__l

CCR Meet.

v.1

ARIZONA ADVISORY COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

FORUM ON IMMIGRATION REFORM

September 15, 1988

Phoenix, Arizona

Volume I

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES 16213 Ocotillo Drive Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268

(602) 837-0862

I N D E X

2

1

3	Witness	Statement re	Page
4			
5	Mary Rose Wilcox Vice Mayor, Phoenix	Overview of IRCA	9
6 7	Dr. Ernest Feigenbaum Public Health director	Public Health Implications	21
8	Robert I. Donofrio Superintendent, Murphy School District	Educational Issues	33
10	Nancy-Jo Merritt Attorney at Law	Employer sanctions Work Authorization Issues	48
11	Jose Bracamonte Attorney at Law	General Impact of Legalization	63
13	Rafaela Valenzuela Volunteer Lawyers Program	Legalization	69
14	Gloria Elizondo PPEP Organization	QDE misinformation	74
16 17	Enrique Medina Ochoa SER-Jobs for Progress	Training Programs	80
18	Frank Siciliano Assistant Chief Legalization Officer	I.N.S. Perspective	88
19 20	Hermilo Gloria District Director	Implication for Title VII	104
21	E.E.O.C		
22 23	Wendy Hammon Arizona Department of Administration	S.L.I.A.G.	109
24	Father Tony Sotelo Iglesia Del Immaculado Corazon de Maria	Family Unity	117

Page

124

136

143

156

161

166

168

171

178

187

189

1

2

3

4 5

Witness

Francisca Cavazos

Organizing Project

Wesley Community

Steve's Mexican Food

Maricopa County

Paul Arter

Frank Messana

Javier Saucedo

Enrique Moreno

Farm worker

Juan Flores

Enrique Ochoa

LULAC officer

Social Services

Piedad Huerta

Wesley Community

Dr. Edward Valenzuela

Deputy Director EEOC

Farm worker

Matt Wilsh

Paul Arter

Center

Farm Workers Union

Center

6 7

8

9

10

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

* * *

ments

INDEX

(continued)

Statement re

Phase I Application

and Public Charge

Farm Workers View

I.N.S. experience

LULAC organization

Applicants' welfare

Legalization time frame

Family documentation

Central American refugees

Clarification of require-

Remaining illegal aliens

Business Perspective

Phase II, Language, Civics

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

STENOGRAPHIC TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

before the Arizona Advisory Committee, United States Commission on Civil Rights, Forum on Immigration Reform, on Thursday, the 15th day of September, 1988, commencing at 9:30 o'clock in the forenoon, at the Howard Johnson Plaza Hotel, 1500 North 51st Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

Dr. John P. White, Chairman

Senator Manuel Pena

Dr. Morrison Warren

Mrs. Shirley Whitlock

Mr. Richard Zazueta

* * *

Reported by Josie Padilla Cademartori and

Thomas F. Seemeyer, of the reporting firm of Padilla and

Associates, Phoenix, Arizona.

PROCEEDINGS

DR. WHITE: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen.

My name is John White. I am the Chairman of the Arizona

Advisory Committee to the United States Civil Rights

Commission, and I have a brief opening statement here to

describe what it is we hope to do.

This meeting is under the auspices of the Los Angeles regional office of the United States Civil Rights Commission, and we have with us today Mr. Philip Montez who is the Regional Director.

Philip, where are you?

MR. MONTEZ: Right here.

DR. WHITE: Oh, there he is (indicating).

He is the Director of the Western Region, which is a vast area.

How many states is it, Philip?

MR. MONTEZ: Seventeen.

DR. WHITE: Seventeen states.

The Advisory Committee receives information and makes recommendations to the Commission in Washington in areas in which the Committee or any of its subcommittees is authorized to study.

For those of you who are not familiar with the

Civil Rights Commission, it is an independent agency of the United States Government which was established by Congress in 1957 and which was reauthorized in 1982 under Public Law 98-183.

This is a fact-finding meeting, and I wish to emphasize that. It is not an adversary proceeding. We're not here to conduct a debate or to put anybody or anything on trial.

We have invited various individuals to come and share information with the Committee, and each person who will participate has voluntarily agreed to meet with the Committee.

This Committee, in any event, does not have subpoena powers. We cannot compel testimony from anyone, although the Commission itself does have subpoena powers.

Since this is a public meeting, the press and radio and television stations, as well as individuals, are welcome. Persons meeting with the Committee, however, may specifically request that they not be televised. In this case we will comply with their wishes and ask the media people to do the same.

We are concerned that no defamatory material will be presented at this meeting. In other words, we ask that no derogatory references be made to individual persons.

In the unlikely event that this should happen, it

will be necessary for me to call the attention of the person making those statements to this policy and to request that they desist in their action. And such information will be stricken from the record, if necessary.

There is a stenographic record being made. We have a court reporter here. And derogatory statements about individuals will not be permitted in that record.

This public forum is being held to collect information on the implementation in Arizona of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

Now, before I proceed any further, I want to introduce the Members of the Committee.

And, also, I would like to point out that we do have in attendance Barbara Rothenberg of the Government Accounting Office's regional office in Los Angeles. Miss Rothenberg is sitting right out here (indicating). She's here to observe.

The General Accounting Office, as many of you know, is an arm of the Congress of the United States which tries to keep track of the actions taken by government to see that they are in accordance with the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States, and as such the GAO has an interest in such matters as civil rights and alleged discrimination.

So, we're very happy to have Miss Rothenberg in

attendance today.

Now, next I would like to introduce the Members of the Committee who are able to be here today. Not all the Members are. And I'll start to my right.

To my extreme right, Senator Manuel Pena who is a member of the Arizona legislature. And next to him is Dr. Morrison Warren, Professor Emeritus, Arizona State University.

And I am John White, as I said. I also am a Professor Emeritus at Arizona State University.

And then next to me we have Mrs. Shirley Whitlock from Mesa, Arizona. And at the other end of the table we have Mr. Richard Zazueta of Scottsdale, Arizona.

Those are the Members present. In addition, we are expecting later the arrival of Dr. Heinz R. Hink who is a member of the House of Representatives in the Arizona legislature. And so those are the Members of the Committee.

Next, we will commence by inviting to speak Mary Rose Wilcox who is Vice Mayor of the City of Phoenix and chairperson of the Steering Committee on Immigration of Maricopa County.

Miss Wilcox, welcome to you.

MS. MARY ROSE WILCOX: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Please have a seat and make your presentation.

MS. WILCOX: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I think it is very timely that you are here today. We are very pleased.

I wear two hats today, one as the Vice Mayor of the City of Phoenix, and I will speak on the ramifications of the IRCA bill on the City.

The other hat I wear is one of a co-chairman and one of the founding members of an immigration steering committee which basically has served as a watchdog of the IRCA bill on behalf of the community.

As the Vice Mayor, I'm pleased to welcome you here to Phoenix. Some of you are from here. Some of you may have come in, and we welcome you. We have a beautiful city and one, because it is close to the border, which has a large Hispanic population and was very affected by the IRCA bill.

We are here today to talk about the effects of the Immigration Reform and Control Act. Since the Act became effective, roughly 50,000 applications for lawful temporary resident status have been filed in Arizona, with the bulk of these in the Phoenix area.

Phoenix has long been one of the most rapidly growing cities in the U.S. and has always worked hard to keep up with the demands of growth, but this new influx is special. It is a rapid and large population of residents

who have lived and worked here but who have not been counted as residents before; and they have many of the same needs as other residents, as well as some special needs.

At the City level, when the bill became law, we geared up a lot of our services. We felt very strongly that the information from the federal government on the IRCA bill was extremely inadequate.

We used our own PR facilities to get the word out to people who have been living here for a number of years and were qualified under the bill to become citizens.

The City felt a great responsibility, because a lot of these people had already been paying taxes, both at the federal, state and city level, and were, in effect, long-time residents of the City of Phoenix.

We have been very active, also, in assisting the QDEs throughout the city to gear up, as soon as the QDEs came into existence. The Wesley Community Center and Friendly House were the main ones in the Phoenix area that helped, along with the Catholic Social Services.

QDEs, in my estimation, in the city were very underfunded and could not handle the influx of people that came to their doors. As a result of this, we asked the City Council for some monies to be lent to these agencies for clerical assistance so that we could process these people through.

And, again, our main responsibility at the City level was to make sure that people who had a right to become citizens under the IRCA bill could become so and would not be detained because there was no clerical assistance that could work fast enough to get their documentation in and their forms signed and help them with immigration.

The City has been burdened in many aspects. We, as many employers who have geared up, now have a whole new process in our personnel department that complies with the IRCA guidelines.

Our police department, our courts, our social services are taking the brunt of the impact. There are many people who, out of fear, had not been reporting crimes, had not been coming in for help of our social services.

Now that we have the influx, our City departments have had to beef up budgets and we've had to do special things. We as a city do not mind that.

In fact, anything that we can do to assist people to become citizens, you know, is something that we would move forward with immediately.

What we do have reservations about is the way the bill was enacted. There are very many citizens still left in the city who have not had the opportunity to apply under the bill.

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

With all our efforts to get the word out, because

money came down so late for the PR program, I would say the PR program to let people know how they could become citizens under this bill was not effective until almost April, with the deadline being May 4th.

