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I. Executive Summary

Birth tourism refers to expecting mothers traveling to the United States to obtain U.S. citizenship for their children. These tourists often cite the superior educational and professional opportunities available in the United States as their justification for making such a trip. Obtaining U.S. citizenship for their children is a hedged bet—a rainy day fund for a better life.

The benefits of U.S. citizenship require little explanation and should be cherished by all who are presented with such a unique privilege. Birth tourists surely understand the benefits, but fail to comprehend the privilege of U.S. citizenship. Birth tourism is problematic because it short circuits and demeans the U.S. naturalization process. U.S. citizenship is not a backup plan.

* * * * * * * * * *

This report discusses the State Department’s visa policies and other data maintained by the United States Government relevant to birth tourism. It also details two birth tourism companies who served this market.

2015 changes to State Department policies made birth tourism more accessible. In February 2015, State issued a cable on visa adjudication for birth tourism cases to all diplomatic posts. In that cable, the Department reiterated “travel to seek medical treatment, including giving birth, is legally permissible using a B visa.” The cable also instructed that tourists “traveling for the purpose of giving birth should be evaluated in the same manner as applicants traveling for other medical purposes.” This meant that birth tourists no longer had to misrepresent the purpose of their visit to the United States.

The State Department’s 2020 rule change made it more difficult for birth tourism companies to continue operations. In 2020, after the Committee began its investigation, State amended its regulations governing B visas. The amended rule confirmed “that travel to the United States with the primary purpose of obtaining U.S. citizenship for a child by giving birth in the United States is an impermissible basis for the issuance of a B nonimmigrant visa.” In making this change, the Department determined “that a more reasonable interpretation of the statutory provision and a better policy is that the statutory provision authorizing the issuance of visas to temporary visitors for pleasure does not extend to individuals whose primary purpose of travel is to obtain U.S. citizenship for a child.”

During its investigation, the Committee reviewed Customs and Border Protection TECS records in attempt to understand trends in birth tourism travel to
the United States. TECS records document incoming persons as they arrive at United States ports of entry. During this review, several trends emerged including large cash declarations by birth tourists, return visits, and significant adjustments for total healthcare costs.

**Significant Cash Declarations.** Birth tourists often made significant cash declarations upon entry to the United States. These declarations ranged from several thousand to several hundred thousand dollars. While most cash declarations ranged between $20,000 and $50,000, the TECS narrative for one birth tourist from 2019 reported a $301,400 cash declaration for medical expenses.

**Return Visits.** Birth tourists often traveled to the United States several times to secure citizenship for numerous children. It was common for those tourists to cite the educational and professional opportunities in the United States as their reason for doing so.

**Medical Bill Adjustments.** In several instances, the Committee identified tourists who received adjustments exceeding $25,000. As a result, in some cases the state where the child was born was left to pay the outstanding difference on the total costs incurred by the birth tourist. For example, one TECS narrative from 2019 documented that a birth tourist paid “$4,000 out of an approximate $34,000 hospital bill.” According to the narrative, the State of California paid the remaining balance.

As the practice of birth tourism became more prevalent, a cottage industry developed with entire companies catering to these individuals. This report examines two such companies who abused U.S. birthright citizenship. The first—Ada International—was based in California and catered to mostly Chinese customers. The second—Miami Mama—was based in Florida and worked primarily with Russian tourists. Since the Committee began its investigation, both companies appear to have discontinued operations. The report also profiles each company including pricing, housing, and healthcare services offered.
II. Findings and Recommendations

Findings of Fact

(1) Changes to State Department policies governing the issuance of B visas in 2015 made birth tourism more accessible. This change instructed consular officers not to deny visa applicants solely because they planned to travel to the United States to obtain citizenship for their child and that birth tourists should be treated like other medical visa applicants. This change also made visa fraud cases related to birth tourism more difficult to prosecute.

(2) After the Committee began its investigation, in 2020, the State Department amended its policies governing the issuance of B visas to prohibit travel to the United States solely for birth tourism. In its public notice regarding the rule change, the Department said visits “for pleasure” was an ambiguous category under the INA which previously could be interpreted to permit birth tourism. State “concluded that a more reasonable interpretation of the statutory provision and a better policy is that the statutory provision authorizing the issuance of visas to temporary visitors for pleasure does not extend to individuals whose primary purpose of travel is to obtain U.S. citizenship for a child.”

(3) The State Department’s 2020 policy change prohibiting birth tourism was a primary reason Miami Mama discontinued operations. During an interview with the Committee, one of Miami Mama’s owners said this rule change complicated their business operations to the point where it no longer made sense to continue offering services to birth tourists.

(4) Birth tourists often make substantial cash declarations upon entry to the United States, make return trips to secure citizenship for numerous children, and receive significant adjustments for total hospital costs incurred. According to CBP TECS records reviewed by the Committee, the cash declarations made by birth tourists ranged from several thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars. Birth tourists also made return visits citing the superior educational and career opportunities available to United States citizens. Last, the Committee found numerous instances where tourists received adjustments exceeding $25,000 and some cases where the state where the child was born was left to pay the difference.
Recommendations

(1) The State Department and Customs and Border Protection should strengthen their partnership to more comprehensively track birth tourism activity in the United States.

(2) Congress should clarify in law that the Immigration and Nationality Act does not authorize the issuance of visas to temporary visitors for pleasure who only travel to the United States to obtain citizenship for their child.
III. Background

The legal doctrine of birthright citizenship in the United States derives from the English common law of “birthright subjectship.”\(^1\) English common law held “that birth within the king’s dominion established the individual as a subject regardless of [his or her] parents’ nationality.”\(^2\) The American Colonists likewise believed “they owed allegiance to their individual colonial legislatures and to the King.”\(^3\)

Today, birthright citizenship or *jus soli*, is memorialized in the Citizenship Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.\(^4\) That clause states “[a]ll persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.”\(^5\) The Immigration and Nationality Act reaffirms this by stating “a person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof” is a “national[ ] and citizen[ ] of the United States at birth.”\(^6\)

While birthright citizenship has many undeniable benefits, it also enabled a troubling and unintentional phenomenon known as “birth tourism.” Birth tourism describes the practice by which expecting parents travel to the United States to give birth and secure U.S. citizenship for their children.\(^7\)

A. Birthright Citizenship in the United States

Birthright citizenship in the United States is enshrined in the Fourteenth Amendment’s Citizenship Clause. Prior to the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment, the Supreme Court’s 1859 *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision called this principle into question.\(^8\) The Court held that Scott was “not a citizen . . . in the sense in which that word is used in the Constitution,” and therefore that American common law was not applicable to freed slaves of African descent.\(^9\)

---


\(^2\) *Id.* at 672.

\(^3\) *Id.* at 677.


\(^5\) U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1.


Several years later, Congress addressed the *Dred Scott* decision by passing the Civil Rights Act of 1866.\(^{10}\) This law codified birthright citizenship nationally.\(^{11}\) In the same year, Congress reiterated its commitment to birthright citizenship by referring the Fourteenth Amendment to the States for ratification.\(^{12}\)

Despite the Fourteenth Amendment’s adoption, the Citizenship Clause required further judicial interpretation. For example, in the 1898 Supreme Court case *U.S. v. Wong Kim Ark*, the Court considered whether the child of Chinese-citizen parents, who were lawful permanent residents in the United States, was a U.S. citizen under the Fourteenth Amendment.\(^{13}\)

In resolving this issue, the Court determined the Fourteenth Amendment “in clear words and in manifest intent, includes the children born, within the territory of the United States, of all other persons, of whatever race or color, domiciled in the United States.”\(^{14}\) The Court explained further, “every citizen or subject of another country, while domiciled here, is within the allegiance and the protection, and consequently subject to the jurisdiction of the United States.”\(^{15}\) Therefore, the Court held there are no considerations “that can constrain or permit the judiciary to refuse to give full effect to the peremptory and explicit language of the Fourteenth Amendment, which declares and ordains that ‘[a]ll persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States.’”\(^{16}\)

**B. Naturalization**

Persons not granted citizenship at birth can become U.S. citizens through naturalization. To submit an application for naturalization, an individual must meet several requirements.\(^{17}\) First, applicants must be 18 years old and a permanent resident for at least five years at the time the application is filed.\(^{18}\) Second, applicants must demonstrate they “have lived for at least 3 months in the state or [U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services] district” where they apply and document continuous residence five years prior to the submission of the

\(^{10}\) Civil Rights Act of 1866, Pub. L. No. 39-26, 14 Stat. 27 (1866).

