1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
3	HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES HOUSE STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE
4	
5	
6	EAST WING
7	ROOM 60 HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
8	
9	
10	TUESDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2010 9:00 A.M.
11	
12	
13	PUBLIC HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 1359
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	BEFORE:
19	HONORABLE BABETTE JOSEPHS, CHAIRMAN
20	HONORABLE KERRY BENNINGHOFF HONORABLE MARK B. COHEN
21	HONORABLE LAWRENCE H. CURRY HONORABLE FLORINDO FABRIZIO, JR.
22	HONORABLE DAN FRANKEL HONORABLE JARET GIBBONS
23	HONORABLE MICHAEL O'BRIEN HONORABLE JIM COX
24	HONORABLE SHERYL M. DELOZIER HONORABLE MATT GABLER
25	HONORABLE GLEN GRELL
-	

1	CONTINUED:
2	HONORABLE MARCIA M. HAHN HONORABLE TIM KRIEGER
3	HONORABLE TIM KRIEGER HONORABLE DAVID R. MILLARD HONORABLE KATHY L. RAPP
4	HONORABLE BRAD ROAE
5	
6	ALSO PRESENT:
7	
8	HONORABLE RON MARSICO
9	RODNEY OLIVER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (D) SUSAN BOYLE, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (R)
10	MATT HURLBURT, RESEARCH SPECIALIST HELEN NORTON, RESEARCH ANALYST
11	JENNIFER BELZ, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT KRISTEN GRAYBILL, RESEARCH ANALYST JERI DAVIS, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT
12	
13	BRENDA S. HAMILTON, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	OPENING REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN JOSEPH	6	
4	OPENING REMARKS BY REP. BENNINGHOFF	7	
5	REP. RON MARSICO, SPONSOR REMARKS	8	
6 7	HONORABLE SANDI VITO, SECRETARY, PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY	16	
8	MICHAEL R. FROEHLICH, ESQUIRE, COMMUNITY LEGAL SERVICES, INC.	30	
10	KATHLEEN M. APPELL, MEDIA COORDINATOR, PENNSYLVANIANS FOR IMMIGRATION CONTROL AND ENFORCEMENT	46	
11 12	DESIREE HUNG, ASSOCIATE STATE DIRECTOR, AARP PENNSYLVANIA	54	
13 14	MARIANN S. DAVIES, ESQUIRE, CO-FOUNDER AND VICE-CHAIR, YOU DON'T SPEAK FOR ME	62	
15	JULIE ZAEBST, POLICY CENTER MANAGER, GREATER PHILADELPHIA COALITION AGAINST HUNGER	73	
16 17	NICOLE LINDEMYER, POLICY DIRECTOR, PA COALITION AGAINST DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	97	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We have a very full agenda, 3 and on the way here I did the math and it comes out that 4 5 each one of our slots here really I can only give 13.3 minutes to. So -- and that includes questions. 6 7 So we're going to start. I'm going to ask Ms. Belz to take the agenda -- the attendance. I'll note 8 9 when other people come in. 10 I'm going to make an opening statement. going to ask Mr. Chairman Benninghoff if he wants to make 11 12 one. And then I'm going to be very strict. So I will suggest, people who have very 13 14 interesting testimony, and I had a chance to look at much 15 of it last night, please summarize it or you will only 16 get through about six or seven minutes before I interrupt 17 you because I'm sure people will have questions. 18 Ms. Belz, if you'll take the attendance. 19 MS. BELZ: Josephs. 20 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Here. 21 MS. BELZ: Bishop. 22 Boyle. 23 Carroll. 24 Cohen. 25 Curry.

```
1
                REP. CURRY: Here.
 2
                MS. BELZ: Fabrizio.
                Frankel.
 3
                Freeman.
 4
 5
                Galloway
 6
                Gibbons.
 7
                O'Brien.
                REP. O'BRIEN: Here.
 8
               MS. BELZ: Oliver.
 9
10
                Taylor.
11
                Vitali.
12
               Benninghoff.
                REP. BENNINGHOFF: Here.
13
               MS. BELZ: Cox.
14
                Delozier.
15
16
                Gabler.
17
                Grell.
                REP. GRELL: Here.
18
19
               MS. BELZ: Hahn.
20
                REP. HAHN: Here.
21
               MS. BELZ: Krieger.
22
               Miccarelli.
23
               Millard.
24
                REP. MILLARD: Here.
25
                MS. BELZ: Rapp.
```

REP. RAPP: 1 Here. MS. BELZ: 2 Roae. REP. ROAE: Here. 3 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Fabrizio, Mr. O'Brien is 4 5 Mr. Marsico, who is our first witness, has joined us. Mr. Grell. Mr. Frankel. 6 7 We're going to start. Mr. Marsico, I'm going 8 to be really strict. I'm going to say something -- my chairman, my co-chairman is, and we're going to ask you 9 10 to keep to six or seven minutes. 11 REP. MARSICO: Sure. 12 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Please. REP. MARSICO: No problem. 13 14 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: When I first saw this 15 bill, I thought about a number of my constituents. Now, 16 I know that the -- the stereotype of my district is that 17 everybody is rich, but this is not true. There is enormous, and I don't know how 18 19 big, very serious hidden poverty right on the famous landmark, which is the heart of my district, which is the 20 21 Rittenhouse Square. 22 On Rittenhouse Square live many people who 23 have outlived, women most of them, their husband's 24 They were solidly middle class. pensions. They are 25 ashamed of the fact that they are poor. They get all

kinds of assistance if it can be done anonymously.Securely, but anonymously.

They will go hungry rather than show up at a county assistance office presenting identity to show that they indeed qualify for food aid. They will be hungry.

I am very worried about my beautiful, frail, fragile old ladies who cannot move because they're too old and they cannot stay in their apartments or condominiums because they cannot afford the rent and pay for food and heat at the same time.

I worry a lot about them. I see them on the square. I see them walking around town. I think they're hungry.

I'm also worried about the farmers. We move tremendous tons, tons, I don't know how many, of food to Philadelphia and other people across the state who need food. Our farmers need to sell product in those markets. We pay them for that.

I worry about both parties if we do something that makes it difficult for people to get food assistance. I'm happy to have the facts of this case. I hope I'm wrong.

Mr. Chairman, you're on.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: Very briefly, I just

```
want to thankful Madam Chairman for hosting this hearing
1
     on a very important topic. It's important that we have
 2
     open, honest, frank dialogue. I look forward to the
 3
     testifiers' comments, as well as Rep. Marsico on his
 4
     House Bill 1359.
 5
                   Without further ado, we will proceed.
                                                           Ι
 6
7
     will end my comments. Thank you.
 8
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Brevity. A Republican
     trait.
9
10
                   Just good looks, he says, is a Republican
11
     trait.
                   Mr. Marsico, please proceed.
12
                   REP. MARSICO: Well, thank you, Chairman
13
     Josephs and Chairman Benninghoff for holding this hearing
14
     today. We wanted to be here to talk about this
15
16
     legislation, House Bill 1359.
17
                   To put it very simply, and to be
     straightforward, this bill actually, what it does,
18
     prohibits illegals -- illegals --
19
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Marsico --
20
21
     Mr. Marsico, in this -- in this committee we don't call
22
     people names. If you are referring to people who are in
23
     this country, in this state, without documents, I wish
24
     that you would refer to them as --
25
                   REP. MARSICO: I don't know what else to
```

call them, Madam Chairman. 1 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: They are undocumented 2 residents. 3 REP. MARSICO: Okay. We'll call them, as 4 5 you wish, undocumented residents --CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. 6 7 REP. MARSICO: -- of this Commonwealth --8 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. REP. MARSICO: Their benefits are paid for 9 10 by the taxpayers of this Commonwealth. This bill creates the proof of citizenship for the receipt of public 11 benefits. 12 And let me just review some of those public 13 benefits. A public benefit -- a public benefit is 14 defined as any welfare, health, disability, public or 15 16 assisted housing, post-secondary [sic], food assistance, 17 unemployment benefit, or any other similar benefit for which payments or assistance are provided to an 18 19 individual, household, or family eligibility unit by an 20 agency of the Commonwealth or local government. 21 Since the introduction of this legislation, 22 which was in 2009, I received many, many e-mails and 23 correspondence from hundreds of people across 24 Pennsylvania. 25 Every single one of them in districts

across Pennsylvania supports House Bill 1359 and agrees that the Commonwealth simply cannot afford to continue supporting these undocumented residents of the Commonwealth.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you.

The Federation for

REP. MARSICO:

Immigration Reform estimates that Pennsylvania's undocumented residents' population costs the state's taxpayers about \$728 million per year for the education, medical care and incarceration as well.

Frankly, this is an insult to the taxpayers of this Commonwealth. This is a smack in the face to those hard-working, law-abiding, tax-paying Pennsylvanians.

At a time when the state's economy is desperately in need of help we need to fight to do the right thing for Pennsylvania's taxpayers.

Just this -- just recently, we received information from other states than the Commonwealth that have legislation similar to House Bill 1359 and they were recently, for the last year or so, passed. Those states are Arizona, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Missouri -- and Missouri. I think that those are the states. Yeah.

So, Madam Chair, I look forward to hearing the testimony as well and, once again, appreciate the

```
opportunity to present this bill to you. And hopefully I
 1
     stay -- I stayed within the time constraints.
 2
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes, you did. Thank
 3
 4
     you.
                   Are there any questions? Or discussion?
 5
                   Mr. Grell.
 6
 7
                   REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Thank you, Madam
     Chairman.
 8
 9
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Oh, oh. Can I interrupt
     you --
10
11
                   REP. GRELL:
                                Sure.
12
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: -- just to say
     Mr. Gabler has come in.
13
14
                   REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Mr. Gabler, good
15
     morning.
                   Chairman Marsico, are you aware of any
16
17
     groups or individuals that are in favor of your
18
     legislation?
19
                    I noticed that our hearing today has groups
     all of which are opposed to it. I'm wondering whether
20
21
     there are such groups and whether they were invited to
22
     attend.
23
                   REP. MARSICO: Yeah. Probably the most
24
     important group that I can think of are the taxpayers of
25
     this Commonwealth. I can read off some of the e-mails
```

that I received or some of the comments I received from 1 some of the taxpayers of this Commonwealth. 2 One is -- you know, I'm not going to 3 leave -- give you any names, but this is from -- Sheila, 4 5 we'll say. The legislation makes good sense in its approach to fiscal responsibility. What is it about the 6 7 word -- sorry, Madam Chair -- illegal that's so difficult for the people to understand? If you were here with all 8 your papers, you deserve to get benefits. If not, you 9 10 are entitled to nothing. 11 Another e-mail from Carl. I'm all for your 12 proposed legislation. It's time to stop the free handouts or you risk breaking the backs financially of 13 14 the taxpayers. 15 One more. Thank you for trying to do the right thing and not the politically correct thing. 16 17 that's from Susan. So some of the -- to answer your question, 18 Representative Grell, yes, the taxpayers of this 19 20 Commonwealth. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Thank you. 22 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I --23 REP. MARSICO: I'm happy just -- if I could 24 just --25 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I'm sorry.

REP. MARSICO: -- add one thing. I add the 1 Commonwealth Foundation. 2 EXEC. DIRECTOR BOYLE: 3 Yes. REP. MARSICO: We have testimony from the 4 Commonwealth Foundation as well. 5 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We -- we did invite 6 7 Mr. Chairman Benninghoff to ask anybody to testify on his side, and we do have two groups, Do Not Speak For Me and 8 9 the Pennsylvanians for Immigration Control and 10 Enforcement that are here and I think will testify. 11 So if people chose -- if other people chose 12 not to step forward, that was their choice. Ms. Rapp? 13 14 REP. RAPP: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 15 Very quickly, Representative Marsico. 16 Page 4, under the exceptions, this bill does not apply to 17 a person under 18 years of age? REP. MARSICO: Yeah. The point is, I mean 18 19 we do not want to deny benefits to minors. We're directing this legislation towards the -- their families, 20 the adults of the families. 21 22 REP. RAPP: So we're not --23 REP. MARSICO: And --24 REP. RAPP: We're exempting the children --25 REP. MARSICO: Yes.