When that deadline came, the City, along with the League of Cities and Towns, passed a resolution asking Congress to extend the May 4th deadline. We felt very strongly.

There is still a pool of people out there who, because of their fear and because of the PR that was not done in order to promote the legalization of this bill, did not come in and are still out there. They're qualified. But because of their fear, they just did not get in in time.

You know, I know that issue was not acted upon by Congress. But, again, the City stands in strong support of extending that deadline, because we feel we are creating an underclass with the people who are left and the people who will still migrate here.

Traditionally, Mexico, as our country bordering the United States, particularly Arizona, and to many of us our mother country in terms of a lot of ancestors coming from there, has a natural ebb and flow of immigration. Very many people will always come back and forth across the borders.

Because of the Immigration Reform Bill, the doors are shut, and we feel that it is the federal government's responsibility to look at this issue and to deal humanely with the people who are still here undocumented and will still live second-class citizens' lives but are contributing to the welfare of our country through their taxes and through the lives they are leading.

Now, as the steering committee co-chairman, I take on a different hat. At the City I help monitor the immigration reform implementation that we have with this new bill.

The immigration steering committee formed after IRCA was passed. We came together and formed officially in February of 1987, and our purpose in forming was for the purpose of making sure that the bill was implemented in a fair and equitable manner.

I must be quite truthful with you. Some members of the steering committee, who are a very diverse group from all parts of our community, were people who had opposed this bill and fought very long and hard because of the discriminatory nature of the bill, particularly in employer sanctions.

But once the bill was passed, we as a committee felt very strongly that we must now work with the Immigration Department and make sure that the avenue that

was given to legalization for a lot of people in the United States would be open and would be fair and equitable.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We have done quite a few things. We immediately established ourselves. We contacted all of our congressional offices from Senators McCain and DeConcini And Congressman Udall Congressman Kolbe. has been extremely helpful, along with Senators Deconcini and McCain.

We contacted them ourselves and became the link and became the prime input to the congressional offices as to the IRCA bill and implementation.

What we did early is review the first regulations and do a lot of input into the legalization regulations. We worked along with national organizations like the LULAC organization, and we worked in conjunction with them. We had a lot of input from our congressional people to back our input.

And as a result, the regulations were changed.

Not all the changes we wanted went in. But at least they

were, in our opinion, more fair and equitable.

Throughout the year of legalization, we continued in a basically watchdog status. We wanted to make sure that Immigration was reaching out to the community, bringing people in.

And we formed a very good relationship with Miss Ruth Ann Myers, the Immigration and Naturalization

director here in the Phoenix area.

We've worked with Immigration. We have had them sitting at our committee meetings, and we tried to work out the differences the community was feeling as to the bill implementation.

We have been, I think, very successful in getting word back to our congressional people and truly serving as a liaison in the findings and implementation of the first year of the program.

The thing that we have been most disappointed in is, again, the extension period. We felt strongly that the Immigration Department did not do the PR they should have. There was a large sum of money allocated for that, but it geared up too late.

The immigration steering committee joined other entities—as I mentioned before, the City of Phoenix—in putting together a very good PR program and getting in more people than could have gotten in under the regular PR.

In the second phase, we're still in existence and we're keying into the education aspect and the education requirements of the bill.

We stand before you very much in fear that, again, the one point that did not get taken care of in the first year of legalization is going to hurt us and will affect the second year, if it's not improved, and that is public

relations.

We have to get the word out to the community who qualified and are now sitting there with papers in their hands and the first part of legalization done.

We have to get the word out and we have to make them not fearful to come in and take your education classes, because if they do not, they will not actualize the dream that they were promised. I believe that firmly.

And it is my hope that this Board could take to the Civil Rights Commission that strong statement, that we need to get Immigration to key in on the public relations aspect of the second phase of this bill.

SLIAG funding will be distributed throughout our state, and we're hopeful that that will help. But again we need to get the word out there. There is still a lot of fear.

There still are a lot of people who applied and, again, they're holding a piece of paper that says you're legal now; but you're not legal if, within 18 months of when you filed, you haven't gotten your citizenship classes, your English-speaking classes that are required under the second phase of the bill.

We're very fearful that that will not be done, that people won't get the word in time. We're working toward that effort, but that is one of our great fears. We

also have others, but there are others here from the farm worker community who will speak on those issues.

I come primarily to address our concern about the poor public relations and, also, the fear of this committee and that people who were not informed in time will be doomed to a life in underclass.

What are we going to do with the people who are still here, who were afraid to apply in the first place and now have no recourse except to live as undocumenteds?

I am open for questions. There are many committee members who will be here throughout the day. And I would like to commend this Committee for coming in and hearing the concerns of the community as related to the IRCA bill.

DR. WHITE: Thank you, Miss Wilcox.

Does any Member of the Committee have a question?

Mrs. Whitlock.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Do you have any estimate of what we're talking about in numbers? Do you have some kind of an idea?

MS. WILCOX: Rough estimates, I would say there's still about -- When we first came into this, we were told that there were approximately 150,000 people within the state of Arizona who could essentially qualify for legalization.

The numbers in the state were only 50,000 who came

in and applied and qualified. So, if you take Immigration's first numbers, there still could be a pool of about 100,000 people.

DR. WHITE: Senator?

SENATOR PENA: How did the city PR program work?

How did the city try to reach all of those people under the first phase?

MS. WILCOX: Senator, we have a public information channel, and we have talk shows. We went on the talk shows, and we also did a series of press releases and kept reminding people to go out and get into either the QDEs or attorneys who were doing this and make sure that they filed before May 4th.

We did a series of PSAs that were distributed. And we also had some of our workers in our customer service areas, if they felt that they might know of people, remind people as they came up.

We tried to do everything we could within our realm to make sure that people got the word to come in and apply.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

MS. WILCOX: Mr. Chairman, if I could take the prerogative and also congratulate Senator Pena on his election.

DR. WHITE: We all join in that, Senator.

MR. ZAZUETA: Vice Mayor, you mentioned the people that were qualified for amnesty that did not get the word through the public relations and through other means that did not get their papers in. What is going to happen to them?

ì

MS. WILCOX: That is our fear. We believe that there were many people who were afraid. You had a bill that came down and had it implemented by the department that was most feared among undocumenteds.

It took almost eight to nine months of the whole year period for people to even get over a little bit of that fear, by the time the public relations started kicking in from Immigration.

And they did an excellent job, when it finally came together. People were just literally out there getting on radio stations and making sure that people were not afraid, but it was too late. And you cannot overcome a lifetime of fear in a one-year period.

So, I don't know what will happen to those people, and that is our fear. I fear that they will live in an under class forever because of the immigration law, unless we look at it and do some kind of equitable treatment for these people who again have lived here and would probably have qualified quite readily but, because of their fear, did not come in in time.

MR. ZAZUETA: Do you think that some of these people will be deported?

MS. WILCOX: I think they will. I cannot see why they wouldn't, because once the process goes through and once the legalization is complete with the second phase completed, I would think those people who are not holding papers or who are not in the process still of immigrating in through that IRCA bill would be deported.

I would hope that they wouldn't be because again very many of these people have been here for years.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.

Any other questions?

If not, we thank you very much, Miss Wilcox.

MS. WILCOX: I'd like to thank the Committee.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.

We'll proceed with our schedule, and I would like to point out: We do have a very tight schedule here. And, therefore, I'd like to ask the cooperation of the witnesses in using only the time which they have been allotted.

And witnesses have been asked to speak for no more than eight to ten minutes, in order that we may allow time for questions from the Committee.

I might also point out that at 4:00 o'clock, or whenever we finish the scheduled witnesses, members of the public who are not scheduled will be more than welcome to

address the Committee with whatever concerns they might have.

Now, coming back to the time thing: In order for us to keep on our schedule, as the Chairman I will have to enforce this rule. And I hope no one will take offense, if I remind you that your time is up and that you should conclude as soon as possible.

I am sympathetic to the desire to continue. You have something important to say. In my profession, academic profession, we're used to talking in 50-minute sound bites, as they say in television. But there's only so much time available. So, I do ask your cooperation and understanding in that matter.

Now, therefore, let's continue. Our next witness is Dr. Ernest Feigenbaum who is Director of Public Health for the Maricopa County Health Department, and he wishes to address the Committee on: The Public Health Implications of IRCA.

Dr. Feigenbaum?

DR. ERNEST FEIGENBAUM: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission: I'm very pleased to be with you this morning.

Maricopa County, as you know, has a population of approximately two million people. We estimate that the number of people undergoing legalization under the amnesty

program in the county is somewhere between twenty-five and thirty thousand people.

The county does run a complete health care system which involves thirteen primary care centers providing ambulatory care, providing about a quarter of a million visits per year, and runs a 550-bed acute care hospital, as well as a long-term care program, and is an AHCCCS-HMO provider to the Maricopa County health plan.

That said, the first area of my concern with respect to the amnesty program is the question of entitlements for various and sundry federal programs. I would also include the two community health centers which are federally funded in our county.

And, of course, with due respect to the taxpayers and our obligation to the community, we do go through an entitlement process which involves the people we serve to make sure that other sources of payment beyond taxpayers' contributions are used for health care. And this, indeed, is the purpose of much of the system.

