LIBRARY

II.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

RHODE ISLAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO
THE UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

CONSULTATION PROCEEDINGS ON THE

IMPACT OF THE PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1996

ON LEGAL IMMIGRANTS IN RHODE ISLAND

LIBRARY

LS. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Providence, Rhode Island
February 9, 1998

CCR 3 Meet. 397

BETA

A Full Service Reporting Company
... There is No Substitute for Quality
1-800-522-BETA

1	ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:
2	ROBERT G. LEE, CHAIRPERSON
3	LESTER HILTON
4	STEVEN KLAMKIN
5	SOPHAI MOEUY
6	OLGA NOGUERA
7	DAVID SHOLES
8	JOHN THOMPSON
9	DOROTHY ZIMMERING
1.0	CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:
11	KI-TAEK CHUN
12	RUBY G. MOY
13	FERNANDO SWERPA
14.	·
1.5	
16 .	
17	
18	
19	
2 0	·
21	·
2.2	

PROCEEDINGS

2 (9:20 a.m.)

MR. LEE: Good Morning. I'm glad you could attend this Consultation on the Impact of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 on Legal Immigrants in Rhode Island. We are the Rhode Island Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

Before I introduce the committee members and our guests from Washington, let me tell you a little bit about the Commission and its work with the Rhode Island State Advisory

Committee.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was created by the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

It's an independent bipartisan fact finding agency whose mission is to protect and promote civil rights afforded all of us under the Constitution and the Acts of Congress.

The Rhode Island Advisory Committee is one of 51 committees created to advise the

2.0

17 ·

Commission on matters relating to discrimination or the denials of equal protection under the law based on race, color, religion, ethnic origin, age, or disability and to bring to the attention of the Commission the civil rights issues pertaining to various states and to assist the Commission with statutory obligations to serve as a clearinghouse for information on these matters.

Our primary role is to gather pertinent information in our state and to report back to the Commission. Today's consultation is one in which we seek to inquire into the effects of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 on legal immigrants in Rhode Island. This consultation will be divided into four sessions.

The first session will be statements from immigrants or family members

1.5

of immigrants directly affected by the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. Our second panel will be statements from civil rights and immigrant rights advocates and community service providers. The third session will be statements from federal and state agencies and representatives, and the fourth session will be statements from the Rhode Island State and Congressional delegations.

In addition to hearing presentations from our speakers, the Committee would also appreciate any background materials, data, surveys, written reports that any of the participants may be able to provide to help us with a better understanding of the situation. This meeting will run from 9:20 to 5:30 and we are very pleased to have knowledgeable people from all of these areas to come to talk to us about this issue.

Each speaker is to going to be

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1:6

17

18

19

20

21

asked to give about a seven to ten minute presentation and then members of the Committee may ask questions of the speaker or for further follow-up. There will also be at the end of each panel a period for public comment and questions. If you have prepared a written statement, please give it to Mr. Fernando Serpa or Mr. Ki-Taek Chun. For those of you that have a prepared statement, please help us by keeping your presentations and comments sharply focused and also abide by our legal obligations to refrain from defaming or degrading any individual in your remarks, whether present or not.

This briefing is being transcribed.

As you can see we have a court reporter to ensure that we are actually getting these statements correctly attributed to the person speaking. I'm going to ask that when you start to speak or give your presentation you introduce yourself so that we can be sure that the commentaries are attributed to the

9 .

.17

correct person.

Speakers here are voluntarily offering comments for this public record; therefore, although the media has been invited, speakers retain the right not to be photographed while addressing us today. If you wish to exercise that right, please inform the staff so that we may accommodate you.

Let me emphasize that as the eyes and ears of the Commission for Rhode Island, our first duty is to listen in an impartial manner. If we fail to understand a statement, we may ask for clarification; therefore, when we pose questions please do not feel that you are being subject to cross examination. We are simply trying to get as many facts as possible.

After this meeting is adjourned, we may need to ask for further clarification on information provided to us, so we look forward to your cooperation in your giving

information to us today. Also, our records will remain open for 30 days to receive comments from any persons who wish to contribute to our better understanding of the issues.

Let me introduce the Committee members and our staff representatives from the Commission in Washington, and then we will open the sessions. I'm Robert Lee. the Chair of the Rhode Island Advisory Committee. In my other life, I am Associate Professor in the Department of American Civilization at Brown University, and I teach Asian American studies there. I have .doctorate in history from Brown and a master's from the University of California at . Berkeley. I've been a member of the Chinese American Subcommittee of the Rhode Island State Heritage Commission.

Let me move from the end of the table. Steve Klamkin is representing Nancy Mayer who is on the Committee. Nancy Mayer

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

is General Treasurer of the State of Rhode
Island. Next to Steve is Sophai Moeuy, a
Cambodian immigrant who came to the United
States in 1982. He became a U.S. citizen in
1987 and has been actively involved with the
Southeast Asian community for ten years and
graduated from Rhode Island College in 1997.

1.8

2.0

Sitting next to Mr. Moeuy is

Dorothy Zimmering. Ms. Zimmering resides in

Barrington, Rhode Island and is a retired

family counselor and mediator. In the past,

she served as an officer of the League of

Women Voters and the American Civil Liberties

Union and was a candidate for the State

Legislature in 1980. She has also been

active in the United Way, providing training

for staff-board relations, and as a Chair of

the agency's Allocations Committee. She has

a bachelor's degree in journalism and a

master's degree in education both from the

University of Missouri.

Lester Hilton, a resident of

Cumberland, Rhode Island, is a private insurance broker. He is a graduate of the American College of Life Underwriters. Long active with civic organizations, he is currently the president of the Board of United Cerebral Palsy of Rhode Island. He's been very active in the Rhode Island Republican Party affairs, a member of the State Central Republican Executive Committee and Chairperson of the Cumberland Town Committee since 1974. He is past president of the American Badminton Association.

Over here there's Olga Noguera.

Ms. Noguera is a resident of Providence and is Assistant Coordinator of Community

Relations for the Department of Human

Services. She holds a master's degree in social work and has been an active crusader in the fight against hunger. She has also served as Food and Nutrition Coordinator of the Blackstone Valley Community Action

Program.

iο

2.1

Next to Olga is David Sholes. 1 David Sholes is a senior partner in the law 2 firm of Sholes & Sholes in Warwick, Rhode 3 Island. He served in the Rhode Island State 4 Senate from 1977 to 1992. He served as 5 6 Chairman of the Senate Committee on Health, 7 Education and Welfare, vice-chairman on the 8 Joint Committee on Retirement, and a member of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. 9 also served as Chairperson of the Rhode 10 11 Island SAC for the period 1986 to 1990. 12 been a longtime civil rights advocate in 13 Rhode Island. He serves as a member of the 14 Rhode Island Commission of Religious, Racial 15 and Ethnic Harassment, which he helped 1.6 create. He was also instrumental in the 17 passage of landmark legislation to combat 18 harassment and intimidation motivated by 19 racial, religious and ethnic prejudice. 20 been the Chairman for the Civil Rights 21 Committee of the Anti-Defamation League of

the B'nai B'rith of Rhode Island.

1 And at the end of the table is Mr. John Thompson. Mr. Thompson is an attorney 2 3 in Cranston, an estate planner and tax lawyer by training, admitted to both Massachusetts 4 5 and Rhode Island. He was with the 6 Massachusetts Laborers' Legal Services Fund, 7 where he counseled eligible members on employment and discrimination matters, as 8 . 9 well as general, personal and legal matters. 10 His present practice involves counseling of 11 elderly clients on matters of housing and 12 handicapped clients on matters of access and 13 employment discrimination. He is a member of 14 the Governor's Commission on the Handicapped and the Board of Directors of the Cerebral 15 16 Palsy Association, also active as a member of 17 the ADA Advisory Committee to the Governor's 18 Commission. A victim of Multiple Sclerosis, 19 he walks with a cane or forearm crutches and 20 is particularly sensitive to issues of 21 handicap access. A son of a second generation Italo-American, he's fluent in 22

Italian and particularly sensitive to issues of discrimination on the basis of national origin and ethnicity.

Well, that's the members of the committee. Now I would like to introduce the staff members who have been able to join us here from Washington. Let me begin with the Honorable Ruby Moy seated to my right. She's the Staff Director of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Ms. Moy was recently appointed to this position in June of 1997. Ms. Moy served before that, between 1993 and 1997, as Executive Assistant to the Director of the White House Office of Public Liaison, Alexis Herman, who is now Secretary of Labor.

In the past, Ms. Moy has been consistently involved in constituency outreach programs. Ms. Moy served as Chief of Staff to Representative Frank Horton, a Republican from New York, from 1973 to 1992. Her responsibilities at the Washington and district offices included managing the

Washington and district offices, representing the Congressman at meetings with other key members on the Hill, advising on policy programs, development of legislation and serving as liaison to members, staff, committees and constituents.

She has also been the Executive

Coordinator to the bipartisan New York State

Congressional delegation of which

Representative Horton was Dean. During her

tenure with Representative Horton, Ms. Moy

spearheaded legislation to recognize May as

Asian/Pacific American Heritage Week and

Month until it became permanent. She has

served as Chairperson of the Congressional

Staff Caucus for Asian Pacific Americans, as

group leader to the Congressional Staff

Delegations to various Asian countries, and

as a co-founding member of the New York State

Republican Administrative Assistants.

Ms. Moy attended George Washington University. For the Commission, Ms. Moy is

·15

in charge of day-to-day operations as Staff
Director.

16 .

17 .

2.0

To my immediate left is Fernando

Serpa, Civil Rights Analyst with the

Commission. He's been with the Commission

for three years. Previously, he was

appointed by the White House to serve as

Assistant Director for Immigration and Asylum

Policy at the Department of Justice. He

holds a law degree from George Washington

University and he has been our connection

with Washington, Rhode Island's connection

with Washington, and I should say has been

instrumental in setting up this consultation.

Without his very hard work, this would not

have happened.

Mr. Chun, who is sitting in the back, is a trained psychologist from the University of California at Berkeley, did research and taught part-time at the University of Michigan and the Institute of Social Research before joining the Commission

as Deputy Director of the Office of Research in 1975. He now serves as Director of the Eastern Regional office overseeing the operation of the State Advisory Committees in the eastern region.

Let me just, before we begin, read a welcoming statement from the Governor who, unfortunately, couldn't be with us today but sent his greetings. He writes:

"Congratulations to the Rhode
Island Advisory Committee to the U.S.
Commission on Civil Rights for undertaking
the consultation examining the impact the
federal welfare reform has had on legal
immigrant population within the State of
Rhode Island. This is an important and vital
consideration. By bringing together
representatives of affected groups, including
the Hispanic, Cambodian, and Russian
immigrants, civil rights and immigrant rights
advocates, community service providers,
federal, state and local officials, and the

9.

1.5

general public, you are giving our state the chance to highlight the actions that we have taken to work in tandem with the federal changes.

I want to thank you, General
Treasurer Nancy Mayer, Malvene Brice, Lester
Hilton, Olga Noguera, David Sholes, Chhem
Sip, John Thompson, Norman Tilles, and
Dorothy Zimmering for all of your efforts on
behalf of the preservation and expansion of
civil rights within our state and nation.

Signed, Lincoln Almond."

Let me turn to Ruby Moy for some introductory remarks.

MS. MOY: Good morning. My name is
Ruby Moy. I was appointed by President
Clinton to the Commission on June 13 to serve
as Staff Director for the U.S. Commission on
Civil Rights. I began my career in the
Federal Government at the height of the civil
rights movement. I was working at the White
House when President Johnson signed three

1.6

civil rights laws, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1965 Voting Rights Act, and also in 1965 immigration legislation.

As Dr. Lee has said, I also served as Chief of Staff to Congressman Frank

Horton, a New York representative, and enjoyed my years there and especially in spearheading the legislation on Asian Pacific American Heritage Week and Month.

I went back to the White House during the Clinton Administration and became Staff Director in June of 1999. The position of the Staff Director is very similar to that of a Chief Executive Officer of a company. The Staff Director is responsible for implementing the major policy decisions of the Commission, including overseeing regional programs and the day-to-day operations of the Commission. Dr. Lee has already expressed the Commission's work and I just wanted to add to that in discharging its duties the Commission relies heavily on the work of the

. 9

.17

State Advisory Committees.

1.

The Commission has 51 Advisory

Committees, including one from the District

of Columbia. Each is composed of citizen

volunteers familiar with local and state

civil rights issues. The Advisory Committee

serves as the eyes and ears for the

Commission dealing with civil rights issues

on the state and local level.

The Commission and I recognize that the Committee members serve without compensation and we deeply appreciate their dedication to advancing civil rights in their states. The Commission would like to compliment the Committee for their efforts as it studies the effects of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act on legal immigrants. The Rhode Island Advisory Committee is the first state Advisory Committee to address this issue and will add greatly to the Commission's overall important function in

monitoring this topic.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Welfare reform legislation's impact on legal immigrants is an important issue, but it is at the same time not fully understood or appreciated. In Rhode Island, the Advisory Committee has taken an important step toward articulating the issues by bringing together civil rights and immigrant rights advocates, federal, state and local officials, community service providers and the effected persons themselves.

Once again I applaud the Committee, its current Chairperson, Dr. Bob Lee, and past Chairperson Sarah Murphy and David .Sholes, for their hard work and look forward to a productive and informative day. Thank you.

MR. LEE: Mr. David Sholes will now give us some background on this project.

MR. SHOLES: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission. Ladies and gentlemen, I'd like to give you a background of what this project is and what we intend to accomplish, but first of all I would like to tell you what the two pieces of legislation are about that brings us here today.

Two recently enacted pieces of legislation have dramatically and substantially changed the eligibility of aliens for benefits in the United States. August 22, 1996, President Clinton signed into law the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, the so called "Welfare Act." This legislation dramatically altered the current welfare system and in Title IV restricted the access of legal and illegal immigrants to a wide range of public benefits. The law also provided for changes in the Immigration Act requiring the service to establish a verification system to determine the eligibility for most federal public benefits.

On September 30, 1996, the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 ·

18

19

20

21

President signed into law the Illegal
Immigration Reform and Immigration
Responsibility Act and provided for strict
changes in the immigration policies in this
country. I'd like to give you a summary of
the changes in the Welfare Act which is now
law, and these are just the high points.

Most citizens are no longer eligible for SSI and food stamp benefits.

New immigrants arriving after August 22,
1996, are barred from federal "means tested" benefits for five years. After the five-year bar, new immigrants that have sponsors must include their sponsor's income when applying for federal means tested benefits until the immigrant retains citizenship or ten years of work.

After January 1, 1997, the states have the option to determine current immigrant eligibility for temporary assistance to needy families, Medicaid and other benefits. States have the option to

9.

1.5

provide or bar state-funded programs for current new immigrants. State and local funded programs may deem for new immigrants as of March 1997, and undocumented immigrants are ineligible for federal, state and local public benefits. And many of these benefits which are set forth in the statute include assisted housing, educational benefits, post-secondary education, amendments to the internal revenue code, professional licenses, loans and grants from the states and the federal government.

Now, these bills have a potentially devastating impact on legal immigrants residing in this country. Although immigrants are only about five percent of the population receiving welfare benefits, almost half of the \$54.2 billion cuts in welfare benefits mandated by the Act comes from eliminating federal benefits for legal immigrants.

I emphasize legal immigrants.

According to the Urban Institute, an estimated 1.2 million legal immigrants and their families, many of whom are U.S. citizen's children, will be pushed below poverty level by the welfare cuts. These provisions will also be responsible for almost half of the over one million children being forced into poverty.

estimates that over a million legal immigrants will lose access to food stamps and thousands, tens of thousands, of legal refugees will lose their SSI benefits in the next five years. These losses in assistance are doubled if states exercise the authority reserved in the Act to deny additional benefits, such as the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families, Medicaid, and other benefits.

In light of these concerns and the losses to this population group, the Commission issued a letter to the President in which it stressed that the Act

. 9 .

2.1

specifically states that civil rights prohibit discrimination from federally assisted programs applied to programs under the new legislation and that the Commission and state Advisory Committees will closely monitor its implementation.

The premise of welfare reform is that people who are able to work should be encouraged to find employment so that they will not have to remain dependent on government assistance; nonetheless, the blind, the elderly, and the disabled, a group that's been targeted by this act, are the least likely to find sufficient employment to sustain themselves.

The immigrant provisions of the Act raises serious legal objections by conditioning eligibility for government benefits based on citizen status.

Citizenship status is not a prerequisite for equal protection under the Civil Rights Act.

This Act, the Welfare Act, discriminates

against national origin, racial and ethnic minorities, particularly Asians and Hispanics, that comprise the majority of the immigrant population, new immigrant population, to the United States over the last 20 years.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Let's look at Rhode Island. Island's a home to a large number of legal immigrants. In 1996, two years ago, last available figures show that approximately 4,114 elderly and disabled legal immigrants in Rhode Island received SSI benefits. Also in 1996, approximately 8,250 legal immigrants, Rhode Islanders living in approximately 5,200, families received food stamp assistance and it's estimated by August of 1997 (we don't have those figures) that approximately 6,400 legal immigrants in Rhode Island will have been removed from the federal food stamp program and thousands of elderly and disabled legal immigrants will not be eligible for the federal SSI program.

Today's consultation is an attempt for this Committee to learn from the community about the adverse impact of the Welfare Reform Legislation. We would like to look at three major concerns or focus of this consultation.

First is to determine the nature and extent to which the implementation of the Welfare Act will have upon the legal immigrants and their American citizen children, what will be the adverse impact. Two is to determine if and how the state policies plan to ameliorate these adverse conditions which will result in the implementation of this Act. And the third major issue is to learn the current efforts from the Rhode Island Congressional Delegation, what is planned to ameliorate the adverse conditions that may result from the implementation of the Act, in particular, of the implementation of the regulation that will be implemented pursuant to those Acts.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 .

18

19

20

21

Thank you very much.

9.

15.

MS. NOGUERA: At this time I would like to ask if we have any immigrant families or immigrants themselves that would like to come forward to speak this morning. Is there anybody from the community that would like to take this opportunity to speak? If we don't have anybody here, I would like to turn to Dorothy Zimmering.

MR. LEE: Before we turn to Dorothy
Zimmering, let me say that it was our
intention to have this be a forum in which
immigrants and their family members who have
been impacted by these changes in law to come
and speak in an open forum and as this day
grew closer and we found that the response
was not forthcoming, we realized that, in
fact, there are substantial barriers,
cultural barriers, and fear about speaking at
a public forum with regard to any issues
related to ones of immigrant status.

One of our plans now is for the

Committee itself to do field interviews and I think we, hopefully, will be in touch with Committee organizations in an effort to try to arrange one on one or small group field interviews.

MS. MARTINEZ: Mr. Chairman, good morning. My name is Patricia Martinez and I am from Progresso Latino. One of the things I wanted to suggest is if the Committee, within the 30 days that you mention, could come out in the community and instead of one-on-one interviews, one of the things that I could suggest is to offer a focus group targeting certain people.

The agency could help you set up and organize these focus groups. In my efforts last week in trying to recruit some participants, some of the people who wanted to come and testify one of the bigger problems, along with fear that you mentioned, was the whole issue of whether or not being able to come here today. They said, "I would

love to go. I have so many things to say.

