	213	
1	CC/ 3 ARIZONA ADVISORY COMMITTEE Week	β
2	337	
3	UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS Y. 3	
4		ļ
5		
6	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	ļ
7		ļ
8		ļ
9	FORUM ON IMMIGRATION REFORM	
10	November 3, 1988	ļ
11	Tucson, Arizona	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16	Volume III	
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	PADILLA & ASSOCIATES	
22	16213 Ocotillo Drive	
23	Fountain Hills, Arizona 85268	
24	(602) 953-1307	
24 CC	R	
25 Me	eet.	
33 V.		

PADILLA & ASSOCIATES (602) 953-1307

And Mr. Dan Gebhart, with the Arizona Restaurant 1 2 Association. 3 So we will be calling on Mr. Thacker, first. And welcome you to the meeting, sir. And you may proceed. 5 6 MR. THACKER: Thank you. When this whole law went into effect, you look at 7 it with a certain bit of trepidation, realizing that you 8 9 are not fully going to understand, at least from the 10 inception. 11 In my business that could dig in the information 12 and find out what is going on. 13 We began applying on November 6, in our particular 14 business, and I called the board of the Southern Arizona 15 Innkeepers Association this morning and basically so nobody had any problems. The members of the association 16 17 such as ours, perhaps had some type of trance. 18 We had some speaker come in and speak with the 19 people as to what was required. The information was 20 available in our newsletter as to what was required. 21 I find that as I read the newspaper, for example, 22 today that the people that have been having difficulties 23 are not members of our organization. They are people who, 24 basically, have not taken the trouble to find out what is

25

going on.

Obviously, the thing is a pain in the butt. You have to require or keep records that we didn't have to keep in the past.

It cost me xeroxing money, but, we basically did for the same information in our hotel environment as they are asking now.

It's just a question in the past we used to verify and now we have to keep copies and have documents that we keep in records, that's basically the difference from our standpoint.

A few things are troublesome, and perhaps, I'm clear from my standpoint dealing with independent contractors is a little bit difficult when they are working on their own or have a license they are employers themselves. And what our responsibilities from that standpoint hiring an individual person such as a contractor, for example, to a layman in your establishment. For one, it's our responsibility to get the documentation for that worker who is doing the job for that independent contractor, even though, we are paying him as another worker, which is a little bit independent and doesn't make a lot of sense.

I can see the point for having the law, it's unfortunate, that businesses are in a position of having to basically be the watchdog in order to implement this.

1 And it's a burden, but, I think once you get the 2 system down you start doing -- it's certainly not any worse than the rest of the bureaucracy we have to deal 3 4 with the government. 5 DR. WHITE: Any questions? SENATOR PENA: 6 Yes. 7 DR. WHITE: Senator Pena. 8 SENATOR PENA: The application for employment, I 9 guess you have a standard application for all your 10 members? 11 MR. THACKER: Yes, sir. 12 SENATOR PENA: How do you determine who may or may 13 not be an illegal alien? 14 MR. THACKER: You ask for the same documentation 15 from everyone across the board. 16 Anybody who applies for the job you ask for the same documentation before we let them go through 17 18 orientation, they have to provide the documentation and 19 that's the standard documentation that's set forth by the 20 law. 21 SENATOR PENA: Someone who may have been born in 22 Tucson, what kind of documentation would you require from 23 that person? 24 MR. THACKER: Well, I haven't dealt with this since 25 November the 6th of last year.

1 SENATOR PENA: What does the application say on it? MR. THACKER: Well, the application says on it that 2 you need to have proof of citizenship and proof of 3 identity. 4 And, then there is specific criteria that are set 5 6 out as subsections of that. And that's what we require. And then we have to keep copies of that we actually 7 make xerox copies of driver's licenses and things like 8 9 that passports, whatever. The documentation is that we are receiving from the 10 11 employee, Social Security card, we take xerox copies of 12 that. There is cost inherent in that. 1.3 But anybody who comes on board, we require that 14 before they set foot on the property. 15 We used to actually, you know, before November 16 the 6th last year, we would hire people and get the 17 documentation a week a day after they were hired 18 and complete their file. 19 Now, they don't step foot on the property until 20 they have the information and we've xeroxed it. 21 As far as knowing whether or not that is 22 counterfeit information or if that's information that is 23 not them, we use our best judgement possible. That's why

DR. WHITE: Anything further?

we use the xerox copies.

24

If not, thank you, Mr. Thacker. 1 Now, I'd like to call Mr. Dan Gebhart of the 2 Arizona Restaurant Association. 3 MR. GEBHART: Thank you for inviting us to be here this afternoon. 5 6 I'm the owner of Hardy's Restaurants here in 7 Tucson. 8 President of the Tucson Chapter of the State of 9 Arizona Restaurant Association. 10 And I pretty much go along with what John is saying there, but, I'd like to get maybe just a little more 11 specific on a few instances. 12 13 Initially, when the law came out there was that 14 feeling of here we go again, more government, once they 15 get their foot in the door more bureaucracy, more 16 paperwork, more storage, more cost associated with it, et cetera. 17 18 We understand the intent and the purpose of the law 19 and are certainly willing to comply with that. 20 I think, what I would like to propose would be for 21 you to look at it through the eyes of a businessman. 22 And look at the cost that is really associated with 23 that. Because, needless to say, it impacts us, who in 24 turn, is going to impact our customers, you, and everybody

25

else out there.

So, those cost, needless to say, have to be passed on and they will be born eventually by the customer.

Businesses cannot continue to finance the government by incurring all of those costs.

б

Some of the situations that are probably pretty unique to the fast food industry, and particularily to the restaurant industry, but, I say fast foods, because that's where I deal with.

The restaurant industry is not a 9:00 to 5:00 job, it's an ongoing situation. Particularly people that are involved in the fast food industry, the assistant managers that come in at the change of shifts at 5:00 o'clock at night, in most restaurants, are young individuals.

And, as we know, I don't think there is anybody in this room here that is totally knowledgeable and at sometime or other has not forgot certain things.

And we do the best job we certainly can within our industry to train our people so that they're knowledgeable, and that they get all the paperwork filled out, et cetera.

I, as an owner, have to go into my restaurants from time to time and check and make sure that the managers and the assistant managers are following up on their work.

Again, we are talking -- some of these people that are in the capacity age wise maybe 17, 18, 19 years old

that are in charge from time to time.

I see as a hindrance to the business, the ability for government to come in and fine me personally or civally if we in fact, don't have those forms totally complied with.

Now, we're doing everything we possibly can and we have not ever been cited nor have we ever been audited.

But, I'm sure there is going to come a time when some businessman out there, in fact, is going to be audited.

And again, he's going to do the best job he possibly can, and again the chains are really great about this, the chains are really informed about the whole process, the restaurant chains, about how the whole process was going to work when it was going to be implemented, et cetera.

But, realistically, if you got an individual in there that's young, and let's assume that the manager is on vacation and the assistant manager is doing the paperwork and he forgets, he forgets one form. Well, there is a possibility there that I can be fined, I can be assessed through really not negligence on my behalf, okay, but, on the negligence of somebody that we've trained, but, because of pure human err, pure human err, not trying to falsify that, I could be cited. And I think there are

some inequities in that system.

It has, in fact, created more paperwork for us, which in turn causes more storage problems that are associated with the job.

It also, as John said, cost of business, the cost of going out there and getting xerox copies of all these forms.

In the restaurant industry there is a high turnover, particularly, fast foods. And those cost can and do mount up, and they mount up rather significantly.

That cost again is got to be born by whom? We all know the answer to that question.

What it also entails is that the manager, manager, supposed to manage is in fact spending more and more time doing paperwork and administrative work instead of doing the job out there managing, managing his people.

So that we can get better products out for our customers, we can get faster service, we can have better cleanliness.

More and more time is being spent with the administration of paperwork, and I'm afraid that's unfortunate. Because our customers really aren't concerned about that piece of paper that's in a file. They are concerned about fast food, quality service, cleanliness, atmosphere, hospitality, and all the things

that are associated with it.

I have heard from some of the restaurant tourist within the industry that there may be, and again, maybe it's just because our proximity to Mexico, but, there's a feeling among some restaurant tourist that this is really designed, basically, to go after the Hispanic. And I'm not saying that that is the case. Maybe, if we were up in Canada maybe the people that border Minnosota felt that maybe it's specifically for the Canadians, I don't know. But, there is some resentment out there that this law is pretty much targeted at Hispanics.