Now, where somebody does not have a source of payment for needed health care, then, of course, the county provides it. But one of the problems that we're running into very early on is that there is great confusion as to who exactly and under what circumstances is entitled, as a person undergoing amnesty, and for which subsidized either

county, state or federal services.

To date about the only information that we've been able to obtain is from essentially a voluntary organization, which has put out some matrixes which involve the various cross-references as to what program entitlements are available to people undergoing amnesty and what program entitlements might severely compromise a person's amnesty status and perhaps require that they be rejected from the program during the preliminary phase or during the entire five-year period.

Such things as cash-grant welfare payments under many, many circumstances would, of course, make somebody unqualified to continue in their amnesty status.

There's also some vague reference in the Act as well as to allowability of certain emergency medical care subsidized assistance types of activities.

Emergency medical care is not well defined, and exactly where emergency care stops and where other types of medical care entitlement starts which could compromise a person's eligibility is not clear.

So that my impression is, in a nutshell, that much of the language in the regulations involved in the Act essentially have been put together from an I.N.S. point of view, which is understandable, but I think there is a need for considerably more health and social service input in the

defining of the regulations and finding out exactly under what circumstances people can get needed health services. This is very, very important.

We're experiencing a situation in the county, for instance, where many people are staying away from needed services such as prenatal care because of apprehension having to do with entanglements in a system which might gravitate against their amnesty status.

And this is very, very poor economy, obviously, because somebody who does not receive proper prenatal care, for example, ultimately costs the taxpayers considerably more money creates all kinds of social problems and very, very severe human problems for the people involved in the outcome of the pregnancy and whatever.

So that many needed services to women and to children, social, medical and whatever, are being foregone simply because of apprehension as to what the consequences might be of the entitlement process which is required by law in most cases.

It's very, very important that we get something official that allows us to proceed with due deliberation in putting all this together. We cannot operate on the basis of some guidelines which a voluntary agency gives us, which are well thought out, as the basis for an eligibility screening process in the Department of Economic Security in

the state of Arizona for the county eligibility operation.

I won't go into the details of the various and sundry programs. They're very myriad, having to do with everything from nutritional assistance for pregnant women and their children to breast feeding. It has to do with eligibility for medical care. It has to do with an enormous number of things.

But we do need some guidelines as to exactly what might gravitate against a person and what type of counseling we can give people.

This again is perhaps compounded by the fact that eligibility workers, of which there are hundreds and hundreds in the state of Arizona, tend to address every person that they deal with in accord with the usual, conventional standards.

This leads me into my next point, and that is:

Under the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant program which is also part of the Act, there is the requirement that there be tracking of people who are ELAs, eligible legalized aliens.

The problem with that is that we do not have very good guidelines from either the federal government or the state as to finding out how much is an invasion of privacy and how much is legitimate tracking.

And I point out again that in order to recoup the

funds under the impact grant program, we have to account for the services that we provide to people undergoing amnesty; and we also have to be able to counsel them wisely as to what programs they are prohibited from becoming involved in and what programs they are indeed entitled to.

And, again, there is no clarity as to what our right is to sit down with somebody and ask them: Are you an alien undergoing amnesty?

What circumstances involve that type of questioning? How is the information to be kept, and with what degree of confidentiality?

There are a whole myriad of ethical issues, and probably legal issues, which I certainly am not prepared to address but which have not been particularly clarified.

The only other area I'd like to touch on very, very briefly is the question of AIDS testing. And as you know, AIDS testing did become a part of the amnesty program as of December 1st. And there is a catch-up phase. It was from December 1st forward.

A part of the physical examination is a standardized form that must be filled out starting December 1st for all people coming into the program. People who came into the program prior to December 1st must be tested for AIDS subsequently as a step towards getting permanent residence status.

There is great confusion as to whether people should be required to pay a second time if they were not tested for AIDS initially, since the people who came after December 1st had that test included under their physical examination, and this can be upwards of \$100 under certain circumstances.

And the price of the physical examination was set and civil surgeons designated by the I.N.S. to accomplish all this.

So, there is confusion as to whether people who are not tested should be charged an additional fee. We, as the civil surgeons of Maricopa County, are running into this where people are coming around in a second round.

I'll stop at that point, and I'll be very pleased to answer any questions.

DR. WHITE: Thank you, Dr. Feigenbaum.

Any questions?

DR. WARREN: I have one.

DR. WHITE: Dr. Warren?

DR. WARREN: What percentage of usage of your services would you say comes from this pool of persons? Relative. A quarter or -- ?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: It's very, very difficult to say, because we can only account for what we think is a statistically acceptable random survey of the usage of

services by people that we can identify.

We did estimate that one year's worth approached somewhere of the magnitude of perhaps a million and a half dollars within the county system.

This does not include an additional increment which represents the county's share of the AHCCCS-MedicAid program. We distributed to the county \$33 million a year, to the AHCCCS program which covers the medically indigent, medically needy category.

And if you add that up, it's probably approaching \$2 million a year. It's awfully hard to break it down into individual and specific services.

DR. WARREN: I have a second question.

DR. WHITE: Go ahead.

DR. WARREN: Are discussions being held between your office and other concerned offices about the realities of this problem that you're sharing with us today?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: Yes, they are.

And I see Miss Wendy Hammon from the state Department of Administration, who is the single point of contact of the SLIAG program, is to be heard by your group. I am on a committee that she chairs.

One of the problems is that the federal government has not been completely responsive in clarifying some of these very, very important issues.

I would come back to, again, my point that since many of these issues involve health and social service concerns, it requires something more than Immigration and Naturalization Service expertise, which has been very good and very helpful, but it does require an added dimension to clarify some of these things.

We're hard pressed to decide, as is the Department of Economic Security and AHCCCS, as to exactly how to proceed.

DR. WARREN: I have one question on something else.

Are structures in place where progress is almost guaranteed in resolving the issue?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: I wish I could say yes, but I'm afraid I still have considerable apprehensions over just those points.

I think there's a lot more that has to be done to clarify it. We do not have clear guidelines on many of these things.

DR. WARREN: Who is advocating or who is driving this committee that you're talking about?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: The state Department of Administration.

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

DR. WARREN: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

Mrs. Whitlock.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Am I to understand that as people apply for amnesty under the Immigration Act, there are certain services, medical services, that they are denied as a part of that Act and others that they can apply for; and your problem is that it is unclear as to what they are eligible for and what they're not eligible for?

Is that what you're asking?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: Basically, yes. It's not a question of services denied. It's a question of entitlements. And since this is very, very new, there are all kinds of pitfalls.

So, essentially, the services are there. But the basis for payment could very well, if it's done wrong, compromise the person's status under the amnesty program, simply because they were treated as any other person might indeed be treated in that particular set of conditions.

Briefly, a perfect example would be if a woman comes in needing a medical care service, not prenatal care but some other type of service, and she has children and her income level is somewhat marginal and whatever.

That person normally would be sent to the Department of Economic Security for workup perhaps as an AFDC recipient. They do not distinguish between medical services or cash-grant welfare, whatever. That person would

simply be channeled to that particular entitlement workup track.

That person should know, the woman, that if they do indeed go down that road and are certified for cash-grant welfare and start receiving checks, that she would be severely compromised as to their amnesty status.

That woman should request and should know enough to request that she should be worked up as a "medically needy" only person, which requires an awful lot of sophistication, and should not go through that door; they should go through the other door.

It's a question of DES doing the workup or the county doing the workup. I have trouble sorting this out myself, and somebody with limited resources is going to have a major problem.

MRS. WHITLOCK: So, the requirement is up to the individual, then.

DR. FEIGENBAUM: Presuming they have the knowledge. And, really, we don't even have the knowledge at the administrative level.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

SENATOR PENA: Mr. Chairman:

The AIDS testing, who requires that?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: That's a federal requirement.

SENATOR PENA: That's a federal requirement. What kind of report is made? Are people informed? Those that come in that have to be tested, are they informed that they're going to be tested for AIDS?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: Yes, and there is a specific consent. And it is explained to them.

Now, again, I cannot speak for the actual practice by the civil surgeons designated by the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Practice in Arizona and state regulation requires that a positive test be reported to the state. This would not be an exception.

Counseling and consent is uniformly used in primary care centers and certainly is something that is an ethical and professional standard for every licensed physician in Arizona administering these tests because of the severe social disruption which could accompany a lot of aspects of AIDS testing, be it negative or positive.

So that that said, it's handled essentially as other AIDS testing in Arizona, yes. But it is required by the federal government for all people requesting permanent residence status under the amnesty program or other provisions of the Immigration Act.

SENATOR PENA: Is that information passed on to other groups, such as if there's a family involved, schools,

an employer?

, 4

1.1

Is anybody else told?

DR. FEIGENBAUM: Emphatically, no. However, the legislature did pass a bill and it was signed by the governor last year that requires that where a child is positive for AIDS, then that information must by law be passed on to the school district. That was House Bill 2126.

DR. WHITE: Thank you, Dr. Feigenbaum. We appreciate your testimony.

All right, our next scheduled witness is Mr. Robert Donofrio, Sr. Mr. Robert Donofrio is Superintendent of the Murphy Elementary Schools, District No. 21, and he is here to enlighten the Committee on educational issues.

Mr. Donofrio.