The problem is I'm being pressured right now to go and find a 40 hour a week job. I have to go to work at 10 o'clock, so I don't have the time. If I take the time out of work,

I'm going to be punished."

And so I think the timing of this created some of the problems for some of the people to attend. Perhaps if the Committee was available maybe in the late afternoon after the children are home from school or even an evening or a Saturday are some of the times that I would suggest.

MR. LEE: Thank you very much. I think that precisely what we have in mind.

We would like to be in touch with the different organizations and groups and get if not the whole Committee at least various groups of us spread out, so to speak.

MS. ZIMMERING: I don't know whether you would like to -- we only have three chairs set up here -- but perhaps if

1.5

the first three people on the panel would come down to speak to us and then we'll shift. We have a lot of people on the panel. If Ms. Schmidt, Mr. Shuey, and Linda Katz would all come down, please? We have large panel. Maybe we can hear each other better. That's really the only way we can do this.

MR. LÊE: We are running quite early. It could be that some people haven't come yet.

MS. ZIMMERING: Well, let's proceed with those people who are here. Ms. Bath and Sr. Marlene? Let's get one more person on that panel. Mr. Lee? Okay, we have three. Good. Thank you.

I would like to mention at the beginning that I'm going to have two questions for almost everyone who appears before us. I would like to narrow the focus and, so I would like to know from each of you, not necessarily in your initial presentation, one thing that you believe that

9 .

needs to be changed that would make the most difference and, secondly, what should the change be, so that I for one hear from you something that I could focus on. Changing things one thing at a time seems to be more possible in lots of cases than trying to generalize changes. So if you would start, Ms. Katz.

MS. KATZ: Thank you. My name is
Linda Katz. I'm an attorney with Rhode
Island Health Center Association, and we are
a non-profit organization that provides
services to low-income individuals working
particularly with Central Falls, Woonsocket,
and Providence programs. I also had the
honor of working with the Rhode Island
Coalition on Immigrants and Refugees drafting
some of the state's proposals to have Rhode
Island pick up the gaps in services and loss
of assistance from the federal programs.

I guess I should start off now by telling you of some of the changes happening

14.

since the Personal Responsibility Act passed.

I don't think we can appreciate the pain and suffering that the people who lost benefits suffered when the PRA was enacted. Thousands of people throughout the communities were living in uncertainty for a long period of time.

But, as most people here know, Congress did act last year to fix some of the harshest provisions of the PRA with continued eligibility. One group of people that Congress did not restore SSI eligibility reform to are legal immigrants who were in the country before August 22 and who turned 65 and may not be disabled enough to qualify for SSI on the basis of disability, but are elderly, may not have worked for ten years, maybe only worked for eight years, and they don't qualify for SSI benefits. They may have language problems. They may have some health problems, but not serious enough to make them eligible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 ·

18

19

2.0

21

Those people are still threatened with the prospect of no means of support because in Rhode Island we do not have, and some other states do, a state general assistance program that picks up people who are not disabled, who are not eligible, or who do not qualify for federal benefits. Rhode Island we still have that one gap. The coalition did try last year to get legislation passed that would have provided assistance to people who were not eligible for federal benefits, but the General Assembly did not pass the program that would provide benefits to people who were not recipients.

So right now Rhode Island does not have a safety net program for those individuals. There is legislation that is being proposed here in Rhode Island to pick up immigrants who are not eligible for SSI solely because of the changes in the Personal Responsibility Act. That target population

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15 .

16

17

18

19

20

21

would be people who were in the country before August 22 and turned 65 and would not be able to get SSI.

I'd like to focus my remarks on the population of people who come into the country after August 22, 1996, because I think that group has become the group that really has been affected and, having advocated last year with the Coalition to try to restore eligibility for people who were affected by the Personal Responsibility Act, August 22, 1996, was kind of the cutoff date that we were able to say to policy makers that people who were here before that date were living by the rules and they should be able to have the same benefits that they had when they came to this country.

But it's the folks who come in after August 22, 1996, that really are, and I use the term loosely, discriminated against.

Generally, we hear statements very receptive to the arguments that we should be taking

1:6

care of our neighbors whether they were born here or moved here. In 1996, when the General Assembly implemented its Family Independence Program, which is Rhode Island's Block Grant Program of the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families Program, every state set up its own program and in 1996 said that legal immigrants would have access to family independence cash assistance in the same way that citizens have access.

Last year the General Assembly changed the Family Independence Act and cut back eligibility and said that new immigrant families, children, as well as their families would not be eligible for these benefits if they entered the country after August 22, 1996.

So in the legislator's mind, I think, August 22 was kind of the cutoff date. That means if a family comes to the United States and is sponsored here by a family then three years down the road something happens

. 9.

.17

to one of the parents or the children are in need of assistance, they won't be able to get help in Rhode Island.

Similarly, those families could not get food stamps for five years because of the bar and there's not a state-funded food stamp program for them. If one of those individuals is in a serious car accident and becomes disabled they can not get SSI benefits because of the five-year bar.

In response to your question, Ms. Zimmering, I would say that the focus should be setting up barriers to particularly low income families in bringing other family members to this country. We're saying that there's a flat bar for five years for accessing public assistance. We also have set the bar higher for what income a family must have to bring family members here. Sponsorship rules have always applied to the public assistance program in the past where sponsors are considered available for a

certain number of years before immigrants get assistance. This combination of the five-year bar and the higher barrier to be able to sponsor somebody here means that families who come here and work hard at lower paying jobs may not be eligible to bring family members here. If they do, if those families members come and they work hard they can't get access to assistance here.

So to a new immigrant coming in we're saying, "Sorry you can't access the same assistance that we give to somebody sitting next to you who is a citizen working for the same wage." I think those are areas of focus that we really should be looking at.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you.

MS. KATZ: Thank you for the opportunity to come here and identify these issues. I think that most people don't understand the broad sweep that the Personal Responsibility Act had. If any member has any questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

14.

MR. KLAMKIN: Ms. Katz, I just want to compliment you on your work and study that we saw that you provided. Have you been able to quantify numbers of people who, senior citizens, for example, who have been cut off or been left in the lurch, as it were, after the August 22, 1996, date?

Also, we've been told by our staff, our staff did some work, that's it's been difficult to find any kind of definitive or comprehensive demographic data that goes into determining how many people are affected by these changes. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations for them? Who, for example, ought to be compiling this data?

MS. KATZ: Well, I think there will be information coming from the groups today that work with the immigrant community about the number of people they feel have been affected. I think in gathering the data, places like -- and this gets tricky which I think is part of the problem of trying to

2.0

quantify this. Somebody, for example, at the food stamps program should know how many people you turned away because of the rules. They should be able to keep better count of people who are affected by the federal rules.

Administration should be able to tell us how many people who are elderly and applied for assistance and have been told no. I don't think their tracking methods on denials are very good because often in that circumstance they would just say goodbye without taking an application and issuing a formal denial.

I think there's also the compounding factor of the information that's out in the community, who's eligible and who's not, some of which is misinformation.

People don't even knock on the door. I think it's very hard to -- you know, we can extrapolate from the number of people who have been on and use some percentages, but that would be the best we'd be able to do.

9 .

1.1

1.5 .

MR. SERPA: Being from Washington and not familiar with local politics, I'm just curious how receptive was the Assembly to your efforts to make changes by a bipartisan group?

MS. KATZ: It was bipartisan and last year there were some proposals from the Governor's office, originally. Then there were a few proposals from the General Assembly, both from the Senate and House side. I think the response from the General Assembly and, in large part, from many of the General Assembly members on first or second generation immigrants was this is wrong and we're not going to let this happen in Rhode Island.

We're one of ten states that
established a food stamp program and each
state has a different set of restrictions.

Some states only provide assistance to
children, some states only provide assistance
to children and elderly. Our state said we

1.6

will provide them for anybody who was in this country or in the state before August 22.

Nationally, people understood what was happening before it happened.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you.

MR. KLAMKIN: What's become of some of the elderly and disabled people, are you aware?

MS. KATZ: Well, maybe other people from the group that work more closely with them than I do can tell you what the psychological impact has been on some of the people who have fallen through the cracks, but at least on paper all of the people who were eligible and receiving benefits were continuing on the program.

We did see massive harm with respect to if the federal government had not restored eligibility for SSI recipients. We would have seen people have their income cut by a little bit more than half. In terms of elderly people now who would have been

.17

eligible under the old rules but no longer qualify, again some of the groups can give you some of that information and that's the group of people we need to try to quantify and find to pick up under the state program and to make an argument that we should have a state program.

about the recommendations that you proposed to the Commission. The point that you mention about we don't know how many people we turned out of the doors, what will be the recommendation that you would have for the Commission? As far as the Rhode Island regulations and for reason for denials, for instance. We don't know how many and we don't know the reasons for denials. So what would be your recommendations to the Commission?

MS. KATZ: Well, the state and federal agencies could keep better track of requests for assistance and track denials and

the reason for the denials and that would start to give us the new information that we need to see the impact, particularly with people who came after August 22 of '96.

14.

2.1

I think the other, and I get a little bit leery of saying the state should track this information. I think we need to work out a way that people can make a request and the information we extract can be tracked in a more anonymous way. Those are certainly things referred to when tracking information.

I think we can also do a better analysis, perhaps, of people who are recipients and what other family members may be entitled to. So I think the specific recommendation is that we work together as state agencies, ask the right questions so that we can get appropriate information reported back, and therefore get a better handle on that.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you. Any more questions? Okay. Let's move on.

Ms. Bath?

4.

1.8

MS. BATH: My name is Gretchen Bath and I am a lawyer with Rhode Island Legal Services. Rhode Island Legal Services is an agency which provide free legal representation to low-income people. I want to thank you for inviting me here today.

Linda has pretty much covered everything that I was going to say, but maybe I can give you details on the more recent legislation on the state and federal level that somewhat ameliorated the effects of the Personal Responsibility Act in Rhode Island.

And, just to summarize again, in Rhode Island there are two large groups that still remain affected, the elderly, non-disabled legal immigrant population who are no longer eligible for SSI benefits or cash assistance, and, second of all the new entries, legal immigrants who come into the country after August 22, 1996, who are not eligible for food stamps and to some extent

for medical assistance.

-8

9.

1.5

So those are the two groups of legal immigrants who are still affected in Rhode Island by these changes. People who enter the U.S. legally after August 22, 1996, are not eligible, in general, for food stamps, they are not eligible for cash assistance, and they are not eligible for medical assistance, except for pregnant women and children regardless of their date of entry.

I will agree with Linda also that
the new entries are the group of most
concern. I think, otherwise, Linda covered
everything I was going to say about the
public benefit program except for one issue.
I think there has been a lot of national
attention lately in view of the public charge
provisions related to INS and that is that
nationwide states are now getting into the
business of recovering medical assistance or
other public assistance benefits that have

been paid out.

1.6

Let me give you the scenario. A pregnant woman gets medical assistance benefits in the U.S, she's entitled to those benefits. They pay for the cost of her delivery and childbirth and whatever. And in this scenario the husband, who is not eligible, leaves the country and comes back in. When he comes back in the INS says no, you can't come into the country until you repay us the medical assistance benefits that we paid for your wife while she was pregnant.

Now that's something as I

understand it is a recent trend. The states

are starting to recover those benefits by

contacting INS and providing information of

who received medical assistance benefits and

how much those benefits were and then that's

how the INS helps recover the state debt,

supposedly. I saw this being covered

recently in a Spanish newspaper. It was a

newspaper out of L.A. indicating that being

an issue in California, and, as I understand it, it's an issue among immigrants.

9.

You have to remember that these are lawfully paid benefits and there is no question of fraud or overpayment or anything else. We had recently, at Legal Services, run into a hearing decision where the State of Rhode Island collected benefits through this mechanism, through INS, and recovered medical assistance benefits that were legally paid to the spouse in the situation.

We contacted the Department of
Human Services, and, as I understand it they
have been working on this issue. There was
some guidance from the federal government to
all the state Medicaid directors saying you
can't do this. First of all, there is the
issue of confidentiality, and, second of all,
you have no right to repayment in the absence
of fraud. So they have told me that they no
longer engage in this practice.

I understand that the Department of

Human Services is taking steps to reimburse
the families that -- I guess there are two or
three families that this happened to, from
what I understand. And DHS has taken the
steps in abiding by the instructions from the
federal government. At least in Rhode Island
that should be an issue that we need to work
on.

MS. ZIMMERING: What does Legal Services do for people like this? Do you go to the courtroom?

MS. BATH: Yes, among other things, we represent people at agency hearings or in court.

MS. ZIMMERING: How do they usually get to you? Because people are reluctant to go to facilities or organizations like yours.

MS. BATH: Well, we've been around for a long time, and I think the word is out that we are approachable and we're there and available to answer questions, anything from answering questions to full legal

representation and, of course, what 1 information is provided is confidential. 2 MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you. Any 3 questions? 4 5 MR. SERPA: How large is your 6 agency? I think we probably have 7 MS. BATH: about 30 people on staff, just a rough 8 estimate. We have a Newport office that has 9 10 four or five people, and then we have a Providence office that picks up the rest. 11 Historically, have you 12 MR. SERPA: seen an increase in the people coming in? 13 MS. BATH: That's a tough question. 14. One thing we have noticed is somewhat of a 15 16 decrease in the number of people who have 17 contacted us because of public benefit problems since welfare reform. We've been 18 trying to track the number of calls that 19 we've been getting, and I think it's been 20 somewhat of a drop in the number of requests 21

22

for our services.

There's a great sense of 1 resignation among people that well, it's 2 welfare reform and this happened to me and 3 nothing can be done about it; I'm not going 4 to bother fighting it. There were a few 5 hearings on those questions and appeals made 6 when welfare reform started to come out. 7 8 Much of that was probably due because they felt there was nothing that could be done, but I think there are also many situations 10 11 where people just don't do anything about the reduction in benefits. 12

Our sense in our office is there's a general feeling of resignation. This is just the way it has to be. My benefits were cut. This is welfare reform and essentially there is nothing that I can do about it. I don't know if I really answered your question, but in terms of the program, I don't know the answer to that.

MR. KLAMKIN: I have a couple of questions I wanted to ask you. One, I want

13

14

15

16

17 .

1.8

19

20

21

to get a sense, if you can provide us one, of the atmospherics of going before these agencies and carrying out appeals or initiating claims. How well or poorly are people received when they do go before, say, a hearing officer? Do you have any concerns that people's civil rights are being violated?

Well, I think once you MS. BATH: get to the actual formal hearing stage that people are treated very well. It's a formal setting and everyone's treated pretty much similarly. I guess I would say that where I think the problem arises is in the more informal, undocumented kinds of contacts where people might go in and say I don't think this is right. Can I do something about it, and they are told No, you're not eligible. Don't bother.

MR. KLAMKIN: Even when people first walk in the door?

> Well, maybe when walking MS. BATH:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

in the door or maybe walking in after a determination or after receiving a notice terminating their benefits and they might come and say what is this or ask for clarification or maybe even indicate that they want to file on appeal. My sense is from dealing with this over the past years, there's a lot informal denial going on at the federal, Social Security, welfare, and DHS offices and people are told don't bother with that, you are not eligible, and they just leave.

Because that's an oral decision about eligibility, there's no notice that goes out, there's no appeal from that, there's no documentation, even. We get told many, many times from clients they were orally informed that they should not bother applying. I think to be fair in some cases the workers might think that that's helpful rather than questioning their immigration status or whatever or requests for benefits.

They think they are helping the person out by simply sending them away. I think in Social Security, for instance, what we've seen is someone going in to request benefits and they don't take an actual application. They'll just say oh, no. You're really not eligible. You shouldn't apply, and they will be sent away without an application being taken and that means sent away without an actual denial on the record. So I would say that the problem is in the more informal denials, the oral denials, rather than at the actual hearing stage.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you have any concerns about the people who work for that department or do you think it doesn't go that deeply?

MS. BATH: Well, I suppose one thing I didn't mention that's a problem at both DHS and social security is the lack of available interpreters and the lack of notices in their languages. That's certainly

. 9

an issue that needs to be addressed at these agencies. That's a real civil rights issue. The oral denials, I think, is just across the I see it less as a civil rights issue board. and more of a process issue because I think it's not limited to any certain groups of people. I think both agencies do a lot of work in terms of notifying these people in their own language of their rights. that notices are sent out in English, but on the back of the page there is a multilanguage blurb that tells them this is an important notice and requires their attention.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do people frequently walk in alone or do they go in with some help or do they come to your agency only after the fact?

Usually they come to our MS. BATH: agency after the fact. I think it's fairly common for people to come in with a family member when coming to apply and that family

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

```
member or friend can be used as an
 1
       interpreter in some cases. Certainly,
 2
       there's many people who come to our office,
 3
       who have been to an agency, brings somebody
 4
 5
       with them because they have been told before
       there's nobody that speaks their language and
 6
 7
       they have to come back and bring someone that
       speaks their language. And this is a common
 8
       complaint.
 9
                 MR. KLAMKIN:
                                Is that a common or a
10
11
       frequent complaint?
12
                 MS. BATH: Common enough.
                                             It's a
       recurrent complaint, especially at Social
1.3
       Security, I would say.
14
                                Thank you.
15
                 MR. KLAMKIN:
16
                 MR. CHUN: What would be the main
17
       problems your group handles for the legal
       immigrant population prior to August 22,
18
19
       1996?
20
                 MS. BATH: Basically we would
       represent people on SSI, collecting SSI
21
```

benefits. We notify them if they are being

terminated. Food stamps, welfare, medical assistance, some child support issues, some veterans' benefits.

MR. CHUN: With respect to housing issues, does the legislation provide for the transition of the immigrant population and subsidized housing? Have you come across those problems?

MS. BATH: Well, I'm sure our office has but that's part of the drawback of having a compartmentalized system. I don't deal with subsidized housing issues. They have a separate unit for that. There's an office that helps people who are getting evicted or who have applied but got turned down or was denied.

MR. CHUN: I don't know if you have noticed but the Act does provide for the reduction of benefits for post-secondary education. What are your views regarding those problems of immigrants applying for post secondary-education benefits?

1.8

MS. BATH: That I'm not familiar with. Linda, are you familiar with that?

9.

15.

MS. KATZ: Other than asking at the higher education offices for legal immigrants applying for assistance in terms of grants and so forth, that might be something the Committee wants to explore.

MR. CHUN: - Also, the Act would deny a license, professional license or commercial license, benefit to a legal immigrant. Do you have any thoughts about that or have you come across any of these problems?

MS. BATH: Well, again, I'll refer this to Linda. I am not familiar with that.

MS. KATZ: My understanding is that provision applies to people who are nonqualified immigrants, undocumented. I don't know how to get a handle on that issue. I don't know -- again, maybe those workers who deal with the immigrant population may know of individuals who previously would have been applying for professional licenses and

was denied access.

1.6

To pin down in terms of what the scope of what the change will be in who was coming to the door before for professional licenses and who are now applying is hard to say.

MR. LEE: I'd like to ask a question about medical assistance. If one is no longer eligible for medical assistance, what's happening with those people in terms of emergency care and so forth?

MS. BATH: That population is entitled to emergency care for actual, life-threatening situations and for obviously labor and delivery.

