly unfairly abridged by the expedited procedure employed by the government at the NCC. Had he been afforded the minimum amount of time necessary to build an effective defense to the government's charges, his CJA lawyer would have extensively interviewed him, investigated his claims and advised him as to his options. Assuming that there was a question of fact as to whether the government could prove each and every element of the charges, the lawyer would have carefully laid out the options and made a recommendation. In a system of justice that jealously protected his rights, he would have had an adequate opportunity to consider that a conviction for a crime involving moral turpitude would render him forever inadmissible to the U.S., his wife's country of citizenship.

#### **iv. U and T Visas For Crime Victims.**

Given that each of the arrested workers was employed at Agriprocessors, which, at the time of the arrests, had been under investigation for a number of serious violations, it would follow that among the arrested workers were some who may have been victims of trafficking and crimes. Broadly speaking, the U and T visas are designed to protect immigrant victims of human trafficking and crime:

- By insuring access to the U.S. civil and criminal justice systems;
- By safeguarding the victims' availability so they can assist the state and their civil advocates; and
- By providing a path to legal permanent residence regardless of the victims' manner of entry into the United States.<sup>4</sup>

Yet the expedited conviction scheme employed by the government in Iowa did not permit an individualized assessment of the workers' eligibility for protection under the U or T visa categories.

---

<sup>4</sup> See generally, *Advanced Issues In Working With Noncitizen Crime Victims: Winning U and T Visas, Working With Law Enforcement, And Ethical Considerations For All Immigration Practitioners Encountering Victims of Trafficking and Crimes*, by Lea M. Webb, Gail Pendleton, and B. Kent Felty, Immigration and Nationality Handbook (AILA 2008).

#### **v. Special Immigrant Juvenile Status.**

Several juveniles were among the 400 hundred arrested in Agriprocessors. After the raid, the National Consumers League issued a press release in which it called on the Department of Labor to investigate allegations of child labor violations at Agriprocessors. According to Senator Tom Harkin, some eighteen children and teens were allegedly working in the slaughterhouse when it was raided.

It is not clear what happened to them. Dr. Camayd-Freixas recounts that some were released with ankle bracelets while others were processed for immediate deportation. This is disturbing and should be investigated. Congress has given these children very important rights under the immigration law. As juveniles, they could be eligible for Special Immigrant Juvenile status which permits them to stay in the U.S. as legal permanent residents if there is a determination by a competent juvenile court that they are eligible for long term foster care and return to their home country is not in their best interest.

#### **vi. Analysis of Potential Claims to U.S. Citizenship.**

While not technically a form of relief from deportation, anyone charged as a deportable alien cannot be removed if he or she can prove U.S. citizenship. People born outside the United States may be U.S. citizens and not even know it. U.S. citizenship can be derived through parents and grandparents. See, e.g. 8 U.S.C. § 1401. In Postville, the workers, all charged with serious crimes essentially as a result of their status as undocumented immigrants, should have been afforded, as part of their defense, an opportunity to thoroughly examine and analyze claims to U.S. citizenship. Clearly, a claim to U.S. citizenship for any of the workers would have materially affected the merits of the government's case.

### **IV. RECOMMENDATIONS.**

The workers impacted by this raid were essentially coerced into giving up procedural and substantive rights under the immigration law, including the right to a full hearing before an immigration judge which would have required the government to meet its statutory burden and afforded the defendants an opportunity to apply for relief from deportation. To ensure that due process protections are guaranteed in future ICE enforcement actions, the following immediate steps should be taken to guarantee full constitutional protections:

- Congress should enact legislation to require ICE to advise noncitizens of their rights, including the right to obtain counsel at their own expense.

- Immigration officers should advise arrestees that statements they make may be used against them and, when questioning an individual, distinguish between questions that the noncitizen must answer from those that the he or she may refrain from answering.
- ICE should ensure that all detainees remain in the current state where arrested until their cases are adjudicated and be provided with the opportunity to seek release on bond and a fair and full bond determination.
- ICE should ensure that any defendant who, after full consideration with a competent immigration attorney, is found to have a reasonable basis for seeking relief from deportation under our laws be provided with a full and fair immigration court hearing to determine the eligibility for such statutory and discretionary relief.
- AILA opposes expedited procedures that lack appropriate safeguards, including stipulated judicial orders of deportation, but if these measures are used, they should only be used in the most extreme cases and not for large-scale enforcement actions.
- Criminal defense attorneys with immigration expertise should be appointed for defendants who may be eligible for relief from removal and defense counsel should be given adequate time to associate with immigration attorneys for the review of potential relief from removal for those charged.
- Most importantly, ICE should direct its enforcement resources toward investigations of higher level threats to national security, criminal syndicates, and employers that deliberately violate the law rather than workers who contribute to the U.S. economy and social fabric.

The chilling spectacle that unfolded over a two week period at the Cattle Congress is a stain on our justice system and an affront to the core principals for which so many Americans have made the ultimate sacrifice. Congress should act now to ensure that all administration enforcement operations respect core American ideals of due process and fairness.