REP. RAPP: -- of the state? 1 2 REP. MARSICO: Exactly. REP. RAPP: Thank you. Thank you, Madam 3 4 Chair. 5 REP. MARSICO: Just if I can, Madam 6 Chair --7 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Certainly. REP. MARSICO: -- point out, if I could, 8 9 forms of identification that were -- that this legislation has established, you know, a valid driver's 10 11 license. So they'd be required to show either a valid driver's license; a valid identification card issued by 12 any other agency of the Commonwealth; a valid 13 14 identification card issued by the United States government, a state government; a valid United States 15 16 passport; a valid Armed Forces of United States 17 identification card. 18 So those are some of the forms of identification that we would -- that's in the 19 20 legislation. 21 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Millard? 22 REP. MILLARD: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 23 Chairman Marsico, I -- I forget the amount 24 that you said. How much did you say this burden is on 25 the taxpayers of Pennsylvania?

REP. MARSICO: It's -- it's estimated at 1 about \$728 million per year. 2 REP. MILLARD: Thank you. That's all I 3 needed to know. 4 5 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I'd appreciate, not necessarily now, Mr. Marsico, if you could forward to the 6 7 committee the group that made that estimate and the method by which they made it. 8 9 REP. MARSICO: Okay. 10 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. 11 REP. MARSICO: Certainly. 12 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Any other questions? Mr. O'Brien. Mr. O'Brien. 13 14 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 15 16 Mr. Chairman, certainly I appreciate the 17 record. Certainly a record that has been reoccurring in the United States beginning with the native rights of 18 19 1847 dealing with undocumented residents, but -- but 20 certainly I -- I -- I need to wonder, and let me put to 21 you, if perhaps it may be a question of penny wise, pound 22 foolish. 23 Now, at some place along the way if these 24 folks get ill, malnourished, wind up in the hospitals, 25 they need to be treated pursuant to the Hill-Burton Act.

They need to be treated. 1 So perhaps if you take us down the path, if 2 you will, in these states that have passed similar 3 legislation, is there a cost analysis of increases in --4 in nonreimbursed costs in -- in the local hospitals? 5 REP. MARSICO: Well, thanks for the 6 7 I don't have that information for you, but I will certainty forward it to the committee and its 8 9 chairman. 10 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 11 Thank you, Madam Chair. 12 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We want to thank you, 13 Mr. Marsico. We are always, since you are a colleague, 14 open to your further information and suggestions. 15 16 Thank you for being here. Thank you for 17 being brief, particularly. Call up the Honorable Sandy Vito, Secretary 18 19 of the Pennsylvania Department of Labor. Whenever you're ready, Secretary Vito. 20 21 REPRESENTATIVE VITALI: Good morning, 22 Chairperson --23 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: And I'm going to cut you 24 off at about six minutes. 25 SECRETARY VITO: Six minutes. Okay. Thank you.

Good morning, Chairman Josephs, Chairman
Benninghoff, and members of the committee. Thank you for
the opportunity to testify today.

As we all know, the demand to meet the needs of our citizens has increased over the last several years; and given that we're in the -- one of the most challenging economic times in at least a generation, where all the departments are striving to provide services more frugally and efficiently, House Bill 1359 contradicts these responsibilities.

When similar legislation was introduced in 2008, a fiscal analysis estimated that -- that the cost would be about 12 million to the Commonwealth. Given the increased demand in services, that estimate has increased to \$23.5 million for the cost of this bill.

The legislation would add \$3.5 million to the Department of Revenue; two million to DPW, the Department of Public Welfare; 1.8 million to PHEAA, \$842,000 to Insurance; and the Department of Labor and Industry alone would bear the cost of \$15.2 million, including \$10.2 million for an estimated 54,000 additional hearings before the Unemployment Compensation Review Board.

The reason one -- one of the biggest

reasons for the increase in cost estimate is that we now are processing about three million initial unemployment compensation claims through -- January of 2009 through July 2010, and that's really double the number from in the past.

We've replaced the way we do unemployment claims from a very costly, individual, labor-intensive system to one that relies on the Internet and telephone systems. 1359 would move us in -- backwards.

And here's why. We would need to require each individual to either mail to us or bring to us a verification of their citizenship. That would delay the system, delay the payment of benefits greatly.

Similarly, additional costs for Revenue and Community Economic Development would also include the cost of implementing the SAVE system, which is already in use from the Department of Public Welfare but DCED does not have that. That would be an additional \$328,000 just to implement SAVE.

So the provisions of this bill would add to the cost of providing services and at the same time delay providing those services to the people who are entitled to them.

Governor Rendell has emphatically said that he supports public benefits to those who are entitled to

them. Our opposition to 1359 stems from wasting public resources to duplicate and dilute procedures already in use.

The redundant measures that are -- are required in this legislation would delay delivery of many, many types of services. Services, again, that people are rightfully due.

The legislation would require all individuals applying for benefits, even individuals with government-issued identification, to provide proper -- proof -- positive proof of identification.

Until verification through the SAVE system, the legislation would allow benefits to be paid solely on the basis of a signed affidavit, which frankly is in contradiction of the unemployment compensation law.

Nonetheless, getting the affidavit into the system would cause delay of the payment of benefits and could be something that triggers us to be in noncompliance with our federal requirements from the U.S. DOL to pay unemployment compensation benefits in a timely manner.

The public -- the Department of Public Welfare and Labor and Industry already use procedures to ensure that individuals who are entitled to benefits are either citizens and/or documented workers.

It would jeopardize over a hundred million annually in administrative funding for the -- for the unemployment compensation system if we were to fail to comply with federal guidelines.

It would clearly adversely affect the lives of hundreds of thousands of people. It would mean for the 600,000 people seeking property tax and rent rebates -- it would mean significant delays for those individuals.

Individuals who -- students who apply for student loans would also experience delays. Farmers -- farmers who apply to the Department of Agriculture for a grant or loan would also experience delays.

Federal and state laws already require applicants for cash assistance, food stamps, medical assistance to provide proof of citizenship. Individuals applying for rent rebate would -- individuals applying for rent rebate are already on the tax rolls. We know that because they wouldn't be able to apply for rent rebate if they weren't already on the tax rolls.

Federal law also requires those applying for unemployment benefits or workers' compensation to have provided documentation related to their proof of eligibility to work in this nation to their employer.

So, in conclusion, let me just sort of say

the thing that struck me about this legislation that I 1 think was that I thought Republicans and Democrats would 2 come together in opposition. So often Democrats are 3 criticized for adding to the cost of government. 4 5 Republicans are criticized for reducing much-needed services. House Bill 1359 manages to ensure both 6 7 negative outcomes. So we're adding costs and constraining 8 services through this piece of legislation and I, on 9 behalf on the administration, would submit that that 10 11 makes us equally poor stewards -- stewards of the public 12 interest. The bill is redundant. It is costly and 13 14 will create significant delays for people who are eligible for the services. So the administration stands 15 16 in opposition to the bill. 17 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. Thank you. 18 Any questions? 19 Mr. Chairman Benninghoff. 20 REP. BENNINGHOFF: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 21 22 Madam Secretary, I'm having a little 23 trouble following some of your numbers. You had said 24 this would increase costs about \$23 million. Is that on 25 an annual basis?

SECRETARY VITO: Yes.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: I look at the fiscal note for Senate Bill 9, which is almost a mirror of this legislation, and their annual fiscal note is just shy of -- well, just over \$700,000 this year.

That seems to be a large disparity. I'm interested, as was proposed to Chairman Marsico, to find out where your numbers came from, who put it together. It just seems awful extreme.

Unfortunately, sometimes you debate and throw those number out and it kind of confuses the issue.

Can you give us that documentation of where those numbers came from?

SECRETARY VITO: We do. We're happy to submit it to the committee.

But just as -- for a couple of highlights, the fiscal note that we submitted, at least my information tells me that the Governor's office submitted fiscal information of \$12 million for Senate Bill 9, not 700,000, and here's some of the bases for the costs.

The -- the increase -- and moving it to 23 million is because of the increase in demand for services, persons applying for AdultBasic who are on a wait list, persons on the wait list must meet the

eligibility requirement.

By the Insurance Department current projections, the wait list will hit 282,000 by the beginning June of 2009, up from 92 from 2007.

L and I, we reduced our estimates based on, first, the additional claimants that we're seeing. In addition because of the burden to the Unemployment Compensation Review Board which were originally left out of the estimates.

So that assumes two percent of 1.2 million new or re-opened claims are delayed or denied because of the bill. That's 60,000 cases added to the appeal list. Ninety percent of the persons who are denied on an -- on an appeal would -- 90 percent of persons who are denied file an appeal to the board of review, which would then go -- increase the demand.

So there's two levels of appeal at the unemployment compensation.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: All right.

SECRETARY VITO: And the --

REP. BENNINGHOFF: I don't mean to cut you off here, but it seems to me you're kind of clouding the point here.

Real quickly, if we're talking about increasing costs for undocumented citizens, what do you

base your numbers on and how do you know what the numbers 1 are going to be? 2 SECRETARY VITO: We -- that's what I was 3 just explaining. We estimated how many additional 4 appeals were likely to result as a result of the -- of 5 the -- one of the pieces of analysis, how many additional 6 7 appeals, and we estimate them at two percent of 1.2 million claims, which is not unreasonable, and that 8 increases the appeal case load by 60 percent -- percent. 9 10 In addition, there are costs related to actually processing and documenting the information that 11 12 people would now have to send to us. So we have an estimate for each department 13 related to the specific costs of implementing this, and I 14 can go through it again. It's \$842,000 for Insurance. 15 16 REP. BENNINGHOFF: That's all right. 17 for brevity, you provide the documentation to us. don't want to cut you off, but are some of these people 18 19 already provided services? SECRETARY VITO: 20 Yes. 21 REP. BENNINGHOFF: So are we counting them 22 twice under this scenario? 23 SECRETARY VITO: We're counting the extra

work to process their claims, as well as the extra

appeals that are likely to result because of individuals

24

25

who did not -- who were eligible for benefits, for instance, but who did not provide the proper documentation to us.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: All right. Well, I don't want to split hairs with you, but it just seems like the bureaucracy mumbo jumbo. You know, very important to this process and adding to the -- Ron's bill and also the Senate bill, so it's going to exacerbate the costs, almost double the costs from what the Governor's own estimate is on Senate Bill 9 from 12 to 23 million.

With that said, I'll just ask you for your definition, one word to describe. You said that the Governor feels that those who are entitled to them should be provided the services. What's the definition of being entitled?

Because I think that's sort of the crux of today's conversation. I don't think anyone wants someone to go hungry, but there's procedures for people to be eligible, whether it's, you know, the assistance office or driver's license or anywhere else, and the majority of the community is expected to follow those with the guidelines.

I'm curious as to what the difference is in the definition of entitled.