MS. KATZ: We see that people who don't have access to medical assistance coverage receive services. People who are undocumented were never entitled to medical assistance. The loss of medical coverage has really been for people coming in after August 22, 1996. The children are still eligible,

but elderly and disabled persons are not eligible. And we don't have universal health insurance, so there's a whole bunch of people who are not eligible for medical coverage whether they are citizens or not.

Again, it's a tracking issue. If a new immigrant who has a serious problem goes to the hospital expecting to get emergency care, the hospitals may be able to get those costs paid for them. I can't tell you the number of people that we see qualified who previously would have been covered by medical assistance but are not now and those who are undocumented and have never been covered.

MR. KLAMKIN: I don't know if you have had any experience in taking these cases down to the administrative level to the courts in Rhode Island, but do you have any feeling about how well or poorly the courts are responding to these kinds of cases?

MS. BATH: I do have experience representing people appealing from agency

9.

1.5

.17

decisions, not particularly related to an issue of legal immigrant status, just your general garden variety appeal.

MR. KLAMKIN: Have these Acts played into any of those cases yet?

MS. BATH: One of the problems with the 1996 federal legislation was that there were limits placed on what people in the programs can do. We're not allowed, for instance, to bring any litigation challenging any welfare reform provisions. We could not sue or bring up an appeal, even a civil rights appeal, on behalf of the client where the issue was anything related to federal welfare reform changes. So our hands have been tied in terms of that.

Otherwise, I would say, just speaking in terms of sensitivity to low income issues and entitlement to benefits, I think we've had mixed results. I think we do fairly well, I would say, in Superior Court and the State Supreme Court.

. 9

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you. Sister Marlene Laliberte.

SR. LALIBERTE: I would like to thank you for inviting me here today. I'll just tell you a little bit about the Genesis Center, what we do, who we serve, and how the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act would affect the center.

The Genesis Center is a school and support center for adult refugees and immigrants and we provide English as a second language, job skills, survival skills, teaching skills, and job training. We also have support services such as child care for refugees and immigrants. We service a great many Southeast Asians, Hispanics, and Eastern Europeans.

Most of the people that we serve are there to learn English and to move on to work. Many of them have young children and they are in our child care centers which services mostly children of parents who are

on welfare. I think one of the things that we see are people who are trying to learn English. I think you've seen people and the difficulties they have. We see a great number of people who come here who are really trying to learn English. We service a lot of people who are very low in English and it does take them a long time to learn.

from welfare to work in a very short time is kind of unreasonable because employers would not want them there unless they knew enough English to be able to do the job properly.

We see a lot of people trying to get into programs such as English as a Second

Language. There are not enough programs for people who need to learn English. We have maybe 100 to 150 people who would like to learn English and would like to move on but cannot do so.

One of the problems that we see is the insufficient amount of classes for people

14.

who really want to work and get off welfare and better themselves. I think one of the things also, as Linda had mentioned, is the people who are new immigrants entering the country and who have to wait five years in order to be eligible for benefits and then that is turned over to their sponsor's income.

Many times we see people who are trying to rely on their sponsor who doesn't earn enough money to support their own family never mind trying to support other families who are maybe relatives. This becomes a great difficulty. Even when immigrants have sponsored their families and they have a job, when they're filling out the application by the time the people get to this country they may no longer have a job or their status has changed. That proves to be very difficult and people start scrambling around trying to help them and to get funding. I see that as one of the major problems in this Welfare

Reform Act.

9.

15.

And as someone who runs an English as a Second Language program, to be truthful, we need more English as a Second Language programs and it should be available to anyone who needs it so that they can move on.

MS. ZIMMERING: How long is your program? How much time do --

SR. LALIBERTE: Some people have stayed as long as two years, but most of them are in programs where they can only stay 14 weeks, 15 weeks. And to try to learn the whole language in that time period, that's an impossibility. We also have job training and those we get grants from Providence/Cranston Job Training and places like that. They are only allowed 14, 15 weeks to learn English and to do the job training. That isn't enough time. And because they are low level, it's harder for them to get a job and they can't move on.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you.

1	Questions?
2	MS. MOY: When you train them in
3	English do you find that the most of the
4	immigrants stay in the area?
5	SR. LALIBERTE: That's a very hard
6	question. Even when they stay in the area,
7	they move frequently. They are very hard to
8	track because they move once or twice a year,
9	many of them. So to know if they are still
10	in the area is really difficult.
11	MR. SERPA: Do you offer
12	citizenship classes?
13	SR. LALIBERTE: Yes, we do.
14	MR. SERPA: Has there been an
15	increase in that?
16	SR. LALIBERTE: Yes, there has.
17 ·	That's our major work. We worked with 77
18	people last year and this year it was
. 19	probably well in the 80s.
2 0	MR. LEE: What are your funding
21	sources for the ESL program?
2 2	SR. LALIBERTE: Most of our funding

is through grants. There's the Department of Education grant, different organizations, foundations, grants, funds. The Department of Human Services has just come out with if you have your program approved by them then they would give you funding to teach. We haven't really heard that that's in effect yet.

MS. NOGUERA: I just want to go back to Ms. Bath. When you said that public charge is someone who is coming back into the U.S. and they were stopped, what happens to that person? How do immigration officers at the entry port know that this individual used public services before?

MS. BATH: I'm not sure of the technology but I'm sure there is a computerized system. I assume that states provide information, provide names and amounts of debt, and they must have some kind of way of tracking by immigrant's name or by spouse and plug it into the computer at

9.

1.5

1 entry.

1.6

All I really know about it is what I heard from a client and read in hearing decisions which was they simply as soon as he got there said Stop, you have a debt. You're not coming in. You have a debt to pay first. They will not allow them entry.

MS. KATZ: I think it's important for the panel to know that in a program like RIte Care -- for us to say a immigrant who may be working at a \$35,000 a year job and does not have coverage from their employer and relies on the RIte Care program for a pregnancy or for their children, that that somehow affects their immigrant status. I think we have a real serious civil rights issue.

So in my mind we need to start looking at how that assistance affects people's ability to move from being an immigrant to becoming a citizen. And one of my recommendations would be that the DHS,

when training the human service worker, that they understand exactly what the Personal Responsibility Act means so there's not a climate of hostility at the Department of Human Services. People should be able to come and ask questions and that the worker understand what their goals are because I think there's a lot of confusion on the part ... of workers as well.

And this can be a broad thing that ranges from making sure that information is tracked when somebody asks for assistance and are not eligible to maybe seeing that people who have eligible family members get the assistance that they need without family members feeling insecure in coming in. I think training to help the workers understand what the law means and how they need to apply it.

MR. KLAMKIN: Sister, thank you for coming. I had an opportunity to tour your facility about a year ago and I was very,

very impressed with it. I wanted to ask you,
we're seeing a trend perhaps in public
schools against English as a Second Language
instruction, is that a concern, do you think?

SR. LALIBERTE: Yes. We do work very closely with the public schools. There is a new public school that just opened in the area, the Lima School, and they are doing a two-way bilingual. They are teaching both Spanish and English in every classroom. It's kind of an experimental thing that seems to be working. Definitely they should be teaching English as a Second Language in public schools.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you feel that we need to see more of it overall? I mean, are there a lot of other facilities where ESL is available?

SR. LALIBERTE: The Mayor has a committee in Providence and they are surveying to see exactly how much English is given. Some programs give it twice a week in

2.0

the evening and it's only five or six hours and that's very difficult for people to learn English in that short time. There are other support services that are needed to teach skills and many agencies don't give those support services. The people who attend Genesis needs those kinds of services in order to move on.

MR. KLAMKIN: What kinds of services?

SR. LALIBERTE: Well, we do a lot with health. We do a lot with nutrition. We do a lot with survival skills. If you have a child, what do you do when you're going to go get a job? What are the alternatives that you have? People new to the country have a lot of things that they need to learn and those services are what helps them to move on, in addition to English as a Second Language.

MR. KLAMKIN: Are there many other agencies that offer the kind of child care

9.

1.5 .

1	services that yours does?
2	SR. LALIBERTE: Progressive Latino
3	offers child care and I think that we are the
4	only two that offer it. There are other
5	child care centers that would take children
6	who are on welfare, but they are not located
7	in the same building.
8	MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you very
9	much.
10	MR. MOEUY: Do you know what kinds
11	of people go through your program? Such as a
12	breakdown of Southeast Asian people?
13	SR. LALIBERTE: How many Southeast
14 .	Asian people are there?
15	MR. MOEUY: Yes.
16	SR. LALIBERTE: Probably about 50
17 ·	or 60 during the course of a year.
·18	MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you very
19	much. Perhaps we can take a little break now
20	for about fifteen minutes. If you would come
21	back around 10:00, we will continue.

(Recess)

·17

MS. ZIMMERING: I'd like to review my focus, but it's not necessarily the Committee's focus, but it's my focus, my primary interest. As you go through your presentation, which we really appreciate having you here, if you could indicate at the beginning, the middle or the end, anywhere in the five to ten minute presentation, what change you feel would be most productive in being made at this point and what you think the change should be.

If a change could be made, where do you see it being most productive and what do you think that change should be. Rather than saying, "I think things should be changed," if you could tell us how you think it should be changed, I would appreciate that. If we could start with you, Ms. Martinez.

MS. MARTINEZ: Good morning and thank you. Thank you for this opportunity.

It's really exciting to see that this .

Advisory Commission is concerned about the

issues the Asian community faces,

particularly as it relates to welfare reform.

As I said before, I really -- I'm almost

positive that I speak on behalf of most of

the agencies that are here. I would like to

welcome all the Commissions to visit our

agencies, perhaps in the next 30 days, to

meet with some of the participants who are

really being affected by this.

My agency is open to possibly having several focus groups helping to coordinate some of these efforts and hopefully help you guys get some of the information that you would like to get. I'm the Director of Progresso Latino. Progresso Latino is a multi-service agency. Primarily, we service the Latino community. We were established in '78 as an agency to service the Latino community.

What we have seen in the last five years is an increase of other immigrants who are coming to our agency seeking all kinds of

21 .

services. Some of the services that we provide are day care centers, senior citizen programs, health, education, and prevention programs, such as lead prevention, HIV, AIDS, tobacco prevention and control. We have an after-school program for Latino youth ages 12 to 16 years old and we have a large component of our adults in adult education programs, ESL, citizenship, GED, job training.

A part of this component -- we recently for the first time last year we got some funding from the Department of Human Services to provide educational programs for people on welfare. Another program that we provide is case management. Anything that you can think of, sometimes because maybe we take for granted the fact that we speak English, but it could be a simple thing like picking up the phone and making a phone call for a client.

In many cases, a lot of our time is utilized by people who are applying for

14.

public assistance and the first step for them is complete a welfare application. Those people come to us because they don't have anywhere else to go. The office, for instance, welfare office, does not have the personnel to assist some of these families in filling out those forms.

Also, we assist in helping people find housing, employment, schools, connecting the families who are moving into Rhode Island or into the cities where we are located, placing their kids in school, bringing all the documentations they need and many times just working with a lot of the agencies who are present here to refer families and provide comprehensive services.

One of the concerns that we have seen, although, as you heard from Linda and Ms. Bath and Sister Marlene, I think they have said a lot of things in terms of what we have seen in Rhode Island. I think Rhode Island has been a pioneer in terms of strides

in the effects of changes in welfare reform as it relates to the immigrant community.

However, there's still of lot of gaps.

One of the things that I would like to see coming from the Committee is, and I'm not sure what's going to happen after the 30 days, I believe you're going to come up with some recommendations, but one of the things that you mentioned at the very beginning is civil rights protection, citizenship for an immigrant being a prerequisite for civil rights protection.

What we're seeing right now with this welfare reform, it's almost a prerequisite in order for you to be eligible for certain benefits or to be assisted.

Other than that, you're not entitled. When we started seeing the changes of welfare reform and we started seeing the families and the people that were being targeted, it was like everything was the basis of civil rights. It was age discrimination, which was

9.

the elderly. It was women, most of the people on public assistance being females.

It was national origin, most of the people, as you very well stated, are Latinos and Southeast Asians. These are the people that are the being affected.

One of the two biggest concerns
that I have is the effects that welfare
reform is going to have on the immigrant
community in the long run. For instance, one
of the biggest problems we have always had as
immigrants is poverty. Welfare reform is
causing a lot of our families to be in even
worse poverty situations than they were in
before.

Another concern that I have is their children and the dropout rates. When you look at the rates of Latinos dropping out of school, my concern is that in five years those figures may double or triple. And with that, I want to tell you -- Linda and everyone has spoke about the fact that new

17 .

families are not going to be eligible for some of the benefits. What I'm afraid is going to happen is a lot of the numbers that we may see in the near future, it's kids who are coming into the country already 15 and 16 years old looking for jobs because mom and dad don't have enough income to support the whole family. These kids are going to eventually have to drop out and support the whole family.

One of the other concerns that I have relates to housing and somebody brought up the issue of housing. I'm seeing citizen children being punished because their parents are not citizens. I think it unfair and think it's saying we are second-class citizens in this country.

Somebody asked the question of can you find them families after they complete a program? Immigrant families are usually a very transient population. What we're seeing is a lot of these families whose head of the

9.

.17

household, mom or dad, who may not be citizens, they are not eligible for subsidized housing anymore. So what we're seeing is more families doubling up, children living in situations that are not the most healthy places to live in, sometimes even not the best and most safe neighborhoods in this state.

Moving from one place to another, again, affecting the kids' education. If a child is moving from one school to another in a school year ten times, that is going to have an impact on the learning ability of that child. Eventually, that kid is going to end up dropping out of school.

Those are just some of the concerns that I have. Along with that is the whole issue that, I think it was brought out by Ms. Bath in terms of the access and the public charge. I think there's a lot of confusion, even among service providers, as to what is public charge. What we are

seeing, at least in my agency, is a family who has petitioned for their family members. Families who are in the Dominican Republic, Columbia, Peru, whatever country, and who finally after waiting for five years, six years, have a visa available for them and just because that family member who is in this state at the some point received any type of public benefits, that family member overseas is not being given a visa because his family member up here has to repay the state.

There's a confusion in terms of I
want to pay, who do I pay? It's the
Department of Human Services to my
understanding that are saying we don't want
the money. I mean, we're not asking for that
money. There's also some confusion, how can
I come up with \$7,000 and they don't
understand payment plans? If you were given
\$7,000 or \$10,000 worth of, let's say,
medical benefits, you have to pay that amount

14.

of money all at once. Well, I can tell you that, I don't know if any one of you have \$10,000 in the bank, I certainly don't have it and I think that among the immigrant community who are working families and even those who may have been on public assistance, they certainly don't have not even \$5,000 in the bank or they wouldn't be needing public assistance services.

Along with that, because there's so much confusion and misinformation, in terms of setting up a safety net for the families who were receiving public assistance or who were receiving food stamps before and provided a health service for any child under the age of 18 regardless of their family income, one of the things that we are seeing in our agencies is a lot of these families are not wanting to access those services. They are afraid that if they apply for those services today that tomorrow when they go and petition for somebody or that tomorrow when

9 .

they -- there's even confusion in terms of them being afraid when they go to apply for their citizenship that they are going to be denied that benefit.

There's a real big need to reach out to people and I'm not sure if it needs to come from the Department of Human Services or maybe a body of your Commission, I'm not sure who, to be honest with you. There's a lot of confusion in the community and we are really looking forward to have a population in the 21st century that is going to be ready to have the kids ready to learn, having healthy families and healthy communities and these wonderful things that we see everywhere and we need to start by making those services accessible.

The immigrants are always going to be behind. They are not going to be able to access those services because they may not be eligible for any of those services. Again, I would like to emphasize some of the issues

9.

1.5

that were brought up in terms of employment, in terms of poor secondary education. Some of things we are seeing with some of the families who have been affected directly are families who are already being pushed to go to work.

As Sister Marlene mentioned, there are some programs that allow a family or a participant to be in an ESL program for a year or for six months, but after that, because their English skills are still so low, one of the things that is happening with a lot of these people is they are ending up in temporary employment agencies. Because their skills are so low, they are not finding permanent employment.

These are families who are working today. These are families who are going to a temp agency on, say, Dexter Street in Central Falls. They wake up at 5 o'clock in the morning, go there and sit hoping that somebody's going to call and say you're going

17.

·18

to go over to X-factory today.

15 '

.17

And this is the kind of employment opportunities we are providing some of those women. It's not giving them enough opportunity or enough training, period, to really provide a very solid base for them to move out of the system.

year bar, I don't know what's going to happen after five years because, if they don't gain enough skills in the next two years and again Sister Marlene made it very clear, if you're trying to learn another language, if you have very low literacy skills in your language, it's going to take longer for you to learn English or any language in the respect that you are going to come out with very strong skills in less than a year is very unrealistic. What was your question? I'm sorry.

MS. ZIMMERING: If you could change one thing about the $l\bar{a}w$, at this point, that

you think would make the most difference, what would it be?

1.7

MS. MARTINEZ: I think some of the things that need to change if we really wanted to have a very successful rate in five years where a lot of these people would be out of the system, I'm not saying permanently, forever, but at least for a very long period of time, is to expand the educational period. I think that's the key.

We're moving into the 21st century, into an economy that's no longer a manufacturing economy. It's an economy that requires more reading and writing and thinking skills. We cannot compare the immigrants of today with the immigrants at the beginning of the century.

I remember when my father came here. He was brought by a company to work in textiles. And as a textile worker, he could leave his company today and if he wanted to work two jobs, which he had for a long period

of time, all he had to do was walk up the street and say I work at such and such company on the first shift. Do you have anything on the second shift? Sure, you want to start now?

We don't see that anymore. This is not a manufacturing economy. Rather, these people are relying on temporary employment where you may be called in today and you may not have a job for the rest of the week. So I think that for this economy we need to provide these people with very strong skills.

MS. ZIMMERING: Any other questions from the panel? Anyone else? Okay. We'll move right along. Thank you very much.
Mr. Shuey?

MR. SHUEY: Thank you. I see a lot of colleagues: Olga and Dr. Lee in the audience, Susan Sweet from the State of Rhode Island, Linda Katz and a number of other people from various agencies, U.S. Catholic Conference, Ellen Steingold, Jewish Family

Services, a lot of folks that we work with and have worked with.

15.

Along with Patricia Martinez, I have been concerned as an advocate in the community about the impact of welfare reform and the Personal Responsibility Act, particularly for folks who haven't been here long enough to have been deemed eligible for Social Security benefits.

So the elderly was a real concern for Patricia and Linda and others who have worked extremely hard to do a couple of things. One was to get our concerns in front of particularly, the Senate of Rhode Island.

And I think Bernie Beadreau back there,

Executive Director of the Rhode Island

Community Food Bank, a lot of work was done to get the local immigration centers where folks were hungry and etc.

I think the state has come through in a way that temporarily has kept the wolf from the door. I'm a great cynic on the

subject of law. I don't really believe laws are very -- you know, it's a crude tool, I think. And I also feel, just because I'm aware from being involved in human service work for a long time, that people are people. I think poor people are poor people whether they were born here or not.

9.

1.5

These distinctions in my mind aren't very useful in the real world.

Nonetheless, the law that was passed -- in a sense the people who were not yet U.S. citizens were treated somehow differently.