And that is something that I'm sure if you haven't heard you will be hearing, and it's a fact of life out there.

And there is some bad feeling about that. And, again, with our proximity to Mexico being only 60 miles away, we employ a lot of people of Hispanic, Mexicans, Spanish, whatever.

But there is that feeling, that there is some discrimination going on towards that particular cultural group.

As far as the audits are concerned. I talked to one businessman here in Tucson that went through an audit. It was a situation that he -- needless to say, no one likes to take the time to go through audits -- he was not

cited at all, he owns a number of restaurants. He was asked to bring in all the material into one local place for his different businesses, although, they were all under one umbrella roof of a title. The audit took place over a two-day period. Everything was fine, he had no negative comments at all about the way he was treated. It was a very very good and smooth operation. So there's been no problems from that aspect of it at all.

Again, we know what the intent of the law is, we certainly intend to comply with the law. I just want to point out to you some of the handicaps and restrictions that you are placing upon the businessman to some extent.

Thank you.

DR. WHITE: Any questions from the committee? Senator Pena.

SENATOR PENA: Is there any recourse when a human err occurs, an automatic fine or --

MR. GEBHART: Again, I don't know the interpretation of the law. I don't know how they are going -- if that in fact does happen, I can't tell you.

Because, as far as I know, I have not heard of any interpretation coming down that that in fact could occur.

Needless to say, because of a human err, that's going to occur. Someplace, sometime, someone is going to get cited, it's going to happen.

And I think, you know, if we can make a provision in there, as long as it's not somebody out there deliberately trying to accept falcified records or try to deliberately hire people that are not legal, as long as they do the job of instructing their people.

In my case, for example, we have manager's meetings once a week. We bring everybody in we convey what the policies are, the procedures, the rewards, the goals, et cetera, so everybody is instructed.

But, I know there will come a time -- and hopefully not in our business, and hopefully not within our industry, but, somebody is going to go on vacation and some young person is going to be left in charge -- and maybe it's only for a week -- but there is probably going to be one or two applicants that that person thought, gee, I forgot to get that, and then all of sudden he comes along and gets audited. And we can be in a bunch of problems, in a bunch of trouble.

I hope there is a provision. I don't know the answer to your question.

DR. WHITE: Mrs. Whitlock.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Mr. Gebhart, with these restrictions and problems, could you see down the road, if not now, a possibility of discrimination against Hispanics in hiring based on the fact that it's such a pain in the

We know that there are some people that are just prejudice and no matter what the color of their skin is, whether it's black, white or brown, whatever, there will be people out there in this country, that will just not hire them because of that, so, to some degree, yes.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Well, I'm not saying because they are Hispanics for that reason, but, because of this law being as restrictive as it is requiring all this paperwork, if they will try to stay clear of those people?

MR. GEBHART: There will be some that will probably do that.

DR. WHITE: It made me think of the recent hearing that this committee had in Phoenix. Where we did have a witness who was an owner and operator of a restaurant, it's a small business. And he told a horror story about how his record keeping was simplified or had been in the past by simply throwing away papers on people who were no longer employed by him, that's how he kept his files up to date.

So, the day came, when they came down on him and apparently it's going to cost him quite a bit of money, because he was supposed to keep that.

Now, the point of this is that I wonder if you gentlemen perceive that there is a difference in the problem whereas between fairly large enterprises such as

some people have personnel directors, and others —
restaurants have — you have an owner operator who is the
personnel manager, the chief cook, and bottle washer and
everything, and on top of all that, now, he has to be the
record keeper for the Federal Government.

It would seem like that would be a more severe problem for these small businesses than it would be for the larger?

MR. GEBHART: No question about it and I think probably realistically the chains are, I think, in good shape.

But, I'm sure that there are small operators out there, some basically mom and pop operators out there that maybe are not even aware of this particular law.

If they just went into business, they didn't get any information, they just said, well, I'm just going to change vocations — there's probably people — I mean that's a realty of life.

DR. WHITE: They are in danger of some fairly heavy penalties?

MR.GEBHART: Exactly.

MR. THACKER: As I mentioned, if you are not a member of our association, of Dan's or of mine, if you are not a member of a chain or something like that, it's very possible that you know nothing about this, if you don't

read the newspaper, and if you are just a mom or pop operation.

And I think that's where you are running into problems, and you are running into problems not because people are willfully violating the law, they just don't understand what their requirements are, and it's an educational process.

If you read the newspaper today you have some small hotels and some small restaurants that have been fined \$500 to \$600, today, for improper record keeping.

And \$500 or \$600 to a small restaurant can mean a lot of money.

I mean, that can be a question of survival in some of these smaller operations.

And, unfortunately, the newspaper article -- and I have no direct knowledge -- doesn't really detail to what extent or whether there was some willful wrong doing there, or if these people just made innocent mistakes and we could have just said, listen, this is the way that you do it. We are going to come back and check you in another six months and hopefully you will be doing it correctly -- if you haven't been doing it correctly -- at that point in time, we are going to fine you, which would seem to me to be a more compassionate way to do things.

As far as not hiring Hispanics based on this, I think, again, it's a question of education, in my case, that would be, I think, the last thing that would happen. Because it's no more difficult to get the documentation from a Hispanic than it is from a Wasp and we require the same thing no matter what the nationality or perceived nationality of that person might be or ethnic background.

If you walked in we would ask for the same documentation from you that we ask from Dan or from anybody else who we hire.

So, it's not any more difficult to hire a Hispanic than it is to hire anyone.

MRS. FAUST: Mr. Chairman.

DR. WHITE: Yes.

MRS. FAUST: Mr. Gebhart.

MR. GEBHART: Yes, ma'am.

MRS. FAUST: Have you ever estimated the number of hours or the cost for all employees, and if that's the case, do you think it's easier to hold on to an employee rather than to -- you know.

MR. GEBHART: I called each one of our managers this afternoon, and I said, give me an approximate cost as to what it's taking. Because, needless to say, it's taking time out of his schedule.

MRS. FAUST: Aren't you glad I asked?

MR. GEBHART: I'm glad you asked. It takes -- to do the job properly, to verify the ID, to take the time to xerox it out, to go ahead and screen the people properly, what we are estimating, it's taking the manager an average of 10 to 15 minutes per employee to do the job properly. That 10 to 15 minutes for the managers will be in a salary anywhere from a range from 24 to \$36,000 a year.

So, as you can see we employ an average, in the restaurants right now, of about -- the average fast food chain -- probably 50 to 65 employees is on that payroll.

So you can see that that can add up to quite a bit of the managers time being spent.

In terms of actual dollars, no, I did not break it down, specifically in terms of dollars, but, I certainly planned to do that, but, I just ran out of time.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.

MR. GEBHART: You're welcome.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

If not, Mr. Thacker, Mr. Gebhart, we thank you very much for your testimony.

MR. GEBHART: Thank you.

1	DR. WHITE: Our final panel is on enforcement.
2	We have a number of people scheduled.
3	We'll find out who is here.
4	Is Mr. Bill Johnston, here?
5	Would you take a seat here, sir.
6	Mr. O'Leary. Mr. Barron. Mr. Ronstadt. And
7	finally, we have Mr. Dupnik.
8	Of course, we'll proceed as we have, and that is to
9	take the names as they appear on the agenda.
10	So, first, Mr. Bill Johnston of the Immigration
11	Service.
12	MR. JOHNSTON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, our counsel
13	is here and I prefer that Mr. O'Leary go first. And I'll
14	follow him if that's okay with you.
15	DR. WHITE: That's quite all right.
16	Mr. O'Leary.
17	MR. O'LEARY: Thank you members of the panel.
18	My name is Thomas Michael O'Leary, I'm the sector
19	counsel for the Tucson Sector of the United States Border
20	Patrol.
21	I'm not exactly sure as to what direction you wish
22	us to go into, but in terms of enforcement, obviously, an
23	article appeared in the paper today that said that the
24	Tucson sector had since the inception of the Immigration
25	Reform and Control Act fined 15 employers, that's in the

Tucson area and the Phoenix area, as well, our sector covers both those areas.

Perhaps, I should address some of the problems that were recently addressed that the employers had that may be of help to you in making your decisions.

One, and I think the key thing that we should address first is discrimination.

There was an implication or a possibility raised that discrimination could occur especially against Hispanics and especially in this area.

I think that's kind of what Congress had in mind to prevent when they included the anti-discrimination provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, which basically tells employers that you got to comply with the law, but, if you comply with it by discriminating against anybody because of their citizenship which is a new category of discrimination, if you do that you are going to be subject to civil penalties and civil suits.