SECRETARY VITO: The people who are

entitled to benefits are defined by each of the programs, 1 either federally or at the state level. 2 But what I meant by that and what's in my 3 written testimony is individuals who are citizens and/or 4 documented workers. 5 REP. BENNINGHOFF: Legal citizens? 6 7 SECRETARY VITO: Yes. REP. BENNINGHOFF: Just for clarification. 8 9 SECRETARY VITO: Yes. 10 REP. BENNINGHOFF: Okay. Well, if I'm 16 and I take a driver's course, I'm entitled to get a 11 12 driver's license. Correct? I met the requirements. pass the test. I get a driver's license. 13 14 SECRETARY VITO: Yes. 15 REP. BENNINGHOFF: Why should that be any 16 different for any other citizen, whether it's in food 17 supplies, whether it's getting a driver's license, or anything else that's paid for by taxpayers' dollars? 18 19 I think that's really what Chairman Marsico's bill is about, having commonality in our rules, 20 21 in our -- our requirements to be eligible for taxpayer 22 subsidized services. 23 I don't think -- it's not any different, 24 and why is that not in some ways unfair to those people 25 who do follow the procedures?

```
SECRETARY VITO: I think our -- what I've
 1
     outlined to you is that we already do follow procedures
 2
     which ensure that there are, in fact, safeguards, many of
 3
     those requirements come from the federal government, to
 4
 5
     ensure only those folks who are entitled to benefits
     receive them.
 6
 7
                    REP. BENNINGHOFF: All right. I'll end in
     asking just for a succinct definition of what you mean by
 8
 9
     entitled.
10
                    SECRETARY VITO: Again, citizens and people
     who are documented workers.
11
12
                   REP. BENNINGHOFF: Thank you.
13
                    Thank you, Madam Chairman, for your
14
     patience.
                    CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We've been joined by
15
     Ms. Delozier and Mr. Cox.
16
17
                   And I believe Mr. Grell has a question.
                   REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Thank you, Madam
18
19
                I think I have two questions.
     Chairman.
20
                    Secretary Vito, thanks for your testimony.
     I don't want to rehash the -- the numbers. But let's
21
22
     just assume that your numbers are correct and, for the
23
     sake of discussion, assume Chairman Marsico's numbers are
24
     correct.
25
                    If we could spend $23.5 million to save
```

\$728 million in benefits that persons are receiving to 1 which they're not entitled, wouldn't that be proper 2 stewardship? 3 SECRETARY VITO: Again, I -- I want to 4 5 respectfully disagree with Representative Marsico. We do not estimate that we will save that amount of money. 6 7 I just want to give you a quick piece of information. Of all the checks we did last year and 8 9 investigations related to people who potentially were not 10 documented workers, we did 16,000 SAVE checks, 21 illegal 11 immigrants were found. 12 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Okay. SECRETARY VITO: Which would not have saved 13 us anywhere near that kind of money. 14 15 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Okay. I certainly 16 agree with that if that's the case. That sort of leads 17 to my second question. At the bottom of Page 2 of your written 18 19 testimony, you talk about the procedures that are in 20 place at the Department of Public Welfare and suggest 21 that they exceed the requirements of House Bill 1359. 22 Are you aware of what those procedures are 23 and how many ineligible persons have those procedures discovered? 24 I don't know the 25 SECRETARY VITO:

information for the Department of Public Welfare, but I'm 1 sure we could submit it to you. I will say that the 2 Department of Public Welfare already uses the SAVE 3 system. 4 5 REPRESENTATIVE GRELL: Okay. I would appreciate that because if, in fact, what we're already 6 7 doing already exceeds the requirements of this legislation and is proven to be successful, then that 8 9 would make a pretty persuasive argument. 10 So if you or somebody from the department could provide that information, it would be helpful to 11 12 the committee. Thank you. CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes. Ms. -- Madam 13 14 Secretary, if you would submit that to me, I will make sure that it get circulated. 15 And I also want to mention that we will 16 17 circulate this, I guess, at the end of the meeting -that we have testimony from the Commonwealth Foundation 18 19 in writing. We'll get that to everybody. 20 Are there any other questions? 21 Madam Secretary, thank you very much. 22 Appreciate your brevity and the quality of your 23 testimony. 24 Mr. Froehlich, staff attorney from 25 Community Legal Services.

We're doing great here. We only used about three minutes of your time. Not bad.

MR. FROEHLICH: Good morning. Good morning. Thank you very much. My name is Mike Froehlich and I'm an attorney with Community Legal Services and I've been working on benefit issues for over ten years, although this is my first time that I've ever appeared in front of a committee. So thank you very much for inviting me today.

Our Community Legal Services, as many people know, work with low income families in Philadelphia and provide technical assistance to many of the legal services for both programs throughout the Commonwealth. That includes, I imagine, in your -- in your -- assistance for your constituents.

The reason that we oppose House Bill 1359 is that it would impose a significant amount of -- of red tape that would harm hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens and legal immigrants when they go to apply for very critical benefits that they need in -- in this economy.

I understand from listening to

Representative Marsico that the bill's intended targets

who -- are immigrants who are not lawfully residents of

the United States, but they're already ineligible for all

major benefit programs.

And the -- and the representative and none of the proponents have -- have -- have argued at all that this is a widespread problem. In my 13 years of doing this, I've never seen or -- or heard of an undocumented immigrant. I just say I've heard of it in other states but not in Pennsylvania.

I've never seen or worked with any undocumented immigrant who is receiving benefits fraudulently.

Our -- as I say more in my written material, the primary concern with this is that it would require applicants for public benefits to provide a government-issued ID, and I -- I think for many of us, myself included, my government-issued ID is in my wallet right now. It doesn't seem like a big deal.

Representative Benninghoff, you mentioned why shouldn't people all have to play by the same rules, and I think in theory I agree with that. But how it plays out on the ground is that there are about half a million low-income Pennsylvanians that are estimated to not have that ID. There are 350,000 seniors in Pennsylvania that don't have that government-issued ID.

So who are these people? You know, who -- who are these people that they're walking around without

government-issued ID?

In my written material I included about 12 or 13 or 14 stories. I think actually that might be the most interesting part of this -- of my testimony, to be frank. And -- and they sort of explain, well, who doesn't have government-issued ID? These are people who are -- who are getting out of prison and they're trying to put their lives together; who are domestic violence survivors who are fleeing their abusers, who don't have time to stop and get their papers. They're homeless people. There's -- there's mentally ill people.

You know, I've -- I've spoken with -- with some of you and some of your staff, as well as some of the Senators, and I think this is the thing that I have the most trouble sort of explaining, who are these people who don't have government-issued ID? And if they don't have government-issued ID, why don't they just go get it?

And that's the problem at this point, that in this post 9/11 world, getting government-issued IDs can be not just time consuming, takes months and months to get it, but also it just makes me pull my hair out.

You -- you -- see, if somebody doesn't have a post -- the problem is you need a PennDOT ID, a Social Security or birth certificate. And, boy, if you

have -- if you have -- if you don't have one of those three things, then we can work with you. We can get a duplicate.

But if -- you know, God forbid if you don't have a birth certificate and your Social Security card.

But if you don't -- pardon my language -- but you're kind of screwed. You have to then obtain medical records.

You may have to, you know, go get your school records from -- from another state if you went to school there.

Your military record, your church records, you know, to make -- to see when you were baptized.

We've got to, you know, oftentimes file a Freedom of Information Act request, a Social Security Administration, and that costs \$15 that lots of people don't have and can take eight to ten weeks.

You know, I'll tell two quick stories of people I'm currently working with. One is a -- is -- a woman came into my office with her mother. Her mother is about 55 years -- years old and her mom was born in Virginia and her mom had this -- this -- this medical record that said the hospital she was born in and when she was born.

And I thought this would be like a slam dunk case. Right? You just had to write to the Virginia Department of Vital Records, send a check for \$12, and

there you go.

Last week -- she came in June -- June or July. Last week I submitted for the fourth time the request, and what it -- it's October 5th right now. So it's been four or five -- three or four months.

Those requests just keep getting denied for -- for what seem to be completely arbitrary reasons. The last time it was denied because they said my -- my signature was illegible.

Now, I can understand that there might be some bureaucratic reasons, and, God forbid, I -- I don't want IDs going out to people who aren't that person on the ID.

But at the same time, because this process was taking -- it took so long for this woman and it's still ongoing, I mean you can imagine if she needed a benefit, if she wanted to apply for the property tax and rebate program, she would be ineligible.

If she wanted to apply for HEMAP because her house was being foreclosed upon, she would not be eligible for it. She would have been foreclosed upon and homeless long ago.

If she wanted to apply for some food programs, if she wanted to apply for -- for county behavioral health services, she just wouldn't be able to

do it.

I said two stories, and maybe I'll just tell a quick one and move -- move on. The other fellow that comes to my -- that comes to mind is a guy keeps calling me every day asking me if he's gotten his birth certificate in.

His problem is that he got evicted by his landlord for not paying his rent. His fault. He didn't pay rent. But his landlord threw away all his stuff, and so he's one of these people who doesn't have anything and is starting to re-create everything from scratch.

I want to respond to two comments as I've been sitting and listening. One, Representative Grell, you made a -- a point about if it's only -- you know, to Secretary Vito. If it's only going to cost a certain amount of money but the FAIR study says it will save \$700 million, is that a good investment? And I would argue, no, it's not.

Because if this bill, House Bill 1359, does not -- if it passed, it would not change anything in that FAIR study.

The FAIR study is based on education costs. You know, the schooling for -- and not only schooling for undocumented kids but citizen kids that are suspected to be related to undocumented parents.

So this bill isn't going to affect those folks. The -- the FAIR study says that they estimate that there are 600 undocumented Pennsylvanians in jail. This bill isn't going to, you know, open up the jails and let those folks out. So we're spending, you know, incarceration dollars for them.

This bill -- the -- the FAIR study talks about emergency room costs, I think as Representative O'Brien had said. This bill, you know, you can't just turn away people. You can't board up the emergency rooms and turn away people.

And I think there was one other thing that they said. Medicaid, incarceration, yeah, and -- and -- oh, also I should also mention in -- and when -- when Representative Marsico, he promised to circulate the study, he fails also and -- to say that, you know, the FAIR study also admits that -- that undocumented parents do pay taxes. You know, they pay cost -- according to their study, about \$200 million in taxes. And I would argue it's even higher than that.

You know, I think, Representative

Benninghoff, you mentioned earlier, you know, you throw numbers around and you confuse the issues. So I don't want to throw too many of these numbers around, but I mean maybe I'll just close with one thing.

You know, I think this -- this bill is sort 1 of a -- it's kind of like a -- a solution in search of a 2 It will impose all this -- these unfunded 3 problem. mandates on -- on -- on counties and cities and 4 Commonwealth agencies and -- and the collateral -- the 5 collateral damage that it will have on families, 6 7 especially seniors in Pennsylvania, domestic violence survivors, low income folks, mentally ill folks, folks 8 who are getting out of prison and trying to put their 9 10 lives back together, it will just be extraordinary. 11 And I -- I have yet to see that the bill is 12 necessary. But I sure see the cost that the bill will have on the people that I work with. 13 14 Thank you. 15 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Froehlich, I think I 16 said your name wrong. Thank you. I'll say it right this 17 time. 18 Any questions? Mr. Gabler. 19 REP. GABLER: Thank you for your testimony. Just a quick question. 20 21 I was interested in the -- the comment that 22 you made about the undocumented immigrants paying taxes. 23 My understanding of our tax system is such that we've got 24 know where to find somebody in order to charge them the

25

taxes.

Now, I would freely offer, I guess, the 1 notable exception which is sales tax. But aside from 2 sales taxes, how -- how would -- how is it possible for 3 -- that the government would be collecting the taxes from 4 5 undocumented immigrants? MR. FROEHLICH: Right. I'm -- I'm going to 6 7 defer that answer. I saw in the agenda that there is somebody from FAIR or FAIR association groups speaking in 8 9 favor of the bill. 10 It was their study that talks about the -the -- I think it's \$200 million they mention. 11 I think 12 it's \$200 million. And they might be in a better position to answer it. 13 14 I know some of it was sales tax, but I 15 recall there was other taxes in the study as well. 16 REP. GABLER: Thank you very much for that. 17 I would submit that an immigrant -- one thing in a number of allegations that I would be interested in hearing is 18 what is the difference between -- if somebody was fully 19 20 documented, how much they would pay versus the amount of 21 taxes that they are paying being undocumented. 22 Thank you very much. 23 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We've been joined by 24 Mr. Gibbons, and Mr. Cox has a question.