That's not a very useful thing to do and that's sort of something that I think is part of where I'm coming from on this.

We, like Patricia and Joseph Lee
and like others here who are involved with
the immigrant community, we have been
involved in the immigrant community since
1921. In fact, we've been involved in
helping different groups of immigrants
assimilate, be it English instruction,

immigration law assistance. We have people who are on our staff who are attorneys or paralegals who represent people who are claiming, say, political asylum. I think it is really a response to a particular need in the community of people's inability to afford some high-powered legal assistance on immigration matters.

The second thing we do at the International Institute is to teach a lot of English. Immigrants of whatever economic background, and I must say the majority of people coming in our doors are working; in fact, their views on the subject of welfare are interestingly often right at center. In fact, I think, my interpretation of the welfare law is that most Americans really thought it was a good idea to hold people on welfare's feet in the fire.

I'm not sure how I feel about it.

I think I was talking to an attorney this
morning who is a Harvard graduate, works at

1.0

17 .

one of the top legal firms in the state here. I said to him, "How do you feel about welfare reform?" And he said, "Well, there's a lot of abuse in the Dominican community. There's a lot of abuse in the Hispanic community."

And I said, "More than in the 'mainstream' community?"

The truth is there is abuse of the welfare system and we in advocacy don't talk about that because it's not really a priority for us and we don't think it's widespread. But I think it's what's fueling certain political decisions Clinton made. I think what's interesting about this is, when you have the exploitation of the system by certain folks, the "undeserving poor" combined with this disenfranchisement of people who are not citizens, you say they are not people who have been keeping their noses clean and working hard. In fact, you disenfranchise them and others. It really does create some cynicism.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

. 9 .

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

When this lawyer and I were talking he said, "People are cynical in the immigrant community about the system." I think that's something that we shouldn't underestimate when we talk about law changes because many of these changes have some element of realty that fuels them, but, in fact, the effect ultimately create more cynicism and then creates more hardship in the community.

I question a lot of the rhetoric of
the welfare reform and I think its borne out
by the people who have come into our
operation every day to learn English. I tend
to pretty much agree with what Linda Katz,
I'm sure, said. So even though I wasn't here
when she was talking, I'm sure that
everything she said was accurate.

I think that's true of a lot of people who are here. So my concerns are with the common sense problem with green card holders from citizens doesn't make any sense to me. The elderly, people who are really

beyond working age, what happens to them in the Southeast Asian community, refugees, and the Latino community is of concern also. And lastly, I think we need to be concerned about the cynicism that certain laws and the reactions by people in the community to launch interest.

wanted to say. You know, and many of the concerns that Patricia articulated, education and training programs. Most of the female Latinos who are engaged in the programs have been on public assistance for some time, are very concerned about going to work because they have very little experience with jobs where English is, in fact, a requirement. You know, I think the more time they can spend learning English to say nothing of the cultural norms of the work place -- you know, nobody wants to hear that your kid is sick. Nobody wants to hear about that in the work place, particularly with these low-status,

low-paying jobs. And I think people sometimes who have been on public assistance where, you know, social workers are, you know, bleeding heart liberals, they don't always find that in the work place. I think these are the realities that many of us take for granted and I think the immigrant refugee, foreign born community, really, in my judgment, have the same obstacles as native born poor people with the cultural overlay. That's the end of my monologue here.

MS. ZIMMERING: How long do you think, in your experience, does it take for someone to become reasonably literate in English, that is, read, write, and speak English?

MR. SHUEY: That's a good question,
Ms. Zimmering. I am not sure there's an easy
answer. Needless to say, what we found in
terms of achievement and, you know, sort of
ducks taking to water, if you're, in fact,

already literate in several languages, you move through pretty rapidly and you can move into the mainstream.

I think for folks who really have had little time in the classroom it can take years, it can take their whole lifetime. I think, in fact, beyond a certain age it's probably not a highly -- you know, there is a sort of classic conflict between economic needs of our economy and the citizenship issue and the issue of participation in the culture.

In many ways there are two worlds, the business world at work and there's the world of education. I think a short answer is the function of the person's educational background and probably class background to some extent. Some of the most intelligent and most incredible people are in fact illiterate and we need to understand that if we're talking about a pluralistic society that people with low skills can be extraordinary

9.

contributors to our culture and our economy.

17 .

But the literacy issue, given that it's so much more important than it was, say, when Patricia's dad was in his prime -- maybe he's still in his prime, I don't know; my dad thinks he is -- I think to some extent, obviously, without the literacy skills you really are hampered. And I don't mean to say that we think they are going to compete for high tech jobs against college graduates. That's just not going to happen.

MS. ZIMMERING: Are there any other questions from the panel?

MR. MOEUY: I think learning and speaking English depends on the educational backgrounds of those people from Southeast Asia. Most of them come here without education. They can't read or write, so it takes them a long time. They aren't going to learn English fast, but they are holding down jobs and are productive.

MR. SHUEY: Sure. I mean, you're

right. It's a lifetime thing. And I think many people are very productive, working two jobs and in jobs where they aren't required to speak perfect English and they can do quite well, thank you. And I think that's something to be remembered that, in fact, the bulk of the immigrants are in fact surviving quite well and I think we need to remember that.

And I think, certainly, what I find at the Institute is, when I'm talking to my students, I've been teaching a class this year for the first time in quite a while and issues like welfare are very controversial to people who work in factories for a living, and I think people underestimate the complexity here of this that, in fact, there's a lot of sympathy among Americans of all classes towards welfare reform. That's why Clinton was able to get away with it.

And I think for us in the community is how do we -- I don't think this is going

9.

1.5

.17

to be revoked or rescinded. So the question is how do you sort of work with it in a way that helps more people than it hurts. I think that's really a challenge for us and I think if you're for people then it helps. I think that what you're saying is that many Cambodians have done very well and they probably will never read the New York Times or the Providence Journal. Maybe that fact -- does that matter to most of them?

And you have to remember, what about their kids? I think the issue is the children, your children, to what extent are they going to be able to get mainstreamed and to really compete with mainstream people and I think that's the question. I think that is a reality the immigrant experiences. They make an enormous sacrifice coming here, refugee or immigrant, and refugees, of course, are not here by choice. They are here because otherwise they'd be dead.

And I think the Cambodian community

1.6

has adjusted so well and that the fact it doesn't have more problems is sort of extraordinary. It has nothing to do with laws.

Then, again, my skepticism about

the legal impact of law is a function -- I'm

a non-lawyer, I have to say, and I'm sure

there are plenty of lawyers who feel

otherwise, but I think it's important to keep

in mind the whole spectrum of the community

here.

MR. KLAMKIN: You talked about the,

I think you called it, "common sense problem"

of separating out people. I mean, where do

you think this takes us in the future? I

mean, does this establish a separate class of

citizens, a new second class or third class?

MR. SHUEY: Well, technically you have to have your green card and it can be taken away at any time. That's never happened, but I think when we go out in the community and we're working with Progresso

Latino and with Genesis School and with several other groups to promote citizenship, some of the funding is actually coming from the state, and I think part of why the Governor found the money for this was just this question of people who are not citizens and we need to promote it so that they won't lose benefits, which has been a screwed up motive from my point of view.

But, I think, it did sort of put people's feet to the fire on this. But, I think, you know, maybe people are already second class citizens because they are not citizens but that they don't know it or may not even be aware of it because nobody has ever tried to take their green card away.

But in a way this is like, you thought you were here under same footing as everybody else. You work hard, you save your money, you buy a house. It's an interesting question and I'm not sure I know the answer to that, but I think the second class

citizenship thing is a very interesting phrase because there are plenty of second class citizens who have U.S. passports, you know, but I think to the extent there is a relationship between, you know -- it is a green card issued by the immigration service and it can be taken away at any time and that's a fact.

But the fact that it's never
happened -- but now people say wow, this is a
possibility, in a sense and the benefit piece
is part of what I think has pulled the rug
out from people. In terms of a nightmare
scenario, it's certainly something to
consider.

MS. SOUM: My name is Molly Soum and I'm from the Department of Human Services. I just want to add to the mental aspect of this. All of the Cambodians have been mentally abused by Pol Pot. It's very hard for them to learn a second language.

(The following written

9.

statement by Molly Soum was 1 entered into the record: "I 2 have a couple of concerns 3 about the senior Cambodian. 4 First of all, we were abused 5 mentally, physically and 6 emotionally by Pol Pot. Many 7 of us were affected by this 8 Act. Pol Pot has tortured and manipulated so bad that we 10 11 have lost our sense of memory and families. I have been 12 teaching (volunteer) the 13 Cambodian community for almost 14 15 a year. It's very hard to see and hear from my students that 16 17 . keep saying that they will 18 never remember the questions and answers on the tests 19 because they have no memories 20 21 besides having Pol Pot on 22 their minds all the time.")

MR. SHUEY: One of the things about citizenship, if I may, I think elderly people -- we were talking to Senator Reed and one of our practitioners said that, you know, elderly people in particular when we talk about Pol Pot here and these elderly people maybe didn't see their families starve to death and suffer some in this extraordinary way that the Cambodians have.

Any older, elderly person has a heck of a time with English and if you have that as a requirement for citizenship, it makes things harder. And then there's the content -- these folks are never going to become citizens unless some sort of -- you know, at a certain age you need to have some requirements waived and as the director of our program mentioned that is something Senators should be aware of.

And I think it's true that the Cambodians are a special case. No one, I think, when we are talking about a particular

population, it's easy to generalize, but in 1 fact each group is quite different. 2 Cambodians are not citizens, they are 3 refugees, and why they have ended here is a 5 complicated matter, but, I think they have. And, certainly, as the DHS worker here said, 6 this is not a group to whom generalizations 7 8 apply. MS. ZIMMERING: Could I ask you to hold your questions? We'll take questions 10 11 from the group after then panel's finished 12 and questions now from the members. I hate 13 to ask you to do that. MR. KLAMKIN: Is there not a 14 . 15 distinction in the law between refugees or political asylum and immigration? 16 MR. SHUEY: Yes, certainly there 17 18 is. Is that observed? 19 MR. KLAMKIN: MR. SHUEY: Well, I think there's 20 21 some concern about this with respect to this

Personal Responsibility Act and, in fact,

refugees who have not been here the required 1 amount of time, would they be part of the SSI 2 cuts? And the word in the community was that 3 they would possibly lose their benefits, so it was a real concern. And if these refugees 5 have not become citizens because of the 6 language or whatever, then, technically, for 7 benefits and noncitizens don't get SSI 8 benefits, I mean you have a problem. Cambodians would definitely be affected by 10 11 this. 12 MR. SERPA: Just to follow up with Is that provision at the end of seven 13 14. years from the time they entered that their benefits would expire, the refugees? 15 MR. SHUEY: That's really a huge 16 17 issue. I think it's really an issue with the 18 elderly.

MR. LEE: Thank you. Good afternoon. To the lady and gentleman from

MS. ZIMMERING: Joseph Lee, please?

Washington, D.C., I say welcome to Rhode

19

20

21

Island. My name is Joseph Lee, and I'm with the Socio-economic Center for Southeast Asians. Our agency is a coalition of the poor coming from Southeast Asia. The agency was formed in 1987. We are much ahead of the system for the benefit of our people. I can speak four different languages, and, as you know, Cambodian people speak completely different languages, but we are working for a common language and that is English.

We have many different programs from gang prevention to drug prevention, to services for the elderly, Progresso Latino, and the Genesis Center. We serve the elderly. We have tobacco control projects and we serve mothers with children from six to thirteen years old. We work with mothers who have children from birth to three years old. We have substance abuse prevention. We provided services to victims of domestic violence.

I'm here to today to talk about the

impact of the Personal Responsibility and the Work Opportunity and Reconciliation Act. In my opinion, the immigrants' benefits should not have been cut from the outset because they are here legally. They work, they pay taxes and they should be entitled to receive help when they need it.

Fortunately, I would like to thank our lawmakers, I mean the Senate and the House in Washington D.C. for restoring some of those benefits. I would also like to thank our state legislators from the government to pick up the food stamps for the people who lost their benefits. Without their benefits I believe that we are impaired because many people rely on the help and assistance, especially the elderly.

We came here as refugees as Bill just said. We had no choice. We had to run away from communism after the war in Vietnam. The refugees who came here, there are many soldiers who fought together with the

9.

1.5

American soldiers. With them according to what I talked to them about, they have a feeling they have been abandoned a second time. The first time after the war in Vietnam. We should have won that war, but for some reason the American troops run away, left them alone.

7

2

3

4

5

6

7

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

They could not live with the communists, they had to run away. And now say, you know, you're an immigrant you are not citizen, cut you off. They have a feeling as people who were ex-soldiers how they were abandoned again. The second time that they got that feeling. The other thing I talk to Mr. Silver is how can I find something that would impact after they receive food stamps and the food program benefits are restored? There are some people who were denied because of SSI disability and are denied because they say their health improved, that is questionable to me.

Now another problem was that the

people who have been working and for some reason they've been laid off. After employment benefits runs out, they cannot find a job and no help. So there's a problem right there. To us we said they are people who are too old to find jobs but too young to receive SSI.

So if we have the chance we have to think about how to help these people at least with medical assistance which they work and they pay taxes, now they have been laid off and after their benefits run out, they cannot find jobs because for many English is one of the reasons. And as opinions have been expressed, it takes a lifetime for people to learn English.

Now we can come from another country and the level of adjustments to the new society are different. Some people can adjust in a few years, other people may take ten years, other people may take ten years. But we say it only takes five years

9.

·17

and during these five years they are under the pressure of looking for jobs. They have no free time to learn English.

In our agency we only offer vocational English as a Second Language in Woonsocket. We teach our people English and we make sure that their English is fair enough for them so they are not going to be laid off. I remember when I first came here in 1931, luckily I spoke English. that time they are trying to train our refugees for a short time to learn English, three months to six months. I opposed that. If you train people for three months before they go to a job, they come to back to welfare again and especially if they do not . have medical benefits, they are not going to Not because they don't want to work, work. they are very hard working people, but they are scared of losing their health benefits.

Now, you have to work a full-time job, learn English, go home and take care of

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

19

20

21

children. Now, when they came here there is no hope for the first generation. Their hope is for the second generation, that the second generation would grow up with adequate level of English skills so they become good citizens.

Also, another problem is when we're talking about this kind of immigrant we say when the time comes you become a permanent resident and maybe become a U.S. citizen.

Especially when the law passed in August 22, 1996, a lot of movement happened in this country, especially in reference to radio talk shows and in my opinion in northern Rhode Island, the talk shows in northern Rhode Island.

I would suggest that the Commission should set up a special committee to monitor the radio talk shows because they can be very hateful. You have to have a monitor for maybe six months to a year, you will hear what they are saying that immigrants, they

came here to receive welfare. They try to come here to receive benefits. We don't need them, that kind of talk. Especially in my position, I point to the north of Rhode Island. I ask that you please monitor those talk shows.

Also, learning English to our people, Cambodian, is very difficult, especially for the Cambodian. They have their own script and now in order for them to learn English they have to start from the beginning. It's very, very difficult and very, very hard. Now, in our people you will find that we have what's called a post-traumatic syndrome from our country, but they are here now. So it distracts them from learning English.

So what I'm saying is I suggest you should form a special committee to monitor the radio talk shows that can really affect public opinion with regards to immigrants and refugees. The immigrants from Southeast Asia

are now no longer refugees become but considered immigrants. It is very hard for us to become U.S. citizens. It's not that they don't want to. They want to, but the process takes too long.

Lately, I talked to Mr. Silva and we talk about the number of immigrants who came here after August 22, 1996. What is the number? I don't know because they are sponsored by their relatives and they don't usually come to us but we know of some. The most difficulty we have with benefits is the medical assistance. They don't care about food stamps, they can take of the food, but they worry about medical assistance. We should help especially at least with medical assistance. That's what we're asking for.

Last Friday I had a staff meeting and one of my staff told me there was an old woman, Cambodian, that had to go back to Cambodia after living here for almost a year because her children could not be able to

Я

9.

support her. The mother did not want to see the children have a hard time, so rather than break their hearts decided to move back to Cambodia. I would like to answer any questions from the Committee.

MS. MOY: Thank you, Mr. Lee.

Concerning your disparaging remarks on the radio shows, have you approached the station managers either as an organization or support group?

MR. LEE: I think we want to attack the problem tactfully. We don't want to be aggressive. We don't want to stir up problems. We don't want to make it worse than it is and stir up more hate.

MS. MARTINEZ: I think one of the things that we did do last year, I think some of the members of the coalition were invited to be on some of these talk shows; however, it was only like one or two personal presentations versus 365 days a year where you hear these attacks.

17 .

If I could just add something that maybe relates to your question. Committee seems like a very impressive Committee to me and my understanding is you're all from Rhode Island, correct, except for the two Washington staff members? think one of the things that could change is if you as members of this Advisory Commission could join forces with us and with some of 9. the people in terms of educating the general population in terms of -- for instance the role that you play and how this in a way is a violation of their civil rights. And just in your daily travels, to talk to your colleagues and some of the people that you deal with on a daily basis and bring them to réalize that the immigrant community is not getting off the plane or off the boat and is not going to the welfare office the following day and applying for benefits.

myths has really brought all the

And, unfortunately, it's a set of

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

anti-immigrant sentiment that we see across the nation and we're seeing it here in Rhode Island as well.

MS. ZIMMERING: My understand is, to answer your questions, and I would like some feedback from the Washington people in particularly, that we can speak as individuals or members of other groups, but we are really not allowed to speak for the U.S. Commission; is that correct Fernando?

MR. SERPA: That's correct. You can lobby and advocate as a private citizen.

As a Committee itself you can represent the Committee in your official capacity and meet with other groups.

MR. LEE: One more thing I would like to add. We don't come to here to receive benefits. Our people work hard. They go to find jobs everywhere, even for \$5, they don't care. They go to work up to the point where other people could not find jobs and they go back to the \$5 jobs and say they

1.6

took all the jobs from us.

MR. KLAMKIN: I have a question with regards to a general rising of anti-immigrant sentiment and if we're seeing them manifested in violence against an immigrant in Rhode Island, by say, assaults or violence against immigrants?

MS. MARTINEZ: My first reaction is not physical violence, but I can tell you that, as least as an agency, Progresso Latino paid dearly when we were working during the rallies that we had the last year because we were very involved. Every single morning we were coming into our agency and finding all kinds of messages in our voice mail, "You Spics, you come into this country and you are the problem with this country. It's you guys and people like your agency that's the problem."

All kinds of vulgar language. "Get out of this country," and "You are the ones that's creating the problems." So physical,

no, but in terms of that kind of hatred we as an agency has seen it. The kids are seeing it in their schools. Perhaps some of the people that work with kids could testify to the fact that we have seen kids whose parents had last year testified whether it was at a hearing and their name may happen to be in the paper the following day and they say, "Mom, why did you do that. I don't want my friends to know that we are on welfare." So these kinds of things we have seen.

MR. SHUEY: I mean, to me talk radio is like, you have time for this stuff. I mean, give me a break here. It's really not something that's acceptable unless people think they are not going to be affected by it. In terms of the law, what else can you do about it. This is a country where you can say anything. Even if your opinion is worth nothing, you can still say it. That's both the beauty and the horror of America. I'd like to compare it with Radio Rwanda where

they are not just talking about how evil they are, but, like when to go get them and organizing the neighborhood to go kill them.