MR. ROBERT I. DONOFRIO: Thank you.

Firstly, I want to thank the Commission. Only in America with all our faults and flaws in our system could a forum like this be possible.

Secondly, I especially want to thank all those social agencies, the QDEs who have been in the trenches working long hours against insurmountable odds to implement this law.

As an educator, I think it's important that I at least, if only briefly, touch on a little bit of the

historical points of immigration. I then will jump right into three or four major impacts that affect education and then close with some closing remarks.

I will be reading from a prepared text which I have written which will be provided to the chairperson of the Committee.

DR. WHITE: Be happy to receive it.

MR. DONOFRIO: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore; send these homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

It would appear that the policymakers, especially those shaping immigration laws, have forgotten this inscription on the Statue of Liberty.

For some 17 million immigrants between 1882 and 1924 who passed through Ellis Island, America became the land of dreams and hope. Like the people before them, most came to escape hard lives.

They left behind poverty, the army, religious persecution, hunger and despair. What did they have to lose? A spirit of optimism lighted their minds with dreams, giving them the courage to face an unknown world.

To many in the United States, the immigrants from eastern Europe were a shabby, bizarre, ugly group of people.

They complained that the newcomers were too short, too dark-

colored, too poor; generally, of a low order. Their languages were incomprehensible, nothing short of gibberish. Nativists who favored Nordic types found them "deficient".

Others, however, saw their beauty. What a lucky country, they said, to receive a procession of the people of the world, people with skills and talents eager to learn.

In the words of poet Pablo Neruda, they brought to their homeland "gifts precious and golden as wheat."

Most of these millions did not go west to farm. The frontier was closed. They filled the factories with their cheap labor power. They worked in the coal mine, wielded a pickax, split rails, converted ore to steel, dug roads, built tunnels and bridges.

Women and children put their labor into textile mills and the clothing industry. They worked in fire-trap factories, 12 to 14 hours a day, for low wages. They lived in slums and died of tuberculosis.

And my grandparents on both sides of my family, like many of yours today in this room, were some of those people.

Close to a hundred years later, we are embroiled in the same types of controversy, this time impacting largely our Mexican and Latino neighbors to the south. It is apparent from a brief review of our history that immigration policies reflect the economic conditions during

that era.

In times of opening new frontiers, it was popular to allow millions to come to our great country so we could benefit from their cheap labor. In times of historic budget deficits and high unemployment, it has become popular to close the door to millions seeking meaningful employment and a better way of life.

It is these times of high unemployment, budget deficits and ultra-conservative administrations that reactionary, discriminatory laws such as the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 are passed.

While many hailed this law as a positive step toward granting millions of undocumented workers legal access to U.S. citizenry, it is my belief that it is yet another attempt at discriminatory and racist laws which stem back as far as 1798 when this then young country passed the Alien and Sedition Acts which gave the President special powers.

He could deport any alien he considered "dangerous to the peace and safety of the United States" or anyone stirring up trouble against the President and Congress. These acts were declared unconstitutional two years later.

The impact on education of the Amnesty Act can largely be seen by a significant drop in student enrollment and subsequent loss in revenues to operate our schools.

This is particularly true in districts which have high concentrations of Hispanic students and have lower socioeconomic status.

For example, the Murphy Elementary School District No. 21 in southwest Phoenix, which I am Superintendent of, is comprised of four schools with approximately 2,500 students, of which 73 percent are Hispanic and 95 percent are poor.

During the 1987-88 school year, there was a sudden drop in student enrollment of approximately 200 students in comparison to the 1986-87 school year, from 2600 in '86-87 to 2400 in '87-88, which was the year of the implementation of the law. This translated into an average daily membership drop of 109 students or approximately \$288,850 in state aid reimbursement lost to our budgets.

We have had to lay people off. We have had to cut back in many areas of our budget, because everything that we do, as far as our budget, is based on that ADM figure.

The district, prior to the enactment of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986, had a ten-year history of extremely stable student enrollment, neither gaining or declining significantly.

Upon investigation of this situation, we were able to track the loss of over 100 students from one large apartment complex commonly referred to by community members

as Little Mexico, due to the large numbers of undocumented workers.

4.

I might add that several Attorneys' General opinions and the position of the district is not one of certifying U.S. citizenship but one of educating, provided they reside within the district and meet legal age entrance and immunization requirements.

In talking with many of the parents who pulled their children from school, the prevailing comments could be summarized as follows:

Fear that this was an attempt by I.N.S. to deport them. Uncertainty about their chances for qualifying for permanent residency.

Fear that their families would be broken apart, especially in cases whereby some members of the family might be eligible and others not. For example, father eligible but mother or children may not be eligible.

Many immigrant students leaving school on their own to find jobs to earn the \$400 needed to apply for amnesty.

Working members losing their jobs due to sanctions placed on employers, thereby forcing families to move back to Mexico or move ahead of eviction notices because of lost employment. And, also, negative attitudes of I.N.S. workers.

While the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 cannot be the sole blame for the loss of some 200 students and subsequent revenue loss in the Murphy School District, it is the single most contributing factor.

1.2

This has been further substantiated throughout Los Angeles, where an estimated 40 percent of the nation's illegal immigrants live. Only about 15,000 new students enrolled for the '87-88 school year. More than 38,000 new enrollees were anticipated, according to county and city officials.

And the source is Education Week, Volume VII, No. 30, April 20, 1986.

In a new report, school officials cite as the reason for the drop what Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools, Stuart E. Gothold, calls the "immigration amnesty hypothesis". Mr. Gothold speculates that families uncertain about their chances for qualifying for permanent residency may be leaving the country or pulling their children out of school until they are more sure of their status.

"Of the reasons why these students are not enrolling, fear is high on the list," said Bob Grossman, a spokesman for the Los Angeles County Schools, "fear of deportation and fear that their families will be broken apart."

After three years of averaging 11,000 new students per year in the district, only 2,000 new students enrolled in 1987. The budget figures, however, were based on an anticipated enrollment of 14,000 new students, and the result was a loss of \$27 million the district had expected to receive from the state based on average daily attendance figures.

As a country that places great pride in educating the masses, the attitude of I.N.S. has been deplorable and can best be summarized by an I.N.S. spokesman as quoted in Education Week:

"The intent of the bill is to deny illegal aliens the ability to work illegally in the United States so they will gradually flow back to their own countries where they are citizens. If this means that there are fewer illegal children in school, then the bill is impacting exactly the way it was supposed to."

It is exactly this type of "I don't care" attitude by I.N.S. which has caused fear and suspicion among our undocumented workers and caused us to fall far short of our projections of those persons who would take advantage of the Amnesty Act.

I believe nationwide we talked about somewhere's in the neighborhood of four million. We will probably come in somewhere's about half of that.

The loss of student enrollment and subsequent revenue to our schools caused by the Immigration and Control Act of 1986's impact on education, however, is a distant second to the psychological, social and emotional scars that the children and parents have and will continue to suffer under this Act.

The fear of deportation, family separation, frustrations and the struggle for survival among these families will be evident long after the bureaucrats have washed their hands of the whole matter.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Donofrio, your time has expired. So, you can conclude.

SENATOR PENA: Mr. Chairman, some of this testimony is very important to us, and I hope that you'd not adhere to the schedule.

MR. DONOFRIO: About two more minutes, and I will close it up.

DR. WHITE: The Chair will grant two more minutes.

SENATOR PENA: Thank you.

MR. DONOFRIO: The fear of deportation, family separation, frustrations and the struggle for survival among these families will be long evident, and what will be left will be families who have been emotionally scarred by elevated anxiety, stress, loss of self-respect, dignity, and a feeling of second-class status.

All of this emotional baggage because someone picked an arbitrary date which will make someone legal or not legal. All of this because all these people ever wanted to do was to better their life for themselves and their families. All of this because all these people wanted to do was become tax givers rather than tax takers.

As we enter Phase II of the Amnesty Act, we have a golden opportunity to bring literally millions of persons, rich in cultural heritage, into the mainstream of America as productive, educated working members of society.

As Woodrow Wilson once said, "We cannot be separated in interest or divided in purpose." We must work together to see that Phase II, the education process, greets these people with patience, motivation and love in our hearts.

We must not lose one person in the process. We must lobby for increased funding so the millions who have come forward will complete Phase II.

In Phase II we have the greatest power of all, the power of an educated mind. We must make these classes accessible to the participants in an environment which is warm and friendly. We cannot fail. We will not fail.

In closing, no doubt you will hear testimony about specific instances of overt violations of civil rights, but of greater importance is a system that in and of itself

violates the basic principles of a free democracy:

A system which pits employer against employee. A system which chooses an arbitrary date to determine destiny. A system so embattled in red tape that even the most educated have had difficulty understanding the process, not to mention the undereducated who had to use the process.

A system which placed financial means to obtain citizenry. A system which was totally underfunded, understaffed and overworked.

This, My Friends, is the message that you and your staff must bring back to Washington on behalf of the people who make up the back streets of America.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.

MR. DONOFRIO: I'll take any questions.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.

Any questions?

SENATOR PENA: Mr. Chairman?

DR. WHITE: Senator.

SENATOR PENA: Mr. Donofrio, that big drop of 200 students that you experienced at that one point, many of those must have been citizens. Many of those children must have been citizens of this country, while their parents may not have been legal residents.