REP. COX: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

25

```
I just want to make sure I understand your
 1
     role in this process. Do you help in the obtaining of
 2
     benefits for those who have had trouble with that?
 3
     that part of what you do?
 4
 5
                   MR. FROEHLICH: What?
                                          I couldn't hear
 6
     you.
 7
                   REP. COX: Do you assist in helping people
     get benefits when they've had trouble getting them or --
 8
 9
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Yes. Yes.
10
                   REP. COX: I just wanted to make sure that
11
     was --
12
                   MR. FROEHLICH:
                                  Right.
                   REP. COX: -- part of your role.
13
14
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Both. Both getting on
     benefits and getting off benefits.
15
16
                   REP. COX: Okay.
17
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Welfare to work programs
     and subsidized child care and all that.
18
19
                   REP. COX: The people that you help, the
20
     average person, what level of assistance do they
21
     ultimately need, over the course of time might they be
22
     eligible for here? Are we talking about $2,000 of costs
23
     in a year, $20,000? What kind of numbers are you --
24
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Right. It's a good
25
     question.
```

```
So a family -- let's say -- Secretary Vito
1
     was here earlier and she does a lot with the unemployment
2
     compensation system.
 3
 4
                   As you may know or the committee may know,
 5
     there's a -- you know, tens of thousands of
     Pennsylvanians who have -- have gone through their
 6
7
     unemployment, who are no longer eligible for
     unemployment, who still have not been able to find a job
 8
9
     in this economy, those folks -- let's say a family of
10
     three, just to pick one out. A typical family of three
11
     was going to get $403 per month in cash assistance
12
     welfare and about $450 in food stamps, plus federally
     funded Medicaid.
13
14
                   REP. COX: Okay. Doing the math, let's say
     four -- four -- is that four on top of four?
15
16
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Right. 403 in cash, 450 in
17
     food stamps.
18
                   REP. COX: Okay. So 850 roughly and then
19
     on top of that you said there was also the federal --
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Federally funded Medicare,
20
21
     yes.
22
                   REP. COX: Okay. So let's say a thousand
23
     dollars, is that per month?
24
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Per month.
25
                   REP. COX: Is that FAIR?
```

1 MR. FROEHLICH: Right. REP. COX: Okay. So \$12,000 across a year, 2 for me that might be a good estimate. 3 MR. FROEHLICH: Yes. 4 REP. COX: You might guess where I'm going 5 with this, \$15 dollars to receive \$12,000. 6 7 MR. FROEHLICH: Right. 8 REP. COX: Why was that a burden? MR. FROEHLICH: You -- and -- it's not just 9 10 the cost, first of all. I will say that \$15 -- you know, if you have zero, \$15 dollars might as well be \$50 11 12 million. I -- I went to traffic court -- I never go 13 to traffic court on behalf of a client. But I went to 14 traffic court on behalf of this guy last week because he 15 16 had some -- some old traffic tickets, and as a result of 17 having traffic tickets, he -- the judge issued a bench 18 warrant. 19 And -- and like every week the guy kept 20 going in front of the judge saying, I can't get any kind 21 of benefits because I have these traffic tickets, would 22 you lift it? And the judge said, I mean quite 23 reasonably, 50 bucks. If you make \$50 downpayment on 24 account, on this -- on this payment plan and -- and we'll 25 lift the bench warrants.

And this guy went without benefits for 1 months because he didn't have \$50. Because \$50 -- like 2 I -- I was going to say I have \$50 in my wallet but I 3 don't right now. 4 5 But \$50 I could get pretty easily. But if you have zero and you -- and you don't have any family 6 support, then whether it's 50, 15, or 50 million, you 7 know, it's unobtainable. 8 9 REP. COX: I'm -- you know, I'm looking at the -- the cost benefit here. I mean we've got a crisis 10 11 looming --12 MR. FROEHLICH: Yes. REP. COX: -- in Pennsylvania. 13 14 MR. FROEHLICH: Yes. REP. COX: Some would say it's already 15 16 hit. We've got \$3 billion coming down the pike -- we 17 don't know exactly when it's going to be due -- just in our unemployment compensation alone. We've got the 18 pension crisis. 19

We've got to do things to address the fraud, to address the problems that have been identified. The Auditor General has identified problems with fraud, stolen funds, you name it. There have been problems identified in numerous systems within our government.

20

21

22

23

24

25

I'm looking at all the testimony here and 1 I'm like you, I don't see anybody. There's -- there's 2 nobody in this stack of testimony that I see is going to 3 say they like this bill. 4 5 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes, there is. MR. FROEHLICH: There's one to come. 6 7 REP. COX: Okay. One out of seven. 8 However you --9 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Cox, we opened this 10 to everybody. We asked the defenders of the bill to give us names of people and we went to Mr. Marsico and there 11 12 are two others and there's some written testimony as well. 13 14 I have an opinion, but I do try to be fair. 15 16 REP. COX: Well, I quess my bigger question 17 is, you don't like this. Give us some suggestions. We've got to figure out ways to make sure that only those 18 who need it are getting it. That's -- that's where we 19 20 need to go with this. 21 Whether you like this or -- if you don't 22 like this, I'm asking for recommendations. What do you 23 recommend to us? 24 MR. FROEHLICH: Right. And thank you very 25 much for asking that question. I would -- I would really

```
love to talk with you more and after we're done I will
1
     give you my card and we can -- we can brainstorm.
 2
                   I've got plenty of -- of ideas. Some I
 3
     think we can agree on.
 4
 5
                   REP. COX:
                              Right.
                   MR. FROEHLICH: But I think it might be
 6
7
     outside the scope of this.
                   REP. COX: Can you toss out a couple high
 8
     level ones that -- you know, what's the low hanging fruit
9
     there?
10
11
                   MR. FROEHLICH:
                                   I can't.
                                              I think the first
12
     low hanging fruit is to really get a sense of that MA,
     that -- that -- the audits that have been done, you know,
13
     I think there was a special allowance audit that was done
14
     that I think DPW has done a real good job of like
15
16
     changing its processes now to -- to address those.
17
                   There was some -- some questions about
     is -- is DPW addressing -- collecting all of the -- the
18
19
     verification requirements to establish Medicaid
20
     eligibility. I think they made great strides in that.
21
                   But I think there -- there potentially are
22
     more that, like I said, I'd be happy to chat with you
23
     more about.
24
                   REP. COX:
                               Thank you.
25
                   Thank you, Madam Chair.
```

```
CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS:
                                       I would like -- we are
1
     running over time here.
2
                   We've been joined by Mr. Krieger here.
 3
                   Mr. Geesey, if you would like to come up,
 4
 5
     it's my -- and sit with us, it's my --
                   MR. GEESEY: No, that's okay. Thank you.
 6
7
     I've got another meeting.
                                I was just --
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Okay. Mr. Roae had his
 8
     name up -- his hand up. I don't want to cut you off,
9
10
     Mr. Roae, but we want to move on to Pennsylvanians for
11
     Immigration Control and Enforcement.
                   Mr. Froehlich, you will stay around?
12
                   MR. FROEHLICH: Sure.
13
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: This is -- I'll ask you,
14
     I'll call on you, Mr. Roae, if you want.
15
                   REP. ROAE: No. That's fine.
16
17
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS:
                                       Thank you, Mr. Roae.
                   Thank you, Mr. Froehlich.
18
19
                   Looking for Kathleen and Carol from the
20
     Pennsylvanians for Immigration Control and Enforcement.
21
                   I -- I like to think of these hearings as
22
     sort of teasers. There's lots more information.
23
     witnesses on all sides of these issues would be very
24
     happy to give you more information. We just really want
25
     to keep on time.
```

One thing that I would like to have, perhaps Mr. Marsico can supply it to us, is the FAIR study. And if he can't, perhaps someone else on the witness list can. And I will distribute it if you can get it to me. Thank you.

Ms. Appell.

MS. APPELL: Thank you, Chairman Josephs and everyone in attendance, for the opportunity to testify and also thank you for pronouncing my name correctly.

My name is Kathleen Appell and I am a media coordinator for Pennsylvanians for Immigration Control and Enforcement. The acronym being PA4ICE.

In a little more than five years, the PA4ICE has evolved from a small group of local citizens concerned about the escalating illegal immigration to later joining with thousands of other like groups in virtually every state in the nation.

The majority of these groups work in tandem with national organizations such as NumbersUSA and FAIR.

Most recently, we are working with, although not part of, the multitude Tea Party and 9/12 and other Patriot groups, educating their members on the impact of illegal immigration.

We also provided updated information on the

positions and voting records of various candidates and elected and appointed officials on issues specifically related to illegal immigration.

It is my hope that PA4ICE can contribute a valuable perspective to discussions regarding proof of citizenship as a prerequisite to the receipt of public benefits.

Not only -- I -- I'm listening to everyone else advocating, and my one question is, and I wish someone would answer, every single person who advocates for the presence of illegals benefits in some way.

I'm speaking on behalf of the people who are paying for everybody else to benefit. So aside from the PA4ICE, I -- I feel I'm a voice for the everyday citizen.

Not only should we require ID, we're at a point now where we must. Elected officials' sworn oaths of office, government employees' obligation to uphold our laws and the burden to the taxpayer for the cost of public benefits dictates that we no longer have the luxury of continuing the policy of close your eyes and authorize.

The Federation for American Immigration

Reform's most recent study actually concludes that the

cost to incarcerate and educate and medi -- educate

undocumented in Pennsylvania actually increased from 768 million to \$1.4 billion a year. That's astonishing news to the taxpayers, albeit it's only a partial accounting for the real costs associated with the undocumented.

A total of \$1.4 billion a year for services provided to undocumented persons who reside with impunity in Pennsylvania should be enough to convince any elected officials of the need to remedy taxpayers bearing the cost for lax government oversight.

Mandating proof of citizenship prior to receipt of public benefits is one small step which will ensure the loss of yet one more benefit to people who have no right to be in this state or country and one very positive message to the constituents you represent who are burdened with paying millions of dollars for the services provided to them.

The ever increasing number of taxpayers educated on the impact of those undocumented in this state and country are no longer so naive as to accept the excuses for the presence of the undocumented persons and the crimes and costs associated with them from legislators, farmers, manufacturers, union, the Chamber of Commerce, and other special interests groups that all profit by blatantly violating our laws by simultaneously expecting law-abiding citizens to pay so as to enable the

criminal behavior.

Government in Pennsylvania constantly reminds us of existing dire economic conditions and the need to toll any and everything that is covered in concrete. Simultaneously, residents are growing increasingly resentful of steadily rising taxes coinciding with decreasing economic conditions.

How does a government justify increasing taxes or mandating new tolls while spending 1.4 billion, which is just a portion actually of what -- of what we pay of our tax money for state services provided to undocumented persons?

Mandating identification of legal presence in the United States as a prerequisite to the receipt of public benefits is a logical, albeit minuscule, step towards ensuring taxpayers are not further penalized due to lax government oversight.

Recently Governor Rendell prided himself on a commercial many people labeled offensive, citing Big Brother overtones. Displaying a pinpoint location on a screen, the message -- and I'll paraphrase -- we know where you are and we're coming after you. You are a criminal. And other such offensive remarks meant to intimidate those who owe taxes.

At the conclusion of the ad run newspapers

touted the fact that embarrassing Pennsylvanians late paying their taxes worked so well that consideration was being given to use the same tactic for other purposes.

Mayor Nutter touted the revenue amount returned to his -- to Philadelphia as a result of the intimidating ad. Coinciding with his pride at the monies that were returned for back taxes, he also announced that he declared Philadelphia a sanctuary city welcoming any and every --

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Ms. Appell -- Appell -- now I can't say it. I'm sorry.

MS. APPELL: Appell.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: If you could begin to wrap up.

MS. APPELL: Okay. All right. My question is -- to you is what is the difference? I'm sure all of you participated in the -- in the advertisement. What is the difference between those who owe taxes and those who steal our tax dollars via services provided to people who have no right to be in this state and country?

There was expressed satisfaction regarding the collection of millions of back taxes as a result of intimidating and threatening U.S. citizens. Why then is our government not running ads to recoup billions of dollars by informing illegal aliens that we know where

they are and we're coming after them? 1 I'd -- I'd be glad to answer any questions 2 or provide information. 3 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. Thank you. 4 Any questions? I have one, but I want 5 other people to be able to proceed. 6 7 Your interpretation of the statute, because it doesn't say -- I'm interested in knowing, we provide 8 child care for many reasons. First of all, to prepare 9 10 children for school. But also so that if they have a single parent or two working parents that their parents 11 12 can go to their job. Do you -- would you count child care as a 13 benefit to people under 18 or a benefit to adults who are 14 going to work? Would it fall under this bill in your 15 16 interpretation? 17 MS. APPELL: If it's provided to people who are here legally, then I have no problem with it. If 18 they're here illegally, then I do have a problem with 19 20 it. 21 Because I don't find anything noble in 22 feeding other people's children while ours go hungry. We 23 have 1.7 million --24 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: My question is do 25 these -- do child care services fall under this -- fall

under this bill? 1 I -- quite honestly --2 MS. APPELL: CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: In your interpretation. 3 I don't know the answer. 4 5 MS. APPELL: My interpretation is that anyone, any services in Pennsylvania, is because -- it's 6 7 a joke about who -- I mean in Bucks County, they all know where to go, they all know where to get the money, and 8 they're undocumented. So when you say child protective 9 10 services, I --11 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: No. Child care. 12 MS. APPELL: Child care. I -- no, absolutely not. Not if they're undocumented and -- and I 13 14 think that's what the representative is alluding to, that we have to cut back on services provided, because these 15 16 illegals have mistaken our kindness for weakness. 17 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. Thank you. I understand your answer. 18 19 Any other questions? 20 Mr. Frankel. 21 REP. FRANKEL: Just a comment. It seems to 22 me that one of the issues that we have to grapple with 23 here is -- I mean between the testimonies that we're 24 hearing about and reading, we're talking about two different universes of numbers. I mean it is, you know, 25

absolutely so far apart in terms of what the dimensions of what this problem are.