That's the kind of thing that we are blessedly free of in this country or hate radio.

But anybody with an ounce of sophistication takes that literally.

Obviously, you're brown or yellow, you know, or black, then you learn to develop strategies to deal with this stuff. In fact at the Institute I must say one of the most useful things we try to do in our English classes is to help people develop strategies for this stuff because racism is very much part of our culture. I mean it's a crosscultural experience. You're probably going to experience more racism here than you did in, say, Cambodia.

Although one could question -- it raises some sort of universal thing, any culture, there's some kind of racist

9.

1.5 .

behavior. It may not be precisely skin color, it's other stuff. And I think, in fact, somehow it's human hate. I hate to say that because one does have to resist it in public forums, but I think in private law there's some pretty strong stuff here.

1.8

This is a tough issue and I think racism is really a big fundamental issue in all human -- I mean, the other thing I just wanted say, the biggest three things when you talk to people in our classes, people come over here with racist views. These are the kinds of things that are kind of universal among people in our English classes. I don't think you can sort of -- I don't want to argue that immigrants are holier than the rest of us. I doubt that's true, but certainly they should be treated no differently.

That's, I think, what we are talking about here is why when you talk about poor people do you separate out immigrants.

That's the common sense problem I have. You know, I just don't get that.

. 9.

MR. LEE: When you hear how they talk about the people, you immediately feel a hate with the people they mention. When our people go to apply for a job, the best jobs are probably not available, but they call them dead beats and there is nothing that you can do. In my work I put myself into the people who live here hundred years. In reality, I have hate for these people right there. So my presentation today is not to talk about racism or hatred, but my presentation to you is to present how hard

our people has to work to become a U.S. citizen because, in order to be recognized, we came here originally as refugees, and as time passes the process takes a long time.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It's not easy. Don't try to say the program is successful by placing pressure on the people. Now the impact, yes, without assistance our people have a very, very difficult time in this country and with this culture. And they, at the same time, raise their children with the hope that the second generation will be very important members of this society.

But all of this MR. KLAMKIN: doesn't help. All of this makes it more . difficult --

MR. LEE: Difficult for us, also, but we need help and we lose that help. is difficult and the difficult process of becoming a citizen is not recognized and is not easy because of obstacles.

> MS. ZIMMERING: Are there anymore

questions?

MR. KLAMKIN: I want to go back to
Ms. Martinez. One of the things we heard
from the earlier panels was talk about what
would be required to reimburse the government
for their medical assistance or other forms
of assistance. I thought in one of the
earlier panels somebody mentioned that this
was changed in some way or that this had been
reversed in some way. Is that not the case
or do you know?

MS. MARTINEZ: I'm not sure. I stepped out for a minute, so maybe it was at that point when you heard somebody refer to it. The cases that we have seen in our office is people who have petitioned, as I mentioned, for relatives a long time ago and have waited all these years and finally because that person may have applied at some point for any type of services are now -- in order for that relative to be given a visa abroad, they are asking that the person makes

some kind of arrangement with the agency in the state where they are residing before the relative is given a visa abroad.

What I think I heard Ms. Bath say was that she has seen cases where when the person is coming, meaning at the port of entry in Miami or New York or whatever. We haven't seen those cases. The ones that we have seen are the ones as the person goes to the embassy abroad. That's when they are asking that. They would not be getting a visa until they have some type of proof that the relative who has petitioned for them has paid the state.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you see that as a significant bar to immigration?

MS. MARTINEZ: I do. As I said, one of the concerns that I have because people are hearing some of those issues, the ones that are here, some of the elderly that may be eligible for something or even the children who are eligible for RIte Care or

9 .

1.0

even child cares services, even though child services are a state service, those families don't even want to go near the welfare department because unfortunately you apply for these benefits at the welfare department and they are just afraid that if they utilize any of the services that at some point in the future they may be denied.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you very much for coming. You were very helpful. Do we have Ms. Carrera, Ms. Steingold,
Mr. Beadreau? Well, then we'll go back. Is
Ms. Schmidt here yet? Maybe if we just wait a moment. Could we start with you?

MR. BEADREAU: I'm Bernie Beadreau and I am the Executive Director of the Rhode Island Community Food Bank and have been Executive Director for about two and a half years. I have a few comments about the impact of the Personal Responsibility Act on legal immigrants in Rhode Island.

About a year ago when the

9.

15 .

Governor's budget came out it had some money in the budget for ESL and citizenship classes and also money in the budget for food assistance, about \$250,000 for food assistance for legal immigrants. We joined with different groups to eliminate childhood poverty and to basically start a campaign to get a message to the Governor and the state legislature that that would certainly not be enough money to take of the human need that we were going to be seeing and had already begun to see in our food pantries and soup kitchens, 150 of which are members of the Rhode Island Community Food Banks stretching from Woonsocket to Westerly to New Bedford and beyond New Bedford into Southeastern Massachusetts.

We over the course of about six weeks generated about 3200 signatures, petitions to the state legislature, that was coincident with the Senate Finance Committee passing a bill to reinstate a food stamp bill

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 .

.18

19

20

21

that would be would be a state food stamp funded bill, probably only the second or third state in the country to do so. We lobbied very hard. We pushed and we were especially successful. The House of Representatives passed the bill, it was in the budget, and Rhode Island became one of the few states in the country to have a state funded food stamp bill. Not only did we fund that, but the Department of Human Services food stamp program again, thankfully, implemented that program in record time.

So while other states in the country had a noticeable impact instead of the many immigrants coming to food pantries, really running out of the food, here in Rhode Island we had minimized that because of the campaign we launched and because of the fast action of the state food stamp program to implement that program. Depending on what the President does or is successful with his budget or not, he will have commit that

. 9.

program again, at some level, anyway.

So our recommendations to this

Committee are going to be probably to keep
the food stamp program going for legal
immigrants. What the food bank had done, in
addition to that, was to gear up an emergency
food distribution program starting in
September. We purchased over two hundred
fifty thousand dollars worth of food at
wholesale prices and through about eight key
food pantries and organizations that were
located in high impact areas where there are
a lot of legal immigrants and we distributed
food.

What we found was that our food pantry system was ill-equipped to take on a huge influx of people who was limited in English-speaking ability. People who were foreign to the whole food charity system which in and of itself was a process. People had to register, they had to wait in line, and they'd get handed a bag of food, quite

different than going to the supermarket to buy your own food.

People that our food pantry system now reaches number about 75,000 people in the region. Most of them have been in our food pantry system for over a year. It was difficult for them to get started, and every person I have ever talked to who has been part of a food pantry program said it was a long process of swallowing their pride, being less concerned about their own dignity and being concerned about their children, and accepting the charity. And that's an aspect of the system that I would really like to change.

I don't think people should have to trade in their dignity in order to get a bag of food which I believe is a basic human right. So the new population of legal immigrants find that process just as difficult. What we found was that organizations that had a real presence of

14.

people of color running the organization were far more successful in reaching out to the legal immigrants.

The Cape Verdian American Community
Organization in Pawtucket is the classic
example. By November they had been serving
516 households a month, not only Cape
Verdians, but they had reached out to all
Blackstone Valley. They put ads in the
newspaper and there was a real difference
between how they were able to reach out to
the immigrant community and how other food
pantries, typically staffed by volunteers who
are white, who were retired, who could not
deal with the language barriers, and that
alone was a huge problem.

A lot of people were not well served by some of our pantries because of the barriers that were inherent. One impact on us is that we could not really instantly get food to people. The point we made before we started that was it was far better to have a

food stamp program where people can buy food on their own time and making their own choices about what they are going to eat and choice of foods is a big issue, too.

Culturally, different foods we were ill equipped to handle. That was a big impact on the food bank. We worked with some of those problems. I don't recommend that food pantry systems and food banking is remotely close to an alternative to food stamps or income assistance, so I will continue to advocate for income assistance type programs.

But I would have to say that the impact of this law has been to put many more legal immigrants at risk of hunger and suffering from hunger. Right now there are more hungry legal immigrants in Rhode Island than there were a year ago. We know this because people are denying themselves the access to the food that we have waiting in the food pantry. They are afraid of the

9.

process, and, if you think about it, if you'd been put out there as the problem in our society, that's what welfare reform did. It was like poor people are the reason why we have trouble in our country. And add to that people feeling that legal immigrants are doubly reasonable for our problems in society, they do feel threatened in situations where some parts of the community want to reach out and help them.

All of the familiar talk shows, the message coming from the Congress of the United States is saying no, you have to change; you're part of our problem. So it shouldn't be any surprise that we can't attract more legal immigrants to our food pantries. It's a difficult process.

So the Congress and the President's initiative here to kind of reform welfare has made many more people hungry in this country.

More children are hungry and this flies in the face of these issues, the limited issues,

17 .

and about the economy being low unemployment.

There's another America out there.

They are the long term unemployed. Those are the people Patricia Martinez's references have been in regards to manufacturing jobs.

Just here in Rhode Island there's been a loss of 36,000 manufacturing jobs in ten years.

That's a lot of income. That's a lot of jobs there that did not require higher skills.

Again, they've been replaced, most of them by service sector jobs requiring literacy and

So anyway, that's what I'd like to say about the impact of the law. It should absolutely be changed. And I think Congress should issue an apology to the legal immigrants of the United States.

MR. ZIMMERING: Thank you. Do you make a distinction when they come in that they have to indicate that they are legal immigrants?

MR. BEADREAU: No, our food

higher level skills.

pantries really have not been willing to do 1 that. Sometimes that information is offered, 2 but that would send some people right out the 3 door. 5 MR. KLAMKIN: Mr. Beadreau, how many pantries are there and how does that 6 7 work? We have 150 in Rhode MR. BEADREAU: 8 Island and southeastern Massachusetts. 9 There's a food bank located in West Warwick. 10 11 These food pantries come to West Warwick, 12 they load up their cars and vans once a week

they load up their cars and vans once a week with food, and they go off. Last year we distributed 4 million pounds of food. That was a 43 percent increase other the year

before and a 66 percent increase over '95.

17 Our contact is increased hundreds.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you attribute that to these changes in the law?

MR. BEADREAU: No, that trend was in place before the changes in the law. So legal immigrants being pushed out the

13

14

15

1.6

18

19

2.0

21

assistance adds to that already what I call a severe trend, really, people that are deepening in poverty that are not counted in the unemployment statistics or anywhere, for that matter. Half of the people that have left welfare in this country are still unemployed.

MR. SHOLES: The population we just heard of, and I just want to get a handle on this, what percentage would you say are legal immigrants and what percentage are citizens?

MR. BEADREAU: Well, we searched recent statistics that we have and they indicate that -- I have those numbers in my head -- it's 17 percent that we serve people with color, meaning African American, Latino, etc. What percentage of those folks, I really couldn't venture a guess. I think there are about twelve thousand in this state. Really, I can't guess. Cape Verdian Community Development, for example, had 516 families in November İmmigrants.

14.

MR. SHOLES: Do you make a 1 distinction between the legal immigrant and 2 the citizen when the person applies for food? 3 MR. BEADREAU: Not at all. The 4 5 only requirement that people indicate that they are in need of food and they will get 6 food. We ask them to prove their residence, that they have address, that kind of thing. 8 MR. SHOLES: What type of funding 9 do you get from the state and the federal 10 11 government? MR. BEADREAU: Our total budget is 12 about a million dollars. We get routinely 13 about \$37,000 from the state and no federal 14 money. Last year we got an extra \$250,000 15 16 towards purchasing this food. Has anybody from the 17 MR. KLAMKIN: 18 federal government asked you to keep track of 19 the immigrant population that you service? 20 MR. BEADREAU: Yes. We worked it 21 out with the food stamp program and the

Department of Human Services to try to keep

track of that. I do have statistics back in the office where each of our pantries have estimated the number of people that are legal immigrants, and I didn't compile that for today.

When I compiled that in early

November, it was about 1200 people, 1200

households from the beginning of September

for two months, September and October, were

1200 households. And I know that the numbers

have increased since then.

MR. SHOLES: What would you say would be the average stay for a family in the food pantry program?

MR. BEADREAU: Sixty-nine percent of the people that get food from the pantry system right now have been doing that for more than a year. That really speaks of the longtime problem of poverty that's really meant to be short term help for people.

MR. SHOLES: Mrs. Zimmering asked a question earlier in the presentation as to

9.

what recommendation would you make to change 1 one thing in this program, I mean, in these 2 new Acts that would make life better for the 3 population that you serve? What would you 4 5 do? MR. BEADREAU: I would refund and 6 put the money back in for the food stamp 7 program and make no distinction between legal 8 immigrants and citizens. I would put a 9 package together that would put a lot of 10 money into job retraining and education so 11 that it's not welfare to work, but it's 12 welfare to training to work. 13 Thank you. 14 MR. SHOLES: MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you very-15 much. 16 17 MR. KLAMKIN: I just want to understand. Your funding, at least on a 18 state level, is not connected in any way to 19 20 food stamp funding?

MR. BEADREAU: No, it isn't, not at

Most of our money comes from direct

21

mail solicitations and foundation grants. 1 2 have about 18,000 donors now, people who give us \$25 or \$50 a year. 3 MR. KLAMKIN: But, as far as state 4 or federal funding, it's not in the food 5 6 stamps --7 MR. BEADREAU: No, it isn't. 8 MR. KLAMKIN: You're not charging people for the food? . 9 10 MR. BEADREAU: No, people are not 11 charged or required to pay for the food they 12 get. 13 MR. KLAMKIN: When you talk about 14 making changes to the food stamps program, 15 just so I have an understanding of this, the 16 funding for food stamps is contingent on an 17 annual appropriation from the general 18 assembly? 19 MR. BEADREAU: I think Linda can 20 answer that better than I could. 21 MS. KATZ: There's statutory 22 authorizations from the food stamp program,

so the state would have to repeal the authorizations.

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. KLAMKIN: Thank you.

MR. BEADREAU: Thank you.

MS. CARRERA: Good afternoon. My name is Estella Carrera. I work at Proyecto Esperanza in Central Falls. We realize that people need assistance such as medical assistance including medication. We have many programs. We provide services to help immigrants receive rental assistance and medical services. We have a youth program in the afternoon dealing with youth substance abuse prevention and alcohol prevention program. We work closely with the immigration office to provide people with immigration services, especially with citizenship papers and we have classes in EST. I.

Have been working with Ms. Sweet from the Department of Human Services and I would like to say thank you to her. We have

been providing Rhode Island assistance for maybe 27 years. Maybe at this point you want listen to all the statistics, but I was thinking about what I would talk about this morning and maybe telling you about my own experience as an immigrant in this country.

After five months of being in Rhode Island, we had a fire in our apartment and we lost everything. I have two children and people say Department Human Service, they can help you. I went there with my two kids. At that time Jennifer was almost a year and my son was 14 months. At that time I was here only for a few months. Of course, they don't help me with anything. Nobody explained that to me and I still don't understand that even after 19 years.

Because Jennifer was born in this country they were able get me health assistance for Jennifer. Nobody spoke Hispanic at that office. But it's been 19

years and now we're seeing old people coming to my office and crying because you have to be an American citizen and you have to learn our language and she tried and she went to classes in the afternoon and she couldn't pass the test. She failed the test. She tried to again, but it's so hard for her.

That's why it's so hard for many people. The old folks, if you look at the old folks, not many people love old people. The old folks they are grumpy, they smell, they are sick, who wants the old folks? And many times I saw people in my office I said, "My God. If something doesn't change they will have a hard time." Now I am gray and realize the hardships of the elderly population.

Education is the key. It's different now than it was 20 years ago. Many factories are closed. Now the people want computer skills, communication skills, and other new techniques. That's why I think

education is the key.

9.

15.

1.8

MS. NOGUERA: You say that you provide rental, utilities, and medical assistance to the community. Have you seen an increase in persons who are immigrants coming to you to receive these services?

MS. CARRERA: Yes, especially for medication. Many people go now for medication because you have to pay for the medication. Say you are 75, you get sick, and the little money you have, you have to pay the rent. You prefer to have a home, you don't want to be homeless anymore, and so they don't get the medication.

Rental assistance in Central Falls,
the area I am located, if you ask somebody,
there are now absentee landlords and they
increase the rents one hundred percent. Now,
apartments, of course, the people from
Washington say, "Oh, come on. That's cheap."
But it's different in Rhode Island. For an
apartment with only one bedroom you can pay

easily \$475, and I have to say that's a lot of money for them and the children. They go to bed without food because some of the people they have only that lunch, that school lunch program.

I am talking about people who work for the minimum wage. They bring home \$190 a week. You have two or three children.

There's no way you can survive in this world now and they are too proud to go and ask for that kind of assistance.

MR. KLAMKIN: Mr. Beadreau, who preceded you, talked about the stigma in going and revealing themselves to food pantries. How do you cope with that?

MS. CARRERA: Food, and especially in the United States and I myself think, "Oh, my God. That's important, everybody must have food." To come to an agency for a bag of food as opposed to being able to go to the market and buy what you want as with the food stamp program, it's a small community

1.1

1.4

17 .

.18

1 environment and everybody knows everybody and everything. And, like you said, it's a 2 stigma. They have to go to a food bank and 3 4 get their food. It's not easy. MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you. I think 5 we'll take a lunch break now, but I would 6 7 like to tell you that later this afternoon we 8 expect representatives from both state and federal offices here. So, if you would like 9.

to stay or come back and hear what they have

to say in regards to alleviating some of
these problems, we would be delighted to have

you. We will break now and come back at 2

14 o'clock.

15 (Whereupon, at 12:50 p.m., a luncheon recess was taken.)

17

18

19

20

21

AFTERNOON SESSION

2 (2:00 p.m.)

MR. LEE: I'd to welcome to you all back to the afternoon session of the Rhode
Island Committee to the U.S. Commission on
Civil Rights concentration on impact of the
Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity
Reconciliation Act of 1996 on legal
immigrants in Rhode Island.

This morning we heard from a panel of service provider and immigrant rights advocates and community organizations, and this afternoon we'll be hearing statements from federal and state agency representatives. In this coming panel and in our final panel will be statements from Rhode Island State and Congressional delegations.

We are asking each of our presenters to speak for seven, eight or ten minutes. We will have questions from the Committee. After the whole panel makes their presentation there will be a period for

1.1

public questions and comments. Also I would ask if any of you have prepared statements or other written materials that you you'd like to share with the Committee to please give them to either Fernando Serpa or to that gentleman sitting in the back. I would like to turn the panel over to Mr. Hilton who is the moderator.

MR. HILTON: Thank you,

Mr. Chairman. The first speaker is Susan

Sweet. And is Dr. Simon here? And Barbara

Raynor?

MS. SWEET: I'd like to begin by really setting forth the kinds of programs in Rhode Island and federally that have modified the original Personal Responsibility Act which I often refer to as ----.

Welfare reform, because as we heard this morning there are some people that would question whether in fact that that was truly welfare reform. First of all, the state had options that it had to select, first of all,

14.

whether or not they would have legal immigrants eligible for medical assistance and temporary assistance to needy families.

Also, Rhode Island had special conditions in that we already had a state welfare law called the Family Independence Act. Rhode

Island opted to take both of those options to cover legal and qualified immigrants for both medical assistance and for cash assistance to needy families.