\(^{11}\) Id.


\(^{13}\) United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649 (1898).

\(^{14}\) Id. at 693.

\(^{15}\) Id.

\(^{16}\) Id. at 694 (quoting U.S. CONST. amend. XIV, § 1).


\(^{18}\) Id.
application.\textsuperscript{19} Beyond residency requirements, applicants must be able to read, write, and speak basic English.\textsuperscript{20} Applicants must also maintain a basic understanding of U.S. government and “demonstrate an attachment to the principles and ideals of the U.S. Constitution.”\textsuperscript{21}

If an individual is eligible to naturalize, they must go through several steps to become a U.S. citizen.\textsuperscript{22} First, applicants must prepare and submit an N-400 form.\textsuperscript{23} This application includes documents demonstrating eligibility and other supporting documents like passport photos.\textsuperscript{24} After candidates submit the application, the FBI records biometrics for its criminal background checks.\textsuperscript{25} These background checks must be completed before an applicant will be granted an interview.\textsuperscript{26}

Once the preliminary steps are completed, applicants sit for their interview with U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (“USCIS”).\textsuperscript{27} During that interview, USCIS asks questions about the materials submitted in the N-400 form and applicants sit for English and civic tests.\textsuperscript{28} In some cases, applications are continued because an individual fails the English or civics test, submits incorrect documentation, or USCIS determines they need additional information.\textsuperscript{29} Applicants who fail one of the examinations are given another opportunity within 60 to 90 days of their first interview.\textsuperscript{30}

Following the interview, USCIS provides the applicant with a “written notice of decision.”\textsuperscript{31} If USCIS denies the application, individuals have 30 days to submit a formal appeal.\textsuperscript{32} If an applicant fails to meet this deadline, USCIS’s decision is final.\textsuperscript{33} For those USCIS approves, the naturalization process concludes with an
oath of allegiance. This oath is often administered by a judge during a judicial ceremony.

C. United States Visa Policy & Admission of Nonimmigrants

The Immigration and Nationality Act (“INA”) governs all migration to the United States. For this purpose, the INA distinguishes foreign nationals who are admitted on a temporary basis from those admitted permanently. Foreign nationals admitted on a temporary basis are referred to as nonimmigrants. This class includes “tourists, foreign students, diplomats, temporary agricultural workers, cultural exchange visitors, internationally known entertainers, foreign media representatives, intracompany business personnel, and crew members on foreign vessels.”

While nonimmigrant visitors have a positive influence on the economy, their admission at times may also lead to security concerns and illegal immigration. For example, “recent estimates suggest that nonimmigrants who overstay their visas now account for more than half of all new entrants to the unauthorized alien population.” Congress also recently highlighted the efforts of certain individuals admitted as non-immigrants to influence debate on U.S. college campuses and compromise federally funded research projects.

1. Nonimmigrant Visas

The State Department (“State”) and the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) each have significant roles in nonimmigrant admissions to the United States. On the front end of the process, foreign nationals seeking nonimmigrant admission must submit a visa application to a U.S. embassy or consulate. Once submitted, an applicant must satisfy a State Department consular officer that

34 Id.
35 Id.
37 Id.
38 Id.
40 Id.
41 Id.
42 STAFF OF S. PERMANENT SUBCOMM. ON INVESTIGATIONS, 116TH CONG., REP. ON CHINA’S IMPACT ON U.S. EDUCATION SYSTEM (COMM. PRINT 2019); STAFF OF S. PERMANENT SUBCOMM. ON INVESTIGATIONS, 116TH CONG., REP. ON THREATS TO THE U.S. RESEARCH ENTERPRISE: CHINA’S TALENT RECRUITMENT PLANS (COMM. PRINT 2019).
44 Id.
applicant is eligible to receive a nonimmigrant visa. Upon entry to the United States, a DHS Customs and Border Protection (“CBP”) inspector must be convinced of the same. For each of these evaluations, the burden is on the applicant to demonstrate he or she qualifies for a nonimmigrant visa.

Nonimmigrant visas are very broad, spanning 24 categories and 80 different visa types. Some of these categories cover diplomats, tourists, temporary workers, multinational corporate executives, and students. For each of these categories, there are different requirements “regarding length of stay, foreign residence requirements, employment authorization, labor market test requirements, [and] annual numerical limit.”

Under the Visa Waiver Program, however, some nonimmigrant visitors can travel to the United States without obtaining a visa. In particular, business and tourist visitors from 40 countries in Europe, Asia, Oceania, and South America can travel to the United States without a visa for 90 days or less. Before traveling to the U.S., visa waiver travelers “must obtain pre-travel authorization through the Electronic System for Travel Authorization (“ESTA”). DHS runs this system and “determines the eligibility of the foreign national to enter under the [waiver program].” Once granted, ESTA authorization is valid for multiple entries over two years.

---

45 Id.
46 Id.
47 Id.
54 Id.
55 Id.
a. Visitors for Pleasure

The most commonly used nonimmigrant visa category pertaining to birth tourism is visits for pleasure. This travel falls under the State’s B-2 visa category and includes travel that is recreational, including tourism, visiting friends or relatives, or is related to medical treatment, activities of a fraternal, social, or service nature. Individuals using these visas cannot receive payment for any activities performed while in the United States. When compared to other nonimmigrant categories, “tourists have consistently been the largest nonimmigrant class of admission to the United States.”

b. Policies Governing Admission of Visitors for Pleasure

Beyond agency policies and regulations, the INA Section 212 establishes several grounds for inadmissibility. These include:

- health-related grounds;
- past criminal convictions;
- security or terrorist activities;
- public charge;
- labor certification and qualifications for certain immigrants;
- illegal entrants and immigration violators;
- lack of valid passport and related entry documents;
- ineligible for citizenship;
- aliens previously removed; and
- miscellaneous (polygamists, kidnappers, and unlawful voters).

The INA does, however, provide waivers for foreign nationals found inadmissible to the United States. For example, the DHS Secretary has the authority to waive an inadmissibility determination based on health-related grounds “in the case of any alien who is the spouse or the unmarried son or daughter, or the minor unmarried lawfully adopted child, of a United States citizen, or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, or of an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa.” Likewise, waivers may be issued to certain foreign nationals based on compassionate grounds or when it is in the U.S. national interest.

---

57 Id.
58 JILL H. WILSON, CONG. RESEARCH SERV., R45040, IMMIGRATION: NONIMMIGRANT (TEMPORARY) ADMISSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES 6 (2019).
60 Id.
61 Id. at 1182(g); 22 C.F.R. § 40 (2019).
interest, such as for foreign officials.\textsuperscript{62} The discretion to grant waivers varies depending on inadmissibility ground and each is evaluated on a case-by-case basis.\textsuperscript{63}

In addition to the inadmissibility grounds listed in section 212 of the INA, consular officers may deny foreign nationals a B-2 visa under section 214(b) of the INA.\textsuperscript{64} Section 214(b) establishes a rebuttable presumption that every foreign national intends to remain in the United States on a permanent basis until proven otherwise to the satisfaction of the consular officer.\textsuperscript{65} This presumption is the “most common basis for rejecting nonimmigrant visa applications.”\textsuperscript{66}

\textit{State Department Policies}

State’s Foreign Affairs Manual (“FAM”) provides guidance to consular officers regarding the issuance of B-2 visas.\textsuperscript{67} The FAM is the “Department’s single, comprehensive, and authoritative source for the Department’s organization structures, policies, and procedures that govern the operations of the State Department, the Foreign Service, and, when applicable, other federal agencies.”\textsuperscript{68} This guidance ensures consular officers adjudicate B visa applications according to specific criteria developed by the State Department’s immigration attorneys.\textsuperscript{69}

When assessing applications for temporary visitors, consular officers must consider whether the applicant: (1) has residence in a foreign country which the applicant intends to retain; (2) intends to visit the United States for only a limited time period; and (3) seeks admission for legal activities involving business or pleasure.\textsuperscript{70} If an applicant does not meet one or more of these requirements, consular officers “must refuse the applicant under [section 214(b) of the INA].”\textsuperscript{71}

As it relates to B-2 visitors for pleasure, permissible criteria includes:

- tourism;
- family visits;