As we heard from the Secretary of Labor it -- it is not as extensive as -- as is \$1.4 billion that was just testified to here.

Then there are the issues which even this bill doesn't address that there are significant costs with respect to education. We are exempting children under 18 years of age. Is that a substantial part of it? Who may be here who are legal with undocumented parents?

So I think -- from my standpoint I think we need to get some sense, with some unbiased information, with respect to what are -- what is -- what are the dimensions of the problem.

Because it's just -- we're sitting here listening to two different realities, two different universes, and I think from my standpoint before I would move forward with any type of legislation like this, I'd want to have that kind of nailed down.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Frankel, a very sound observation. I don't doubt that there are millions and millions of people in this country who don't have documents for one reason or another. Whether or not they're accessing public benefits is the question for

me.

Any -- any more discussions? That's why I keep asking for all of the studies. And, Ms. Appell, if you would like to submit something written -- I noticed that you gave something to the steno -- and to my office, I will make sure that it's circulated.

Ms. -- Ms. Hung.

Oh, did I -- please start. Associate director of AARP. You're on. And we're only a minute behind. Sorry for being so compulsive.

 $\label{eq:def:DIRECTOR HUNG:} \mbox{My remarks are brief so} \\ \mbox{I'll rush through them.}$

Good morning. My name is Desiree Hung.

I'm the Associate State Director for Advocacy for AARP

Pennsylvania. AARP Pennsylvania strongly opposes the

passage of House Bill 1359 because of the devastating -
devastating effect it would have on many of the

Commonwealth's Boomers.

Boomers are a large and important part of the population in Pennsylvania. According to the U.S. Census 3-year American Community Estimate more than three million people in Pennsylvania are between 45 and 64 years of age.

Many Pennsylvania seniors rely on a variety of public benefits to help them with their ever

increasing expenses. Programs such as property tax and rent rebate programs, the Housing Emergency Mortgage
Assistance Program, and unemployment compensation.

House Bill 1359 would require that all Boomers provide a government-issued ID in order to apply for these benefits. Unfortunately, older Pennsylvanians are less likely to possess government-issued identification than any other group.

Many older citizens do not have access to documents such as birth certificates or Social Security cards. Recent changes make it harder than ever to get government-issued ID.

In order to get a driver's license or non-drivers state-issued ID, for example, you need a birth certificate and Social Security card. You generally need a government-issued photo ID to get either of these documents. For someone who gave up their driver's license, misplaced their Social Security card, or is born out-of-state, this presents -- this presents a Catch-22 situation.

It's extremely difficult for those who are homebound or have difficulty driving or getting around to go to PennDOT or the Social Security office or the Department of Public Welfare [sic] to apply for these documents.

It's even more difficult to navigate these bureaucracies for the nine percent of the Pennsylvania households who speak a language other than English at home.

AARP has opposed laws that require citizens to show government-issued ID to vote in such states as Indiana, Georgia and, two years ago, Pennsylvania. These laws, like House Bill 1359, impose cumbersome and unnecessary burdens on Boomers.

House Bill 1359 would have an alarming effect on Pennsylvania Boomers, many of whom have worked hard all of their lives and are now struggling to afford life's necessities.

AARP worries that they will -- they already do not get the services that they need for their economic security. House Bill 1359 will create a hostile and confusing atmosphere that would deter many from applying for benefits for which they are eligible.

I'd be happy to answer any questions if I can.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Cox, thank you for being brief. I don't have a question myself, but Mr. Cox does.

REP. COX: Can I ask what your position would be if we were to offer an amendment to this that

```
would exempt people over the age of 50?
 1
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: That's certainly
 2
     reasonable. I have to check with our policy. I just
 3
     couldn't --
 4
 5
                   REP. COX: I'm just tossing out something,
     hearing what you're saying as far as the previous
 6
 7
     testimony setting out the aging population and
     difficulties getting there and so forth.
 8
 9
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: Our membership goes from 50
10
     years old and up.
                   REP. COX: I do understand.
11
12
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: Previously we spoke out
     against Senate Bill 9, which is very similar, and this
13
14
     bill exempted people that were 65 and over that were on
     Medicare.
15
16
                   I would certainly be happy to talk to you
17
     about that.
                  I think it's more than reasonable for us.
18
                   REP. COX: Thank you.
19
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: Uh-huh.
                   REP. COX: Thank you, Madam Chairman.
20
21
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Krieger.
22
                   REP. KRIEGER:
                                   Thank you, Madam Chair.
23
     Thank you, Madam Chairman.
24
                   Thank you for being here today.
25
                   I have to say that I'm stunned with the
```

```
problem you're describing. In my office I talk to
1
     hundreds, perhaps thousands of people.
2
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Maybe you could get
 3
     closer to the microphone.
 4
 5
                   REP. KRIEGER: I talk to hundreds, perhaps
     thousands of people on the issues you're describing and I
 6
7
     have to tell you, I've never heard one complaint like
     you're describing.
 8
9
                   Where are you -- how are you -- how do
10
     you -- how are you getting that information about the
11
     problem you're speaking of?
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: We have statistics I'll be
12
13
     happy to get to you. We have a department at AARP, our
14
     Public Policy Institute. We gather that kind of
     information from various sources. We maintain some
15
16
     records on our own. I'd be happy to get that for you.
17
                   REP. KRIEGER: Please, do.
                   DIRECTOR HUNG: Sure. I'll be happy to.
18
19
     Sure.
                                  Thank you. That's all I
20
                   REP. KRIEGER:
21
     have.
22
                   CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Anybody who has any
23
     information that's based on a study, testimony echoing
24
     Mr. Frankel, I'd like to have them to circulate. We
25
     can't really make a policy decision until we know what
```

we're dealing with. 1 DIRECTOR HUNG: If -- if I can just raise 2 something anecdotally. 3 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Certainly. 4 DIRECTOR HUNG: I don't -- I don't know if 5 this -- it may not come up often, but I do know in 1973 6 7 the military records repository in St. Louis was burned and the federal government is still in the process of 8 re-creating some of those military records and they're 9 10 actually pulling in records from payrolls in other departments in order to re-create those records. 11 12 I mean personally that affected my father. I don't know if you've ever come across such a situation 13 but...I just thought I'd bring that up. 14 15 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Anecdotally, I would 16 I had a problem myself. When I was elected repeat. 17 here, I had to produce a birth certificate. I was not born in this state. We got it quickly. First of all, it 18 19 was pre-9/11, but the clerk here called the clerk in the 20 state where I was -- where I was born. She -- he, they 21 knew each other professionally, and it got produced. 22 But everybody can have a problem. 23 lost my original certificate somewhere.

I might -- you remind me. My father-in-law was born not in this country. The only proof of birth

24

25

was in the family Bible and afterwards it turned out his mother had made him a year older than he really was because she wanted to send him to school. He was a real problem. You know, a year earlier before he was really -- he was very middle class. He just never had a birth certificate that we could find.

Mr. Krieger.

REP. KRIEGER: Yes, Madam Chair. And just -- just one follow-up.

And I guess that's really the point I'm trying to make. You were able to get a birth certificate. And I haven't -- I haven't seen a circumstance where someone who is born in the United States cannot get one.

So I have to publicly say I -- I -- I'd like to see your study, but I have some -- some doubts as to whether this is a significant problem.

Thank you very much.

DIRECTOR HUNG: I -- I do know about one woman. I'll be happy to have her contact your office. She was born out of state. She's very elderly. She was born at home by a midwife who was illiterate and when the midwife filled out the birth certificate, she spelled her name incorrectly. So the family spelled it the way they wanted to spell it and she went all her life using the

spelling she did. When she went to get a copy of her birth certificate, she couldn't get it because it didn't match the name on her driver's license.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes.

DIRECTOR HUNG: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Chairman

Benninghoff.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: Just one quick comment. It just seems to me that the one thing we all agree on is the fact that the cumbersome -- cumbersomeness of government red tape is probably as problematic as some of the concerns raised in this bill. Maybe as policymakers and to our friends in the federal level, we ought to be striving for some better efficiency.

I just have a hard time in this technological age that we're in today -- and I can go to New Zealand and make a purchase and I guarantee that VISA is going to make sure there's a bill in my mailbox in 30 days.

This is inexcusable to sit here and listen to these nightmares of four or five months, not to mention this is the same entity that we're going to turn our national health care system over to, so it's crazy that we use the excuse that, well, it's difficult, it's hard to get through this.

I think we can do better than that, and probably become the mutual goals of trying to provide people who don't have identification, because whether we like it or not, the requirements or need for identification is going to get greater.

Everyone sitting in this room had to provide some form of identification to enter this building. We didn't do that when I first came here, and that need is going to continue.

So maybe part of the goal ought to be to make that whole business less cumbersome, at least here in Pennsylvania.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Chairman

Benninghoff, I will be very happy, no matter who comes

back in the majority, the minority, the Governor, the

Senators, to work on that with you in a bipartisan

manner. It really needs to be worked on. Thank you for

that suggestion.

Mariann Davies, You Don't Speak For Me.

MS. DAVIES: Thank you, Madam -- thank you, Madam Chairman, for allowing me to be here today and the members of the committee.

First of all, I -- I was really taken aback. I didn't know if I should laugh or cry. I fall on the tail end of the demographic that Ms. Hung spoke

about, but I've never had a problem having my -- in getting my library card, my bar card, my insurance card, my debit card or my driver's license. And you know what? My parents were immigrants and my first language was not English.

I am here today because illegal -- to support -- first of all, to make it clear that we support House Bill 1359, the Proof of Citizenship for Receipt of Public Benefits Act Legislation.

Illegal immigration is a national crisis that affects every household, every taxpayer, every state including the state of Pennsylvania.

I'm speaking here to you -- to you here today as not only a resident and taxpayer of the Commonwealth, but as a daughter of legal immigrants from Ecuador who immigrated here legally over 50 years ago.

My family came here to live the American dream and participate and contribute to this nation, not demand or abuse the generosity of its people or its public institutions.

I have been a spokesperson for national organizations of Hispanic Americans who support legal immigration over illegal immigration, support a strong border security plan over open borders, and believe in assimilation rather than ethnic-isolation, and English

language immersion over bilingual education.

We believe these principles lead to a more successful integration of recent immigrants as possible contributors to the fabric of American society.

Today I am speaking to this committee to urge that this piece of legislation be considered for a full House vote. Sadly, and I don't think anybody has discussed this so far, the business of identity theft and public benefit fraud has been identified as the profiteers of illegal immigration as a profit center.

And let me -- let me just say, the profiteers of illegal immigration not only exploit the immigrants themselves but they exploit the taxpayers, the American citizens, the working poor, especially in minority communities, as well as the legal immigrants that are here. So anyone who supports illegal immigration or providing benefits to those who are here illegally is directly and indirectly supporting the profiteers of illegal immigration.

Today I would like to -- excuse me -- the business of selling Social Security numbers, driver's licenses, and fraudulent immigration documents to non-U.S. citizens in order to access employment, welfare, health care, disability, public-assisted housing, the TANF program, or other public benefits is well

established.

Indeed, in an era where states must make -must make painful cuts to necessary programs, it's
imperative that no eligible Pennsylvanian legal resident
be turned away because ineligible non-citizens were
accessing said programs through the use of false or
fraudulent documents.

Policy should dictate public monies and public benefits should not be awarded to those who openly violate our laws.

Pennsylvania has a duty to its legal residents and citizens. Our Commonwealth has an important role to play in this effort to reduce the illegal immigration just as it does to assist the federal government in enforcing all other federal laws.