The second thing that this state opted to do is to authorize and fund a food stamp program that was state funded; that is, you!d qualify for the same number or same amount of food benefits. The process and eligibility would be exactly the same, but, if you were no longer eligible because of the passage of the law you would then be eligible for the state food stamp program.

The third thing was cash assistance for elderly disabled persons who at that point would be taken off SSI. The State

9 .

15.

passed an authorization with funding for anyone who is elderly or disabled and who would be taken off of SSI. The standard would be \$200 a month for anyone living in the community and \$40 a month for someone who was institutionalized.

It turned out, because of federal legislation that passed, the Balanced Budget Act in 1997, that, in fact, those funds were not needed. What happened was the federal government had chosen to opt to retain pay for those people who were in the country and receiving SSI, so we haven't yet come to the point where the state money had to be used; however, I should point out that there's a gap in the safety net, if you will, in that those people who were not receiving still were not eligible. And so that's a gap in the services currently.

Also, the state passed a bill that medical assistance, regardless of not being able to participate in the federal funding,

9.

would be eligible if the person were in the country before 8/22/96 and in the state before 7/1/97. Also, noncitizens' children would be covered under RIte Start, which provides a comprehensive medical service for children and for pregnant women. Prenatal, delivery and post-partum services would also be covered for any lawfully admitted resident.

RIte Start was also made available if the child was in the country after 8/22/96, and in the state before 7/1/97. We also funded a citizenship initiative which funded 13 community agencies for citizenship classes which included ESL. And in fact, the speakers who were here this morning, most of them, I think all of them, did receive funds from the Department of Human Services to fund citizenship classes. That was in the amount \$389,000 last year. And also it provided of that \$389,000, \$59,000 to partially fund a new organization called The Citizenship

1.8

2.1

2.5

Collaborative, which is really part of a partnership receiving National Foundation funds as well as receiving money from the Department of Human Service.

And what happens, we hope, is to standardized and bring the level of citizenship classes up to a standard across the state so that even when moving from one state to another they would be able to continue to receive citizenship services at the same quality. In addition, Bernie Beadreau had pointed out that they did provide \$250,000 to the food bank for particular assistance, in addition to their outpatient services to the legal immigrant, which was less problematic after the passage of the state-funded food stamp program, which I should point out was up and running in September.

The legislature had passed the program in July and the state funded food stamp program was up and running in September

1.6

and really we stopped cutting people off food stamps and just kept them on as citizens in the state food stamp program, so it was less traumatic and less difficult for people.

want to point out that certainly the passage of ——— even ameliorated by the federal actions taken since then, which in a sense modified or appealed some of that. And very positive actions taken by the state still do not abrogate the fact that certainly there are numbers of immigrants who have been hurt and certainly that has created a different way of looking at citizens versus those legal immigrants who are not citizens and that continues to remain to be a problem. So with that I would be happy to take any questions or to address some of my colleagues.

MR. HILTON: What is one of the single most problems you feel you have with the Act and what would you suggest as a way to remedy it?

1.0

1.5

MS. SWEET: It's going to be very 1 hard for me to give you a single answer. 2 3 me say that there remains outstanding a number of issues. One is that as low-income 4 5 older people over 65 those who are immigrants 6 and not qualified under the very specific rules of ----. There is no provision as of 7 now to have those people on some sort of assistance for the aged. There is some provision for disabled, but I am particularly 10 concerned about the aged. 11

Also, there appears to be some attempt by the President's budget to address that, but at this point covering not only disabled but aged immigrants that are legal, the same as we are doing for citizens, I think would be a major remedy that needs to be done.

The five-year ban is also so complete in terms of not having people be eligible for benefits for five years regardless of their change in circumstance I

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

think needs to be modified to include circumstances. And then certainly the food stamp program which on the federal level I think needs to be changed so that once again legal, permanent residents and citizens have the protection and the same respect under the laws. Those, I think, are the most problematic things right now.

MR. HILTON: Any members have any questions?

MR. SHOLES: I'd like to ask you a few questions relating to the number of people in these population groups. You indicated that one of the problems is the low income immigrant group that turned 65 that won't be entitled to financial assistance from the government. Could you put a handle on that number?

MS. SWEET: I would be very happy to put a handle on that number and this is a number that's going to grow yearly. We were fortunate in that the federal government had

grandfathered to those persons who had been receiving benefits as 8/22/96. But what's going to happen is there is going to be a small number in Rhode Island, perhaps five or six hundred a year. That number is going to grow as more people become 65, are low income and can't receive Social Security.

At this point there is another small number, perhaps three percent of the current immigrants who are 65 and over who will no longer be eligible after 9/30/98 unless Congress changes that. So in terms of numbers, I would say it's probably less than a thousand this year, but it will continue to grow.

MR. SHOLES: These people are barred from collecting Social Security, supplemental Social Security, I think, under the Act even though they've been paying They are also barred from collecting Social Security benefits.

MS. SWEET: Most of these people

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 .

18

19

20

21

would be eligible if they have a sufficient work history, to collect Social Security benefits but not SSI.

9.

15.

MR. SHOLES: I just want clarification. So under the Act this really doesn't affect their Social Security benefits?

MS. SWEET: No, it doesn't.

MR. SHOLES: Then you indicated that you want to change the five-year ban.

If Congress doesn't change the five-year ban and eliminate it, what do you think would be the minimum number of years you put on that so this would eliminate this?

MS. SWEET: Rather than putting a different number on it I would rather allow for circumstances under which the five-year ban would not apply so there could be some flexibility. I think it's not realistic to say that in all cases it's five years or three years or two years. You could have a situation where a person could lose their

job, burned out of their home or through no fault of their own have a terrible illness, and I think there needs to be provisions for the human condition in any time period.

MR. SHOLES: My last question

pertains to the housing assistance. The Act

says that you shouldn't look to the

government to speed up the transition of the

legal immigrant from the assisted housing

program. So my question is what is the state

doing in that regard to help those

individuals?

MS. SWEET: First of all, I should say that I'm not aware of anything the state is doing to help out those individuals. And also I should point out that a legal immigrant, as well as the citizens of the U.S. born and naturalized, there's not a lot of options for housing.

subsidized housing and it has not traditionally at this point other than when

You have a certain amount of

1.6

it first began in the last 20 years, there has been situations where families could not easily go from subsidized housing to the free market because the expense is so great. And if they are working at not even minimum wage, but even double the minimum wage and have a family, it's very difficult for them to go from subsidized housing to somewhere you might have to pay four, five hundred dollars a month, etc. So I think we have a problem of affordable, decent housing across the board.

1.1.

MR. SHOLES: It's also a double whammy for those people who are collecting SSI because they are the ones who live in subsidized housing. Then, when they are removed from the SSI program, they also lose their subsidized housing.

MS. SWEET: If they have no income, there's no way that they could make that transition to the free market.

MR. KLAMKIN: Ms. Sweet, what

becomes of people who are turning 65 and are no longer eligible for benefits?

MS. SWEET: What happens to people who turn 65 or are disabled, are low income, and would have therefore qualified for SSI?

I don't think we know. It's very much like what happens to all of the people who left the welfare roll. You explain to some of them who have been able to achieve a certain level of economic independence and have jobs but that certainly doesn't account for all of the changes in the numbers.

Many people like you know live with families who have to take the additional burden of supporting them without any help whatsoever. Some of those people had been in the country, had worked, perhaps are ill and fulfill the level of disability required by SSI.

I mean, we can always point to the fact that the community has absorbed them in some way. We all also know a lot of older

people actually left this country and went back to their countries of origin even though in many cases they have no families left there to go back to.

MR. KLAMKIN: Are you prohibited

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

(202) 638-2400

from offering any services to these people? MS. SWEET: No, there are certain services that are available to folks regardless of their immigrant status. of those are provided by food banks, by nonprofit agencies that provide services and

perhaps goods and assistance, health centers.

The Department of Elderly Affairs has, for example, jobs for people over 55 and .helps them get subsidized employment. They have Rhode Island Family Assistance to the Elderly Program, which is open to everybody regardless of immigrant status or citizenship status. That pays 60 percent of the cost of the number of prescription drugs used to treat chronic illnesses. The senior centers and meal sites are open to everyone

regardless of immigrant status or citizenship status. And there a number of programs that are not limited to citizens.

The problem is no cash assistance in the form of either SSI, and then medical assistance is limited, especially for people who have recently come to this country and don't fit either the child or the pregnant woman profile.

MR. LEE: Am I correct in thinking that in an earlier period whether or not you were eligible for SSI you could get general public assistance?

MS. SWEET: There was a program many years ago called Aid to the Aged, Blind and Disabled. That program was essentially phased out when SSI came in. When SSI came in, it took over all of those people who were either aged, blind or disabled, totally state funded and really the SSI program is a combination of state and federal funds.

So what happen was the Aged, Blind

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17 ·

18

19

2.0

21

and Disabled program of Rhode Island went away. In the meantime, general public assistance, as we used to know it, which would help anyone who was low income and in need of that help, has been whittled down to a very temporary assistance under very rigid circumstances, so you really have no program to take up that slack.

The closest thing was the legislation that passed last year that would have kicked the people off SSI, but again I should point out that those people who were not currently receiving SSI but become aged in that they reached their 65th birthday and at this point have no recourse for any type of cash assistance.

MR. LEE: Is there any discussion of proposed legislation to remedy this?

MS. SWEET: My understanding is that within the last week, very recently, legislation has been introduced in the House and Senate in the State House and the State

9.

15 .

Senate that would provide for those people that are achieving their 65th birthday and would be eligible economically for SSI. I haven't seen it nor has the Department of Humans Services or DEA. I can't comment on that or take a position on that other than knowing that we recognize there is a gap in those services.

MS. ZIMMERING: I just have a brief question, Susan. Everyone here this morning has mentioned the elderly and the weaknesses in those provisions. I haven't heard anyone mention children. Are the children being pretty well taken care of at this point?

MS. SWEET: Well, the children are right now because of the mixture of state and federal changes and help. They are in a better position. I'm not saying that it's perfect. First of all, let me address the issue of documented persons. We never really talked about that very much.

Undocumented persons are not

1

2

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

1:6

17

18

19

20

21

7 eligible for much. They never really were. Basically, they are eligible for emergency 2 services, emergency medical services, really. 3 The children in this state, because RIte Care 4 and RIte Start are for legal immigrants, are 5 6 covered, as well as pregnant women are covered. We made that specific choice to go 7 further than the current state law and the 8 federal law allows. So, except for these . 9 10 cases, very new immigrants and undocumented 11 immigrants, it's not as pressing a problem at is this point. 12

MR. KLAMKIN: If I might put to you, Ms. Sweet, have you had any notable effect on your agency when you operate as a result of these laws taken place?

MS. SWEET: Well, first of all, I should tell you that it has made a complicated situation much more complicated. The state and federal, particularly federal, assistance laws, both medical assistance and it used to be AFDC, it is now Tanif, it is

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

21

elaborate to begin with.

1

2

3

5

6

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

I just want to point out that a suggestion, which was a good one, of training our Department of Human Service workers is actually ongoing and has been ongoing, but it is very complicated because everything has changed, there are many more exclusions, and many more -- for instance, a worker has to learn and understand the laws and it's very difficult because it changes every few months.

So I'm afraid it's made it much more difficult on the DHS worker and therefore much more complicated and problematic for the client who may walk in not knowing whether they qualify or if they should even walk in and ask if they qualify. So, as much training as we can give, it still won't be enough.

MR. KLAMKIN: You were here earlier so you heard some of the issues that came up such as tracking people who are denied or

told informally they should not perhaps even bother to apply. I mean, is that realistic to start to track that or more closely monitor that?

MS. SWEET: I think it's realistic to track the numbers of anyone who makes an application and how many are approved or denied.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you have any figures along those lines that you could provide the Committee?

MS. SWEET: I don't at this time,
but we could get those. This, again, which I
think has been mentioned, there maybe first
of all people who choose not to go because
they are not sure others that might go in and
the worker might say don't even bother
applying. You are not eligible.

That may or may not be correct, and, even if it is correct, it prevents us from tracking how many people applied and were not eligible. So you have this vast

2.1

number out there that either didn't apply or came and made inquiries but didn't make out paper work.

MR. KLAMKIN: What about translation services? Has that been a problem?

MS. SWEET: It's always a problem but it's less of a problem than it used to be a number of years ago. The department does have a number of people in the field and translators who speak Spanish, Southeast Asian languages, a number other languages. You are also going to get people that might walk in and have a language that they do not have on board a translator to translate. But we also have access to other agencies that will translate. It's not perfect but better than it used to be.

MR. KLAMKIN: Do you have or could you state what portion of your budget goes to administration or goes to provide services?

MS. SWEET: I'm not prepared to

17 ·

really give you those figures.

9.

.15

<u>i</u>9

MR. KLAMKIN: Is that a fair comparison, say, perhaps between states or, you know, trying to assess whether you're providing assistance at a good level?

MS. SWEET: Do you mean the ratio between administration and benefits? I know the ratio of that would be very small in terms of administration versus benefits.

There are certain caps except certain other programs don't have caps if they are a state funded one.

The majority of the budget of DHS goes to benefits. You also have to look at administration or personnel and field work and those interviewing folks and deciding whether they are eligible and putting them through the process. It depends on if you narrow that to administration being managers, or are we talking about personnel that are delivering these services.

MR. SERPA: Could you obtain for

us, unless you know offhand, a breakdown of your staff racially, how many Hispanic you have or --

MS. SWEET: I don't have that information.

MR. HILTON: Are there any other questions?

MS. NOGUERA: In your programs for elderly affairs and the elderly you have in the medication program and meal sites if any reference has been made to allow the persons any type of assistance to come in and if you have anybody there that speak languages other than English, if there has been any outreach for these people on medication that they receive the medication when their case load increases because of some of the cuts?

MS. SWEET: In terms of the Rhode
Island Pharmaceutical Assistance to the
Elderly Program, there has been outreach with
a number of community groups; for example,
Westminster Senior Center has been doing

21 .

outreach basically on the medication programs and we have a number of other folks doing that.

The Gray Panthers had a grant from the Department of Elderly Affairs to deal with a number of different ethnic groups through community groups. We have not been very successful in that regard. Also, your point about the meal sites, very few meal sites have people there who speak languages other than English, and that's something that definitely needs to be improved.

I would agree with you that in terms of elderly services there has been less progress in making sure that the services on a statewide basis are acceptable and accessible to immigrants and folks who don't speak or understand English very well.

That's an area that we're going to be concentrating on this year very strongly in order to bring that up to a level where people will feel welcome to use those

8.

io

1.5

.17

services.

15.

MR. HILTON: Are there any other questions? Dr. Simon.

DR. SIMON: Good afternoon. My name is Dr. Peter Simon and I am an Assistant Medical Director for the Division of Family Health of the Rhode Island Department of Health. Our function is really to develop assessment information and health policy and assure that the systems are in place that provide access to both preventative, curative, as well as rehabilitation services for the community.

In some ways we have resources that hopefully supplement the community based on the organization's ability to deliver these services and fill the gaps created by these overlapping and rapidly changing entitlements, federal as well as state. Many of our programs do not require legal status to be documented for participation; for instance, the immunization program that we

1 run.

They all pretty much ignore the infant or the family's legal status to participate in these programs. They are transparent if they are an immigrant with the health care industry. Most of what the department is here to do is to provide a surveillance system, the ability to diagnose at the community level when there are systems problems, and to answer the question of what the implications are going to be when reducing access to financial assistance through medical assistance, federal finance, Medicaid, Title 19, or the federal welfare program.

We see most of the impact falling upon families with young children. Questions about the impacts on child health and family health probably are of a concern for the Department of Health. One of the immediate effects that we are going to feel to many children who become eligible for some of our

entitlement programs like WIC or early intervention programs are going to be requiring more and more state funded components of their care plans since their entitlements to federal subsidies are lost through the legislation.

And in the case of early intervention, which deals with infants and toddlers authorized under our federal special education law idea, we will probably see an increasing number of services having to be financed by your state appropriations without the ability to leverage Medicaid federal participation or receive Medicaid financing through eligibility through SSI so that the programs that we have that we have we will probably see impacts on the children who are served by entitlement programs.

As I said before, the ones that the programs that we served all kids in Rhode

Island regardless of income, regardless of immigrant status, we probably will not see

1.4

17 ·

2.0

much of an impact because, again, those activities are essentially covered by state appropriations, state and federal appropriations, without the requirement for determination of legal status.

We are concerned that, if this issue of eligibility and access to services gets any more confusing, then the communities that are most recently arrived in Rhode Island are going to be confused and frustrated because of the difficulties in finding out accurate information. think the comments about training of our eligibility staff as well as an outreach effort that is culturally competent is probably going to be the most important approach that Rhode Island, both in our agency as well as all human services, is going to have as a challenge because people are easily confused.

Many surveillance systems that we have indicate that we have harder and harder

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

1.8

19

20

21

times facing families in communities like 1 2 Central Falls, Pawtucket, Providence, Woonsocket, where we know resettlement from 3 outside of Rhode Island is most concentrated. 5 We know we're having more and more difficulty engaging families with infants and young 6 7 children in our programs. We think, although 8 · we haven't completed it, we have just begun an assessment in Woonsocket for us to 10 understand where these gaps, myths, and 11 misinformation are coming from. But we are 12 seeing an increasing resistance to 13 participate in some of the public health 14 programs for women and families. Many people 15 have speculated that it's become very 1.6 confusing and families are not just sure what 17 will happen if they participate. And again I'd be glad to answer any questions. 18 19 MR. KLAMKIN: Are you under any 20 obligations to keeps reports or 21 documentations?

DR. SIMON: To my knowledge there

are no public health requirements through any of the programs that are funded in the Department of Health that require that. perception on the part of the community is often somewhat different than what the reality is. Our information suggests that there's a lot of myths and misinformation that's scaring these people about seeking assistance from even community based organizations that are clearly not government entities.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

21

22

(202) 638-2400

I recognize there are MR. KLAMKIN: cultural taboos associated with this, but is there much of a degree of taking advantage of the number of programs and services increasing or is that not a factor do you think?

DR. SIMON: Substance abuse treatment is probably the only service component that we would have information about access and I don't have any information about substance abuse treatment access within the resettlement communities in Rhode Island.

MR. KLAMKIN: There's no state support of mental health services for immigrants or --

DR. SIMON: There are special mental health services for immigrants funded by the Department of Mental Health Retardation and Hospitals and the Department of Children, Youth and Families. But mental health services coming from the state level may come through other than from the Department of Health.

We have substance abuse in our early intervention program which deals with behavior issues and self-help problems which are often mitigated by a family substance abuse. So there are some -- obviously, again, some concern that the loss of these entitlements is going to make it more difficult to serve a family of a child who is eligible for early intervention if there are mental issues that are again substance

1 programs that can't be served.

MR. HILTON: Are there any other questions?

MR. SERPA: We heard this morning about legislation in which immigrants or their family members are asked to pay back health care costs before they enter or re-enter the country. Is that under your agency or department?

MR. SIMON: I'm not sure I understand what actually is happening. Can you give me an example?