\textsuperscript{63} Id.
\textsuperscript{65} Id.
\textsuperscript{67} Letter from Mary Elizabeth Taylor, U.S. Dep’t of State, Assistant Secretary Bureau of Legislative Affairs to Sen. Rob Portman (Feb. 14, 2019).
\textsuperscript{68} Id.
\textsuperscript{69} 9 FAM 402.2-2(B).
\textsuperscript{70} Id.
\textsuperscript{71} Id.
participation in social events;
armed forces dependents;
most courses of study;
amateur entertainers & athletes; and
medical treatment.\textsuperscript{72}

If an applicant seeks travel for medical reasons, consular officers “must be satisfied that a medical practitioner in the United States has agreed to treat the applicant, and the applicant must provide information indicating the projected cost of treatment and any incidental expenses.”\textsuperscript{73} Consular officers must also be satisfied that applicants have the ability and intent to pay for all medical treatment and expenses “including transportation and living expenses, doctors’ and hospitalization fees, as well as other medical and related expenses, either independently or with the pre-arranged assistance of others.”\textsuperscript{74}

To determine if an applicant meets these requirements, consular officers can request supporting documentation and evidence. For example, they can ask for “a medical diagnosis from a local physician, explaining the nature of the ailment and the reason the applicant seeks medical treatment in the United States.”\textsuperscript{75} They can also request a letter from a U.S. doctor or hospital “stating that they are willing to treat the applicant’s specific ailment and detailing the projected length and cost of treatment, including doctors’ fees, hospitalization fees, and all medical-related expenses.”\textsuperscript{76} Last, consular officers may request proof that the visitor’s expenses will be paid during their time in the United States.\textsuperscript{77} To demonstrate sufficient funds, applicants can present a range of financial documents, including bank statements, investment statements, or certified copies of income tax returns.\textsuperscript{78}

Although birth tourist travel to the United States was previously permissible under the medical treatment category, in January 2020 State updated the FAM to include specific provisions on travel to give birth.\textsuperscript{79} That FAM section states “visiting temporarily for pleasure does not include travel for the primary purpose of obtaining U.S. citizenship for a child by giving birth in the United States.”\textsuperscript{80} If consular officers believe the applicant will give birth during her time in the United States, the applicant is “presumed to be traveling for the primary purpose of

\textsuperscript{72} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A).
\textsuperscript{73} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(2).
\textsuperscript{74} Id.
\textsuperscript{75} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(2)(a).
\textsuperscript{76} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(2)(b).
\textsuperscript{77} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(2)(c).
\textsuperscript{78} Id.
\textsuperscript{79} 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(8).
\textsuperscript{80} Id.
obtaining U.S. citizenship for the child.”81 This rebuttable presumption can be overcome if the applicant establishes some other legitimate purpose for the travel.82

The FAM does, however, limit a consular officer’s ability to determine when an applicant’s primary reason for visiting is to give birth. For instance, officers are instructed not to directly “ask a visa applicant whether they are pregnant unless [they] have a specific articulable reason to believe [the applicant] may be pregnant and planning to give birth in the United States.”83 The FAM explicitly prohibits officers from asking female applicants if they are pregnant or otherwise requesting information demonstrating they are not pregnant.84

Beyond those limitations, the FAM provides several circumstances under which the presumption described above is overcome. One example is when an applicant travels to visit a dying family member and the applicant’s due date happens to overlap.85 The presumption can also be overcome by a complicated pregnancy requiring specialized medical care that is not presently “available in or near the country where the applicant resides.”86

Nevertheless, just because an applicant arranges a birth plan with a U.S. doctor or otherwise indicates she prefers to give birth in the United States, that “is not sufficient to rebut the presumption that [the applicant’s] primary purpose of travel is obtaining U.S. citizenship for the child.”87 Under the FAM, the key consideration for consular officers in these situations is “whether the applicant has access to reasonable medical care in or near the country where the applicant resides.”88

**CBP Inspection Process**

After State issues a visa to a nonimmigrant traveler, CBP screens all air passengers traveling to the United States.89 To facilitate these checks, commercial airlines transmit Passenger Name Record (“PNR”) data to CBP 72 hours before the passenger’s flight.90 Moreover, when nonimmigrant travelers check in for their international flight, airlines send passenger and crew manifests to CBP for

81 Id.
82 Id.
83 9 FAM 402.2-4(A)(8(a).
84 Id.
85 9 FAM 402.-4(A)(8(d).
86 9 FAM 402.-4(A)(8(c).
87 9 FAM 402.-4(A)(8(e).
88 Id.
90 Id.
additional vetting. This biographic data is submitted to CBP’s Advance Passenger Information System (“APIS”). APIS houses the passenger information from inbound flights used to “identify high-risk and inadmissible passengers.”

Once CBP receives the PNR and APIS data, it is sent to its National Targeting Center (“NTC”) where passengers “are vetted against intelligence and law enforcement databases.” This includes checks against terrorist watch lists. If NTC identifies a match, it can issue no-board recommendations to the airline or flag passengers for secondary inspection upon arrival in the United States.

In addition to the NTC, CBP’s Immigration Advisory Program (“IAP”) authorizes officers to similarly review documents and conduct interviews to identify high-risk travelers. The IAP posts officers at eleven airports in nine different countries. Officers participating in this program lack enforcement authority, but can make no-board recommendations and flag passengers for secondary inspection. Officers serve only as advisors to partner nations and “hold no authority while working in the host country.”

Once travelers arrive in the United States, CBP officers confirm they are entitled to enter the United States. At the same time, biographic information on the passenger is fed into CBP’s TECS system. TECS checks “travelers against law enforcement and national security watchlists and . . . [records] and [reports] on primary and secondary inspection results.”

Beyond these checks, upon entry all non-citizens must also submit biometric data including fingerprints and photographs. If these examinations trigger no red flags, travelers are granted entry. If an officer has suspicions surrounding the admissibility of a passenger, the officer can conduct secondary inspections.
This suspicion can stem from a high Automated Targeting System ("ATS") score, or negative information found by CBP officers in TECS. General suspicious behavior, responses, or documents may also trigger additional examinations. A small percentage of arriving travelers are also selected at random for secondary inspection.

In years past, nonimmigrant visitors filled out an I-94 form upon arrival in the United States. That form contained the visitor’s date of admission, admission class, and visa expiration date. The I-94 form helped CBP identify individuals overstaying their visas. Nonetheless, the collection of these forms proved ineffective because they were often not collected from travelers as they exited the country.

Today, electronic I-94 forms are only issued at land border points of entry. For air and sea arrivals, CBP automatically gathers arrival and departure information from its electronic records. Due to these changes, information regarding a visitor’s departure from the United States is now recorded electronically through CBP’s review of flight manifests provided by the airlines. Beyond the added accuracy of the electronic method, “this automation streamlines the process for travelers, facilitates security and reduces federal costs.”

During secondary inspection, travelers must undergo several additional vetting procedures. These include extensive interviews, physical searches, and fingerprinting. During these examinations, the burden is on the visitor to establish they are eligible to be admitted to the United States. In particular, travelers “must present whatever documents are required and must establish to the satisfaction of the inspecting officer that the alien is not subject to removal” under the laws of the United States. If a visitor is found inadmissible, they are

---

107 Id.
108 Id. at 12.
109 Id.
110 Id. at 12.
111 Id.
112 Id.
113 Id.
115 Id.
116 Id.
117 Id.
119 8 C.F.R. § 235.1(f).
120 Id.
normally removed in one of four ways: withdrawal of application, standard removal, expedited removal, and criminal arrest.121

When an application for admission is withdrawn, “the alien’s decision to withdraw his or her application for admission must be made voluntarily, but nothing in this [regulation] shall be construed as to give an alien the right to withdraw his or her application for admission.”122 Moreover, “permission to withdraw an application for admission should not normally be granted unless the alien intends and is able to depart the United States immediately.”123

Under standard removal proceedings, written notice must be provided to the applicant.124 That notice, among other things, must specify: (1) the nature of the proceedings against the alien; (2) the alleged unlawful conduct; and (3) the charges brought against the alien.125 Prior to removal, an alien is entitled to a hearing before an immigration judge.126 During this hearing, the alien is entitled to representation by counsel, but not at the government’s expense.127 The alien also has the reasonable opportunity “to examine the evidence against [them], to present evidence on the [their] own behalf, and to cross-examine witnesses presented by the Government.”128

Foreign travelers lacking appropriate documents or who present fraudulent information may be subject to expedited removal.129 Expedited procedures allow CBP to “order the alien removed from the United States without further hearing or review unless the alien indicates either an intention to apply for asylum . . . or [articulates] a fear of persecution.”130

Last, CBP officers have the authority to arrest aliens upon the discovery of an outstanding warrant for their arrest.131 Under this authority, USCIS operates the Criminal Alien Tracking Center which assists “Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in identifying and locating aliens who may be subject to

---

122 8 C.F.R. § 235.4.
123 Id.
125 Id.
127 Id.
128 Id.
130 Id.
removal by reason of their conviction of aggravated felonies, . . . not lawfully present in the United States, or otherwise removable.”