Unless the Pennsylvania legislature takes immediate action to discourage more illegal immigrants from settling here, via restriction of benefits and the lure of illegal and often exploited employment, then the cost to taxpayers will necessarily increase. This bill is a small but necessary step. I call this the trust and verify.

I encourage lawmakers here today to consider making this law work by also requiring verification of the documents presented to prove

citizenship much in the same way that in employment situations E-verify is used to verify Social Security numbers and worker eligibility.

Individual and criminal enterprises that use fraudulent documents -- use fraudulent documents to obtain driver's licenses, Social Security cards, and then these documents, in turn, are used to illegally obtain government financial benefits.

That's why we don't have -- really have any idea. No one in this room has really any idea how much we are spending on people who are not citizens who are not eligible to receive public benefits in this Commonwealth.

With the exception of the Department of Public Welfare, no other agency uses a verification program. So we have no idea. None of us do. We need to do that.

In recent months, dozens of individuals —
to illustrate this concept, identity theft is rampant and
goes hand in hand with illegal immigration. I take
exception to everyone who has previously said that
there's undocumented workers. In fact, I know many of
those in the ranks that have plenty of documents. They
may not be good. They may not be theirs. They might be
borrowed, stolen, or bought on the black-market. But

they're very well documented.

Identity theft is rampant. Goes hand in hand with illegal immigration. Therefore, this law should be amended to require the verification of the Social Security numbers and/or immigration status through the SAVE program.

In recent months, dozens of individuals living, working in Pennsylvania illegally have been subjects of indictments, arrests, and convictions for engaging in various schemes involving the lucrative business of fraudulent documents and identity theft.

I'll briefly summarize the most -- the three most recent cases. The first one was just was -- excuse me -- released on the news release September 10th by ICE. Just -- just a few days ago.

PennDOT -- a PennDOT official was charged with extortion and ID theft. Roy Davila, Felix Davila, and Rafael De La Rosa Duran, residing in Philadelphia, were charged with manufacturing fraudulent identity -- identity documents, extortion, and aggravated identity theft. These individuals were selling Social Security cards and birth certificates as recently as April and July of 2010.

The second recent case was July 12th, 2010. A New Jersey man was sentenced in a cash scheme

for driver's licenses. Michael Lominy of Irvington,
Pennsylvania and 20 others were sent to prison for a
scheme to pay cash to pay state -- PA state driver's
license examiners to assist illegal aliens and foreign
nationals in obtaining driver licenses via fraud at
various Philadelphia PennDOT offices. Most of the
customers hailed from Africa and the Caribbean. This
criminal scheme placed over a hundred illegal drivers on
our roads and highways, some with truck driver's
licenses.

On May 6th of 2010, 20 arrested in Philadelphia in a corruption and document fraud case. Three PennDOT employees sold licenses to criminals and illegal aliens. This case involved a 17-year scheme operating in Pennsylvania and other states, including three Philadelphians running a driving school that assisted illegal aliens in obtaining driver's licenses and identity cards. At least seven of the people caught with one of these fraudulent licenses were caught transporting narcotics or large sum -- sums of cash.

In order to ensure that public benefits are being granted only to eligible applicants and exclude those that present false or fraudulent identification -- and this would mean anyone who is providing false -- false or fraudulent identification -- it would be wise

for the state of Pennsylvania to enroll in the SAVE initiative designed to aid benefit-granting agencies in determining an applicant's immigration status.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The program is an electronic service for benefit-issuing agencies, institutions, licensing -licensing bureaus and government entities. In fact, usually when one enters in a record electronically through their web site, I looked through their training video, USCIS explained that it takes only three to five seconds to get an answer. And there is a multiple layer or procedure for appeals in the event that there is some kind of problem, which is very rare. They process -they have information on over a hundred million records through the Department of Homeland Security and can determine the immigration status of benefit applicants to ensure, again, that only entitled applicants receive federal, state, or local benefits and licenses.

In conclusion, we urge that this committee consider that these measures were already passed in the Senate with bipartisan support. We ask this committee to support this legislation and allow the members of the House of Representatives to vote on this measure.

It's time to put the interests of the legal residents and taxpayers of the Commonwealth above the interests of illegal immigrants and the profiteers of

illegal immigration. 1 2 Thank you. CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you, Ms. Davies. 3 Any questions, discussion? 4 I don't think you gave us anything in 5 writing, but you're certainly welcome to do that. 6 7 Mr. Cox. REP. COX: It's not so much a question as 8 it is a comment. I want to thank you for your 9 10 testimony. You have been a perfect example of what I hear in my district. 11 I have had former DPW workers from our 12 county come to my office and sit there and tell me case 13 after case where they asked them for identification and 14 they flipped through a series of -- of driver's 15 licenses. 16 17 I have had turnpike workers tell me that when someone comes to the tollbooth and does not have 18 money to pay, they say, can I get your identification and 19 20 follow the process in place there, it's the same type of 21 thing, flipping through a series of driver's licenses to 22 find the one that they want to leave. 23 The three instances I've heard on the 24 turnpike, all three of them drove off leaving one of the 25 driver's --

MS. DAVIES: Sure.

REP. COX: -- licenses in the hands of the turnpike worker. But fraud is prevalent. And I think this bill, Representative Marsico's bill is part of a larger plan, that we need to put it in place to make sure of that documentation on all levels. Because if you've got a fraudulent birth certificate or a fraudulent driver's license or other documentation, it's a little bit too late in the game when they go to apply for benefits with the fraudulent documents. How do we expect the people in that office to --

MS. DAVIES: Sure.

REP. COX: -- to know? It's things like the multiples that kind of send up a red flag. So I want to thank you for verifying some of the things that I've heard already in my district in Berks County, which unfortunately is one of the places that is advertised to come to for -- for great benefits.

MS. DAVIES: Sure. And we're not expecting state employees to become immigration agents or experts on -- on identifying fraudulent documents. That is why we have the SAVE program. The federal government has that.

On the employment side that's why we also have the E-verify as well. We're not trying to put human

resources, you know, professionals and/or state employees 1 in a position of being immigration agents whatsoever. 2 REP. COX: Thank you. 3 MS. DAVIES: You're welcome. 4 5 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Is there anyone else? It occurred to me, Mr. Cox, that that 6 7 caseworker was in violation of the law by having a little discussion here and for not reporting that fraud to 8 9 someone beside yourself, but perhaps not. 10 REP. COX: Just a quick comment to that, 11 Madam Chairman. 12 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes. REP. COX: If the municipal protection laws 13 were better in Pennsylvania, I think we might see that. 14 That's another discussion for another day. But that's 15 16 certainly something we'd be willing to discuss. 17 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Good. Good. willing to discuss that as well. 18 19 Ms. Davies, thank you for your testimony. 20 MS. DAVIES: You're welcome. 21 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We're joined by 22 Mr. Cohen. 23 Mr. -- Ms. Zaebst from -- the Policy Center 24 Manager from the Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against 25 Hunger.

One thing I'm interested in before we -while you're sitting down, I mentioned it before you were
present, I think, I'm really interested in how much food,
you know, how much -- if you have that information. If
not, maybe you can get that for us.

Thank you. Please, proceed.

MS. ZAEBST: Sure. Thank you very much. Representative Josephs, Representative Benninghoff, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify about this bill today.

I apologize for my lateness. I was a last-minute addition to the agenda yesterday and then had to do a little bit of schedule juggling to make it here this morning. But I really appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today.

My name is Julie Zaebst, and I represent the Greater Philadelphia Coalition Against Hunger, or The Coalition.

We're a nonprofit organization serving the five county region of southeastern Pennsylvania. Our mission to height -- fight hunger through education, through advocacy, and through outreach.

I'm going to tell you briefly about two of our programs so you get a flavor for what it is that we do today.

One is the Hunger Fighters Network which provides support to over a hundred food kitchens and food pantries throughout the region. These kitchens and pantries are staffed by volunteers and clinicians who work tirelessly to provide food to the families in need that come to them.

They serve tens of thousands of people each year. They provide bags of groceries and they serve hot meals to the folks at their time of need.

We also operate a Food Resource Hotline and have done so for the last seven years. This is a place that folks in need can call to find out about benefits that they might be eligible for, including the food stamp program, now called the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP.

 $\label{eq:weak_provide} \text{We also provide them other food resources}$ that they may be eligible for.

Over the last seven years that we've been operating this hotline, we've served over 40,000 households in need of food via our hotline.

So I'm here today representing the clients that we serve, as well as the volunteers who work at food pantries and soup kitchens in our region and the clients that they serve.

The coalition opposes House Bill 1359. We

believe it has the message to increase hunger and food insecurity across the state by preventing citizens and eligible immigrants from accessing food assistance and other benefits that help them to support their families.

I want to be clear that the bill as it's written would affect citizens and eligible immigrants who are currently assisted by these food programs as well as by other public benefits programs.

As we all know, House Bill 1359 would require Pennsylvanians to provide certain types of identification in order to obtain a wide variety of public benefits, and this includes several food assistance programs.

I want to talk to you specifically about which programs we believe would be affected and what those programs provide to citizens of our Commonwealth.

The State Food Purchase Program serves eligible households with income below 150 percent of the poverty line. So that's less than \$2300 per month gross for a family of three.

The Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture estimates that 2.5 million people were served by this program last year.

And for your question, Representative

Josephs, I can take a look and see how much food that was

that was provided to households. I have the most recent annual report of the State Food Purchase Program.

What the state food funds do is they provide groceries and hot meals for families in need. The program does make it a priority to purchase Pennsylvania food products, so it also supports farmers and food distributors across the state.

Most of the state food, as I mentioned, is distributed by private charitable organizations. Those state-based food cupboards and soup kitchens that I mentioned to you previously.

Therefore, many recipients of state food don't apply directly to a government agency as defined by this bill, and they would not be covered by its provisions.

However, some state food is distributed by city government agencies, and recipients of this food may be affected by the bill. Many of the people who receive state food from government agencies are homeless, and they really rely on this food for nourishment.

So that's one food program that we believe will be affected by House Bill 1359.

The other food assistance program that may be impacted by the bill is the Farmers Market Nutrition Program. This program serves low income seniors as well

as low income women and their infants and children who are receiving benefits through the Women, Infants, and Children program called WIC.

Each season they get \$20 in vouchers that they can redeem for fresh fruits and vegetables at certified farmers market vendors. These are local farmers, again, whose businesses also benefit from the program and receive specific support through this program.

Seniors get their market vouchers from local senior centers and the WIC participants get their vouchers from their local WIC offices.

It's our understanding that this bill would not apply to seniors receiving certain benefits, like SSI. However, it would apply to some seniors participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program, including many between the ages of 60 and 65.

We're unclear as to whether the bill would apply to WIC recipients who receive farmers market vouchers. The benefit might be exempt because the bill explicitly excludes services provided to women, infants, and children through the WIC program. However, this program is actually administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture so it's a little unclear whether this benefit would be affected by the bill.

I want to make clear that many applicants for these food assistance programs and for the other benefits that we're talking about here today do not have the type of government-issued ID that's required by this bill.

In our experience, many of the clients that we serve directly, as well as many of the clients that our pantries and soup kitchen serve, lack the type of government-issued ID that would be necessary in order to obtain this food assistance.

I want to be clear with the committee these are citizens and eligible immigrants who do, in fact, qualify for food assistance and other benefits, but they could be denied that help they need because they are lacking these government-issued IDs.

Recipients of state food at soup kitchens and homeless shelters, as well as seniors participating in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program are especially likely to lack the types of ID required by this bill.

Participants in these programs are by definition low income. These are programs that serve low income people. And a recent opinion by the Opinion Research Corporation found that 15 percent of people with incomes below \$35,000 a year lack a photo ID which is essentially the same requirement as this bill.

Many recipients of state food at shelter facilities and soup kitchens I mentioned is homeless, and this population is especially unlikely to have the type of ID this bill would require to in order to receive food assistance. Homeless applicants may have lost their ID amidst their moves. They may be victims of domestic violence or fleeing a difficult home situation. Some may be mentally ill and just unable to maintain their documents.