MR. SERPA: We heard that a woman coming into this country, an immigrant coming to this country, has a baby and has been given health care through Medicaid. Her husband goes back to his country and comes back and applies for visa to come back and he is told by embassy personnel that he can't come back until he pays the health care costs that are outstanding.

MR. SIMON: I am not aware of that.

MS. SWEET: DHS would be the one contacted. In fact, that did happen a few times. What happens is generally the person is to seeking to re-enter the country or enter the country who has a family member already here who has applied to sponsor them. The person either has been here or seeking to bring someone in has used benefits and is questioned about that, generally at the embassy, in order to issue a visa for that person to re-enter or for that person to come in.

We have been contacted a number of times by the person themselves, not the staff member of the embassy, not anyone from immigration, but by the person who was the recipient to say I have to pay this back or I can't get a visa. Three times we did make available the amount of money that that person had used in benefits. We don't ask for the money back. This is so they can get a visa for themselves or their family member.

1.8

However, this problem that's come up around the around the country and evidently in some states, their Department of Human Service are stationing people even at places to get that funding. They are still issuing guidelines on it and we are in the process of returning these funds to, I think, three cases. But I wanted to emphasize the size of the problem is not with any agency in 9 the state. The problem is that this person is told they must repay benefits in order to become eligible. And it doesn't happen every day, but it is happening from time to time.

> MR. KLAMKIN: Is there any sense of why or is there some inconsistency in the --∹-- law?

Overall, I think since MS. SWEET: the passage of the new immigration laws and ---- and the emphasis on people's immigrant status and public benefits, I think that there is more of a jealous feeling of safeguarding public benefits on the part of

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

io

7 1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

some people that are issuing visas. sure it's across the board.

MS. TANCREDI: Well, speaking about the issue of public charges, who is someone is not eligible to come into the country if they would be a public charge. And, as you know, many people probably live in the United States illegally and when they go back to get their immigrant visa they are questioned about if they had received any benefits.

It is not the State Department or the Immigration Service's responsibility to have someone repay back any money that they have received, but they do have to prove to us that they will not become a public charge. And I know this is an issue that, to be honest with you, I know there's new things on this but I haven't read all of it.

The issue with the Welfare Reform Act and the other immigration law that was passed recently, I should say that we're trying to make sure that people are

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

accountable for what they are going to do
when they file the affidavit of support
because there was no way to enforce that this
person would actually be responsible for them
if they receive some assistance.

Now there is a new form and new law in effect that will make the people who has filed the affidavit be responsible. So I think we've seen some overzealous people ask for them, but that's not within our jurisdiction, really, to make them pay back any kind of benefits they might have received.

MR. KLAMKIN: Just so I understand.

You said that the state has reimbursed people who made those payments?

MS. SWEET: We're in the process of doing that with those three cases. In fact, in one case they reimbursed the state and then, when they got back to the country, they put a stop order on that payment, so actually there was no transaction.

9 .

.17

In the other two cases, we are in
the process of paying those people back in
accordance with the new finance agency. New
guidelines are coming out. They are just
beginning to address this problem. And we
are in the middle of it, and now we're trying
to respond to whatever is considered
appropriate.

MS. NOGUERA: You said that it's harder to engage families, particularly in the communities you mentioned, Central Falls, Pawtucket and Providence, with infants and small children. In hearing about the public charge statements that Ms. Sweet and Ms. Tancredi had made, one, could it be that the possibility exists that they heard about this and they don't want to participate in any governmental programs and two, these lack of engagements of families are some of the problems because of that?

MR. SIMON: True. We're not Los Angeles County, thank God. Three children

have died from measles and several other children who have lifelong disabilities, hearing loss and mental retardation, because of a measles outbreak. And our measles immunization rates in Rhode Island have been close to a hundred percent for the past the few years. I've just receive preliminary information from the National Immunization Survey that our immunization rates are falling.

And, again, I'm concerned that this disengagement or reluctance to participate in our programs may lead the community to evolve into various outbreaks of disease. And bacteria and viruses don't discriminate against people with legal status. They are equal opportunity agents. These are the ultimate concerns of the health agencies that we are supposed to be here protecting and promoting health in the community. And we see a threat, a potential threat, if we don't continue to maintain high levels of

14.

1.8

participation in some of those community wide programs to prevent or detect early diseases that have public health significance.

MR. HILTON: Any other questions? Thank you, Doctor.

MS. TANCREDI: As an immigration service, the agency that is responsible for the naturalization of its citizens, we have been greatly affected by the Welfare Reform Act. The numbers of people who are applying for naturalization have increased dramatically in recent years.

Just a few statistics here. In fiscal year '95, 3,428 people applied for citizenship in Rhode Island. The Providence INS Office is within the jurisdiction of the State of Rhode Island. In fiscal year '96, we received 3,239, and in fiscal year '97, we received 5,832. In these same years we've been able to swear in as citizens in '95 it was 1,535, in '96 it was 2,862, and in '97 it was 3,163.

17 ·

Currently, the processing time to become a U.S. citizen is about ten to twelve months. There are many reasons for this extended period that it takes to become a citizen. One is because there are more people applying, and the other is that the immigration service in recent years instituted new quality procedures in our naturalization processing which does lengthen the time.

It's put in place to preserve the integrity and to make sure that people who are becoming citizens are entitled to become citizens. Normally, applications for naturalization are processed pretty much from the day they are received at the INS office. We do entertain requests by people who are affected by some compelling reason to expedite applications. If someone wishes to be given expedited processing of the citizenship application, they would have to make a written request to the officer in

·i0

change and explain the reasons needed for consideration. And we will consider these on a case-by-case basis, taking into account our work load and resources available.

Obviously, if people wanted to continue their benefits they could become U.S. citizens. The process before coming through naturalization, there are certain provisions that have to be passed in order for them to become a citizen and many people find it difficult to qualify. I could go over the whole procedure for you, but the basic thing is that the person who wants to become a U.S. citizen has to be a permanent resident for five years, they have to be eighteen years of age or older, they have to reside, before filing the application, in the United States for five years and during that period have to have been present in the U.S.

You couldn't leave. You have to show that you've been at least here half the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

1:6

17

18

19

20

21

time. During that same five year period, you have to show that you are a person of moral character and that you adhered to the principles of the Constitution. Also, the requirements under the Act require that you be able to read, write, speak and understand English and that you have a fundamental knowledge of U.S. history and government.

The law does allow certain exceptions for certain groups. If you are 50 years of age or 20 years of residence or 55 years of age and 15 years of residence, you are eligible to take the test for citizenship, but you will be tested in your native language. You don't have to qualify under the English but still have to show that you have an understanding of U.S. history and government. If you're 65 years of age and 20 years of residence, your test given on history and government is limited to 25 questions that could be asked. Usually, just a few questions. -

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Also, recently there was passed a disability exception which really has nothing to do with the Welfare Reform Act. This law was passed in 1984. The regulations came out just about the time that this Act was passed. So I think people interpret that this was put into play so that people would be able to apply for citizenship who wouldn't be eligible previously. And the disability exception applies to people have a medically determined mental or physical impairment which has lasted for more than a year or will last for a year.

If you can prove that, you would be exempt from the English and history requirement. To apply for that benefit, you have to have a form issued by the service, completed by a medical doctor or a clinical psychologist and you submit with that with your application and we in turn make a decision whether you qualify for a disability exception.

15.

It's important also to stress that, 1 even if you if qualify for the disability 2 exception, all people that applied for 3 naturalization are required to take an oath 4 of allegiance to the United States. And they 5 6 must understand the meaning of that oath. So, even if you might qualify for disability, 7 if you do not understand the meaning of the 8 oath, you would not be eligible for 9 naturalization. That's about it. If you 10 11 have any questions, I'll be glad to answer 12 them.

MR. HILTON: Does anyone have a question for Ms. Tancredi?

MR. SHOLES: Under the Act, what additional requirements are there for a person to become an American citizen?

MS. TANCREDI: There have been no changes. As I said, there's been a few exceptions about the English requirement.

The most recent change was the 65 years of age and then 20 and this disability exception

13

14.

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that's been in effect about a year now.

17 .

MR. SHOLES: Now, I notice in the Act that the local government can prohibit persons permitted to withhold information concerning the legal immigrant to the INS.

Has there been a problem on the reporting of that information to your service?

MS. TANCREDI: There has been no provision in the law that would require people, that I know, to tell us who is here illegally because that's what you're talking about. Am I understanding you correctly?

MR. SHOLES: I understand that in the City of New York, specifically, by executive order the mayor prohibited the agencies or city departments from reporting to the INS anything about illegal immigrants unless the person committed a crime. I would take it that there's an inference that this Act requires that agencies will report to the INS concerning the activities of illegal immigrants. I'm just-curious as to what this

is all about. 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. TANCREDI: As far I know, there has nothing in place where we would make it mandatory for all agencies to tell us if a person is here and if they are here illegally. If, in the pursuit of one investigation or something, we ask an agency if this person is here and they have records, we will do that. As far as I know, we are 9. not requesting anyone to tell us who is here illegally.

> MR. SHOLES: Are there any I know the Act doesn't requirements? specifically say that, but I don't know whether there would be rules and regulations to promulgate that?

There might be in MS. TANCREDI: the future, but I am not aware of any regulations in effect right now.

MR. SHOLES: There are no regulations or rules that reguire the state agencies to report to the INS those

immigrants that are qualified --

1.6

MS. TANCREDI: No. There are no regulations that I know of that have been published. I know it might be addressed in the Act, but sometimes it takes a little longer for it to become a regulation.

MS. ZIMMERING: I have a very brief question. In the disability exception, is there a residency requirement?

MS. TANCREDI: The disability exception would be the same for anybody that qualifies. You'd still have to qualify and have five years residency.

MR. MOEUY: I just have a few questions regarding if the person come to United States and is a parolee, how long does it takes to become a citizen in this country?

MS. TANCREDI: Well, to qualify for citizenship you first must be a lawful permanent resident. A parolee in not a lawful permanent resident. I know for Asians recently that have come in, they don't

qualify to come in as a refugee. They have paroled certain people in for an indefinite period basically because there is a relative already in the United States that might already filed for them to come in as an immigrant.

This is a very complicated procedure and there is no visa number available for them. So what they have done is allowed them to come in here and they have to wait until there is a visa number available for them to become lawful, permanent resident. Only when they become a lawful and permanent resident do they start accruing time to become a citizen.

MR. MOEUY: So that's what a parolee is?

MS. TANCREDI: Well, a parolee is a status that we allow them to come even though they really don't fit in any other categories that we have in the law for emergency situations or some extenuating circumstances.

. 9

MR. MOEUY: Do you know how long they have to wait?

9 .

MS. TANCREDI: Well, it could be years. Sometimes, you know, there is a brother who will be petitioning for a brother and they'll have to wait seven, eight years for a visa number to become available.

MR. KLAMKIN: You talked about the increase in applications and so forth, have you been able to accommodate that?

MS. TANCREDI: It's been difficult in my office. As I said, the Welfare Reform Act has been one of the reasons there has been an increase in citizenship applications. Also, right around this time, there was a legalization provision which gave amnesty to groups of people back in the beginning of the '90s. They are also all becoming eligible for citizenship at this time. We've seen quite a dramatic increase.

And, as I said, also, recently they put the these new quality procedures in which

2 checks to make sure that no one who has a criminal record that is filing to become a 3 citizen will become one. So this has been 4 quite a task to try to handle the new 5 procedures to use and then to handle the many 6 7 more applications we've been getting. We're in the process of trying to get more help 8 right now for officers to do the 9 interviewing. The service is going to set up 10 what's called "Application Service Centers" 11 where applicants will go get their 12 13 fingerprints taken. There are many new regulations and policies being put into play 14 .15 right through immigration services. This has 16 an effect on how fast you can process these 17. applications. 18 MR. KLAMKIN: How big of an 19 operation do you have? 20 MS. TANCREDI: The INS is a full 21 benefit service office. There are about 35

they are very lengthy in securing security

employees at this point for examination

22

staff, which is the staff that would handle
the people applying for citizenship. We
currently have two full-time and one
part-time persons. I have another person
that's been out on extended leave, so we've
had to fill in and it's been a difficult
time.

MR. KLAMKIN: I don't know if you were here this morning, but we heard a number of people from various community agencies talk about how the immigrants view coming to INS or coming to DHS as a somewhat daunting experience. Is that a fair characterization, do you think?

MS. TANCREDI: Well, I think if
people are not aware of what goes on at the
Immigration Service, they might be
intimidated, but anybody can come into the
information room and request information.
This is an agency. We have officers. If you
want to inquire about what benefits you seek,
you have to visit the office or call us. We

17 .

.18

try to be as accommodating and professional when dealing with people as possible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SIMON: My experience is it's not so much the destination that's the problem, it's the whole path and process and difficulty negotiating for transportation, child care, release time from work. To get into a welfare office or any federal agency you have to go during work hours. Financial, shelter, food, and security being the primary concern for the people, they can't leave work and miss that much time. They will lose their jobs.

In the six years that I worked with . lot of Asian families trying to get good maternal child health services for about 1,600 families in Providence, it wasn't so much that the big buildings or the uncertain eligibility questions, all this stuff that we would take for granted, it was they don't want to risk losing what they already have.

> MR. KLAMKIN: As far as translation

services, is that a problem to provide?

MS. TANCREDI: If somebody's going to come in for an interview for benefits we should provide an interpreter. If somebody comes just for information, we'll try to accommodate them. Usually they bring someone with them or we have people in the office that we could help with translation a few languages.

MR. HILTON: Are there any other questions?

MS. NOGUERA: You mentioned that you have expedited services for someone to become a citizen right away. How many persons have used that? And also the second question that I have is that you take the persons who are 50 years old and here 20 years or 55 years old and here 15, they can take the examination in their own language.

Is there any part of the examination done in English even though the questions maybe asked in Spanish?

MS. TANCREDI: No, if someone qualifies for the exception which means they would not be tested on the English requirement, they can have an interpreter with them. Part of the examination is to go over the application, and they can have an interpreter with them. We will go over every question, but the interpreter can translate.

MS. NOGUERA: Of the persons who go to you, you say in '95 you took 3,000 applications and swore in 1,100 and in '96, 2,800 and then '97, could you tell us the reason why there is difference in the numbers of persons being sworn in? Are there any particular reasons that come to you?

MS. TANCREDI: Well, as I said, the numbers I gave you for applications are people that applied. It's not people that did not qualify. It also would be that the applications have just not been finalized within the fiscal year that they were actually sworn in as \bar{U} .S.citizens.

1.5 .

. 17

1	MS. NOGUERA: Can you give the
2	committee those numbers
3	MS. TANCREDI: How many were
4	denied?
5	MS. NOGUERA: Right.
6	MS. TANCREDI: Yes, I could.
7	MS. ZIMMERING: I have a logistics
8	question and I'll be very brief. I know that
9 .	it is much more convenient for someone to
10	work nine to five, but are there any
11	provisions for occasionally having evening or
12	Saturday hours for agencies such as yours?
13	MS. TANCREDI: There is no
14	provision that I know for this office that's
15	going to be staying open other than regular
16	office hours. There is an information line
17	available by telephone at immigration that is
18	available I think for an extended period of
19	time.
20	MS. ZIMMERING: Has that ever been
21	taken under consideration?
22	MS. TANCREDI: As I brought up, we

have these applications service centers which are really going to take fingerprints and such. These are going to be operating on extended hours.

MR. HILTON: Are there any other questions?

MR. SHOLES: Just a couple of questions. Rhode Island isn't New York or Los Angeles but I do notice that there is international flights landing at Green Airport. Is this a port of entry for immigrants into this state?

MS. TANCREDI: Rhode Island is a port of entry on the books, it's a port of entry. People come here and we have a big shipping industry here. There are many ships that come in. We are what's called a Class A port which means we will process people for entry into the United States. In fact, usually at Green Airport there are a bunch of smaller airports in the state that we will go out to if there's a flight coming in.

Whether you are talking about whether there are that many flights, there really aren't.

17 ·

MR. SHOLES: Last year how many people did you process? I'm not talking about those people that come in for a quick visit. I'm more interested in those people who intend to stay in this country.

MS. TANCREDI: I don't have those statistics available to me. They are in a book that is published that will tell me what state they put down as intended residence.

I'm sorry. I don't have that information with me.

MR. SHOLES: The other information we are looking for is to try to get a handle on the number of immigrants in this country, at least through numbers that are maintained by your department. Do you have that data available?

MS. TANCREDI: We published a book, in fact. The latest one finished was 1996.

That has tables in it of all these numbers.

1 MR. SHOLES: That would be great if you could provide that. 2 MR. MOEUY: Do you have the number 3 of people that passed the testing 4 requirements to become a citizen? 5 6 MS. TANCREDI: The number of people 7 who passed would be the number of people we swore in as citizens for a fiscal year. 8 9. year we swore in as new citizens 3,163. 10 MR. MOEUY: Do you know the number 11 of Asians, Hispanics, etc? 12 MS. TANCREDI: Yes, this book that I was talking about, that does have that, but 13 unfortunately some statistics are kept but 14 15. not by state. I know there are tables for different nationalities. I'll make the book 16 available to you. 17 18 MR. KLAMKIN: I wonder if people 19 have claimed disability exception and tried . to use that as a excuse to stay or has there 20 21 otherwise been in a increase in the anxiety

level?

1	MS. TANCREDI: I think we're seeing
2	people that are applying for citizenship that
3	normally would not have applied for U.S.
4	citizenship.
5	MS. NOGUERA: What do you mean by
6	that? Can you explain?
7	MS. TANCREDI: I think they find it
8	very difficult to meet the requirements for
9.	citizenship and normally they probably would
10	not have applied.
11	MR. HILTON: Are there any other
12 .	questions?
13	MR. LEE: If you had one thing to
14	change, what would that be to make your life
15	easier?
16	MS. TANCREDI: Well, it would make
17	my life easier if I had sufficient staff to
18	accommodate all these people that are
19	requesting citizenship. That's my goal, to
. 20	shorten this lengthy time that they have to
21	wait.
22	MR. LEE: Añy procedural changes

1 that you --

2

3

4

5

7

8

. 9

10

11

1.2

13

14

15 .

16

.17

18

19

20

21

22

MS. TANCREDI: There are things that are in process right now, but unfortunately this seems like a very long time to me. We do have quite a large population of noncitizens, but in comparison to other states in this country we're not that bad. I know in other states the time lapses are like two years, but I'm trying bring it down to a reasonable time period.

MS. NOGUERA: Can you tell us a little about deeming and who is going to be responsible for deeming, who's going to set up the policies for deeming, deeming meaning provisions that are supposed to be applied to persons who are come into the United States?

MS. TANCREDI: Like the affidavit of support?

MS. NOGUERA: Right. Who's going to be ultimately responsible for carrying out : that policy?

> MS. TANCREDI: Well, carrying out

1	the policy, there is an application that has
2	to be submitted that we will determine
3	whether the benefit petitioner has met the
4	requirements and that they can show that they
5	can afford whether to petition for anyone.
6	Beyond that, to be honest with you, I don't
7	think we would get into that at this point,
8	so I'm not really prepared to answer anything
9 ·	more than that. We are responsible for
10	adjudicating the affidavit of support in
11	connection with the application. I am not
12	familiar with the term "deeming."
13	MR. KLAMKIN: Deeming speaks to,
14	and correct me if I am wrong, whether an
15.	applicant's sponsor's income goes toward the
16	overall income that an applicant can show
17	MS. TANCREDI: We will make that
18	determination from the application. We have
19	a formula that we have to use.
20	MR. HILTON: At this time we will

(Recess)

21

22

take a short recess.