And they broadened the jurisdiction, if you will, for lowering the number of employees that an employer needs to employ to three or more.

So, I think Congress had this in mind and put in provisions to prevent this by ensuring that the Justice Department would have an enforcement agency. And that's

the office of the special counsel located in Washington to enforce that provision, if that would occur.

That was expected to be raised, I think, when IRCA was contemplated and, I think that's what Congress intended to put in there to prevent that.

Some of the less perhaps serious problems, obviously, that's the most serious. But, less serious problems. Small businessmen, as opposed to large national corporations with personnel directors.

True, that they are probably more of a disadvantage to that employer but they are disadvantaged and competing against that employer at any respect.

But that's part of the effort that the Immigration

Naturalization Service has undertaken since June 1,

1987.

And coupled that with the idea of minor infraction the young manager or the young assistant manager 17 years old who in his haste to accomplish his mission processes an employee without filling out an I-9 and later on down the line that I-9 is missing at an audit, let's say. Well, Commissioner Nelson of the Immigration Services does have a policy regarding enforcement.

One is education: No employer, no employer in the

United States will be fined unless that employer received an educational visit, and has been educated in the law.

And every employer that has been fined in the United States today, well, let me just lower that and say that every employer that has been fined by the Tucson sector has had an educational visit, in many cases, more than one.

Forty-seven citations, during the citation period, the warning period, were issued. Several employers received fines because they had already received the citation.

So that's the commission's policy there of education is designed to help the small businessmen, well, it's the large businessman.

And the second thing to that is enforcement. We are not looking for minor infractions, we are not looking, you did not date your form, boy, you put that on the wrong line or something like that.

What we are looking for is the employment of unauthorized workers, not necessarily illegal aliens.

You see illegal aliens can be employed.

First of all, any illegal alien employed prior to November 6th, is what we call grandfathered. And they can remain employed by that employer without any

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

13

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sanctions whatsoever occurring, possibly occurring.

Second, illegal aliens who may be facing a deportation hearing or in the process of resolving their difficulties with the Immigration Service may have work authorization has been granted to them if they are asylum applicants or something, and that enables them to work in the United States.

So, it's the unauthorized worker, the illegal alien who is not known perhaps to the Immigration Service and has not received any type of work authorization and has authority to work in the United States by the order no of Congress. And that's the individuals we are looking for.

And, it's only when an employer has employed an unauthorized worker that a fine will ensue. Whether that fine may be for a paperwork violation -- but there is the predicate, the absolute prerequisite, of employing an unauthorized worker before it will trigger a fine.

The only exception to that is when the paperwork is absolutely a grevious. And we can define a grevious by looking in Webster and it's serious, it's absolute disregard for IRCA.

But, again, coupled with the educational provision the citation period and the commission's policy on enforcement, I think that you can see that those fears may be allay to the businessmen that nobody is going to hit you over the head if you didn't dot an "I" and cross a "T".

It's only if you are engaging in the employment of unauthorized workers, knowingly, that this will occur.

So, some of that fear we hope will be dissipated if it exist.

Most employers who have had contact with the Immigration Service know that.

And we've had contact with the Chambers of Commerce and the various Innkeepers Association and they've learned that, and I think that's a guiding principal.

If you don't employ an unauthorized worker, if you are just careful enough to ensure that you don't have an unauthorized worker.

And the last thing on that. Fraud was mentioned, counterfeit documents. The employer is not the enforcer of IRCA.

If the documents are what we call reasonable on their face and nobody expects an employer to run checks with Social Security or the Immigration Service for numbers or anything like that.

PADILLA and ASSOCIATES

If the documents are reasonable on their face, but, they turn out to be counterfeit fraudulent and that person is actually an unauthorized worker, the employer, will not be the recipient of the fine, rather the individual will probably be the recipient of a trip to court for prosecution.

And, again, that's part of IRCA. Which allows that type of prosecution.

So, I think, sometimes, I don't give as much credit to Congress as perhaps they deserve. But, in this case they did look at the complete picture here and try to cover all aspects of it, to try to cover any kind of retrenching to discrimination by the anti- discrimination provision and try to ensure that minor infractions, the undot "I" the uncrossed "T" will not be punishable to stand the tie of illegal immigration by preventing the attraction, the magnet, the employment.

That's about all I have, right now. I've taken a lot of time. I apologize for that, but, I'll turn it over to Bill.

DR. WHITE: Well, let's see if any member of the committee has any questions before we move on.

SENATOR PENA: Mr. Chairman.

DR. WHITE: Yes, Senator Pena.

SENATOR PENA: Do I understand that the Immigration
Services is the only agency that is authorized to enforce
the Act, is that correct?

MR. O'LEARY: The employer sanctions provisions,

The Justice Department through the Immigration

Service. The Immigration Service includes both the

Immigration Naturalization Service and the United States

Border Patrol.

SENATOR PENA: You stated that you folks are not looking for minor violations.

We had testimony today, as a matter of fact, many of the folks that testified today stated that the local police are stopping and questioning Hispanic-looking individuals, and after they are satisfied that they have not broken a local law they are referred to you folks for prosecution and deportation.

Is there any truth to that?

MR. O'LEARY: Is there any truth to the fact that sometimes we get calls from other law enforcement agencies that there might be a possible undocumented alien. Yes, there is truth to that.

SENATOR PENA: Are you authorized to do that under the Immigration Act?

MR. O'LEARY: They would not necessarily stop

that's correct.

an alien because he's an alien. They may stop him for another reason and, I think, these gentlemen may be better able to address that.

There may be various reasons why an individual is stopped, but, if during the course of that stop they become aware or suspicious that he is an undocumented alien they would turn them over to us, they would call us in to do questioning.

And we may question them and find out that they have a hearing scheduled in Phoenix, and they are released.

Or if they are actually undocumented or unlawfully in this country, they may be apprehended.

So, there seems to be an implication that the initial stop is somehow or other improper. I don't know if that's the case. I trust that it's not.

The law enforcement agents that we normally deal with have integrity and they don't engage in that.

But, once they are turned over to us to question about their immigration status.

SENATOR PENA: In one case and there was several.

The one about an individual Hispanic-looking -- that met some kind of profile -- was standing at a Circle K and a local officer questioned him, standing there, and determined that there -- I guess standing there was not

a violation of the local ordinances, but, referred him to the Immigration Services and they came and picked him up.

MR. JOHNSTON: Excuse me, Senator.

Is this question -- is this in the context of the Immigration Reform and Control Act, or just overall policy?

There is nothing in the -- the Reform and Control

Act -- was a multifaceted piece of legislation. It

attacked, you know, many issues regarding illegal

immigration, but, it didn't address what we are talking

about.

SENATOR PENA: What I'm trying to determine is -MR. JOHNSTON: There is no police power granted in
the employer sanctions, in section 274 of IRCA.

In other words, the police and the Sheriff were not given powers to enforce I-9 requirements or employees at a worksite.

DR. WHITE: Well, Senator, I wonder if this question might properly be addressed to -- we do have two local law enforcement people with us, perhaps either or both of them would like to address what the relationship is between local law enforcement and the federal enforcement of the Immigration statutes.

Would either of you gentlemen like to do that?

MR. DUPNIK: I'm Clarence Dupnik, Pima County Sheriff.

As Mr. Johnston was saying the 1986 Act really has no impact on local law enforcement, it doesn't change anything.

We don't have any authority, we don't have any responsibility.

If you're question is: What is our general policy reference to the issue of illegal aliens, generally, I could response to that.

SENATOR PENA: Would you, please.

MR. DUPNIK: Sure.

Our policy is not to deliberately get involved in instances of enforcing the Immigration Act.

There are circumstances where police officers routinely in the course of their duties come across people who are considered to be suspicious for one reason or another.

Ethnicity is not an issue. People of all races, national origins, get involved in circumstances which are either reported to us by citizens, merchants, or merely observed by officers on patrol to be in circumstances that are suspicious, and in those situations they routinely stop and interview people, ask for identification and so forth. And I would

imagine that in most instances if it turns

out during the course of that interview the

person is determined to be an illegal alien, in some

instances, and I would think most, the border patrol

is notified.

In the jail, when prisoners are brought in who are determined to be illegal aliens, the border patrol is rountinely notified.

But, the 1986 Act to us is a non-issue.

MR. ZAZUETA: May I follow up on that?

DR. WHITE: Yes.

MR. ZAZUETA: Is there problems with the jurisdiction of the federal and local Sheriff's Office?