IV. State Department Policies Governing Birth Tourism

Starting in 2014, several changes to State Department policy made birth tourism more accessible. The first of these changes came in November 2014 when the United States and China entered a ten-year reciprocal visa agreement. Before this agreement, visas issued to Chinese citizens only lasted for one year. Subsequently, a February 2015 State Department cable to all consular offices explained consular officers should not deny visa applicants solely because they planned to travel to the United States to obtain citizenship for their child, and that birth tourists should be treated like other medical visa applicants.

In a 2019 letter to the Committee, the State Department downplayed the impact of the February 2015 cable. The Department stated it “has not made any substantial changes since 2009 to its guidance on the permissibility of visa issuance for medical travel.” The Department also said “the sole change to the relevant FAM provision was made on December 28, 2017, explicitly instructing officers to examine an applicant’s means to pay for treatment in determining eligibility for a visa.”

A. State Department Cables Related to Birth Tourism

February 2015 Cable

On February 20, 2015, the State Department issued a cable to all diplomatic and consular posts regarding visa adjudication for birth tourism cases. The February 2015 cable reiterated “travel to seek medical treatment, including giving birth, is legally permissible using a B visa.” The cable furthermore acknowledged “many foreign nationals purposefully seek out the world-class medical care available in the United States, and individuals traveling to the United States solely to obtain U.S. citizenship for their newborn children are not in violation of any

---

132 Id.
134 Id.
135 Id.
136 Id.
137 U.S. Dep’t of State Letter to the Committee (Feb. 14, 2019) (on file with the Committee).
138 Id.
139 Id.
141 Id.
Most importantly, the cable clarified that “those traveling for the purpose of giving birth should be evaluated in the same manner as applicants traveling for other medical purposes.”

In situations where applicants directly stated their intention to travel to the United States to give birth, the cable specified it was reasonable for consular officers “to request proof of her ability to pay for the treatment, which could include doctors’ and hospitalization fees as well as other medical and related expenses.” If it became clear the applicant could not provide for those costs “without resorting to unlawful employment,” the cable indicated refusal under INA section 214(b) was appropriate.

The cable concluded with a discussion of how to properly apply INA ineligibilities. On this point, the cable instructed, “no visa applicant can be found inadmissible solely on the basis of a plan to give birth in the United States.” Moreover, it specified that an applicant’s prior receipt of Medicaid or other government benefits should not result in an automatic ineligibility under the INA. The cable did, however, point out that past “receipt of public benefits does justify greater scrutiny of an applicant’s present intent and possible qualifications of 214(b).”

When asked by the Committee how the 2015 cable impacted potential birth tourist visitors, State officials responded “that the cable did not prevent consular officers from denying visa applicants intending to give birth in the United States.” State instead maintained that the cable “instruct[ed] officers to evaluate these applicants in the same manner as applicants traveling for other medical purposes.” In a subsequent call with Committee staff, the Department reiterated its position that the cable did not represent a policy change with respect to birth tourism when issued in 2015. Nevertheless, State officials were not able to speak to the motivation behind the cable. According to the officials, the cable represented the maintenance of the status quo as it relates to birth tourism.
The impact of this cable, however, has not been consistent across the U.S. Government. Since its release, the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s Homeland Security Investigations (“HSI”) has struggled to prosecute birth tourist visa fraud cases previously predicated on an applicant’s false statements regarding the purpose of their visit. Because travel to give birth was treated like all other forms of medical travel, birth tourists no longer had to misrepresent the purpose of their visit. Due to this change, and without the ability to bring visa fraud cases, HSI had to shift their focus to the fraudulent and illegal business practices of birth tourism companies.

March 2016 Cable

Following the November 2014 announcement of the ten-year multi-entry visa agreement, “the governments of the United States and China mutually recognized that the United States would require Chinese citizens to periodically and electronically update biographical information submitted in their original visa applications.” The cable hailed the B visa extension as “a milestone in the diplomatic relations between the United States and China, and reflects the continued deepening of people-to-people ties between our two nations.”

The cable required ten-year B visa holders to update all biographical information prior to their initial trip to the United States and then every two years thereafter or if they obtained a new passport. All visitor information was to be stored in the Electronic Visa Update System (“EVUS”) managed by CBP.

Once EVUS was operational, the cable stated all “Chinese 10-year B visa holders, regardless of issuance date, who have not enrolled in EVUS will not be permitted to board a plane to the United States.” Failure to update biographical information as required by the cable did not carry significant consequences as travelers could correct these omissions at any time prior to travel.

The EVUS rollout coincided with the United States-China Tourism Year. This was “an initiative designed to expand and shape travel between [the two] countries, support progress on market access, and advance initiatives for both the United States and China to ensure a quality visitor experience for increasing
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156 Id.
157 Id.
159 Id.
160 Id.
161 Id.
162 Id. at 1–2.
163 Id. at 2.
numbers of travelers.”\textsuperscript{164} The cable noted a smooth rollout of EVUS was necessary to prevent any disruption to Chinese tourist travel to the United States.\textsuperscript{165}

With ten-year multi-entry visas, Chinese citizens were no longer required to undergo annual interviews upon entry into the United States. When asked by the Committee about the impact of the B visa extension, the Department responded “we are not tracking birth tourists” meaning State does not have a clear picture of how prevalent birth tourism is in the United States.\textsuperscript{166} When asked if State thought the EVUS system served as a sufficient proxy for annual interviews, Department officials said they defer to CBP on whether the system does a good job of maintaining accurate visa holder information.\textsuperscript{167}

\textit{December 2018 Cable}

In December 2018, State issued updated guidance on birth and medical tourism cases.\textsuperscript{168} This cable took a stronger tone summarizing that all visa applicants seeking medical care, including birth tourists, “must demonstrate . . . that they had the means and intent to pay for all treatment-related costs.”\textsuperscript{169}

Much like the 2015 cable, the updated guidance stipulated that a visa applicant’s ability to pay included doctor and hospitalization costs as well as living expenses for the duration of their stay.\textsuperscript{170} To determine ability and intent, consular officers could request bank documents, insurance arrangements, and other financial documents.\textsuperscript{171} According to the cable, this evaluation could “also include checking and confirming the bona fides of service companies, health providers, and hospitals in the United States identified by the applicant.”\textsuperscript{172}

If consular officers identified an applicant who previously failed to pay for medical expenses while in the United States, the cable instructed officers to “consider a line of questions appropriate for determining the applicant’s credibility and intent to engage in potentially unlawful activity or otherwise evade payment of future medical expenses in the United States.”\textsuperscript{173} Nevertheless, the cable clarified

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{164} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Committee call with the U.S. Dep’t of State (Dec. 13, 2019).
\item \textsuperscript{167} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{168} U.S. DEP’T OF STATE, UPDATED ADJUDICATION GUIDANCE ON BIRTH AND MEDICAL TOURISM CASES 1 (Dec. 1, 2018).
\item \textsuperscript{169} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{170} Id. at 2.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{173} Id.
\end{itemize}
that a previous unpaid medical bill alone was not sufficient grounds for visa denial.\textsuperscript{174}

The cable concluded with the instruction to consider denials under INA section 214(b) prior to INA section 212(a)(4)’s public charge.\textsuperscript{175} This was because section 214(b) “applies equally to all B visa applicants, regardless of purpose of travel.”\textsuperscript{176}

State indicated that the 2018 cable did not represent a policy change but instead was issued as part of the Department’s efforts to promote consistency in the visa adjudication process.\textsuperscript{177} At the same time, State noted the 2018 cable’s reiteration that birth tourism is not prohibited under the INA.\textsuperscript{178} Officials also highlighted the cable’s strengthened language regarding inadmissibilities for public charge.\textsuperscript{179}