Do you have any kind of feeling as to the numbers of those children who are citizens of this country who were

removed by the parents because of their fear?

MR. DONOFRIO: I would think -- Again, it's difficult to get that, but I think your assumption is correct.

I think many of the parents were not here legally, but the children were born while the parents were here illegally. Our best estimates would probably say it's about half and half.

Generally, the pattern that we see, if the children are not born here, is the father comes over first, establishes himself, seeks and obtains employment, and then starts sending for the rest of the family members.

My guess would be that it would be about half and half. Of the 200 kids that we lost, maybe half of them were U.S. born and the other half would have migrated from Mexico with their parents.

SENATOR PENA: One more.

Does the system allow your school district to become involved in Phase II, providing facilities and teachers?

MR. DONOFRIO: Well, in answer to your question, yes.

For several years we have been involved in adult education; English, a second language class, specifically. We run anywhere's from two to three classes a year, with

upwards of over 100 parents in those classes.

Through negotiations with the state Department of Education and Phoenix Union High School, which is the fiscal agent for the adult education funds, it would appear that this year we'll be able to expand from just that ESL component into civic, citizenship and some basic literacy, just reading, writing and basic computation.

However, we will only begin to touch the surface, based on the availability of resources and what the demand is. We have had probably over 200 parents already seek to get into programs and will fall far short of being able to accommodate them. Where they will go, I cannot answer that, sir.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?
Mrs. Whitlock.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Were you involved in the PR for these people; in other words, letting the people in your district know that these programs are available and that they need to come forward and go through the process?

MR. DONOFRIO: Yes, we were, as best we could. We don't have media specialists, but we did announce some things in our bulletins that go home with the children to the home environment.

We have some community workers that are here today who worked with our parents day and night trying to get them

through the process.

We do fund a migrant program for the farm workers, and an awful lot of education was disseminated through that particular program. We have a comprehensive bilingual program having to do with the parent advisory impact, an an awful lot of information was passed through there.

In rushing to finish, there is one other impact in education that I didn't really get to; and that is the influx of students that we are going to have that are going to need transitional native-language instruction and English-as-second-language instruction.

We're already seeing that just in the eight days we have been open this year. Our bilingual classes are sometimes running twice the number of students in those classes than are nonbilingual classes.

And it's very difficult to find resources, because you're teaching in both languages or using the dominant language to accomplish transition. And the goal is, of course, to teach English. But you've got to start somewhere.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Zazueta?

MR. ZAZUETA: Yes.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration Law, I'd like to thank you for your thoughtful and timely statements.

MR. DONOFRIO:

MR. DONOFRIO: I appreciate that.

DR. W.

DR. WARREN: I have one other question.

There is a metaphor in education which says, in effect: Great schools only take place where parents know what schools look like.

In other words, schools are driven by parental perception. Would you agree with that?

MR. DONOFRIO: Most certainly.

DR. WARREN: So, my question would be as to the quality of external pressure and organized pressure by parents in the schools, such as what you speak of.

I would suspect parents are recessive, do not come, raise a lot of questions, systematically, out of fear and distrust of institutions.

MR. DONOFRIO: You know, Dr. Warren, five years ago I would have agreed with that.

But I think through the years, while we certainly do not have the level that we need to have because of the fear and the intimidation that, you know, an institution places on the environment, we're breaking through that.

At least, you know, from where I sit and from what I see, our parent involvement, even among the undocumented persons, is on the rise.

The Immigration Act certainly stepped us backwards, because now the agency that they most feared all

the time they were here illegally is the agency who is implementing the law.

So, while some of them were getting assimilated into the environment, into the educational community environment, with the law they took a step back.

And I think that's where we lost the 200 students, in that they were fearful that the school would be connected somehow in getting them deported. And it took a great PR program to get around that. And I think, you know, we'll eventually been able to win that battle.

But they do see the school as a safe place and a place that is there to assist them, not to hurt them. And that's why we're seeing these hundreds of parents literally coming out to get into the Phase II process.

DR. WARREN: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: If there are no further questions, I wish to thank you, sir, for your testimony.

MR. DONOFRIO: You're welcome.

MR. WHITE: Our next scheduled witness is Nancy-Jo Merritt. Is she here?

Nancy-Jo Merritt is an attorney and an immigration specialist, and she wishes to address the Committee on employer sanctions and work authorization issues.

Welcome, Miss Merritt.

MS. NANCY-JO MERRITT: Thank you.

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

I'm especially pleased to be here because I addressed the Committee several years ago at the beginning of this law, and I'd like to correct some of the statements I've made, in case anybody ever reads it again.

At that time I was unusual among immigration lawyers because I was in favor of employer sanctions, and I spoke rather well, I thought, and said that I felt it was important for employers to bear part or their share of the burden with respect to the employment of persons who were in the United States illegally.

Prior to that time, I think illegal aliens were frequently abused; they were discriminated against, and they were treated very poorly by employers. The only person who had any part of that burden was the alien himself, and employers could take advantage of that; and many did, and it was a serious problem.

I thought that this Act would in some sense correct part of that and put part of the responsibility on the employer, and I also thought that employers would tend to be more helpful to their work force and make attempts to help them become legalized and to do what they could to make sure that their work force was able to stay here and work properly.

However, I do not believe that that has happened.

And, in fact, some of the things that have really surprised

me--though, in retrospect, perhaps I should have known--have occurred as a result of the employer sanctions provisions of the Act, which I think is serious and appalling and in some cases shocking.

One of the problems is that employers have to comply with a law that I.N.S. itself has trouble administering.

I have spoken many, many times about legalization, and one of the problems of legalization--and I think one of the main reasons why we had lower numbers applying than anybody expected--was I.N.S.'s administration of the law.

There have been many false statements. Forms didn't come out until the very last second. Literally, people did not have forms to comply with employer sanctions until it was practically upon them.

And the rules change. I.N.S. will come out with a regulation, and then they'll change it or they'll find out that the regulation is not in conformance with the Act.

This type of confusion and disarray at the level of the agency that has to enforce employer sanctions has been very difficult for employers to deal with. While the commercial world kind of kept on going, I.N.S. was going back and forth and unable to decide.

The other day my very own accountant called me to ask me about employing someone who was not a citizen, and I

reminded him about discrimination provisions. We talked about it a little bit.

And I said: Well, now, when she filled out the I-9s, that should have really answered all your questions about whether or not you can employ her. He said: The what?

And he had never gotten the form, didn't know what the I-9 was. He'd heard about employer sanctions. He was aware that he had to have some concerns, but he'd never seen the form. It had never been mailed to him, for whatever reason. He was shocked. And I immediately sent him everything over in a letter and told him how to do it.

But, you know, this is a person who normally complies with the law and an intelligent, well-educated man, a good businessman, been around for a while, and he absolutely did not know what the form was and had never seen a copy of it.

Now, I do know that I.N.S. has made a strong effort to educate employers. They gave a lot of seminars. But I think that the overall effort has been lacking and the many changes that have occurred with respect to the administration of the law have been very harmful.

Now, another aspect, and maybe a little more subtle, of employer sanctions that I am seeing very frequently is that:

First of all, employers are still somewhat confused about how to properly comply with the paperwork aspects of the law, and they frequently do not understand when they can and cannot hire someone.

Employers live in total fear because the antidiscrimination provisions are so very strong, and the anti-discrimination provisions themselves are just difficult to understand.

I mean, they have to interface with Title VII. They apply to so many different aspects, such as if you have so many employees here, and if you have less there. They're very confusing, and employers are concerned about them and they have fear about them.

The paperwork violations can be quite expensive, if you have a lot of employees and you have made errors in your paperwork violations.

What we are seeing happening is that because it is so expensive to fight a citation, even if you believe it's been improperly issued, most employers, especially larger employers, will pay the fine and acquiesce rather than pay the considerable costs of hiring an attorney and having the issue properly adjudicated.

And so I think what's happening is we frequently are really not getting definitive standards on what the merits are of some of the citation violations. That only

occurs when there's some kind of adjudication by an impartial source.

So, what is happening now is that the last word at this point on what is a violation and what is not belongs to the I.N.S. which is charged with enforcing it.

And given the confusion and disarray that led up to the enforcement procedures beginning, I think that this is resulting in an enforcement of the Act in ways that's inappropriate.

I don't think that I.N.S. has shouldered its very responsibility with respect to education, not only with respect to legalization but with respect to employer sanctions. And I say that even though I know that it was a very difficult responsibility for I.N.S. to take upon itself. But even so, it was not properly handled.

It was even more severe in the case of legalization. But with respect to employer sanctions, where at least the recipients have the education and are people who should be able to deal with some of the issues, business people who are used to dealing with government regulations, even so, it has not been properly handled.

What that means is that we have another law which has engendered disrespect for the statute. And even worse:

I think many employers, who would not have done so in the past, are taking a very conservative approach to hiring that

will cause a subtle discriminatory affect on nonwhites and on persons who are not citizens.

And I want you to know that two years ago, before all this started, I argued very strongly in front of many different groups that this would not happen. And I apologize to everyone I ever spoke to then, because I do believe that it is happening, and I think that all attorneys who deal in this area are seeing the effects of it.

Another aspect of sanctions that I think has been very difficult is that the agency which has been publicizing the law is the agency which enforces it.