MR. DUPNIK: No. There is no problems at all because we don't have any jurisdiction. We have neither any jurisdiction nor any responsibility.

To us the issue of illegal aliens is a non-issue in local law enforcement, in my opinion.

I can understand -- and we do get complaints not only from Hispanics, but we get complaints from people of all ethnic backgrounds, that they were stopped and interviewed under circumstances that they didn't feel warranted.

DR. WHITE: Sheriff, would this be like the

classic case of the motorist who is stopped because his tail light is off and then they find a body in the trunk?

In other words, the question, because an officer felt there might be a certain violation, and then he finds that there is no such violation, but, there is another one.

Some of the witnesses that we have heard seem to feel that local law enforcement officers when they are unable to make a case for violation of any local laws, but, they say, well, this guy looks like an illegal alien, so, we'll turn them in. And their feeling is that this is somehow improper. So, that's, I suppose, the issue we are dealing with.

MR. DUPNIK: As I said, when it is determined that the person is an illegal alien, I would think that in most of the cases the border patrol is notified.

MRS. FAUST: Mr. Chairman.

DR. WHITE: Yes.

MRS. FAUST: Sheriff Dupnik, and also Chief
Ronstadt, do you have specific guidelines or
criterias by which you quote, unquote, pick up and
arrest these suspicious Mexicans?

MR. DUPNIK: We do not pick up and arrest suspicious people, period. It's against the law. We

1 don't do that. MRS. FAUST: Well, you just stated that there are 2 certain circumstances? 3 MR. DUPNIK: Under in which we interview people. 4 5 It might be during the course of that interview that a person admits that they are in the country 6 7 illegally. MRS. FAUST: Today we seem to find contradictions 8 9 to what you are saying about picking up, unless it is 10 hearsay. And it was mentioned earlier we asked if you had 11 guidelines and criterias. That's why I bring it up now. 12 13 MR. DUPNIK: We do. MRS. FAUST: Would it be to much to ask --14 MS. DUPNIK: No, I'd be happy to furnish the 15 commission with whatever we have on the subject. 16 17 DR. WHITE: We'd appreciate any documents that you 18 may have. MR. DUPNIK: But, I'm only speaking for the Pima 19 20 County Sheriff's Department. Leonard Deech who is the Deputy Chief from the 21 22 Tucson Police Department is here to speak for his own 23 agency. And I certainly don't presume to speak for him. 24

MRS. FAUST: Oh, that's why I addressed it to both

of you gentlemen. I didn't realize -- I'm sorry.

б

MR. RONSTADT: In response to your question.

I think there is a bit of confusion when an officer contacts a citizen. By our definition an officer can contact a citizen at any time. We can walk up to anybody and say, "Hi, good afternoon, how's it going?"

That individual can, if they so desire, can say, "Get lost," and tries to walk away from us. So be it. They say it and then they walk away from us and that's the end of it.

If, on the other hand, we walk up to an individual and we say, "Hi, good morning or good afternoon, how are you?" but we have probable cause to believe that that individual either has or is committing a crime and the individual says, "Get lost" and trys to walk away, that individual will be allowed to walk away.

Now, that is an arrest. The distinction being you must have some "PC" probable cause to hold an individual. But, as far as making contact with an individual, we strongly believe that we, like anybody else, can contact anyone. We can walk up to the door and knock on the door and if they say, "I don't want to talk to you and if we do not have any PC, we turn around and walk away.

So there is a distinction there between a contact and a situation where we are going to have an arrest.

And the key there again, is the probable cause.

In the Tucson Police Department our policy is almost identical to what Sheriff Dupnik indicated.

Our policy states that if in the course of normal police business we come across someone who cannot identify themselves and we believe to be an undocumented alien, we will contact the border patrol and turn the individual over to the border patrol.

Our rule and reg goes on to state that if the border patrol can respond in a reasonable length of time we will hold the individual for the border patrol.

We specifically identify that reasonable length of time as twenty minutes. If in contacting the border patrol they indicate that they cannot arrive within twenty minutes, we then gather the information from the individual, it's called an FI card, field interview card, and put the information on the card and forward it to the border patrol.

We use these information cards not just for this purpose but for any field interview. And we try to get the individual's name, address, place of business, et cetera. If the individual has no identification they can give us any name that they desire to. We

have no way of cross-checking at that point.

We put on the card whatever they give us.

What I'm saying in essence is, I'm sure in many contacts when we do an FI card the individual does not tell us their name, their correct address, their business address, et cetera, and, therefore, the card cannot be followed up on by the border patrol nor can it be followed-up by our detectives later if they believe that individual was in a location where a crime had occurred and may possibly be a suspect relative to that crime.

DR. WHITE: I believe Mrs. Whitlock has a question.

MRS. WHITLOCK: Chief Ronstadt, looking at my notes from an earlier person who was testifying before us. An attorney with ACLU mentioned specifically a raid by the local police of a trailer court where they picked up and turned over to the INS about 15 individuals and according to this ACLU attorney she said that there is a police memo saying that they would be starting to pick up undocumented workers when they stop people to check to see if they were here illegally.

MR. RONSTADT: No. We do not stop people to find out whether they are here illegally, that's not our job.

I've never heard of such a memo. I'd like to

know what the raid is about because -- I would take a
wild guess on what went on there.

We had information about a dope situation. We probably -- because that's about the only time we have quote, unquote, raids. We probably hit the trailer park relative to the dope situation. And I don't know whether we arrested anybody because they had dope there or because they were trying to sale dope to us, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

But, it would not surprise me that in the course of that investigation we may have come across some people who did not have any identification and may have called the border patrol.

Again, that's a situation that I just described that is in the normal course of police business.

But, simply because somebody appears to be of
Hispanic origin, our officers do not stop them on the
street and say show me your green card, show me some
ID, if you can't show me some ID, I'm going to call the
border patrol.

That's not our job. That's not our function.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Johnston, we haven't heard from you yet. Do you wish to speak?

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes, I'd like to return to the topic we were invited for today, the IRCA.

I'm going to be very brief, and if you have any questions.

б

I'm with the Immigration Service in Tucson.

That does not belong to border patrol. We have the investigations, examinations, inspections, and deportation unit.

But, we do much of the same work, as a matter of fact, in some cases duplicate the same work at a much smaller scale. We are a small office.

When IRCA was passed in November of 1986. I was one of the sceptics, I was probably the only one in the Immigration Service that didn't like sanctions and thought they wouldn't work and thought they'd be difficult, and I have since become a convert with the emphasis on education with a staff of between two and three in my investigations unit.

We managed to contact 6,713 people since November of 1986. And my observations in dealing with the employers and employer groups was that they did not find it burdensome, which is one of the predictions, it would be a burdensome test. We had a very good booklet presented to the employer with a personal presentation.

Most employers seemed to feel that it was an extremely easy form to fill out, because as luck

would have it we followed very close behind the W-4, and I quess by comparison it was easy.

We have found only one case in all the 6,713 that we did where somebody said, "Get out, we don't want to talk to you, get out of my door, we just don't want anything to do with it." All the rest were receptive they gave us time, some came down to our office. Many requested extra booklets and many requested us to go back and talk with various groups that were in a similar business.

So, the first thing I was surprised at is that the fact that most employers said, if it's the law, we'll do it, maybe we're not crazy about it, but we're glad to do it and it isn't as bad as we thought.

The second thing I noticed was that -- and I was concerned about discrimination, I'm sure we all are -- -- once we emphasized -- the policy was to emphasize that this law applied to everybody, you know, with the exception of contract and casual labor, that it didn't matter whether you were Anglo, Hispanic, Oriental or Black or anything else, it did apply to whatever employee came into your employment. And once that was understood and the employer realized that he was not an immigration enforcement officer, I think that did a lot to ease the way.

And, so, I myself am a convert. And I talk to a lot of employers almost daily and when we went back and enforced under a program and did randomly went to employers for no other reason other than a random selection was made, we found almost all in compliance and, we found minor technical violations and we dealt with those minor technical violations the same way we do if someone makes an inquiry. We told them how to correct it and didn't take any enforcement action whatsoever.

As far as the new law, the commission did mention in their invitation for us to speak today they did discuss the legalization sections, which, of course, is a vital part of it.

And here in Tucson where we don't have a huge illegal population, we did get 7,740 applications from aliens who have lived here in illegal status since 1982.

In addition, we received 7,648 applications from the seasonal agricultural workers. Those who worked in the fields for 90 days in any one of the years specified in the act.