During a conference call with the Department, Committee staff asked several questions surrounding State’s procedures for validating financial documents presented by visa applicants.\textsuperscript{180} The Department informed the Committee that State’s Fraud Prevention Unit at consulates evaluate the validity of bank documents presented during applicant interviews.\textsuperscript{181} State, however, does not have a strong relationship with Chinese banks, and so confirming the authenticity of these documents is difficult.\textsuperscript{182} As a result, the Department tries to rely on applicant interviews instead of documents.\textsuperscript{183} As an alternative to financial statements, consular officers attempt to determine an applicant’s income by asking questions like what kind of car they drive.\textsuperscript{184} Nevertheless, when an applicant presents financial documents during interviews, State does not retain or otherwise scan them into a database.\textsuperscript{185} The Department did note that consular officers sometimes take notes for visa applicant files, but this is often reserved for medical emergencies.\textsuperscript{186}

When asked by the Committee if the Department felt there were national security risks associated with birth tourism, State officials said they were hesitant
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to answer the question and thought DHS is a better group to speak to this point.\footnote{Id.} State officials did say they were unaware of any particular threats, but they could see some risk down the road where individuals would have access to sensitive national security jobs.\footnote{Id.}

**B. 2020 Rule Change**

Just over a month after a Committee call with the State Department, State amended its regulation governing B visas.\footnote{Id.; Visas: Temporary Visitors for Business or Pleasure, 85 Fed. Reg. 4,219–4,225 (Jan. 24, 2020) (codified at 22 C.F.R. pt. 22).} The amended rule “estabishes that travel to the United States with the primary purpose of obtaining U.S. citizenship for a child by giving birth in the United States is an impermissible basis for the issuance of a B nonimmigrant visa.”\footnote{Id.} The Department justified the change saying it “does not believe that visiting the United States for the primary purpose of obtaining U.S. citizenship for a child by giving birth in the United States . . . is a legitimate activity for pleasure or of a recreational nature, for purposes of consular officers adjudicating applications for B nonimmigrant visas.”\footnote{Id.} Last, the new rule creates a rebuttable presumption that the primary purpose of an applicant’s visit is to secure U.S. citizenship for the child if a consular officer has reason to believe the applicant will give birth in the United States.\footnote{Id.}

The new rule limits the definition of “pleasure” to “legitimate activities of a recreational character, including tourism, amusement, visits with friends or relatives, rest, medical treatment, and activities of a fraternal, social, or services nature.”\footnote{Id.} It does not, however, include travel to secure U.S. citizenship for a child.\footnote{Id.} The new rule also includes strengthened language on medical travel in general. For instance, a new provision “provides that a nonimmigrant B visa applicant seeking medical treatment in the United States shall be denied a visa under INA section 214(b) . . . if [they are] unable to establish, to the satisfaction of a consular officer, a legitimate reason why he or she wishes to travel to the United States for medical treatment.”\footnote{Id.} In addition to having a legitimate reason for medical travel, the applicant must demonstrate the means and intent to pay for all treatment costs and incidental expenses while in the United States.\footnote{Id.}
In its public notice regarding the rule change, the Department said visits “for pleasure” is an ambiguous category under the INA which previously could be interpreted to permit birth tourism. State “concluded that a more reasonable interpretation of the statutory provision and a better policy is that the statutory provision authorizing the issuance of visas to temporary visitors for pleasure does not extend to individuals whose primary purpose of travel is to obtain U.S. citizenship for a child.” State clarified that it “considers birth tourism an inappropriate basis for the issuance of temporary visitor visas.”

The Department was careful to point out that the change does not impact B visas for specialized and legitimate medical travel. Instead, according to the Department, the “rule seeks to balance the United States’ strong interest in curtailing birth tourism with its interests in facilitating legitimate medical travel.”

In further discussing reasons for the rule change, the Department identified national security and law enforcement concerns with birth tourism. State estimates that thousands of children are born to B visa visitors on an annual basis. This estimate is based on reports from U.S. embassies and consulates which have observed an increasing number of B visa applicants listing child birth as their primary purpose for travel to the United States.

One national security risk identified by the Department is the potential for enhanced hostile actor access to the United States. In particular, State said “permitting short-term visitors with no demonstrable ties to the United States to obtain visas to travel to the United States primarily to obtain U.S. citizenship for a child creates a potential long-term vulnerability for national security.” This change, therefore, sought to close that potential national security vulnerability.

To highlight the issues associated with birth tourism, the Department contrasted the numerous requirements a foreign national seeking naturalization...
must satisfy with those of a birth tourist child.\textsuperscript{208} The steps for naturalizing are extensive and include establishing:

attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States and favorable disposition toward the “good order and happiness” of the United States, including a depth of conviction that would lead to active support of the Constitution, and not be hostile to the basic form of government of the United States, or disbelieve in the principles of the Constitution.\textsuperscript{209}

As a result, when foreign nationals obtain citizenship as birth tourists, they “are able to help that child avoid the scrutiny, standards, and procedures that he or she would normally undergo if he or she sought to become a U.S citizen through naturalization.”\textsuperscript{210}

State also acknowledged the previous regulation’s failure “to address the national security vulnerability that could allow foreign governments or entities to recruit or groom U.S. citizens who were born as the result of birth tourism and raised overseas, without attachment to the United States, in manners that threaten the security of the United States.”\textsuperscript{211} This demeans the naturalization process of foreign nationals who demonstrate a clear and present intent to meaningfully contribute to American society.

V. Data on Birth Tourism in the United States

During a call with Committee staff, the State Department said it does not comprehensively track birth tourism.\textsuperscript{212} This includes the Department’s Consular Consolidated Database (“CCD”) which is “a data warehouse that holds current and archived data from the Bureau of Consular Affairs domestic and post databases.”\textsuperscript{213} CCD was created to provide “a near real-time aggregate of the consular transaction activity collected domestically and at post databases worldwide.”\textsuperscript{214}

According to the Department, it has no business interest in tracking birth tourism information, and it would require a legal justification to do so.\textsuperscript{215} Officials did point out, however, that there is a question on visa applications that asks for
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the general purpose of the travel.\textsuperscript{216} But, State said there is currently no way to disaggregate birth tourism from the larger medical travel subset.\textsuperscript{217}

Although not specific to tracking birth tourism, CBP’s TECS system does contain information on birth tourists. TECS is the “principal system used by officers at the border to assist with screening and determinations regarding admissibility of arriving persons.”\textsuperscript{218}

To get a sense of the most common features of the birth tourism industry in the United States, the Committee reviewed approximately 3,000 TECS narratives referencing “birth tourism” from 2015 to 2020. During that review, several trends emerged, including substantial cash declarations, return visits, and significant adjustments for total hospital costs incurred.

**Significant Cash Declarations.** TECS entries discussing travel for birth tourism often document the significant cash declarations made by prospective birth tourists. The amount of these declarations ranged from several thousand dollars to several hundred thousand dollars.\textsuperscript{219} Nevertheless, the most common cash declaration ranged from $20,000 to $50,000.\textsuperscript{220}

Below are examples of large cash declarations made by birth tourists during the timeframe reviewed by the Committee:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.01.15</td>
<td>SUBJECT IS A PHYSICIAN IN CHINA TRAVELING WITH WIFE (7 MONTHS PREGNANT). THEY ARE PLANNING TO HAVE THE 2ND CHILD ADDITIONAL COMMENTS BIRTH TOURISM. HIS WIFE AND PARENTS IN LAW ARE SCHEDULED TO RETURN TO CHINA IN DECEMBER 2015. HE WILL STAY 1 WEEK AND RETURN TO CHINA TO RESUME WORK. DECLARED $60,000 CASH. COUPLE IS FULLY AWARE THAT THEY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL THE FINANCIAL FEE ASSOCIATED.\textsuperscript{221}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.16</td>
<td>SUBJECT IS TRAVELING WITH HER HUSBAND FOR BIRTH TOURISM WITH RETURN TICKET FOR 08/03/2016. SUBJECT AND HER HUSBAND ADDITIONAL COMMENTS DISCLOSED THEIR INTENT TO AMCON, AND NOTES REFLECT SUCH IN CCD. SUBJECTS HUSBAND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Return Visits. Beyond large cash declarations, many birth tourists traveled to the United States several times to secure citizenship for their children. According to the TECS entries reviewed by the Committee, tourists were willing to make numerous trips because of the superior educational and career opportunities available to United States citizens. In addition, prior failure to disclose intent to give birth in the United States did not foreclose future travel for the same purpose.