But regardless of the reason, if they come to a state food site that's run by city government, requesting a hot meal or bag of groceries to get them through the day or end of the month, they may be denied this food assistance simply because they don't have the type of government-issued ID that would be necessary in order to obtain these benefits.

So I'm sure that some of my colleagues here today have spoke about how complex the process of obtaining government ID can be, so I won't go into great detail about that. But I do want to emphasize the process of getting this ID can take many months. We've seen this with many of our clients and applicants who simply cannot wait to get the food that they need.

Our clients have a difficult time getting ID from the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation

when they, for instance, don't have access to their birth certificate or to their Social Security card for a variety of reasons. They're caught in a Catch-22 situation that can take months to resolve and a fair amount of staff time, to be honest with you. And sometimes it takes longer than that.

And, as I said before, people seeking food assistance cannot wait that amount of time to get the help they need. Particularly the folks who are seeking state food from shelters and soup kitchens literally have nowhere else to turn for a nutritious meal. So that if they don't food this out in the time that they are seeking it, they may well go hungry.

Of course, we know that hunger and food insecurity have enormous human costs. I'm just going to cite one study about the cost of hunger and food insecurity. It's a recent study by the Harvard School of Public Health, and they found that people who were hungry and food insecure are three times more likely to have a poor overall health status and three times more likely to suffer from activity-limiting health impairments.

We already have 1.4 million people in the Commonwealth who are at risk of hunger and we believe that any piece of legislation that has the potential to increase the hungry people in our state is simply

unacceptable.

In addition to these human costs of House Bill 1359, there are significant financial costs.

Hunger itself costs the state money. The same study that I just cited estimates that hunger already costs Pennsylvania somewhere in the number of \$3.25 billion per year. That's mostly increased medical expenses and decreased worker activity.

And that's not to mention the direct costs of implementing this legislation.

This bill calls for the addition of layers and layers of red tape to many government programs. And as I'm sure you've heard today, state and local agencies would have to make significant changes to their applications process to comply with this legislation.

This is inefficient and costly. We're in a time period right now when there are more and more people in need of benefits, and we can't afford to increase the cost of administering these benefits while the state is still reeling from the recession and more folks are seeking food assistance and other benefits to support their families.

So in closing, I want to state that I understand that the proponents of this bill have already characterized it as a way to save money by preventing

immigrants who are not authorized to be in the United States from receiving public benefits.

However, there are already adequate checks in place to ensure that ineligible immigrants do not receive those benefits.

And from our perspective, what we see is that the real effect of this bill would be to harm U.S. citizens and lawfully present residents. It would prevent them from getting benefits to which they are entitled as citizens and as eligible immigrants simply because they cannot obtain government-issued ID or cannot obtain it quickly enough to get the food assistance that they need.

We believe that the costs to citizens and eligible immigrants, as well as the cost to state and local government, far outweigh any savings that might be achieved.

So on behalf of the soup kitchens and food cupboards that we work with, on behalf of the clients that we serve, we strongly urge the committee today to oppose this legislation.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. Two things before I ask for questions. I would like to see whatever study anybody has --

MS. ZAEBST: Sure.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: -- that is still present on the costs of implementing this to government, to citizens. And I also would love to see, of course, the information in tons of food, if we can find that, that come from local -- I'm a foodie. I've got a lot of local --

MS. ZAEBST: Sure.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: -- markets, food and farmers markets in my district.

MS. ZAEBST: Sure.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: The ladies that I spoke about who now can get a card that looks like a VISA card come down and use the food market at Rittenhouse Square. But if they have to go in person to apply for food, they're going to be hungry.

MS. ZAEBST: So I'm looking right now at the most recent report -- report from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture that tells us a little bit about the State Food Purchase Program in the last fiscal year and according to Appendix C of this report it's \$15,640,000 of food that is purchased through this program.

I can't tell you exactly how much of that comes from Pennsylvania farmers and Pennsylvania food

manufacturers, but they are prioritized by law for the 1 State Food Purchase Program. 2 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: 3 Thank you. Ms. Delozier. 4 REP. DELOZIER: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 5 I just have a quick question. 6 7 MS. ZAEBST: Sure. REP. DELOZIER: As you receive state 8 funding, which is why you'd be compelled by this type of 9 law, correct? 10 11 Does our organization receive MS. ZAEBST: 12 state funding? We do receive state funding. REP. DELOZIER: You do? 13 14 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. 15 REP. DELOZIER: So this morning I'm just 16 trying to clarify the difference as to what you do now 17 and what -- and I understand what the bill is -- is saying. At this point in time you -- it is the law that 18 19 illegal immigrants cannot receive the way -- the type of funding -- or food that you're providing for them. 20 21 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. That's correct. 22 REP. DELOZIER: So in order to abide by 23 that law, what do you do now to verify that they are 24 legal? 25 MS. ZAEBST: Sure. I want to be clear that our organization does not distribute state food and we do not participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Program.

So we represent food cupboards and soup kitchens that do distribute that food, and we work with vendors that participate in the Farmers Market Nutrition Market. So I don't want to misspeak and give you inaccurate information, because we are not directly dealing with those programs. But I am aware that the food cupboards and soup kitchens that distribute state food first have to have filled out a declaration of need which indicates their identity, their income, and their residency.

And I know that most of the distributors of state food do require identification at this time, but it's a flexible identification requirement. So if folks can't provide, for instance, the type of government-issued ID that would be required with this bill or other ways of verifying their ID --

REP. DELOZIER: What other types of identity do they -- that's where -- I'm trying to --

MS. ZAEBST: Sure.

REP. DELOZIER: -- decipher the difference between what the bill is asking for, which would be a typical, you know, type of photo ID, versus what is acceptable right now.

Sure. Some folks are able to get 1 MS. ZAEBST: referrals to food cupboards and soup kitchens from 2 agencies to which they are known, so they -- we have 3 worked with them and feel that we can accurately verify 4 their identify and we can refer them to food cupboards 5 and soup kitchens. 6 7 If they are residents of a shelter, they can 8 verify their identity. That's an option for them. 9 REP. DELOZIER: So you're saying at this point 10 in time the folks that are coming to you --11 MS. ZAEBST: Uh-huh. 12 REP. DELOZIER: -- in some cases -- and actually there's many other types -- in some cases if you're 13 14 referred to -- they're referred by a church --15 MS. ZAEBST: Sure. 16 REP. DELOZIER: -- or some other entity, you are 17 counting on them, that that entity too has verified that they are a U.S. citizen. 18 19 MS. ZAEBST: Or an eligible immigrant. REP. DELOZIER: Or an eligible immigrant. 20 21 MS. ZAEBST: Eligible for food assistance. 22 Because it's meeting a very basic need. 23 REP. DELOZIER: Right. Right. So okay. 24 they're referrals or if they do not have a referral, then 25 those entities are having that individual fill out a

declaration of need. 1 MS. ZAEBST: Uh-huh. 2 REP. DELOZIER: And you're sort of taking their 3 word for the fact that they are a resident or eligible 4 for the services. 5 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. 6 7 REP. DELOZIER: Is there any other type of --MS. ZAEBST: And I want to clarify this is 8 specifically in regard to state food. The Farmers Market 9 Nutrition Program is more strictly regulated because it's 10 11 being administered by low-income senior citizen centers and the WIC offices. 12 REP. DELOZIER: And that's fine. 13 I'm just 14 trying to make -- you're the first one to talk about an 15 actual operating program. MS. ZAEBST: Sure. 16 17 REP. DELOZIER: That's why I have these questions. So it's either a declaration of need, a 18 19 possible referral --20 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. 21 REP. DELOZIER: -- from another entity. 22 MS. ZAEBST: The declaration of need is 23 required. Even if I refer clients to state food sites, they still have to complete a declaration of need to 24 25 ensure that they're under the income, which means they're

below 150 percent of poverty. 1 REP. DELOZIER: And so this declaration of 2 need, is that ever then verified? Or what is the 3 process? Once you receive that declaration of need, what 4 5 do you do with that? MS. ZAEBST: The places that distribute state 6 7 food simply maintain those on file to, you know, prove that the folks that came to them had declared that they 8 9 were eligible. 10 REP. DELOZIER: Okay. MS. ZAEBST: I don't think that there are 11 12 further requirements in terms of verifying the identity of that individual. Most of them will bring in proof of 13 14 residency. If they have an address and a place to receive mail, that's one thing that they can relate to. 15 16 REP. DELOZIER: Okay. So you guys keep that in 17 your file in case someone else questions or --18 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. 19 REP. DELOZIER: -- you're asked questions about 20 that? 21 MS. ZAEBST: Exactly. 22 REP. DELOZIER: If you were asked those 23 questions.

MS. ZAEBST: And the folks that sign also, you

know, this is true and accurate information that they are

24

25

providing us. 1 REP. DELOZIER: Okay. So there's -- at this 2 point then, from them being able to fill out this 3 4 declaration, you could -- I could go in and fill in a residency or address? 5 MS. ZAEBST: Yes. 6 7 REP. DELOZIER: An apartment building in the town, okay, and say that I live there. But there's no 8 9 other types of paper documentation or anything like that, 10 rent or mortgage or anything like that? 11 MR. ZAEBST: No. There may be. Folks may 12 chose to provide that, but it's not required. REP. DELOZIER: Okay. That's fine. Thank you 13 14 very much. 15 MS. ZAEBST: You're welcome. 16 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Krieger. 17 REP. KRIEGER: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have a question for you. 18 19 MS. ZAEBST: Sure. 20 REP. KRIEGER: Probably follows on 21 Representative Delozier's questions. 22 You mentioned in your testimony there are 23 adequate checks to prevent illegal immigrants from 24 obtaining benefits. You mentioned the declaration of 25 need. Is that the adequate check you're talking about or

is that --1 MS. ZAEBST: It depends on the program, as 2 I say. So as we don't administer these programs 3 directly, I don't want to misspeak and give you 4 inaccurate information. 5 But when folks apply for WIC benefits and 6 7 for the Farmers Market Nutrition Program, there is additional documentation that is required of them. 8 9 And certainly in terms of the other 10 benefits that would be covered by this piece of legislation, there are more rigorous checks in place, in 11 12 part because most of those programs are administered directly by government agencies whereas state food is 13 14 distributed, as I said, largely by a private charitable network that is fee based. 15 16 REP. KRIEGER: Can you describe those 17 requirements you just mentioned? MS. ZAEBST: For which program? 18 19 sorry. 20 REP. KRIEGER: For any of those programs. 21 MS. ZAEBST: I would rather not misspeak 22 about the specific requirements for a program that we 23 don't work with directly. 24 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Krieger, I make a 25 general ask here. Anybody in the audience or anyone who

hears about this hearing or knows of people, I would like 1 to know myself how rigorous and what is done, aside from 2 the SAVE system, which we've heard about, from anybody 3 here who has any information and I will distribute it to 4 the committee or anybody else who is interested. 5 REP. KRIEGER: Thank you, Madam Chair. Ι 6 7 can appreciate that. And I understand our witness perhaps doesn't have knowledge of the program and in her 8 testimony she didn't -- she did testify there were 9 10 adequate checks in place. I was just merely inquiring as to the basis 11 12 of her testimony in that regard. I have one other question. 13 14 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Certainly. 15 REP. KRIEGER: Can you estimate for us this 16 universe you're talking about of the hungry in 17 Pennsylvania? MS. ZAEBST: 18 Sure. 19 REP. KRIEGER: How large is that? 20 MS. ZAEBST: According to the most recent 21 estimates by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, it's 1.4 22 million people in the Commonwealth, and I suspect that 23 that number has increased as a result of the recent 24 recession.

Those numbers are a little bit outdated at

25

this point, but that number is quoted again in this report from the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture that I referenced earlier.

REP. KRIEGER: And of that 1.4 million people, can you estimate the number that would not be eligible or not be able to prove their eligibility if this bill would become law?

MS. ZAEBST: That is a really tough question to answer. I know that the study that I cited about the number of folks who lack photo ID said that 11 percent of the people that participated in their survey, which is a representative national sample, lacked photo identification, which is essentially the same requirements as this bill.

However, because people who are hungry and food insecure tend to be low income, I would guess that number is, in fact, even higher.

That same study found that 15 percent of people with incomes below \$35,000 lacked photo identification. So I don't want to make any exact claims, but we can extrapolate from that study to the hungry in Pennsylvania and make a guess as to how many of them would be lacking this type of identification.