So we think that the educational effort and the work with the designated agencies that were certified to help out in that effort led to a pretty good turn out.

We feel confident that every single person that was eligible to apply knew about the law and could make a

choice whether to come and apply for it.

Although, I don't work with the legalization office and by law our operation is segregated from that operation, I'm a little bit familiar with it. And I think we made a very good effort in this area towards education in both of those areas. So with that, I don't know anything but border patrol.

DR. WHITE: Any questions?

MR. ZAZUETA: Yes, sir.

On the legalization, most of the testimony this morning was opposite of your understanding. They said that there was a lot of confusion, misunderstanding, a lot of information did not get out and it was too late and too little from the QDE and from the legal lawyers that talked to us this morning, that testified this morning.

Why was that, do you know why there was all that confusion and misinformation?

MR. JOHNSTON: I don't agree with the premise. Of course, there is always confusion, not only confusion, but there is also development and regulations evolve as a result of the legislation. But, I don't think it was, considering the short amount of time that we had to implement that, you know, six months before our first application could be accepted — I think that the efforts through the QDEs, through the communities,

through the spot commercials, through the media, and just getting the word out in the communities -- I thought it went out rather well. I don't agree with the premise. So, I can't answer why there was confusion.

And as I said, here we are in a city where -- this city is not a magnet for the undocumented because of the nature of the employment in this city.

We don't have the -- you know, we don't have the big agricultural operations, we don't have the clothing factories, we don't have the turkey farms, and chicken ranches and stuff like that where traditionally there is lots and lots of undocumented working. And to have 15,000 people come forward and apply, doesn't sound like there is very much confusion. I'm sure it could happen, but, it certainly wasn't through any lack of effort to get the word out.

DR. WHITE: Mr. Barron, we haven't heard from you yet.

MR. BARRON: Well, my name is Benny Barron, and I'm Assistant Chief of the Border Patrol, Tucson Sector.

The Tucson sector includes almost all the State of Arizona. And we have some ten border patrol stations under our management with the headquarters being here in Tucson.

And I have management responsibility for this area, for IRCA, for the enforcement of the Immigration Reform and Control Act.

However, our counsel, Mr. O'Leary, has pretty well stated our case. He has pretty well answered some of the questions and fears that we heard as we walked in to the session here.

I don't know what I could add to that. I can certainly answer questions if you like.

Mr. Bill Johnston of the Immigration our counterpart here has added a great deal as far as legalization goes.

I would like to reiterate if I might.

That the border patrol in the past year has educated, has made more than 30,000 educational visits to employers in this area of responsibility, in the State of Arizona excluding two counties to the far west that belong to the Yuma sector.

And we continue to educate employers on a daily basis now at the rate of about 150 to 200 per week.

So, educational visits to employers is done every day. We make contact sheets on those places of employment and they are kept on file.

Any time we apprehend an illegal alien who is employed we first check for a contact sheet as to

whether that employer has been educated or not. And if he hasn't we do that educational visit at that time and no further action.

If he has been educated then we do an inspection of the I-9s and consider whether the violation is grievous enough to warrant an administrative fine.

Quite often it results in a warning letter only.

It is way down the road and usually after multiple violations before any employers are ever fined administratively.

So the commissioner's policy, just to reiterate Mr. O'Leary words, the commissioner's policy to enforce the employer sanctions portion of IRCA in a fair and impartial manner is being done at least in this sector. And I can only speak for this sector.

I think unless you have some questions. I think -I just wanted to reiterate that part.

One other point I wanted to make and that is:

As far as discrimination goes on the employers

visit, on the educational visit to the employer, we not only advice them of the anti-discrimination section of the act, but, we also give them posters to post on their bulletin board in their business office or their coffee room or whatever they may have where employees

1 congregate.

And the poster very clearly lists the name and address and phone number of our special counsel who prosecutes for that violation, discrimination and the hiring.

And apart from that -- and we too will take the complaint for the employee if they feel like they have been refused employment based on discriminatory reasons we will take the complaint and report it to the special counsel.

So, that's pretty well covered and I think very fairly.

Unless you have questions of the border patrol.

DR. WHITE: Any questions?

SENATOR PENA: Does the border patrol issue voluntary departure documents?

MR. BARRON: Yes, sir.

SENATOR PENA: Now, we heard testimony today that often folks are not given total and complete information and are coerced into signing a voluntary departure document. Would you enlighten us on that?

MR. BARRON: That is a common complaint, however, it's not true.

At least in this sector the Tucson sector.

We have some very strict guidelines on how -- first

of all voluntary departure is a two-way street.

First of all, the service has to agree to allow an alien to return to his or her home country voluntarily in lieu of deportation.

Secondly, the alien has to agree to returning to his or her home country in lieu of deportation.

So it requires, that number one, we are an officer of service agree and sign a document that that's being agreed to and the alien has to agree and sign the same document.

We have some very strict guidelines as to how that is presented. It's presented in Spanish and in English, it's written in Spanish and in English. It's presented verbally, it's presented in written form, it's signed.

There are numerous safeguards on any type of coercion or force being used. Not only that, we have disciplinary measures in place and an officer subject to disciplinary action, if it can be shown that he or she forced or coerced an alien to accept voluntary departure.

Now, after having said that, I'd like to also say that it behooves an alien unless they have long standing residence in the country, unless they have a substantial amount of equity in the country, it

behooves them to take the voluntary departure, because there is no formal deportation. A formal deportation and entry, an illegal entry, into this country after a formal deportation is a criminal violation.

An illegal entry into this country after a voluntary departure is not, it is a misdemeanor as opposed to a felony. Let me put it that way. They are both criminal violations. But, the misdemeanor hardly ever is prosecuted. The felony is almost always prosecuted.

So, you know, there are safeguards in place. And there are some very strict guidelines, and there are disciplinary measures for violation of it on the part of the officer.

MR. O'LEARY: May I add something to that?

DR. WHITE: Go ahead.

MR. O'LEARY: Our officers are also instructed and it's part of the requirement of the interview that they question the alien as to whether that alien has a prima facie case for legalization.

Well, legalization is over now, but during the period of legalization, for legalization or whether they have a prima facie case for SAW status, the special agriculture worker status. And if they do, that would prevent voluntarily departure.

We would basically tell them where to go to file their claim. So, that is also covered in detail buy the officer.

And I think that's pretty critical because part of complaints may revolve around I was eligible to stay in this country and I got forced to take voluntarily departure.

Again, all the safeguards that we can put into place are there. The form is written, the individual has a right to have a deportation hearing, or in case if he is eligible for the benefits allowed by IRCA would be shown or told where the legalization office is, where they could apply. So, that's an additional safeguard.

SENATOR PENA: That flies in the face of the testimony that we have heard today.

MR. O'LEARY: Well, that testimony flies in the face of my testimony.

SENATOR PENA: They have a complete packet they have already qualified, but, one of your officers has insisted that they be, in lieu of deportation, that they sign a voluntarily departure document, and they're gone.

We've had that testimony here today by several people.

DR. WHITE: As in a testimony from one person that an individual was told that if you don't sign for voluntary departure, we are going to throw you in jail and keep you there for a while.

And I take it, that you would say, that that is something that, as far as you know, it doesn't happen.

Is that true?

MR. JOHNSTON: Let's start at the beginning. The first -- sometimes these get embellished with time after encouragement from people that have an agenda they want to get across. I see very few.

For instance, I've been here for eight years,
I've never been sued for a civil rights violation.
None of these cases have gone to court because of
some grevious action on the part of one of my
officers.

It might be, you know, somebody might want to make the case that when we've offered somebody their options.

When you offer somebody an option and you say look it, okay, these are the facts, you are a native and citizen of such and such a country. The information that we generally go on an Order to Show Cause which begins deportation proceedings.

You say, yes, and you entered the country by

jumping the fence and you have no spouse here or child here or anything that might get you -- now you have the opportunity of a deportation hearing to adjudicate your ability, your right to remain in the United States or because you are a person of good moral character and you meet the statutory requirements you may leave voluntarily.

Now, that's not coercion, that's giving someone their option.

And, as Mr. Barron said, they are given in writing and in the language the person speaks, not only that, but on the form itself before it's signed they're notified quite specifically. They can change their mind at any time before they leave the United States, that their option to receive voluntary departure can be revoked on their part, you know.

But this brings me to the second thing.

I can't say that a specific instance that you referred to never happened. But to me -- the form -- there's a form there that if somebody's right to a hearing has been violated there is an appropriate form for that.