MR. LEE: Let's reconvene. Last but not least we have with us today statements from the Rhode Island State and Congressional delegations. David Sholes will moderate this panel.

MR. SHOLES: Thank you very much,
Mr. Chairman. There are a number of people
who have been contacted and I'd like to call
upon the representatives or aides from the
following: Members of Congressional
Delegation, John Chaffee's office, Jack
Reed's office, Bob Weygand's office, and
Patrick Kennedy's office. There's a table
right up here.

Just feel free to come on up. If
there are any representatives from the State
Senate or the State House of Representatives?
Is there anyone from the House? Thank you
for coming. Perhaps you could just identify
yourself and proceed?

MS. HERRINGTON: My name is Marlene Herrington. I'm from Senator John Chaffee's

office. Basically, we were asked here today to discuss what efforts we've made in the past year and a half to eliminate some adverse effects of the '96 legislation, in addition to what effort we plan on making for the coming year.

Senator Chaffee, although
supportive of the overall welfare format,
stated when it came out that he was very much
against some of the impacts this legislation
would have. He stated he would work for the
next term to eliminate some of the adverse
effects. I think in the past year he has
done just that. In April he formed State
Bipartisan Coalition Centers to introduce
various Immigrant Acts on legislation to
restore efforts to provide these benefits,
such as SSI, for local immigrants.
Throughout the summer and into the early fall
he worked to make sure the budget did include
these provisions.

Unfortunately, food stamps was

17 ·

eliminated from the final budget, but SSI was restored to immigrants receiving SSI at the time and future immigrants who became disabled in the future after August '96. And with regard to food stamps, although the Senator did try through this legislation to get the food stamp program re-enacted, he was unsuccessful.

But he has, in working with the administration, introduced a bill to bring food stamps back to the legal immigrant. He looks forward to working with the administration on that. He realizes that when he introduced it, along with the other senators, that it was an uphill fight and that President Clinton will have a battle ahead of him to get food stamps re-enacted, as well as the Medicaid program also, which the President has also proposed restoring. He's looking forward to working with the administration to help get legal immigrants the rights they deserve.

9.

15.

I don't really want to speak too much on his behalf. He's not here and I can't really answer anything, but I can answer any questions on what he plans on doing and what he has done.

MR. SHOLES: Does the committee have any questions?

MS. ZIMMERING: You have been here, as I noticed, off and on during most of the day. One of the things that we have heard today is that one of the real hardships is to elderly who are now disqualified from receiving assistance. You heard all the testimony. And if you take this back to Senator Chaffee and then maybe some accommodations can be included in some of these bills being proposed.

MS. HERRINGTON: I believe that the President's proposal does address the elderly. His recent budget proposal addresses the issues of individuals over the age of 65. Senator Chaffee plans on working

1:6

on that and seeing what work we can do on that. That was just recently thrown on the table last week, I think, and it's still a little early to discuss it.

Obviously, Senator Chaffee is very supportive of the elderly in the community.

As you know, he is 75 years old right now and he is definitely supportive of anything that impacts adversely on elderly immigrants due to these adverse effects.

MS. ZIMMERING: Thank you.

MR. SHOLES: Any other questions?

MR. LABONTE: My name Christopher
Labonte. I work for Congressman Weygand and
he couldn't be here today. Congressman
Weygand feels very much like Senator Chaffee
regarding benefits to legal immigrants and
also with how the Senator felt about the
passage of the Welfare Reform Act. The
Congressman stated publicly before that he
was already against the Act because of some

of the harsh provisions.

. 9

.17

Unfortunately, he was not in

Congress at the time, but now that he's there
he's been working hard with the
administration and his congressional
colleagues to restore some of the benefits
which were lost in the Welfare Reform Act.

Last year he worked with the President and pledged to work on restoring some of the benefits. And in his first year as Congressman he worked on the budget committee and supported many efforts of the budget committee and throughout the budgetary restoration process to restore some of the benefits, mainly SSI and some Medicaid benefits to immigrants. The Congressman will continue to work with the administration and a lot of his colleagues on our side and with the Senate to restore those benefits.

This year there's so many other benefit that need to be restored; namely food stamp benefits for legal immigrants. The President's budget submitted proposes to

1.0

restore food stamps for immigrant families with children, which is a very crucial benefit that we'd be restoring and the Congressman was pleased to see that.

For the elderly and disabled,
benefits would be restored to qualified
aliens who were here prior to the enactment
of the Welfare Reform Act. And any child who
comes into the country following the
enactment wouldn't be barred for five years
from any federal health benefits as if they
were here prior to the enactment. States do
have the option to provide benefits, so that
is very important.

Also, a piece in the budget which is presumptive Medicaid benefits for women and children, the Congressman will be looking at that very closely as the budget process continues. Like I said, the Congressman looks forward to working with the administration and his colleagues in the both the House and the Senāte in restoring the

food stamp benefits that are especially important to those families with children.

So on behalf of the Congressman who, like I said, has been working hard as he was last session in restoring the benefits which he thought were too harsh when they were taken away.

MR. SHOLES: Any questions from to

MR. SHOLES: Any questions from the Committee?

MR. KLAMKIN: We heard earlier about the restoration of food stamp benefits here on the state level. Were there none of the kind of qualifications that you just enumerated for food stamp benefits?

MR. LABONTE: I believe states can use either 10, 20 or Title XX money to provide food stamps for legal immigrants.

I'm not entirely sure, but I think the state did have the option in Rhode Island, but that's just an option the states have, but are by no means required to do that.

MR. KLAMKIN: Have there been any

17 .

cost estimates --

9.

15.

MR. LABONTE: I have the numbers somewhere. We can get those numbers for you if you would like those for the record.

MS. HERRINGTON: The food stamp benefits were at a cost of 2.43 billion over five years and Medicaid to women and children costs 230 million for five years.

MS. NOGUERA: I have a concern and my concern is that, and you can take this back to your Congressmen and Senators, the law is somehow misleading because, even though a person will not be eligible -- legal immigrants, persons who come here after 8/22/96 -- for five years and after a year the affidavit of support kicks in and people are very confused because if you read the guidelines for persons who qualify for assistance in the fourth quarter, you have to have worked at least ten years and then there are all the layers of accessibility for some services, what are the Congressmen and

Senators in the State of Rhode Island doing as it relates to the affidavit of support because immigrant families make very little money and to put a burden upon them to support another family who entered in the United States would be very tough. What are the Congressmen and Senators doing with this?

1.6

MR. LABONTE: I will certainly present the Congressman with that issue. I will definitely get that answer to you regarding that particular issue.

MS. HERRINGTON: The way that the affidavit of support came about was what we had assumed was that the joint affidavit was going to be filed and that that would make up for the fact that that would be filed for other individuals. I think they weren't, again sort of speaking on my own behalf, I think that maybe they weren't thinking that the joint affidavit would be a family.

Like now, you said, many families together, combined, won't make enough money

for the affidavit to be valid, but I think that's something that will be looked at this year. At least, I will mention it to the Senator.

MR. SHOLES: It's been brought to my attention that a representative from Senator Jack Reed's office is here. Please step forward. You can take the third chair.

MS. CONSUEGRA: Good afternoon. My name is Norelys Consuegra, and I deal with people who have immigration issues for the Senator. The Senator could not be with us today, but he has sent me to represent him and he has submitted a statement.

As you know, Senator Reed did some work regarding the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act because he believes that an important first step towards reform is to help these people move from dependency to work. Even though this legislation was not perfect, the Senator believed that the passage of this law was an extremely

.17

difficult process for members of Congress and the President.

It called for sweeping changes that affected the lives of many. He expressed concerns about the federal components of the law which denied legal immigrants access to SSI, food stamps and other services. He believes we should work to reform our nation's welfare system without targeting one specific group, which is women and children and legal immigrants.

In 1996, the Senator stated that he would work on this issue and the promise has been kept. Last year, the Senator worked on legislation to help restore SSI and Medicaid benefits for legal immigrants. He has supported amendments offered by Senator Dubbin to help restore food stamps to legal immigrants under the age of eighteen. While this amendment failed, the Senator continued to support efforts by joining with several of his colleagues to endorse the restoration of

·1 0

15.

food stamp benefits to foreign born legal immigrants.

He also worked to find funding for several other vital nutrition programs this year. In response, he has proposed that the budget call for the restoration of food stamp eligibility for certain legal immigrants which will restore the benefits. This issue will be brought up in the next session in December. This budget roughly will restore the benefits of approximately 73,000 immigrants in the year 1999.

Senator Reed does not believe that in future these immigrants who pay taxes should be prohibited from receiving federal benefits. He looks forward to working with you on these issues and he appreciates all your efforts on behalf of the legal immigrants in Rhode Island.

MR. SHOLES: Does anyone have any questions?

MR. LEE: I would like to ask a

question that all of you or any of you could answer. I want ask a question about the restoration of SSI for low-income immigrants, legal immigrants who turn 65 after 1996, or immigrants over 65 who have entered since 1996, and whether that group of immigrants is going to be considered in this upcoming legislation and if you know of any discussion of that particular group of people.

MS. CONSUEGRA: You're referring to immigrants that came in after August 22, 1996 and over the age of 65?

MR. LEE: Right.

MS. CONSUEGRA: Well, as far as the information that I know, people are required to submit the affidavit of support, and my experience has been as of August of 1996 that everyone has asked for a level of income for families. I just want to make reference to the earlier question about the affidavit of support and the regulations for the affidavit of support.

17 ·

2.0

You are responsible for your immigrant family coming over for ten years and that legality expires if the sponsor dies or moves out of the United States. In the case that people after five years, which is the requirement not to receive SSI benefits, the programs are available for you in case your sponsor, something happens to your sponsor, whether they passed or move away, the state or federal agency can provide assistance to the people. I think that's what you're asking.

The other issue is marriages. If you bring your wife over or your husband you are responsible for that person for ten years. Divorce does not stop the fact that you have to support your spouse. You're still responsible for ten years even though the marriage has dissolved.

MR. SHOLES: Any other questions?

MR. KLAMKIN: You say you deal with

people who have immigration issues --

.

1.5

MS. CONSUEGRA: Immigration issues for the Senator.

1.2

1.6

MR. KLAMKIN: Are you aware of any information received by the centers or departments, specifically in terms of the civil rights aspects of the law and the way people are being treated when they do make application and come face to face and ask the center for benefits?

informed where an applicant was ever denied for a benefit based on the race or nationality or gender of the applicant.

Usually the people that come through our office are people seeking information on the laws or any type of courtesy that the Senator can provide. I don't know if we have ever received any information where an applicant was denied based on discrimination.

MS. HERRINGTON: We deal with many of the same issues, and, no, I haven't heard of this, as far as immigration issues are

If I did, obviously, that's sort concerned. of part of my job to work with the immigration service to try to figure out what may have happened, but I haven't heard of anything specific.

MS. ZIMMERING: One of the issues is that sometimes there are not enough people who are fluent in the language of the applicant to interpret so that applicants have a difficult time understanding exactly what they are supposed to do and when they are supposed to do it and how they are supposed to do it. They are not always treated maybe as courteously as they could be under the circumstances or having an interpreter provided for them.

MR. LABONTE: Congressman Weygand feels all applicants should be treated the same no matter what language they speak.

MS. ZIMMERING: But we have heard --

22 MR. LABONTE: I would encourage

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

. 9 .

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

19

20

anybody from the state to contact our office if they feel their civil rights have been violated.

MR. SHOLES: Before I ask a question, is there anyone here from the State Senate or State House of Representatives?

MS. NEWELL: Deborah Newell,

Internship Consortium. I'm from the Senate,

but I just started there and feel as though

I'm not informed enough to speak on their

behalf.

MR. LEE: Two issues kept coming up this morning. Service providers often return to the question of training, ESL programs, and sufficiency of ESL programs to meet the needs in Rhode Island, and training, job training and for it to have realistic expectations in this whole process of going from welfare to work. The time allowed for that, five years, really was not realistic for certain immigrants, particularly those of whom language was a real serious obstacle and

then the other issue was training, both in getting training programs and ESL programs that are sufficient. Is there discussion that you know of or any legislation pending that might deal with those issues?

MR. LABONTE: Again, the budget was just submitted last week, so obviously we will be looking for funding for those programs. Members of the budget committee, I'm sure they did make sure that adequate funds are available for those sort of programs.

MS. HERRINGTON: One of the things,
I think, that I definitely did see from this
morning's session that I definitely will
bring back to the Senator's attention is what
Joseph Lee had mentioned about the length of
time between being taught English and trained
well enough to, one, go out and get a job
and, two, get enough money to sponsor a
family. That is definitely one of the issues
that were discussed pretty thoroughly this

morning and it is something that I will bring back to the Senator's attention.

MS. CONSUEGRA: Unfortunately I wasn't here this morning. I was at a prior engagement, but recently the Senator and I have spoken about ESL programs around the I come from an immigrant family. I was born here, but I had to learn English, so I do know how important it is for ESL classes to be efficient for people, especially when you come to a country and you don't know what the laws are and you have to learn not only how to say your name properly, where you live or your phone number, but you also have to learn how to operate a computer, especially for jobs in the state.

The Senator is fully aware of that. I will make sure that I reinforce that issue that was discussed today.

MR. SHOLES: I have a few questions. Since you work in the Congressional Delegation's Offices and you

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

17 .

are uniquely aware of what type of legislation is introduced into both the House and the Senate regarding this issue, and I know that the Senators and the Representatives in this state have great interest in the adverse impact of this Act. I'm just curious as to what type of legislation other Representatives and other Senators throughout the state have introduced 9. in this term to this soften the impact of this legislation.

There have been over MR. LABONTE: 3,000 bills filed in the House. I know we were ones to sponsor acts that would restore all of the benefits that belonged to the immigrants during the Welfare Reform Act. Also, along with that, I'd like to mention, with regard to SSI and Medicaid eligibility, the passing of the Rhode Island Balanced . Budget Act, and, again, portions of that legislation were included in that.

There's Hunger as a Cure Act which

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

i 0

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

would restore food stamps benefits which was 1 2 introduced by Representative Jim Walsh, I believe, of New York. There's thousands of 3 pieces of legislation filed. I wish I knew them all off the top of my head, it would 5 6 make my job a lot easier. There's a lot of 7 legislation being proposed out there, and failing to mention them now is probably not 8 fair to them, but --MR. SHOLES: When President Clinton 10 11 signed the bills into law he issued some directives to his departments to soften the 12

signed the bills into law he issued some directives to his departments to soften the impact, as least with respect to naturalization and food stamps. Are you aware of any other directives the President has issued ameliorate the impact --

MR. LABONTE: As far as administrative remedies?

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. SHOLES: Yes.

MR. LABONTE: Other than working with Congress to restore some of the benefits, I can't think any off of the top of

my head. I know he did direct the Cabinet
Secretaries to make sure that the provisions
would be carried out as gently as possible.
As far as any administration or executive
order, I can't recall any within the past
year.

MR. SHOLES: And I think Steve had asked you questions of whether the Congressional Delegations felt that were violation from a civil rights point of view with respect to this Act. I just want to take it from a different point of view in reference to this Act. Has any of the citizens or noncitizens of this state, in asking for services or help from your various offices, ever complained about a perceived violation of the Civil Rights Acts such as discrimination because of racial, ethnic or national origin?

MS. CONSUEGRA: The only thing that

I'm aware of is that many of the people that

call our office can't speak English. I don't

1.5

.17

know who at the administration work at the front desk when you first walk in, but I do know a lot of them have trouble in expressing what concerns that they have or even filling out an application, but that's the only thing that I am aware of that. You don't get what you're looking for because you don't speak English.

also expressed by June from U.S. Immigration when she said that would be the one thing that she would like to see changed would be the amount of caseworkers we have employed who are fluent in other languages. The number of languages out there is immense. In order to take applications from people with all these languages in one organization is difficult for the amount of staff immigration has right now. It's pretty impossible at this point and June's wish list for more employees will address that, hopefully.

MR. KLAMKIN: I'd like to mention

.10

15.

agency in Rhode Island that doesn't ask for additional staff or help. I can imagine what sort of insecurity they have in calling a Congressional office when they might not think somebody there speaks their language.

I don't know if it's the fact we're not hearing from them or they are not out there or if maybe we're not hearing about them because they may be frightened to be contacted. So it's our job to let them know they can call our offices.

MR. SHOLES: Any further questions?

MS. ZIMMERING: I would just like

to make one comment. While you're doing the budget, another few million dollars for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights would be very welcome.

MR. SHOLES: I want to thank you very much for taking the time to come here today and speak for the civil rights of legal immigrants.

14.

MR. LEE: Are there any other people who would like to speak to the Committee?

1.8

2'2

MS. SILVIA: Kristen Silva, R.I.

Senate Policy Office. I just have one
question for you. I brought a question that
has been brought up to my attention over and
over again. We keep talking about the
welfare recipient and I hope that someone
here can clarify what incentives are there to
a welfare recipient in actually getting their
citizenship. Does that affect their benefits
in any way? Can someone clarify that for me?

MS. NOGUERA: I think that becoming a citizen you would be able to accept all those kinds of jobs that you may not be able to accept if you're not a citizen. I think that would be one incentive to provide to somebody who is thinking of becoming a citizen. I think it is a myth that they want to remain a legal immigrant because they receive assistance.

We have heard today that only five percent are receiving public assistance. I think that it is an incentive for someone to become a citizen in order to receive benefits. For somebody who was receiving benefits and wants to continue receiving, that's a different case, but not because citizens can receive public assistance. don't think there is a need for that. -

MS. SILVIA: I think the issue is raised because of frequent public opinion or, I don't know, we called them myths, and I'm just wondering how we go about clarifying some of these myths and, as was mentioned earlier, put out by some of those radio talk shows. It may be that something is said and misprinted in the news and that sends a message that these people are different. I'm just wondering how we can be better advocates for this population group.

MS. ZIMMERING: Only about three percent of immigrants are welfare recipients,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

1 which is a very low number. It's probably lower than the number of citizens who are 2 3 welfare recipients. So there really is a myth that immigrants receive an undue share or come to this country in order to receive 5 welfare benefits. 6 7 There may be a few, but there are a 8 few who do everything in all walks of life. The purpose is really so that they would be 9 10 eligible for all of the things that citizens of this country are eligible for, especially 11 for their children. 12 13 MR. LEE: Are there any other 14 comments or questions? We can adjourn. 15 Thank you. 16 (Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the 17 PROCEEDINGS were adjourned.) 18 19 20 21

CERTIFICATE 1 I, Kim M. Desmarais, hereby certify 2 that the foregoing is a true and accurate and 3 complete transcript of my notes taken at the 4 above-entitled hearing. 5 IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto 6 set my hand this 16th day of February, 1998. 7 8 . 9 KIM M. DESMARAIS, 10 Notary Public/Certified Shorthand Reporter My Commission Expires: November 4, 2001 11 12 13 14 15 ' 16 .17 18 19 20 21