The following TECS narratives provide examples of tourists who traveled to the United States on more than one occasion to attain citizenship for their children:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>06.16.17</td>
<td>GOING FOR BIRTH TOURISM. ALREADY HAS TWO CHILDREN BORN IN THE US. PLANS TO GIVE BIRTH IN CALIFORNIA. HAS SISTER LIVING IN THE US. WILL GIVE BIRTH IN HOSPITAL CLOSE TO HER. BROUGHT PROOF OF PAYMENT AND HOSPITAL LETTERS FOR FIRST TWO CHILDREN. HUSBAND IS MILITARY OFFICER. B-2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 04.17.18   | SUBJECT HAD DISCLOSED BIRTH TOURISM INTENT TO AMCON ON CURRENT (2ND) VISA ISSUED ON 03/30/2018 BUT SHE DID NOT DISCLOSE INTENT ON FIRST VISA IN 2014. AMCON-SHENYANG WAS AWARE OF HER BIRTH TOURISM FOR BOTH TRIPS AND PROMPTLY ISSUED HER A VISA. SUBJECT SAID SHE DID NOT REALIZE SHE CAN DECLARE BIRTH TOURISM INTENT TO AMCON TO OBTAIN HER VISA BUT ONCE SHE FOUND OUT SHE DECIDED TO BE HONEST THIS TIME. SUBJECT STATED SHE DID NOT USE PUBLIC BENEFITS ON FIRST DELIVERY IN 2014. THE AMOUNT SHE PAID $5K WAS THE CASH PAYMENT RATE CHARGED BY HOSPITALS TO THOSE WITHOUT HEALTH INSURANCE.  

09.27.18   | DISCLOSED BIRTH TOURISM. BABY BORN IN 2017. COMING TO HAVE 2ND US BABY. 2ND BABY DUE 11/07/2018. WILL DELIVER AT SOUTH COAST GLOBAL MEDICAL CENTER. SUBJECT PRESENTED RECEIPTS FROM 1ST BIRTH. RECEIVED $27K ADJUSTMENT. PAID CASH FLAT RATE.  

04.02.19   | THE SUBJECT IS TRAVELING SPECIFICALLY FOR BIRTH TOURISM. SHE PROVIDED BILLINGS AND PROOF OF INCOME. THE SUBJECT 1ST CHILD WAS BORN IN THE UNITED STATES THE SUBJECT PROVIDED A LIMITED BILLING INDICATED THEY PAID ONLY 3600USD FOR BIRTH AND HOSPITAL VISIT ON TOP OF DISCOUNTS. THE SUBJECT WAS NOT ABLE TO PROVIDE WHAT THE DISCOUNTS WAS. THEY FAILED TO OVERCOME THE BELIEF THEY USED PUBLIC BENEFITS.  

05.23.19   | BIRTH TOURISM, TRAVELING WITH HUSBAND, MOTHER AND FIRST USC CHILD. WILL RETURN IN THE END OF JULY WITH A RETURN TICKET TO DEPART. GAVE BIRTH TO FIRST CHILD IN 2016 FOR THE PURPOSE OF GETTING BETTER EDUCATION AND JOB OPPORTUNITY FOR CHILD. PRESENTED HOSPITAL INVOICE WITH THE TOTAL OF $9000 BUT PAID $2900 WITH AN ADJUSTMENT. STATED THEY HAVE MONEY AND DO NOT NEED DISCOUNT FROM THE HOSPITAL.  

**Medical Bill Adjustments.** A final trend worth noting is the significant adjustments many birth tourists had deducted from their total medical bills and covered by the state health care system or Medicaid. In numerous cases, the Committee identified instances where tourists received adjustments exceeding well over $25,000. In some cases, the state where the child was born paid the difference between the total cost incurred by the tourist and their cash payment.
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On more than one occasion, the tourists were unable to explain why they received such large adjustments.\(^{236}\)

Below are examples of birth tourists who paid far less than the total costs incurred:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05.25.17</td>
<td>PAID GARFIELD MEDICAL CENTER HOSPITAL $6,125 ON A CHARGE OF $56,510. RECEIVED ADJUSTMENT FOR PAYING CASH. TYPICAL OF BIRTH TOURISM FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS.(^{237})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.28.17</td>
<td>DISCLOSED BIRTH TO AMCON SECOND CHILD - ADMITTED B2 ADVISED NOT TO TAKE DISCOUNT AND PROVIDE PROOF OF PAYMENT - PAX ACQUIRED 20K DISCOUNT ON LAST CHILD AND ONLY PAID 3K - WARNED NOT TO REPEAT FRAUD.(^{238})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.02.18</td>
<td>SUBJECT PROVIDED ITEMIZED BILL FOR BIRTH FROM GARFIELD MEDICAL CENTER. SUBJECT RACKED UP A BILL OF $52,160 FOR THE CHILD BIRTH. SUBJECT RECEIVED AN ADJUSTMENT OF $46,810. PAID A FLAT RATE OF $5,350. SUBJECTS US-BORN SON ALSO HAD TO GO TO HOSPITAL AT 19 DAYS OLD FOR ILLNESS. BILL WAS FOR $16,758.53. PAID CASH DISCOUNT OF $6,055.00.(^{239})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.18.18</td>
<td>GAVE BIRTH AT POMONA VALLEY HOSPITAL MEDICAL CENTER EMPLOYING THE SERVICES OF FEMCARE MEDICAL ASSOCIATES, INC. SUN PROVIDED RECEIPTS INDICATING THAT SERVICES WERE PROVIDED FROM AUGUST 15, 2017 TO AUGUST 17, 2017. THE TOTAL CHARGES FOR THE BIRTH WAS $62,139.40. TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS WERE $55,139.40 WHICH LEFT LEFT A BALANCE OWING OF $7,000.00. THE RECEIPT INDICATED A CASH PAYMENT WAS MADE FOR THE $7K BALANCE ON AUGUST 31, 2017.(^{240})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.23.18</td>
<td>SUBJECT ALSO PRESENTED A DOCUMENT SHOWED THE TOTAL CHARGE WAS $39,473.75, AND TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS $33,373.75. TOTAL PAYMENT $6100, TOTAL BALANCE $0. SUBJECT NOT ABLE TO EXPLAIN WHERE IS THE ADJUSTMENT $33,373.75 CAME FROM, WHY DID SHE GET THE ADJUSTMENT. SUBJECT WAS ADVISED NEED TO GET FULL, COMPLETE AND CORRECT DOCUMENTS FROM HOSPITAL, TRAVEL WITH HER FOR THE FUTURE TRIP INSPECTION, AND PAID OFF THE AMOUNT WAS ADJUSTED OR EXPLAIN THE REASON WHO PAID THE ADJUSTMENT AMOUNT $33,373.75.(^{241})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.02.19</td>
<td>SUBJECT COMING TO THE US FOR BIRTH TOURISM FOR THE SECOND TIME. ON HER FIRST VISIT SUBJECT HAD A BABY IN CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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AND PAID ABOUT $4,000 OUT OF AN APPROXIMATE $34,000 HOSPITAL BILL. THE STATE OF CA APPARENTLY PAID OFF THE REMAINING BALANCE. MOREOVER, SOMEHOW THIS DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A PUBLIC CHARGE. THEREFORE, SUBJECT WILL BE DULY ADMITTED AS A B-2 TOURIST.242

VI. Process & Online Presence of Birth Tourism Companies

To illustrate how prospective birth tourists plan trips to the United States, the section below examines the websites and procedures of two birth tourism companies. According to corporate filings and interviews conducted by Committee staff, both companies have since discontinued operations.243 The first, was based in California, primarily catered to Chinese clients; the other operated in Florida and worked predominately with Russian customers. The examination of each website discusses pricing, visa consultation services, housing and recreational activities, and healthcare services.