REP. KRIEGER: And one follow-up. Of that 11 percent or 15, whatever that percentage is, how large

is the universe of folks that could not obtain photo ID if they -- if they attempted to do so?

MS. ZAEBST: I imagine that the majority of them could obtain photo ID if they attempted to do so; but, as I mentioned in my testimony, if they lack a birth certificate or Social Security card, it becomes very difficult for them to get a photo ID from PennDOT because they need to bring in a birth certificate, a Social Security card, and two proofs of residency.

And so by the time they go through the process of getting the birth certificate and Social Security card and then get down to PennDOT to obtain their photo ID, it can, as I said, take many, many months to make that happen.

So I believe that with a lot of time, a lot of effort, and a lot of support from social services staff that the vast majority of them could get a photo ID. As I said, they — these folks need food assistance and other benefits right away. And they simply don't have several months in order to get the bag of groceries that they needed to get them through the end of the month.

REP. KRIEGER: Okay. Thank you. And just -- just one -- one comment. I guess the crux of the matter really is how great of a burden are we placing on

folks to be able to obtain a photo ID whenever they're coming to us and asking for government benefits? And I guess just from my -- my summary is I don't think that that's great a bene -- that great of a burden and that's why we follow it.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Benninghoff.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: Thank you, Madam

Chairman.

Very briefly and first of all, thank you for your detailed testimony. It was very impressive, your comments and your knowledge of your field.

Real quick, building on what Representative Krieger was asking, is access to a place to get ID an issue in a lot of your provider areas?

It seems to me, yes, it's a little cumbersome at the time, but I would suspect that a lot of your clientele -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- are not a one-time visit.

And so for those that provide the service, it's got to be somewhat cumbersome to have the same person coming to them month after month after month and go through the same questioning, telling them they don't have ID, that part of me says we ought to be trying to cultivate the ability to obtain some form of ID, and I'm

just curious of how difficult the actual access to some center that would do that would be.

MS. ZAEBST: It's not -- particularly in Philadelphia, it's not so difficult for most of our clients to get to a PennDOT office. It's the process of getting a birth certificate, which if you're born out of state, and sometimes the Social Security card, it can be really difficult.

It's not really physical access to the office, but a lot of the bureaucratic hurdles that they have to jump through in order to get the documents they need in order to get a photo ID they need in order to get the benefits that they need.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: And then that's what we actually cultivated at our offices, obviously as we look for some answers to some of these questions, can't we help at least with the person who's getting a birth certificate, which is easy for me to advocate, since I'm not involved with them, as Madam Chairman says the policy. But, again, I think the ultimate goal in this room is to try to break down some of these barriers —

MS. ZAEBST? Yes.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: -- and be more progressive so that the whole system is not difficult.

MS. ZAEBST: Absolutely.

REP. BENNINGHOFF: And yet it may be a 1 one-time expense in the long run, but it's got to be a 2 little more efficient. 3 MS. ZAEBST: Correct. I think Community 4 5 Legal Services, who testified earlier, has extensive experience in walking clients through the process of 6 7 obtaining the ID and they may have a better sense than I personally do of all the hurdles involved in that. 8 9 I think they can speak to the staff time it requires and what it would take to assist more of our 10 11 clients, this estimated 11 percent of Pennsylvanians, in 12 getting this ID. REP. BENNINGHOFF: I sit on the board for a 13 14 center, and we go through these same types of hurdles, maybe a little smaller, but I appreciate your assistance 15 16 in that questioning. 17 Thank you, Madam Chairman. 18 MS. ZAEBST: Thank you. 19

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24

25

We do have another witness, but before -before I would like to say -- and I can speak for all the people, including members who oppose this bill, without even asking them, we are not for illegal immigrants.

We are not for people here to be in the country who don't belong in this country. We are not for

them to be using public benefits if they're not eligible 1 We are not for anybody to be accessing public 2 benefits for which they are not eligible. 3 Nobody wants that. We don't want -- what 4 we worry about is eligible people not being able to 5 access things like food -- like food -- and what we worry 6 7 about is costing more than we get back from instituting these kinds of procedures. 8 9 Just to clarify my position and those of 10 others. Thank you. 11 MS. ZAEBST: Thank you. CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: All of the witnesses 12 who -- will make themselves available for questions and 13 who -- will let us whatever information I know. 14 15 Ms. Lindemyer from the Pennsylvania 16 Coalition Against Domestic Violence. 17 Thank you very much for your testimony, Ms. Zaebst. 18 19 DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: Good morning. My name is Nicole Lindemyer, and I'm the public policy director 20 21 for the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic 22 Violence. 23 The coalition is a statewide network for 60 24 domestic violence programs throughout Pennsylvania,

consisting of shelters, hotlines, counseling programs,

25

legal and medical advocacy projects, children's advocacy, and some transitional housing projects for victims of domestic violence and their children.

Every year millions of women are assaulted by their intimate partners, and millions more children are exposed to this violence.

Here in Pennsylvania the prevalence of domestic violence reminds us that it is an issue of enormous magnitude and its victims are no small minority. And each year between 90,000 and 100,000 victims reach out for help and receive services from domestic violence programs in the state.

In addition to the prevalence, the fatal consequences of domestic violence also remind us that it is no minor matter. Between 2000 and 2009 at least 1,455 people died in domestic violence-related incidents, a rate that has spiked 51 percent in recent years from 121 in 2007 to 180 deaths in 2009.

It's irrefutable that domestic violence is tragically widespread and too often has fatal consequences. To comprehend the enormity of domestic violence, it is critical to understand the array of obstacles that victims face in trying to break free from abusive relationships and rebuild their house, obstacles that would be exacerbated by House Bill 1359.

Leaving an abusive relationship and rebuilding one's entire life is an enormous undertaking that most of us can barely fathom. For most victims, their batterers have so controlled their lives and constrained their options that to break free means they will be forced to start over with nothing.

They know that wherever they may go their abusers are likely to follow. Countless victims are able to escape the violence only by uprooting their entire life and moving to a new, confidential location where they spend every day looking over their shoulder, anticipating that their abuser will find them and commence the abuse again.

Within this environment of constant fear, domestic violence victims confront a spectrum of needs that must be met in order for them to live independent of their abusers.

Of course, safety is a paramount priority, but safety depends on the victim's ability to meet their basic needs like shelter, food, transportation, without which victims have no choice but to return to their abusers.

Perhaps the most basic of all needs, victims need the financial resources to cover the myriad of costs associated with starting a new life, including

relocation expenses, housing and utility deposits, food, clothing, school supplies, transportation, the kinds of life necessities we all require.

However, many victims rely on the financial contributions of the abuser to make ends meet. Victims such as stay at home, pregnant or disabled victims, victims living in dire poverty, and victims' abusers have forbidden them from working.

Without the abuser's contributions to the household, often victims must turn temporarily to public assistance during the transition from abuse to self-sufficiency. During this transition, economic assistance, as well as food stamps, medical coverage, job training, and other forms of public benefits become a lifeline for domestic violence victims. These types of assistance are very literally the bridge out of violent homes and into safety and independence. A bridge to a future free from abuse.

Indeed, often the reason domestic violence victims remain in abusive relationships is precisely because they're not able to financially support themselves and their children without the abuser's income. It is no surprise --

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We're going on the floor at 11:00. So we have to conclude this.

DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: I will finish in time.

2 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: But I would think there

3 might be questions.

DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I know you're not talking maybe -- not talking fast but summarize if possible. I know you have a lot of information that's very valuable.

DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: Well, we think that it's really imperative that the resources that victims need to break free of abuse -- that we ensure our laws and policies do not erect further barriers to getting the help they need. For this reason, it's critical that we recognize the unintended consequences of House Bill 1359.

Of primary concern to the Coalition is the increased standard for identification for -- as a condition of receiving a form of public benefits.

As you know, the bill would require applicants to show government-issued ID. However, this requirement would be an obstacle because -- for domestic violence victims because when fleeing abuse, and indeed many victims come into shelters directly from emergency rooms or after an acute assault -- it's extremely rare for them to have the opportunity to grab their driver's

license or other important documents and take them with them.

I'll tell you in talking with one victim advocate about this bill, she told me about a victim she recently helped. The victim is a 32-year-old Caucasian mother of three. Her husband had been abusive for years, but the violence was escalating and she had the gut sense he was going to kill her.

One morning he became irate, throwing her against the wall and yelling obscenities. He told her he was going to, quote, handle something and he'd be right back to finish what she started. When he walked away, she was terrified. She grabbed her children and ran out the door. Both she and her daughter didn't even have shoes on their feet, much less any form of identification.

This situation is exemplary of many thousands of victims who flee to shelters with nothing but the clothes on their backs. For the same reasons victims lack government-issued ID, they also lack documents necessary to get government-issued ID. It takes months and extensive records fees to get those replacement documents such as Social Security and birth certificates.

Another situation I'll tell you about is

that of a battered woman who stayed in a shelter in Centre County. She had fled here to Pennsylvania from several states because everywhere she went her abuser tracked her down and tried to kill her. He went to elaborate lengths to find her again and again, through constant surveillance, monitoring records and stalking and threatening --

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: We're going to be onto the floor in just a few minutes. I'm sorry.

DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: Okay. Cases like hers demonstrate how extremely difficult it is for victims fleeing abuse.

Advocates can attest to situations where abusers deliberately destroy or take away victims' identification as a means of keeping victims dependent and unable to leave.

Victims in crisis must prioritize their own lives and the lives of their children above packing a bag and taking personal documents with them, but must not be indirectly penalized for doing so.

House Bill 1359 would have the unconscionable result of denying a battered woman the assistance she needs to break free of abuse, for the reason that her purse -- her driver's license is in her purse and the purse is in the home of the person who has

tried and pledged to kill her.

Domestic violence victims would not be able to comply with the requirements of this bill and for this reason the Coalition urges this committee to oppose it.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Ms. Lindemyer, I think you have a place on the floor of the House of Representatives in Pennsylvania for your perseverance alone.

Any questions?

Ms. Delozier.

REP. DELOZIER: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony.

With the issue of dealing with victims of domestic violence, personally I feel like if they have the guts to leave, we should be there to help them in that case.

And it seems -- I was reading through your testimony before, so I did hear everything. In reading through it, the biggest obstacle in my understanding in having worked with victims is trying to get them what they need once they have taken that step, because the economic and emotional needs obviously overwhelm them.

The biggest hurdle it seems in your testimony is getting that new ID, whether it be in

another name for protective reasons, or just getting it 1 so they can go on somewhere else. 2 DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: 3 Yes. REP. DELOZIER: And so to end with what the 4 5 -- Chairman Benninghoff had mentioned about the fact of providing more ease of getting that ID and more ease --6 7 taking away some of those hurdles would be the primary reason as to your opposition to this bill and actually 8 9 getting those? DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: It's also a timeliness 10 issue in that the victims need the assistance 11 12 immediately --13 REP. DELOZIER: Right. 14 DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: -- and the hurdles takes months. So it's a matter of urgency in dealing 15 with that. 16 17 REP. DELOZIER: In each of these cases it is just that, it's an emergency versus in many of the 18 other testimonies that we have heard, while it would be 19 20 still important for them to get certain services quickly, 21 in this case, in my personal opinion, it's more of an 22 actual emergency for their safety. 23 DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: A matter of life and 24 death, ves. 25 REP. DELOZIER: Versus the capability of

them providing -- getting additional services? 1 DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: Yes. 2 REP. DELOZIER: Thank you very much for 3 4 your testimony. DIRECTOR LINDEMYER: You're welcome. 5 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Anything else? 6 7 I want to thank all the witnesses, all the participants and the members of the committee. I know 8 9 our schedules are very demanding. If you don't have anything in writing that 10 11 you would like to have that I have, please let me know. I will circulate. Again, I will circulate any more 12 13 information that comes from the opponents and the 14 proponents of this bill. 15 I think basically what we need is a common 16 fact basis before we can make any kind of real policy 17 decision. 18 Thank you. 19 (The proceedings were concluded at 20 10:57 a.m.) 21 22 23 24 25

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same. Brenda S. Hamilton, RPR Reporter - Notary Public