But, there is no reason why anybody has to be tricked into taking either voluntary departure or a deportation hearing.

an appointment

There is enough business of both types out there, 1 that we have to turn it away. If somebody walks into 2 my office today, and you can ask anybody from the Tucson 3 Ecumenical Council of Southern Arizona Legal Aid, ask 4 them when they testify, how long it takes if they walk in 5 and say I want to be deported, I want to be put under 6 deportation proceedings, please issue an Order to Show 7 Cause, ask them how many months they have to wait 8 before I'll even respond and set up 9 10 for them to come in and be OSCed.

> If somebody right now asks to be put under an Order to Show Cause, I probably wouldn't even accomodate them in the same day.

They would be put on a waiting list and OSCed some later date. Because there are instances at where people want to be under deportation proceedings to grant some form of relief.

So this business of having to trick and coerce in order to either get somebody in or out of a deportation hearing, although, nobody can say it doesn't happen or never happened, I'm just not understanding the reasoning behind it because there is enough of both type cases to last us the rest of our careers.

I don't see the reason why anybody would want

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 to do that.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

MR. ZAZUETA: One of the problems that was brought up this morning, very clearly, INS had a lot of problems changing gears from an enforcement type of agency, to a kind of deportation agency to the amnesty type of agency. Do you agree with that or disagree?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, because we've always worn two hats. We've always been an enforcer of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Under that Act benefits such as Immigration or citizenship or whatever the benefits, have always been there and denial of benefits have always been there.

And really, for instance, we adjudicate in the western United States, we have one office that adjudicates 50,000 applications for benefits a month.

People bring in their parents their mothers, their kids their brothers their sisters, employers bringing in temporary and permanent workers to the United States.

We had a form, we've had forms of legalization in the past. One time it was called registry, another time it was called creation of record for people that had been here before specific dates before 1948, before 1924, there was a date in the 30s.

We've always worn a service hat and we also had an enforcement hat. So, I don't think it took any big switching gears.

I think because of the magnitude of the legalization program that we had to get the word out that it was not an enforcement trick.

In other words, we are not inviting people in to apply for one thing and they get a deportation as a result. We had to get that message across.

And, I'm not so sure that we had to change our gears, we always did it.

Most of us individually in the service have worn both those hats. Most of us started in the border patrol and wound up as inspectors, examiners, adjudicators, some of us have gone from border patrolman to immigration judge. And we've always worn those hats. It's just a matter of applying those laws, whether it's to get somebody in the country or somebody out, it's still the law.

DR. WHITE: Since we've heard so much about this relationship between federal and local enforcement before we leave this, I'd just like to mention one more thing and ask for your opinions.

Some of you, probably all of you know, there are certain communities in California -- Berkley, is one,

that specifically comes to mind, but I know there are others, where the authorities there have announced publically that their police agency will not collaborate with the Federal government enforcing immigration statutes.

Now, why they have done this, I don't know, various reasons might occur.

But, my question would be to this effect:

To what extent do the federal authorities depend on the collaboration of local law enforcement agencies, and what would be the effect in your jurisdiction, if the same thing happened here, and the Chief of Police, and the Sheriff, said, we are not going to turn anybody over to the border patrol or to INS?

MR. JOHNSTON: Okay, first time we start with -- we talk about collaboration.

Part of IRCA -- and one of the parts you very rarely hear about -- calls for the expeditious removal of criminal aliens from the United States.

Most of our dealings -- almost all of our dealings with both the Sheriff's Department and the Police

Department -- most of what I consider an excellent relationship, deals with illegal criminals or criminal illegals. And these are people that are either permanent residents of the United States or people that don't have

any documents -- how to scrape with the State or local authorities and are either being released from jail or they are in prison.

And we depend on that collaboration in order to process these aliens for their well-deserved removal from the United States.

And there is -- we depend on them for notices of arrest. And from the courts we get J and Cs, Judgements and Convictions. And then from the institutions themselves, we get notices of release on aliens we put detainers on. So their cooperation is crucial to the removal of people that are a danger to our communities.

As a matter of fact, here in Tucson, we are living in a dream world, because of the excellent cooperation we get when it comes to criminal aliens from both those agencies.

So, their cooperation for the drug dealers and dangerous criminals breaking and entering aggravated assault are all just crucial to our removal in that program, that is mandated by IRCA.

DR. WHITE: What about the non-criminal aliens?

I would suppose that most of the people who are objecting about this whole business would say that they don't care about dope dealers or criminals of any sort, that they were simply concerned with people

whose only crime was illegal entry into the United 1 2 States. Is there a difference here? 3 MR. JOHNSTON: I don't know. My office would only 4 deal with the criminals. 5 6 DR. WHITE: I wonder if either the chief or the sheriff would have any comment on this subject of 7 8 collaboration. You're feeling about the way some of these 9 communities have said it's none of our business --10 11 MR. DUPNIK: Is the question one of establishing a 12 sanctuary, is that it? 13 DR. WHITE: No, I think that would go to far. 14 They are simply saying -- I'm not here to 15 judge that -- it's not our business, we are not here to enforce federal laws, we are here to enforce the laws 16 17 of the State of California and of our municipality, 18 and, therefore, we are not going to be involved. 19 MR. DUPNIK: Well, I think that's almost our 20 policy now. 21 And I think I can speak for both agencies. 22 I spent 20 years with the Tucson Police 23 Department prior to going to the Sheriff's Department. 24 DR. WHITE: Well, I'm not quite sure. 25 You said that you would turn people over if

you apprehended people and you found out that they
were illegal aliens, and you would turn them over to
the border parol.

MR. DUPNIK: That's right. That's the only exception. But we make no effort to go out and identify illegal aliens.

DR. WHITE: But, you said, that they would take no interest in whether a person is an illegal alien and will not turn them over and will not do anything to them unless they have violated a state or federal law. That clearly is not your practice?

MR. DUPNIK: That's not. That's correct.

DR. WHITE: Does anyone else want to comment on this?

MR. BARRON: I'd like to say a couple of things if I might, with your invitation, of course.

DR. WHITE: Sure.

MR. BARRON: The illegal aliens that are turned to us the border patrol by the Pima County Sheriff's

Department or the Tucson Police Department is almost always in direct result of some violation. Either it may be something as simple as a traffic violation, however, it's a violation. It may be something considerably more serious too, and quite often most often is, all right.

_

And the local authorities both the Sheriff

Department and Police Department, to my knowledge, when
they learn that these individuals are in the country
illegally will forego prosecution for the local violation
as a rule and turn the individual to us with deportation
in mind. For a number of reasons, and the reasons are
obvious, you know, the jails are full, the courts are
full, et cetera.

And almost without exception -- from my experience, and I have been in this sector 5 years, I have 25 years with the border patrol -- almost without exception, we have turned illegals who have for some reason violated some law that caused them to come to the attention of the local authorities, either the Sheriff's Department or the Police Department, and that's why we are called. Either that or in some instances the officer in the field know that border patrol units are also on the street and are patrolling and are available, and once in a while the local officer encounters individuals who speak Spanish only, and they need us for interpretation.

But, apart from that, and it turns out that they are illegals and we take custody of them.

Apart from that, they've almost all without exception committed some sort of violation.

There is no shot-gunning on the street, so to speak, because you or you or you appear to be Hispanic, we don't pick you up and hold you for the border patrol, that does not happen, to my knowledge.

DR. WHITE: Any other questions?

MR. ZAZUETA: There's been testimony today on the State Legalization Impact Assistant Grant, are you familiar with that?

That's where you have education and civic requirements. That there has been some confusion, again, on 30 or 40 hour requirements and that there has been a lot of bureaucracy in getting the funds out.

MR. JOHNSTON: By law the people or the branch of INS that enacted sections 210 and 245-A for the seasonal agriculture workers and for the legalized immigrants is a segregated operation from our operations and, to the best of my knowledge, nobody from that operation was invited to this hearing.

What's been the problem as far as INS is concerned?

At least I called them and they were not invited and not aware of the hearing.