A. Ada International

1. Company Description and Pricing

Ada International or US Baby Ada’s (“Ada”) website described the company as “a professional confinement center directly operated in the United States” and “responsible for the delivery and confinement services of customers going to the United States.”244 Most of the company’s staff was said to have actual operational experience in the United States.245 According to the website, the company’s founder, “Ada Dad,” “is the most well-known visa expert in the industry and is familiar with . . . legal policies.”246

The website had a page entitled “Having a Child Process” outlining the steps a birth tourist must take to plan a trip.247 The first step in this process was consultation.248 Within two months of pregnancy, potential customers “[could] consult [Ada] for free according to [their] actual situation.”249 The consultation introduced customers to the process, provided pricing information, and gave individualized evaluations depending on the client’s situation.250
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The cost per customer varied depending on the services and housing accommodations selected. Ada provided several different packages starting at $22,000 going up to $38,000. The company’s website informed visitors that “the cost of having a baby in the United States is complicated.” In addition to the costs directly associated with the company, “there are hospital doctor fees, certificate fees, and air ticket fees.” The chart below from Ada’s website provides estimates for each of the associated costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charged Items</th>
<th>Consulting fee</th>
<th>Visa service</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Accommodation meals</th>
<th>Doctor’s fee</th>
<th>Hospital expenses</th>
<th>medical insurance</th>
<th>Yuesao care</th>
<th>Baby ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charger</td>
<td>Our company</td>
<td>Our company</td>
<td>airline</td>
<td>Our company</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>hospital</td>
<td>Insurance company</td>
<td>Yuesao</td>
<td>Service staff, U.S. government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include content</td>
<td>Consultation services before signing a contract</td>
<td>Full counselling before visa</td>
<td>Round-trip ticket</td>
<td>Food, accommodation, and other consumption during the period of labor in the United States</td>
<td>Medical services such as obstetric inspection and production</td>
<td>Various insurances such as travel insurance and maternity insurance</td>
<td>The cost of the baby’s handling of documents such as US passports and Chinese travel certificates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated cost</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>About 1WRMB from</td>
<td>Minimum 17,500 dollars from</td>
<td>3000-5000 range</td>
<td>USD 3000-10000</td>
<td>Not equal</td>
<td>USD 4000 + tip</td>
<td>About $ 270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following the consultation, customers executed a service agreement with Ada and paid an up-front deposit. According to the website, Ada’s system was different from other companies who require large deposits before leaving China.
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Ada only required a nominal deposit in China before departing for the United States, and allowed customers to “pay the remaining balance after their arrival.\textsuperscript{258}

Although the chart above lists the standard pricing, the Ada website indicates that the company had periodic sales.\textsuperscript{259} For example, the below screenshot shows Ada’s spring sale with “designated room specials for pregnant mothers who are about to embark on a baby trip to the United States.”\textsuperscript{260}

\begin{center}
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After the service agreement was signed, Ada provided tourists with a private consultant who offers “one-to-one guidance and service throughout the whole process.”\textsuperscript{262}

\section*{2. Visa Consultation Services}

In the next step of the planning process, the birth tourist submitted a visa application to a United States Embassy or consulate.\textsuperscript{263} Ada’s website suggested the sooner the visa application is submitted, the better.\textsuperscript{264} Ada assisted birth tourists with preparing the necessary materials for submitting a visa application.\textsuperscript{265}
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The screenshot above provides a more detailed breakdown of Ada’s visa consultation services including simulated visa tests and other interview guidance. The website also claimed the customer first visa pass rate is as high as 85 percent.

Once the birth tourist’s visa was approved, Ada began formally planning the trip. Ada described this step in the process saying, “your wonderful trip to a foreign land is about to start, and the confinement center will help mothers make an itinerary plan.”

### 3. Housing and Recreation

Following the issuance of the visa, the birth tourist mother next arranged airfare and selected housing for her stay in the United States. Ada describes its confinement center as an upscale community in Irvine, California with an environment that “is clean and elegant, safe and comfortable.” The community had all modern accommodations including air conditioning, fully equipped kitchens, internet, and a shuttle service. The screenshot below provides a full listing of services.

---
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A prospective birth tourist mother had a series of options when selecting housing for their stay. Ada’s website listed about a dozen different suites ranging from luxury to standard accommodations. Each suite had a description of its features and included photos of the bedrooms, bathrooms, and kitchen. Below is the description provided for one of Ada’s luxury suites.

As shown above, Ada emphasized the complex’s recreational activities including parks, swimming pools, spas, basketball courts, and grilling areas. The payment to Ada included access to all of these amenities and did not involve additional fees. Beyond those recreational activities, Ada arranged for customers “to go shopping and play at least three times a week, play on the beach/in the city every week, and go out to eat every week.” This is in addition to “three meals a

---
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day, two snacks, unlimited supply of milk, soy milk, fruits and desserts, ect. throughout the day.” Ada summarized the experience saying customers “only need to eat, drink, sleep, shop and play in the United States, and we will take care of everything else.” Below is a picture of the swimming pool on Ada’s complex from the Ada website.

4. Healthcare

After housing, birth tourists made healthcare arrangements for the delivery of the baby. Ada’s website listed eleven California area hospitals where birth tourist mothers could deliver their child. Each hospital listed on the website was described in detail, including the size, ranking, and features of the hospital.

For example, the website profile for Fountain Valley Regional Medical Center, stated it “is a large general hospital, in which the obstetrics and gynecology is the strongest.” It adds further that “the qualifications of the doctors serving this hospital are very top-notch.” The Ada website clarified that the hospital has “Chinese doctors and bilingual nursing staff to provide you with comprehensive
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care.”289 In addition, each hospital profile listed the doctors who offer their services at that hospital.290

The website provided additional information on the doctors themselves. Each doctor had a profile listing their educational background, the hospitals where they work, and the address of their private clinics.291 Some profiles provided additional background on how long they have practiced and other specialties.292

During the final step of the process and once the mother delivered the child, they return to the confinement center to recover.293 There, Ada staff provided care of the baby 24 hours a day while the mother recovered.294 During this period, Ada offered as many as five meals per day.295

B. Miami Mama

1. Company Description, Consultation, and Pricing

In 2004, Miami Mama began operations in California, Oregon, and Washington.296 In 2009, it moved to Miami upon request of their customers.297 Miami Mama had approximately 30 employees who provide “high-quality translation and will accompany [customers] throughout [their] stay in Miami.”298 The company also had branch offices in Russia and Ukraine to provide information about services offered by Miami Mama.299

The company described its main source of capital as “healthy children born in the conditions of modern American medicine and surrounded by the most comfortable climate on the planet, in Miami.”300 The website claimed customers trust the company with “the most responsible thing in life—the birth of a child!”301 On an annual basis, Miami Mama served between 50 and 80 birth tourists.302
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Miami Mama’s customers were primarily Russian and “people of various professions and ages, with different levels of income and well-being.” The company’s website provided assurances of confidentiality because clients are often “the wives of dignitaries, oligarchs, and celebrities” as shown below. Regardless of status, Miami Mama maintained that all customers share the common desire “to lay a solid foundation for [their child’s] happy and stable future.”

The company’s clients are often people of high profile: the wives of dignitaries, oligarchs and celebrities, or celebrities themselves, athletes, actresses, public figures, and representatives of show business. For such people, it is very important that their personal information is not disclosed.

In addition to medical professionals, Miami Mama employed “licensed medical translators, specialists in the purchase of strollers and other baby items things, document preparation specialists, professional English teachers, [and] personal assistants in grocery and industrial stores.” According to the website, Miami Mama’s “whole process [was] completely thought out based on our many years of practice.”

During the first step in the process, Miami Mama held “consultation meetings” with the expecting mothers. All clients signed a contract with Miami Mama and provided a prepayment for future services. These meetings included discussion of how to prepare for the trip and the services provided by the company.

Miami Mama offered four different birth tourist packages starting at $6,900 and going up to $49,000 for the VIP package. That cost varied depending on hospital and doctor selected by the customer. The VIP package, for example, included consultation from American doctors while still in Russia, a private room at the hospital, and an unlimited driver service. The screenshot below provides additional detail on the items included with each package.

---
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The website acknowledged the State Department’s January 2020 visa policy change. In recognition of the change, the company said “many have heard about the changes that have come into force in the procedure for issuing visas to the United States.” The website further noted “[s]ince January 24, 2020, a restriction has been introduced on the issuance of American visas to pregnant women.” Along with the emergence of the COVID-19 pandemic, this rule change contributed to the company’s decision to shut down operations.