I.N.S. is and has always been a very enforcementminded agency, even though some of the laws that it
administers are not enforcement-type laws. It has an
enforcement mentality, and it's publicity with respect to
the law has been in an enforcement mode.

Now, I'm sure they've done this in order to get the maximum prophylactic effect. They want people to abide by the law and to be concerned about it and to be aware that it's a serious law with serious repercussions.

But what has happened is it's created a real atmosphere of fear which, combined with a lack of knowledge, has led to some very inappropriate responses by employers. And when you add to this the technical difficulties of

complying with the law at all, I think that we have been led to a lot of discrimination.

I want to give you a couple of examples where there are just very subtle things that can lead to difficult decisions that may be made by employers.

One of the benefits of legalization has been that as so many people have come forward to see if they're eligible for legalization, we have seen a lot of U.S. citizens turn up, persons who maybe were born abroad but are citizens by virtue of the fact that maybe their father or their grandfather served in the U.S. Army during the wartime period and became a citizen, or was born in the U.S. and was a citizen. A lot of Canadians and Mexicans are actually U.S. citizens.

Well, if this person comes to me and shows me all of his papers and gives me his family tree and I can see that we have a derivative citizen here, can this person be employed? And, technically speaking, that person is a citizen. They were a citizen when they were born.

But in order to demonstrate that to an employer, what can we do? I can give the employer an opinion letter. But the employer, of course, is not required to care what I think and, in fact, frequently doesn't care what I think.

And so we then must go through a fairly lengthy process of applying for a certificate of citizenship or for

a passport. And although applying for a passport may be speedy, in some instances it is not. This can drag out for a long time.

I

In the meantime, the person who is a citizen does not have employment authorization and will not be hired by employers who feel they might be subject to sanctions, unless they, you know, happen to be brave or I beg and plead for hours on end and they finally give in.

There are other issues that arise with respect to refugees and persons who might be eligible for asylum. And this leads us into what I think has been the most appalling aspect of employer sanctions, and that is work authorization.

In order to properly enforce employer sanctions, there must be some methodology by which employers know that the people they're hiring have work authorization.

Now, a lot of people have the right to stay here. They may be pursuing appeal. They may be applying for asylum. They may be applying for citizenship. There may be a number of avenues available to them that allow them legally to stay inside the United States. But, they do not have work authorization.

In order to get work authorization, they have to apply to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the very agency that is charged with deporting or excluding or

keeping them out and which is charged with enforcement of employer sanctions. This agency is where you apply for work authorization.

DR. WHITE: Excuse me, the time is expiring.

MS. MERRITT: Any questions?

DR. WHITE: Well, that's what I'd like to proceed to. Any questions?

SENATOR PENA: Yes.

DR. WHITE: Senator Pena?

SENATOR PENA: What kind of employers are more confused than others about the impact of the Act? Surely, Motorola, banks and those kind of folks are not confused.

MS. MERRITT: Well, yes, frequently they are.

Now, larger employers either have in-house counsel or they have labor law counsel or they call an immigration lawyer, and they have been able to take the time and money frequently to set up, you know, very sophisticated programs to handle both employer sanctions and the independent contractors and all the other aspects of the Act.

But there are, even so, large employers who struggle with it and don't have proper programs and, of course, smaller employers, you know, who rely upon the newspaper or word of mouth or a package they get in the mail.

You would find a larger proportion of persons

having problems in that area, and I think it cuts across industries. I don't think that I could point to one industry having more trouble than any other one. It's across the board.

DR. WARREN: In that you weren't able to complete your testimony, would you care to make a summary statement regarding your input?

MS. MERRITT: Thank you, I would like to do that.

I think really the rest of my testimony has to do with the very restrictive regulations that I.N.S. has for allowing people to apply for work authorization.

DR. WHITE: Excuse me.

Dr. Warren, if you'd like to make a unanimous consent request that the witness be granted more time, the Chair will be glad to entertain that.

DR. WARREN: Well, I am.

DR. WHITE: How much time do you ask for?

DR. WARREN: Three minutes.

DR. WHITE: Is there objection?

MRS. WHITLOCK: No objection.

MR. ZAZUETA: No objection.

DR. WHITE: I asked if there were objection.

Hearing no objection, an additional three minutes will be allowed.

MS. MERRITT: Thank you. I really appreciate

that. Let me give you an example, and maybe that's the best way to use my three minutes.

Persons who have applied for legalization but who have been denied are not given work authorization during the time that they have to appeal that denial.

Now, in just general due-process terms, is that appropriate? What good is an appeal, if you cannot work and support your family to stay here while you pursue the appeal?

Legalization and I.N.S. have been kept physically separate for reasons of confidentiality, as required by the statute. But the person who made a decision on whether or not a person can have work authorization during the pendency of appeal is the regional commissioner of I.N.S.

And that is the same man who was present at the Chandler Heights raid, which was a staged media event to make employers aware of the problems they have in hiring illegal persons. It's just inappropriate.

Persons who apply for political asylum must ask for employment authorization. The regulations say if it's nonfrivolous, it shall be granted. However, if the district director denies the application for asylum, employment authorization ends.

Then the person, even though they have an appeal, and can go on in front of an immigration judge and ask for

asylum, must first of all be put into the deportation proceedings, must request it, and then the order to show cause issued by the department has to be sent over to the judge. Then and only then can that person reapply for employment authorization.

And this procedure can literally, even with a lawyer begging, pleading and threatening, can literally take months.

People are not able, cannot pursue appeals. They may have a life-threatening situation, if they have to go back to their country, and they are forced between living on the charity of friends and relatives, if they have any in this country, or not pursuing valid appeals.

Employer sanctions has been used as a hammer by I.N.S. to deny work authorizations. They have total, absolute discretion and control over this decision. And it is this that they are using to keep people who have valid appeals and valid reasons to stay in the United States from being able to stay.

DR. WHITE: Thank you. The Committee thanks you for your testimony.

Do you have a question?

MRS. WHITLOCK: Do you have some specific recommendations that you have formulated that might address this, the problems as you see them, to solve these problems?

really

sanctions,

done.

lengthy education period, with suspension of fines during that period so that employers can become educated.

It's a difficult task, and there are a lot of employers. It just could not be done in the manner it was

MS. MERRITT: With respect to employer

I think nothing will solve that problem but perhaps a

With respect to work authorization, I do not believe that applications for work authorization should be subject to the whim and the discretion of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

There surely is, in this government filled with agencies, some other agency which could process those applications and make determinations about whether or not people should have work authorization, when they're allowed to stay here for some legitimate purpose.

And they should be generously granted. In fact, it should be almost automatic. Otherwise, we have a different standard of due process for citizens and noncitizens; and that is clearly unconstitutional.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Zazueta?

MR. ZAZUETA: On the situation with subtle discrimination or a conservative approach to hiring nonwhites, what type of solution do you see there?

1 2 3

5 6.

8

9

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

2324

25

MS. MERRITT: Well, I'll tell you: I don't know that I see a solution. I'm afraid that the imposition of sanctions itself brings that type of discrimination.

I recognize that the statute made an effort to do what it could to avoid discrimination, but I don't think that it works. And I don't think, to tell you the truth, that it can work in this country.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

If not, we thank you very much.

MS. MERRITT: Thank you for hearing me.

DR. WHITE: We have three more witnesses scheduled before our luncheon break, and so we'll proceed.

I'd like to invite any of you to partake of the coffee that we have in the back of the room, and we'll just proceed and hope that we can catch up on our schedule.

Our next witness is Jose Bracamonte. Is he here?

Mr. Bracamonte is an attorney, also, and a specialist on immigration.

But first we'll declare a two-minute recess, if anyone wants to get a cup of coffee.

(Whereupon, at 11:20 o'clock a.m., a short recess was taken.)

* * *

DR. WHITE: Please resume.

Mr. Bracamonte, the Committee welcomes you; and you may proceed.

MR. JOSE BRACAMONTE: Thank you for having me.

Let me just tell you a little bit about myself, I

come by way of my law profession, through Houston College

and UCLA, where I taught, and I now practice law here in

Phoenix.

I'm focusing, and really focusing in a panoramic way, on legalization, the so-called amnesty. I think it's important to understand just a little bit of the origin of amnesty and the concept of immigration law.

Amnesty was first brought up by an organization in the Chicano community, unconditional amnesty. It was during that time period of amnesty they borrowed from that possibly and called for a conditional amnesty toward undocumented persons. Later that notion in the mid 70s was adopted by various Senators an Congressmen, and at least, in my opinion, primarily to sugar-coat the bitter pill of sanctions.

Let's start with the principle aim of amnesty. What is the purpose of legalizing? As stated by Congress it is to regulate. Okay, it is to regulate and bring forth a condensed population. Okay, we have a condensed population that exists in the United States through amnesty. We

currently live in this country, that is the future flow the future will take care of the future flow, but the future population will take care of amnesty.

I think it is fair to say that, unfortunately, that is not the case and will not be the case. See, evidently the problem with legalization is that it is much to limited in scope. The first 5-year requirement since 1982 is much to restrictive, and we know that. And we know that the population is circular. The flow is circular. Not so many come in and stay. In fact it's circular for many reasons and structured that way.