Knowing that there would probably be a question, and they all happen to be in California. This Phase II, my understanding is the regional office that is adjudicating applications for certifications to meet the

educational requirements, you know, to the entities that 1 2 are going to give the English classes and civics classes, what we used to call civic classes, they are being 3 generously awarded. I also called our District Director, Pat Cain, who is the acting director of the Phoenix District, which I'm 6 7 a part, and his opinion was that the State of Arizona is satisfied with their cut of the pie, 8 when it comes to the funding. 9 10 So, you are just going to have to ask somebody 11 that -- I'm not aware incidental to my operation, as to 12 any dissatisfaction in that area. 13 And, as I said, nobody from that separate and 14 distinct operation was invited here today. 15 DR. WHITE: Anything else from the committee? 16 If not, gentlemen we wish to thank you very much. 17 We have reached the conclusion of the testimony of 18 the enforcement panel. 19 Oh, I'm, sorry. 20 MR. RONSTADT: You asked about our rules and 21 regulations. 22 Before I came I took the time to pull a set of our 23 rules and regs on the pertinent topic, if you are

DR. WHITE: Yes, we'll be very happy to have them.

24

25

interested.

1 Thank you very much. 2 3 For the record, would you state your name. 5 MR. GOMEZ: My name is Enrique Gomez, I live in 6 Tucson, Arizona. 7 DR. WHITE: What is your residence? 8 MR. GOMEZ: Tucson, Arizona. 9 DR. WHITE: All right. Would you have a seat and 10 proceed. 11 Mr. Gomez, you may proceed. 12 MR. GOMEZ: My name is Enrique Gomez. 13 I work with a program called El Projecto, Arizona 14 Sonora. 15 We are an Aids Project that works primarily with 16 Latinos here in southern Arizona and in Sonora, Mexico. 17 The reason why I wanted to take the opportunity to 18 speak today was just regarding the added provision later 19 on after the amnesty program began or the mandatory 20 testing regarding HIV anti-body testing. 21 And mainly along the lines of personally 22 considering mandatory testing to be discriminatory in a 23 sense. 24 And considering the fact that mandatory testing so

far has included primarily programs that deal with

25

minorities and over represented by minorities regarding prisons, regarding amnesty, and different programs that require the mandatory testing, just like the Armed Forces, that have an over representation of minorities.

So, when amnesty program began, there was nothing that included the mandatory testing for HIV and later on was added on and just seeing that as another -- I guess -- another -- regarding the whole amnesty program -- something that was entered in, that I thought was discriminatory in a sense -- that all of a sudden this provision was added and people were being asked to submit for anti-body testing.

What I found as a result of that, people that were going for the anti-body testing were not educated as far as what it entailed, and a lot of people were delivering sealed envelopes regarding their status from the person they went to, straight to the people who are handling their paperwork.

So, what I was seeing was people who -- that the Immigration law did not take into consideration or not much thought, as far as educating people or educating the INS themselves, as far as what this program was going to entail.

And not being able to give very clear answers regarding what was going to happen to people who were

1 testing positive regarding the anti-body test for Aids.

And I went around and finally started getting more answers from calling San Francisco and New York and nothing really coming down from here in Tucson.

So, I imagine the people were not very informed here, even working around the issue of immigration, amnesty, and Aids itself. I imagine the people who are going through the testing were less educated.

So, there was a very big concern there.

And also that there is no clear policy as to what is going to happen to the people that have tested positive as a result of the anti-body testing, because of their application for amnesty. And that was one of the biggest concerns I had.

And I think what a bigger concern would be the policy that would be a result of this because of such an afterthought or poor foresight. I would be very concerned about a policy regarding what's going to happen to people who have tested positive as a result of this mandatory testing.

DR. WHITE: Any questions.

SENATOR PENA: Do I understand that's a new rule, a new regulation, adopted by INS?

MR. GOMEZ: For the mandatory testing, yes. If I understand it correct, it was December.

1	SENATOR PENA: When are they required to do that?
2	MR. GOMEZ: Pardon me. This is for persons
3	applying for amnesty as of December of '87.
4	SENATOR PENA: And it's done at their cost?
5	MR. GOMEZ: Yes. And also there is physicians that
6	they are referred to and that's another question regarding
7	the issue of confidentiality who is the persons who are
8	privey to this information regarding their status, whether
9	it's negative or positive.
10	So these are people who after as of December, all
11	the way through have had to test for the anti-body, for
12	the HIV anti-body.
13	And there is no clear provision as to what is going
14	to happen with these people who have tested positive, of
15	which there have been people who have tested already.
16	SENATOR PENA: How many things are they tested for?
17	MR. GOMEZ: Pardon me.
18	SENATOR PENA: How many things are they tested for?
19	MS. GALLEGOS: There are 33 grounds of exclusion to
20	begin with.
21	DR. WHITE: Medical grounds?
22	MS. GALLEGOS: No.
23	DR. WHITE: How many medical grounds?
24	MS. GALLEGOS: Tuberculosis, HIV, mental illness.
25	MR. GOMEZ: Hepatitis B.

DR. WHITE: I'm sure that you know that even during the time when the United States had essentially unlimited immigration in the late '19s early '20s up to 1921 and

essentially anybody who wanted to come could.

But, there were always some exceptions and one of the major exceptions was that people who were found to have certain diseases were excluded.

At that time tuberculosis was a big thing. And, people, immigrants arriving and asylums were routinely examined by physicians, government physicians, and if were found to have certain diseases were excluded.

And it's hard to compare, let's say, tuberculosis in 1890, with Aids in 1988, as to the degree of seriousness, but, clearly in both cases you are dealing with very serious public health problems.

And one would have to assume that in all likelihood there is going to continue to be an official and public concern about this particular thing.

So my question to you would be what do you think should be done about it, other than what is being done, assuming that anything at all is going to be done.

MR. GOMEZ: Yes. And that's the part that is very difficult just trying to figure out, I can assume very much regarding what's going to happen for people who

have tested positive. I can expect the worse and say that they are not eligible and go farther and say you are not welcome, you are not able to be here. Or, I guess mainly there is nothing said and that's the concern that this came up so much later and as if someone thought up, oh, let's include this also. And very much as an afterthought and never instituting any kind of information that would go to the persons who were the applicants, or actually to the people who were in the programs themselves which includes the INS.

My concern would be that yes, there are those serious illnesses and everything and when you couple this with someone who is applying for amnesty, then you are dealing with two major factors in the person's life. Mainly their continuing to live here and continue to live, period.

So my concern would be how this information is being used and I would stress finding out what is the policy regarding the confidentiality of this information regarding the person's status.

And that would be a very big factor on who is privey to this information and what will happen to it, and what will happen to the persons who are positive for the virus in whatever stages.

Personally, I would say for them to continue to be

1 here and for that not to be any part of a strike against them being able to remain here or as far as their 2 filing for amnesty. 3 But, then again, there is nothing clear, so, I 5 can't really say. 6 DR. WHITE: Any other questions? 7 Do you wish to testify? 8 MR. CORDOVA: Yes, sir. 9 DR. WHITE: Now, I'm asking for questions from the 10 committee. Now, if you wish to be heard, we will be 11 pleased to hear from you. 12 Well, if there are no further questions from the 13 committee, we thank you for your testimony. 14 MR. GOMEZ: Thank you. 15 DR. WHITE: All right, sir, if you'll step up. 16 If you would state your name and residence for the 17 record. 18 MR. CORDOVA: My name is Juan Carlos Cordova, and 19 I'm a Salvadoran refugee here. 20 DR. WHITE: You're a what? 21 MR. CORDOVA: Α Salvadoran refugee, from 22 El Salvador. 23 I just have about three points to make. 24 Number one, as a refugee I came to this country 25 because I feared for my life in El Salvador.

I was persecuted by the government of El Salvador, and I learned to fear the authorities of my country.

People who are refugees in this country and are applying for amnesty are being faced with an option like I did.

If you are being persecuted you cannot go to the authorities, because, they will persecute you and kill you or torture you.

Here INS is the one enforcing the amnesty. People have been traditionally and historically been deported by INS.

Therefore, it's an idealogical thing to ask from someone who fears INS to go there and say, okay, I'll apply for amnesty.

I would not go to the police or to any authorities in my country to seek protection, because they wouldn't.

In the same way that here, I could not go to border patrol to ask them to let me stay here because their job is not to let me stay here, their job is to deport me.

That is the fear that we as refugees have.

It was testified here earlier that less than ten percent of Salvadorans here qualify for amnesty, and

less than that applied. And that goes with that fear.

The other thing is that for refugees to get work permits they may get them after they apply for asylum, but they may not get them too. That is determined by the INS. In the meantime they would be unemployed.

Everybody according to IRCA needs to have a work permit to work.

If a refugee is not granted a work permit because he or she has applied for political asylum they might be unemployed for an indefinite period of time.

Therefore, putting them in a hard situation not for them only, but their children their spouses and their family.