2. Visa Consultation Services

Miami Mama also helped birth tourists apply for a U.S. visa. Miami Mama touted its expertise in the area saying, “there are cases when independent attempts to obtain permission to enter the country end in refusal.” According to the website, this “is why before going to the American embassy, it is necessary to carefully prepare and enlist the support of specialists.”

Miami Mama helped customers gather the necessary documents for their visa applications. Miami Mama claimed this was an imperative service because customers “can not only clearly explain, but also document the purpose of [their]
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trip, which will significantly increase the chances of obtaining a visa.”

The documents prepared by the company included “registration of the expectant mother in an American hospital and a personal invitation from the doctor.” The website reaffirmed the company’s pride in this work, and that “almost everyone who turned to us for help receives US visas without any problems.” The screenshot below outlines Miami Mama’s detailed procedures for how to avoid U.S. visa denial.
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**How to avoid failure**

1. **Tell the consul the truth.** To avoid negative consequences during an interview at the American embassy, it is very important to tell the US consul the true purpose of the trip. Given that a birth visa and other medical services in the United States are in the same category as tourist B2 or business B1, many expectant mothers say at the embassy that they are going to travel. But, you must admit that with a visible pregnancy, especially in recent months, the idea of a trip to a distant continent looks, to put it mildly, not entirely plausible. Hence the numerous visa refusals. The logic of the consul is simple: “A man who deceived once, will deceive again.” And Americans value honesty literally worth its weight in gold. Of course, after refusing a visa, you can go for a second interview and try to defend your version again, but with each new refusal, the chances that you will ever get to the USA.

2. **The deception will open.** If the version of tourism in an interesting position did not arouse suspicion at the consul, and you were given a visa, do not forget about the migration control at the entrance to the country. At the same time, when at the airport you will name the purpose of your trip to the migration officer, your words will be recorded in the Federal Database. And if you say that you intend to spend only a couple of weeks in the USA, and you will stay for six months, then when you get your visa again, you will be called to the embassy and given a refusal for fraud, since all US missions have access to the database and can always check what exactly you said to the migration officer when visiting the country. After that, you are unlikely to ever be able to visit the United States.

3. **Extension of the visa.** Since a trip to the United States involves obtaining medical services, you may need to extend your stay in the country by more than six months on the recommendation of your doctor. When you apply to the migration service for an extension of your visa, your fraud regarding the purpose of the trip will be discovered, which will entail the most unpleasant consequences in the future.

4. **Carry all invitation documents with you.** Remember that having a visa does not guarantee entry into the United States. A visa only certifies that a US consular officer has confirmed your right to apply for entry to the United States for a specific purpose. You have to go through migration control at the entrance to the country, explaining the purpose of the trip to the migration officer. We strongly recommend that you have invitation documents from the hospital and doctor, an agreement with Miami-Mama, and documents confirming your intentions to pay for medical services on your own during migration control.
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Miami Mama’s website also had a separate immigration page stating “parents of babies born in the United States have every chance of obtaining a permanent residence permit and living and working in the United States without waiting for the child to come of age.” The website then listed several ways for birth tourist parents to achieve this. These include the diversification lottery, L-1 visas, and EB-5 visas.

Of the options listed, Miami Mama claimed the diversification lottery is “the easiest and most affordable way for everyone to get the coveted ‘green card’ and become a US resident.” The page included instructions on how to enter the lottery and that no payment is required unless the individual is selected.
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If customers are not selected for the lottery, Miami Mama suggested they consider applying for an L-1 visa which the company touts as the most effective and affordable way of business immigration.332 State issues L-1 visas for intracompany transfers who do business in the United States.333 There are several requirements for L-1 visas including that the petitioning company be “the same firm, corporation, or other legal entity, or parent, branch, affiliate, or subsidiary thereof, for whom the beneficiary has been employed abroad.”334 Another is that the beneficiary be “a manager, executive, or an employee having specialized knowledge, and is destined to a managerial or executive position or a position requiring specialized knowledge.”335 According to Miami Mama’s website, after “the US company has been in existence for at least one year, you can apply for a Green Card.”336

The final immigration option described by Miami Mama is the EB-5 visa.337 Under the EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program, foreigners can obtain a green card for making investments that create jobs in the United States.338 EB-5 investors, as well as their spouses and unmarried children under 21, are eligible for green cards if they: (1) make the required commercial investment in the United States; and (2) create 10 full-time jobs for U.S. workers.339

To assist customers interested in EB-5 opportunities, Miami Mama provided the information of one of its “partners” Charles Raether, a “highly qualified immigration lawyer.”340 Raether is the founder and managing partner of AmLaw Group 341 He received his law degree from Georgetown University and is a graduate of Moscow State University.342

According to Miami Mama, 100 percent of green card petitions submitted by AmLaw Group were approved by USCIS.343 In addition, the company asserted “the AmLaw Group enjoys special prestige among Russian investors under the EB-5 investor visa” and that Raether himself “has a deep understanding of the Russian business environment and mentality.”344
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3. Housing and Recreation

After birth tourists secured their visa, they arranged flights and housing for their stay. The website reminded potential customers they “will be in the US for a minimum of 3 months, usually more.” Miami Mama’s peak birth tourist season ran from October through April with rental prices peaking during that timeframe. The website estimated that an apartment with a living room, bedroom, and kitchen costs between $2,200 and $2,800 per month. All payments were made in advance for the duration of their stay.

The above screenshot is the view from one of the company’s premium listings. During the summer months, the apartment rented for $3,500 per month and $4,000 per month during the winter. The apartment complex offered
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amenities such as a gym, pool, and a beach service.\textsuperscript{353} The suite “features a fully equipped kitchen, Italian furnishings, a spacious living room with panoramic floor-to-ceiling windows, a master bedroom with a king-size bed and a twin bedroom.”\textsuperscript{354}

Beyond the luxury housing accommodations, Miami Mama offered recreational activities including yacht charters.\textsuperscript{355} The website described the 66-foot yacht as “our huge floating island—a favorite toy of all children, cruises for several days in the direction [of the] Bahamas or Key West.”\textsuperscript{356} The yacht featured a full kitchen, “4 deluxe cabins with private bathrooms, luxurious leather upholstery, teak dining table, air conditioning, wifi, grill and the loudest music system.”\textsuperscript{357} Finally, “for lovers of speed and extreme sports,” the yacht also had a jet ski.\textsuperscript{358}
4. Healthcare

Miami Mama claimed to work with renowned Florida doctors who delivered the children of “American and Russian movie and sports stars and other world famous celebrities.”360 The company helped customers select a hospital satisfying their preferences and recommended a doctor based on their pregnancy.361 According to the website, several doctors were also Russian speakers.362 After a selection was made, “Miami Mama staff [helped tourists] arrange a contract with a doctor for the provision of medical services for the birth of the child.”363 If the child requires additional treatment after birth, Miami Mama helped “to obtain the most favorable conditions for paying for the treatment for the newborn, as we have established long-term relationships with hospitals and financial departments.”364

Miami Mama claimed to work only with doctors with twenty years of experience who practice out of “the best private hospitals.”365 In addition, the company received “the exclusive right to work with one of the best doctors at Mount Sinai Hospital.”366 This doctor allegedly delivered the grandchildren of President Lyndon Johnson.367 Another doctor, practicing out of Broward Medical Center, has repeatedly delivered the children of “many Russian stars and famous people.”368 According to a former Miami Mama employee, the doctors largely set their own prices.369

The company offered birth tourists the option of seven different hospitals in the Miami area.370 Each hospital listed had an individual profile detailing the features and accommodations.371 For example, the profile for North Shore Medical Center explains that it “strives to provide patients with the utmost in comfort and care by offering the most advanced medical technology in the hands of highly trained professionals.”372 The website describes the rooms as being decorated “in the style of a luxurious hotel room, where new mothers can feel as comfortable as
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possible." To give a better sense of the room, there were virtual video tours of the rooms.

Much like the California birth tourism company described above, Miami Mama had a page listing all of the doctors who offer their services to the company. Each physician profile included educational background, the hospital at which they practice, and other relevant credentials.

VII. Conclusion

The Committee’s investigation demonstrates the prevalence of birth tourism in the United States and how it demeans the naturalization process by monetizing the privilege of U.S. citizenship. The State Department and CBP should work together to better understand the breadth of birth tourism in the United States. Congress should also clarify the Immigration and Nationality Act to exclude birth tourism as a permissible basis for temporary travel to the United States.
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