Hence, many persons have in fact been in the United States for many many years but will not qualify because they happened to have left to visit family, to tend to their lands, because they were injured and could not get social services. All kind of reasons. And that reality, that demographic reality coupled with the facts, eliminated the vast majority from coverage under the Act.

And the question that was raised, and I hope to come back to it at the end, is: What will happen to that population? I believe Mr. Feigenbaum raised the question, what will happen? Even assuming that we accept Congress limitations on continuous residence, okay, what about those people that may have been here 35 years; how have they benefited under the legalization program?

Well, reality has been that we must understand that the bill was passed, and passed in an election rush literally on the last weeks. It left to be interpreted by Immigration. I.N.S. has in fact created a law, as it is mandated to do. Congress drew the outline, I.N.S. has colored in the laws and, in coloring the regulations and implementing and in rendering interpretations, has been excessively, extremely, severely restrictive to the point of being ridiculous, to the point of being ridiculous in many of the interpretations.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I will give you a few examples that I hope will help you.

You must understand that those who had looked at amnesty and the legalization program using it as a historical example understood that legalization is very much like arms control.

The devil is in detail and indeed the devil run havoc with those details. For example: I.N.S. from the start up to the present has given interpretations to For example: The question of law. known to the government. Ironically, you must prove that you have been here, you have to prove you have been here in legal status. There was a requirement that came in that said lawfully you had to show that it was known to the government, that you were lawfully here prior to January 1, 1982.

Okay, the Immigration and Naturalization Service immediately promulgated a regulation and said "No, that really doesn't mean known to the government, it meant to I.N.S. and not just known to the I.N.S. but actually registered in the file with I.N.S. prior to January 1, 1982.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I know of a case where an individual came in from a foreign country lawfully under a student visa, tried to attend college in August, was denied submission and therefore it was not valid. Then he was called out of state for personal reasons, he could not qualify for the reason that they did not register him until August of 1982, the deadline. Immigration said we didn't know about The person was here unlawfully the response is: But, wait a minute, the school for this purpose is serving as an I.N.S. Aren't they the government agency that you deal with? The answer is, yes. I.N.S. said we don't It must be recorded in the file.

The first case in a series of cases after that said I.N.S. you are wrong. Congress could have said no to I.N.S., but they didn't. It wasn't known to the government and the government is a much broader entity than the immigration. It includes social agencies it includes schools other agencies as you must suspect, but that is an example that caused confusion, money and litigation.

The other example locally, of local support was

cotton workers. I.N.S. took the very particular reason that cotton workers were not seasonal workers.

The final example of I.N.S.'s restrictive interpretations, regulation and confusion are student loans. Amnesty people that have been qualified under the amnesty program are very concerned with getting adult education .so they can meet the civic requirements as posed by the law.

The I.N.S. came out with an interpretation, an interpretation that said any student loan that went beyond direct educational needs would be public charge.

Now, that is in direct contradiction to the very respective issue itself. IRCA said that Title 4 of the higher Education Act of 1964 could not be considered as a public charge. I.N.S. had to be added litigation had to be threatened finally they came out with a change in policy. By the way, you are right, the money given through educational loans will not be considered a public charge.

It was, I believe, Vice Mayor-City of Phoenix, Mary Rose Wilcox, who brought out the point that they estimated 150,000 people would be eligible under the law as written by Congress. 50,000 of those eligible actually have applied. I would say that part of that difference with people not applying has been I.N.S. has restrictive readings and interpretations of the law and the statutes, its restriction regulation and failure to properly educate the

community as to what those regulations were.

Speaking as an attorney, it has been quite a task to keep up with all the changes, quite a task. I can imagine someone in the community would have tremendous difficulties. Leaving aside that there are two practical rules in the immigration rules that have been the biggest barriers, and I think unnecessarily so to the legalization of individuals. One is the deportation group. If you have been deported after January 1, 1982 formally deported you can not qualify for legalization.

I know of people, I have a client that has been here for 20 years. Excellent worker, happened to have been deported in 1983, which she was not under the general immigration law, she was not represented by an attorney, she was deported. She cannot qualify. She is a very deserving person. That's the law. That's true, that may be the law, but with general immigration there is a waiver. You can get those deportations waived under IRCA. They have taken the position that those cannot be waived. It is an absolute final barrier to qualification.

It's true that IRCA denies certain waivers, but there is also nothing in the law that denies general immigration in that area.

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

DR. WHITE: The time of the witness has expired.

MR. BRACAMONTE: The last point would be the three

misdemeanors or one felony charge.

DR. WHITE: Any question of the witness? I hear none.

We thank you for your testimony.

All right, the next witness is Rafaela Valenzuela.

Rafaela Valenzuela is with the Volunteer Lawyers Program,

and she will speak on the subject of legalization.

Welcome, and you may proceed.

MS. RAFAELA VALENZUELA: Good morning. I'm Rafaela Valenzuela, and I'm with the Volunteer Lawyers Program. I coordinated the legalization project which provides legal representation for the undocumenteds.

First I'd like to share with you and I'd like for you to look at the law and time frame that I.N.S. had to implement the law.

The law went into effect, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. In May of 1987 the QDEs, which are Qualified Designated Entities, were created to help the individuals prepare their applications.

Also, please keep in mind that the program ends in November of 1988. The regulation did not come out until mid-1987.

So now you have a situation where I.N.S. has an enormous task in educating the QDEs and the community in general. If the regulations came out in 1987, how can

1 2

14.

I.N.S. train the undocumenteds? How can they train? Do you think you can handle it?

Because of the time frame involved, these are the issues that I will touch on.

Please understand that there are many others, but we are only allowed five minutes.

One issue that I would like to touch on is the issue provided by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the result of the massive confusion among case applicants and legal personnel as well. In return, aliens were provided with wrong information.

In another case frivolous claims were filed due to the fact that they were not properly educated by I.N.S. There was no monitoring by the I.N.S. for the QDEs who called themselves immigration experts, which in turn led to frustration and lack of trust by the aliens.

One of the other issues that I would like to touch on is consumer fraud. Why did consumer fraud take place? IRCA does not allow I.N.S. to report consumer fraud. I.N.S. states that they are doing everything possible to assist the undocumenteds. However, there appears to be a problem because of the information.

They will not provide the QDEs and other reputable practitioners so that the agencies can make aliens aware of the suspected wrongdoings.

Also, because of the late start, no one gave thought to businesses that created most of the notary publics to aid the undocumented aliens.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those businesses were not properly monitored by I.N.S. so, thus, exorbitant fees were charged and, as I mentioned before, claims were filed where individuals did not qualify. But due to the money that the notaries could make, they followed through with the applications, anyway.

The other issue that I would like to share with you is separation of families. I have encountered various families that due to the fear that some members of the family would not qualify and that there would be an investigation and these family members would be deported, they in turn did not file or, thus, returned to Mexico and did not file at all.

Another incident that I have seen very often the office is individuals that were fired prior to when the law went into effect. Unfortunately, they did not qualify IRCA but were fired by the employer, due to the fact that the employer was not properly -that those grandfathered employers did not have to provide documentation, but in turn they had to file, as I mentioned earlier.

Our office handles a lot of appeals, as I mentioned earlier. We are the only pro bono agency in the

City of Phoenix. The majority of aliens have been denied temporary residence.

The other thing I'd like you to keep in mind is when an individual has status of residence, if they commit any crime, they will be denied permanent residence.

Jose Bracamonte touched a bit on the issue of the three misdemeanor, one felony charges. When you consider it, anything is a felony. Anything is a misdemeanor, especially if you have been in jail for five days. And, unfortunately, that turns toward the undocumented, the poor, since they do not have the money to be bailed out.

Another issue that I've seen a lot is that case workers were not properly educated on the three-misdemeanor, one-felony issue. They informed many applicants that they were eligible, that were not eligible because of a poor record. There again they did not go into detail. If they had an arrest, that would also contribute to their application.

Deportation is another serious issue. Many case workers were not aware that if an individual had been deported, which interrupts their continuous residence, that they would not be eligible.

My concern is that they do not know what relief is for them, and I think that needs to be changed.

Are there any questions?

DR. WHITE: Do any of the Members of the Committee have a question?

Senator Pena.

1.8

SENATOR PENA: The I.N.S. somehow encourages notaries and other groups to participate in the applications.

My understanding is that if an individual was a notary public they could apply to be a QDE without having any sort of immigration knowledge or background.

The I.N.S. has screened these people? I heard over the radio several people advertising that they were helping I.N.S., that they were qualified. Those same people I've noticed have now been charged as people who have defrauded applicants.

So, my question is: By not screening or by not investigating these organizations that were open to the public, everybody knew that they were there.

Was it an encouragement type of process by the I.N.S. to say you go ahead and charge people whatever, thousands of dollars?

MS. VALENZUELA: I don't think it was a discouragement.

That I am aware of, these individuals did not have, like I mentioned earlier, any kind of experience.

Most of the QDEs set up were not proper organizations, and

I think that was the basic requirement for a QDE.

And as far as notaries, as long as you were a notary in the State of Arizona, you could apply to be a QDE. I know that there were a lot of organizational groups that were doing that kind of work. But I'm also aware of several who actually defrauded people thousands of dollars to fill out a simple packet. I just had not heard that I.N.S. was involved in investigating and stopping them from doing it. Now they are accusing, but it's after the fact.