The other thing is that I have learned English here. Lots of people are slower in learning English. Most everyone is eager to learn.

In order for people to know about IRCA, it was very difficult because there were changes every single month.

I work at a law office here and, yet, I had a hard time keeping up with every change in the law.

I helped other people like myself fill out applications.

It was impossible to do -- because one month you

1	were told you were not eligible, the next month you were
2	told you were.
3	And that is twice as hard for people who don't know
4	the language or don't have a basic understanding of this
5	law, which is a very complicated law. That's all.
6	DR. WHITE: Any questions?
7	MRS. FAUST: How long have you been here?
8	MR. CORDOVA: I came here in 1981.
9	DR. WHITE: Okay. If there are no further
10	questions, we thank you for your testimony.
11	MR. FRANCO: I would like to testify.
12	DR. WHITE: You would like to testify, sir?
13	Come forward.
14	Please state your name and residence for the
15	record.
16	MR. FRANCO: My name is Rene Franco, and I am from
17	Guatemala.
18	DR. WHITE: Would you give me your name again,
19	please.
20	MR. FRANCO: Rene Franco. R-E-N-E F-R-A-N-C-O.
21	DR. WHITE: Okay, thank you.
22	MR. FRANCO: And I am from Guatemala.
23	As Carlos, also, I came to this country as a
24	refugee.
25	One of the things that people, I think, should

understand in this country is when you talk about Guatemalans, about Salvadorans, we are not coming to this country or to Europe or to any other country because we want to leave our homelands.

Most of us have been forced to leave. And I'd be happy to be in my homeland.

There is no country like Guatemala.

And I have been all over this country. And this is a beautiful country too, but there are no mountains like in Guatemala.

One of the things that I think people should know in order to get a sense about why we are here, or why we are coming to this country -- one of the things is that when we talk about laws or regulations, those are done follow with the policies of U. S. and Guatemala and El Salvador.

And, of course, there is friendship among the Guatemalan and the Salvadoran government. United States is going to refuse to see us as political refugees.

So, I think with all those new regulations, laws, that you see, day by day the space is getting -- is close -- you know, for us, and we are always dealing to survive.

You know, as was testified in the morning. Of course, we want to work. That's one of the things that I

tell the students when I go to places to give

presentations is that Guatemalans and Salvadorans, and

I think most of people from Latin American, haven't

had childhood. Why? Because if you are 7 or 8 years

old you have to go with your parents to the

mountains to gather firewood or to help in the cornfield.

So we are used to working.

So, and we see all this new Immigration Law, you know, giving us a hard time, as Carlos was saying, to get a work permit to be able to work and survive, and also feed our families.

So, I think, you know, that today that I have this opportunity to talk to you, to tell you my experience, is with the hope that through your understanding some of those laws and regulations can be changed. Or at least a profound study about the impact of that law among Central Americans.

Because, you know, we are in a really hard situation, you know, with discrimination in the work places, no work permit. If you look Latino, you can get stopped by the police. And I was surprised when the sheriff and the other sir, was saying, no. That's not true, it happens everyday, not only with us, with Latinos, but, also with Anglo people. I have seen that especially in the parks.

1	So that's my testimony.
2	If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer
3	them.
4	MRS. FAUST: If you could change one regulation,
5	which one would you change, and how would you change it?
6	MR. FRANCO: Well, that's hard to say, because
7	there is no point on the law about saying, for instance,
8	helping in a humanitarian way.
9	So, I think, what is needed is to listen to the
10	people that have been involved with Central Americans.
11	They are the ones, firsthand, that knows us, and
12	that knows the situation in Central American.
13	DR. WHITE: Ms. Whitlock.
14	MRS. WHITLOCK: Do you mind saying what your status
15	is presently, your legal status?
16	MR. FRANCO: Oh, yes, I'm legal. I'm a permanent
17	resident.
18	MRS. WHITLOCK: So, did you come in under amnesty
19	or was it prior to that?
20	MR. FRANCO: No, I have almost 6 years years living
21	in this country. So I got my papers through marriage.
22	DR. WHITE: Are you going to apply now?
23	MR. FRANCO: No, I was going to apply, but, when I
24	saw the situation with Guatemalans applying for asylum,
25	you know, I decided to wait.

But then, you know, love is everywhere. So, I met a woman and we got married and here I am.

So, that's why I say love is everywhere and anywhere.

DR. WHITE: It's easier than political asylum.

MR. FRANCO: Well, not exactly.

MR. ZAZUETA: I think that's a good happy ending.

DR. WHITE: I want to thank all of you for your attendance.

MS. GALLEGOS: I wonder if I could clarify two points for the record.

DR. WHITE: Well, briefly. But you have testified previously?

MS. GALLEGOS: Yes, I have.

DR. WHITE: Your name again?

MS. GALLEGOS: Isabel Garcia Gallegos. And I testified this morning.

I wanted to clarify two points, because they were addressed both in the business sector and then in the law enforcement sector.

Number one. I want to remind the Advisory

Committee that when the Legislation was being discussed in particular employer sanctions, INS made much to do with the argument that we needed to protect the undocumented worker against the unscrupulous and exploitive

employer.

We know Congress who these people are we have a pattern and practice of companies who are violating existing labor laws.

But since we don't fund the labor department sufficiently they are not enforced.

We know who they are, this is who we are going against.

What happens after IRCA of '86, unfortunately, Mr. O'Leary is gone. They have focused on the small businesses, on the tortillerias, on the small bakeries, on the small restaurants. They have not gone against the big business that they initially were going to target.

That's why I think some of the reports here were glowing, you know, they have no problems, but the small businesses are bearing the brunt. I have checked with other cities it's been small businesses that have been cited.

In representation of a woman -- who is not here -she was going to make it -- of a small tortilleria here in
Tucson, she had an employee, she attempted to work, she
called the border patrol in to do some educationals -there was some misunderstanding -- she kept in her
employer in October of last year a gentlemen who was going
through legalization, clear legalization applicant, was

waiting to earn the money to pay for the fees he became legalized officially in January of '88.

This woman was cited for an unauthorized hiring that she knowlingly hired an unauthorized person. Is this what we intended, number one?

Then I want to go on to the law enforcement. The testimony has been very very revealing, not only to yourselves, but to me. Because both the Tucson Police Department Assistant Sheriff and the Sheriff of this county stated what we stated previously, and that is that they are not following the law.

The Sheriff, said, "Yes, if we believe, they are illegal aliens, we call border patrol."

That's clearly illegal. They are to detain and keep in detention only people that they have probable cause. He stated later probable cause to believe that they are committing a felony.

To begin with probably the term "illegal alien" is horrible, not only because of the connotations, but, obviously, people are interpreting illegal aliens, that means you are a criminal.

People are charged and convicted of murder, rape everything. They're never called illegals. And yet human beings are called illegals. No human being is illegal, number one.

And what standard did they give you about their stoppage.

You asked, Mr. Johnston, stated this has nothing to do with IRCA.

What our point was this morning was that since passage of IRCA this problem has been exacerbated, it has increased, and they know that it has increased. Of course, they disclaim any wrong police procedures all the way around.

But, I think it's very important for this

Commission to see what we are up against, what we are all

up against.

If the two top law enforcement officials come in here and say, "Well, we don't enforce immigration laws."

But, on the other hand say, "Well, yes, if we believe they're illegal aliens." What do you mean you believe?

What does that mean? Because you are brown, because you don't speak well, because you say I was born in Mexico. So what, my father was born in Mexico, he's a U. S. citizen, so it doesn't matter.

Again, the crime is only if you are going to look at a crime, and, unfortunately, it is a crime right now to cross the border illegally.

That's the only crime that they can investigate, and yet they detain through their own admissions, they

detain people that they believe are.

DR. WHITE: Are you saying that it should not be a crime under any circumstances for anyone to cross the border?

MS. GALLEGOS: I don't believe it should be a criminal penalty. But that's beyond, okay, let's accept it, it's a crime it's on the books. And they're prosecuted.

As a federal defender, I've represented many individuals charged with the offenses -- doing two years in federal prison -- at great taxpayer expense -- because they were found in the country after having been deported one time, previously, officially by the INS.

And, so, they're doing two years in a federal prison at a cost of 20,000 to 30,000 a year to the taxpayers.

But, beyond that question is, that's the criminal offense.

The Sheriff didn't say, "We believed he crossed the border illegally, and so we detained him to investigate that crime."

They said, "Well, if we believe that they are illegal, we detain them." And that's clearly in violation of existing law.

DR. WHITE: Thank you.