SENATOR PENA: That's correct.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

If not, the Committee thanks you very much for your testimony.

We have one more scheduled witness before the lunch break, and that is Mr. Enrique Medina Ochoa.

MR. MONTEZ: He's not here. I talked to him yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and I told him he was scheduled for 11:30. And I don't know.

DR. WHITE: I have an additional witness not scheduled that we may hear at this time.

Ms. Elizondo, would you care to appear now?

Ms. Elizondo is with an organization known as Portable Practical Education Project.

Did I get it right, PPEP? You may proceed. And we thank you for appearing.

MS. GLORIA ELIZONDO: My apologies to begin with my English is sixth grade language in English. I want to be excused because -- I want to ask for excuse before I start because you may not be able to understand my English. I'm going to try very hard.

The reason I'm here is that I was told this morning at 8:00 o'clock to be here by my supervisor, and that's why I'm here. But I have been listening to every witness today, and I agree with all of what they have said.

And just a few minutes ago Rafaela touched on a very good subject. I'm one of those workers. I was offered this job and I took it because I was bilingual and I knew of the needs of a bilingual person in this particular office. And I took the job with no preparation, not knowing what to do, not knowing how to fill out any of these forms.

And I'm going to just give you a little bit of my frustration as a worker.

I work at a QDE organization in Tolleson called PPEP. It is a farm worker's organization that applied for a QDE in Tolleson trying to help all of the farm workers to be legalized.

And yes, we lacked a lot of information. Yes, I was never trained for it. Yes, for frustration after frustration. I'm still having frustration. And I feel like I.N.S. should have done a lot of publicity before they even

tried that program. I thought that maybe we could have helped a lot more people.

If we had we just started to educate the people first, then trying to educate the employers. I was a farm worker myself.

Yesterday I met with a farm owner and he had never heard of the I-9 Form or the manual or a booklet or a I-9 Form and this is running all through the community in the west side. Leaving Rainbow Valley and all this farm workers farm laborers, farm dairyman and all of these people are not aware of the I-9 Form. They have not received or heard about it.

Now, since I have more time I have been trying to locate all these farmers that I have received letters from their workers to be able to apply for legalization. And I'm now involved with it, I'm now sending them. We do have them in the office. Other parts of the program has them. And so I'm doing that now, and I'm trying to educate the farmers especially of this.

And yes, they required a lot of people, for being eligible because of their lack of knowledge for the I.N.S. form.

And that's all I can tell you. I'm still frustrated because I know for a fact -- I was a cashier for 14 years in a grocery store. And I know a lot of people

that are eligible that they have let's say for example: In the Mexican community we all have big families. Myself I have ten kids. You have all these families that two or three of them are American citizens but yet the rest of the family lacks because they are not eligible.

I had a question this morning, a letter on my desk, that said, "Please let me know if I can bring my wife and my kids back." I don't have the answer.

The other question is AHCCCS eligibility workers sending the people back because they applied. And like the gentlemen from the Health Department said, it is true, there is nothing in writing that I.N.S. says, yes, if any apply and they are eligible they will not be denied the second phase of their legalization application.

There is nothing clear to let you know how to work, how to help these people, how to do it.

And as a worker, I'm frustrated. And that's all I can tell you. If this helps you in any way, and if you have any questions, please.

MR. ZAZUETA: Mr. Chairman, perhaps the witness, Ms. Elizondo, will feel a little more comfortable saying a few words in Spanish, if I have your permission.

MS. ELIZONDO: La frustracion de nosotros en la officina, como dije, es grande. La informacion que nos dieron veno muy tarde.

The other thing, in English: PPEP is the only organization that sends us workers out once a month to the State of Sonora. We go two days a month to Hermosio, Sonora, to fill out these applications to the people that work there. They come with check stubs with letters with receipts. So we fill them out the I-700 together with the I-735 with organizational program. And we do this once a month because of lack of funds.

Like somebody said in the beginning, we are not able to go for these two days, and we scheduled our visits until November 5th and 6th.

In Arizona there is a lot of people who is illegal, they don't have the funds, they are lost, they lose the opportunity for legalization.

Gracias.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Before the witness leaves, I'd like to apologize to the witness that some of us are not bilingual.

MS. ELIZONDO: I was born in Mexico. I was a wetback from the age of 16. And I had an opportunity of being a farm worker, and that is my only English. But I do have ten kids, and I'm very proud of them. And I have a freshman and a junior high.

MRS. WHITLOCK: I'd like to compliment the witness on her speaking ability. I understood it very well. And I

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

didn't understand it when you spoke it in your language, but 1 2 you did a beautiful job in my language. Also, I have 21 grandchildren. 3 WHITE: This is a point of 4 personal privilege, and as Chairman, I wish you would not apologize 5 for the other people. 6 This meeting is held under the auspices of 7 United States Government and not on the Republic of Mexico. 8

No one is apologizing, and you may proceed in English.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ZAZUETA: And sir, I do not agree with you.

DR. WHITE: This afternoon we do have a translator.

MR. MONTEZ: I couldn't get him here this morning.

DR. WHITE: That is the point, any more use of the Spanish language, those who wish to use it, those should be prepared to have it translated into the language of this country.

MR. ZAZUETA: Would you explain that? What is the language of this country?

DR. WHITE: Well, I have always been under the impression that English was the language of this country.

MR. ZAZUETA: Would you get a consensus on that?

MR. MONTEZ: Richard, hey, come on now. So we can conclude before the lunch hour.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Ochoa is the Chairman-Board of Directors, SER-Jobs for Progress. I'm informed that SER serves employment for redevelopment?

MR. ENRIQUE OCHOA: Yes. I thank you, sir. I am the Chairman for SER. SER Jobs for Progress is a training program. It is a development community based organization in the State of Arizona.

DR. WHITE: And you are very welcomed, sir. And you may proceed.

MR. OCHOA: My name is Enrique Ochoa and I am, as I stated before, the Chairman for SER Jobs for Progress. I also practice law here in Phoenix, and we are in the law firm that is the legal counsel to the Mexican Consulate. And I did come in on the tail end of this particular conversation.

I do wish to make one comment, and that is that I understand from a legal perspective that it hasn't really been stated or determined by the courts that English is to be officialized as the English language of this country.

I understand that it was started to try to officialize the language, but at this time that is not the case.

There are treaties that have indicated that the language and cultures that were here prior to a lot of the new laws that came in and the efforts to take over the land,

those treaties indicated that the language and culture would be respected. And I would ask that of Mr. White and everybody that is here.

My comments this morning I wish to make in regards to the training and educational programs and the monies and resources that have been allocated through IRCA for this purpose.

At SER Jobs for Progress we have made various attempts to obtain monies to provide educational and training services for those people that are trying to legalize their status through the IRCA program.

It is our position at this point that the monies that have been provided and the designation of resources provided for this purpose is insufficient. We feel that the monies that have been allocated at the nation-wide level have been indicated to be in the millions of dollars and perhaps in the billions of dollars. But for some reason or another they are not coming down.

It seems what is happened with these educational and training monies to provide citizens with English courses for these people, have been insufficient and they have been provided very much as a public relations and information monies that came out earlier, and that is to say, not enough, and at the last minute.

We have been trying, as a community-based

organization, to supplement the efforts that are being initiated by the educational institution to address this particular need.

But we feel, that at this time, at least, in the State of Arizona, by what we can tell in the Southwest, that these monies and these resources will not be enough.

To that, as the Chairman of the SER Jobs for Progress, I wish to state that it makes us very suspicious of the intent and the real initiative behind the law.

We have come to the understanding that those people that will not be provided the educational services to learn English, to learn those things that are necessary to be good citizens, that those people will in turn not qualify for permanent residence.

And so, therefore, it makes us suspicious that perhaps the intent of the law might have been or might be to have a mass deportation of those people that will not qualify.

Again, we encourage this Commission and anybody else that can help in terms of encouraging the Department of Immigration, U.S. Justice Department, and the Department of Immigration and Naturalization Service to address these needs more particularly.

And appropriate resources is what is needed, in order for us to be able to provide educational services for

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES

those people that are trying to live under the statutes and, consequently, be good citizens.

Thank you very much.

DR. WHITE: Any questions?

SENATOR PENA: The funding, then, that is so necessary to provide education and that is necessary for these people to qualify for permanent residence, in your opinion, should come from the federal government? It's their programs?

MR. OCHOA: I believe that it should, because the law is a federal mandated law. It's a nation-wide law that came down.

And the reason that I say that is, just to give you an example, that I say they are insufficient: At this point there is a \$500 cap for educational services to those people.

And a regular elementary secondary school may be able to provide appropriate educational services to bring these people up to the English-speaking level or the citizenship, the learning that is necessary.

But we do know that the educational institutions will not be able, that there are not sufficient educational institutions to provide these kinds of services at this time.

As community-based organizational entities that

are trying to supplement these efforts, the \$500 is really not sufficient to provide the educational services that are needed.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

If not, sir, we thank you for your testimony.

MR. OCHOA: Thank you.

DR. WHITE: The Committee will stand in recess until 1:00 p.m.

(Whereupon, the foregoing proceedings were recessed, to reconvene at 1:00 o'clock p.m.)

* * *