

Testimony of Mark Shea, Administrator of the Immigration Program at  
Catholic Social Services in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia  
Before the State Government Committee of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives  
Hearing on the "National Security Begins at Home Legislative Package"  
August 31, 2011

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for the opportunity to speak before your Committee. My name is Mark Shea, and I am the Administrator of the Immigration Program at Catholic Social Services in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. I am testifying today at the request of the Pennsylvania Catholic Conference, which represents the Catholic bishops of the Commonwealth in the public policy arena.

Today, I wish to impress upon this Committee that every human being possesses inherent dignity, regardless of his or her immigration status. The Conference strongly objects to any dehumanizing rhetoric that has been employed during our immigration debates. We object to any law that treats the actions of men and women to sustain themselves and their families through employment as "criminal."<sup>1</sup> We object to any law that encourages racial profiling by permitting warrantless arrests based on probable cause that an individual is "removable from the United States."<sup>2</sup> We object to any policy of "attrition through enforcement."<sup>3</sup>

"Attrition through enforcement" is a catchy phrase, but we should be clear about what it means in practice. It means that our state government – you, our legislators – would deliberately and actively encourage the breakup of thousands of families currently living in the Commonwealth, attending school with your children, and worshipping alongside you in church. It means that our state laws, passed by you, would multiply the numbers of undocumented mothers forced to leave the U.S. and face the terrible choice of either leaving their children behind or bringing them to a country where they would have little hope of a life without poverty and danger. Please, members of this Committee, consider carefully whether this is really what you stand for.

I have worked for years providing direct services to indigent immigrants in Philadelphia, and I can tell you first-hand of the hardship and heartbreak that would follow such a policy. Currently, about 5 million U.S. citizen children have at least one undocumented parent;<sup>4</sup> in 2007, more than four-in-five (85% of) children in Pennsylvania's immigrant families were U.S. citizens.<sup>5</sup> If one of these parents is deported, the emotional and financial damage to the family members left behind can be devastating. Economic insecurity and health insecurity are documented consequences of increased enforcement of our

---

<sup>1</sup> H.B. 738, Section 9(a & b): making it a "misdemeanor of the third degree" for a "person who is unlawfully present in the United States and is an unauthorized alien to knowingly apply for work, solicit work in a public place or perform work as an employee or independent contractor in this Commonwealth."

<sup>2</sup> H.B. 738, Section 5(5): "A law enforcement officer, with or without a warrant, may arrest a person if the officer has probable cause to believe that the person has committed a public offense that makes the person removable from the United States."

<sup>3</sup> H.B. 738, Section 2(4) "Legislative Intent": "The intent of this act is to make attrition through enforcement the public policy of all agencies of this Commonwealth and its political subdivisions."

<sup>4</sup> Women's Refugee Commission, *Torn Apart by Immigration Enforcement: Parental Rights and Immigration Detention* ["WRC Report"] (December 2010): 1  
<http://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/detention/parental-rights>.

<sup>5</sup> Immigration Policy Center, "New Americans in the Keystone State," <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/new-americans-keystone-state>

currently broken federal immigration system, and these consequences hit children hardest. Parents in immigration detention often face the loss of their parental rights while incarcerated, since they may not receive notice of court proceedings, may not have adequate legal counsel,<sup>6</sup> cannot comply with the terms of family reunification plans mandated by the child welfare system, and are often not even told where their children are.<sup>7</sup> Children of undocumented immigrants suffer terribly as a result of the enforcement of our currently broken immigration laws. The Urban Institute has shown that “Parent-child separations pose serious risks to children’s immediate safety, economic security, well-being, and longer term development.”<sup>8</sup> The report continues:

*Most families in our sample lost a working parent, because they were detained, deported, or released but not allowed to work. Following job loss, households experienced steep declines in income and hardships such as housing instability and food insufficiency. Many families experienced prolonged hardship in part due to extended efforts to contest deportation that took months and often more than a year to adjudicate.*<sup>9</sup>

A policy of “attrition through enforcement” also sacrifices the futures of undocumented children who have no memory of the country of their birth, and who have every promise of educational and professional achievement here in the United States. If the General Assembly wishes to discourage juvenile delinquency and crime, and to build up the productive capacity of every young resident of our state, the best thing it can do is to encourage educational achievement among all of our state’s young people, including those who are undocumented. Encourage them to stay in school, give them hope and the promise of a useful future. Increased state enforcement of our broken federal immigration system will only make them feel hopeless and make it more likely that they will stay in poverty.

Finally, a policy of “attrition through enforcement” makes everyone, citizen and non-citizen, feel less safe. The fear of being detained or deported, of being taken away from children and from families, makes victims as well as neighbors much less likely to report crimes. Law enforcement leaders from Texas<sup>10</sup> to California<sup>11</sup> to Utah<sup>12</sup> to Massachusetts<sup>13</sup> have spoken out about the damage that immigration

---

<sup>6</sup> National Immigrant Justice Center, *Isolated in Detention: Limited Access to Legal Counsel in Immigration Detention Facilities Jeopardizes a Fair Day in Court* (September 2010): 8-10. The report found that several factors contributed to inadequate counsel for those in immigration detention including the geographic isolation of many detention facilities, inadequate phone access, and inadequate legal aid resources.

<sup>7</sup> WRC Report, at 1 <http://www.womensrefugeecommission.org/programs/detention/parental-rights>.

<sup>8</sup> The Urban Institute, *Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement* (February 2010).

[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412020\\_FacingOurFuture\\_final.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/412020_FacingOurFuture_final.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* at vii-viv.

<sup>10</sup> A. Elena Lacayo, “One Year Later: A Look at SB 1070 and Copycat Legislation,” National Council of La Raza (April 18, 2011) [“Lacayo, “One Year Later”]: 5 (quoting Sheriff Richard Wiles of El Paso, TX: “if the people who live in our community are afraid to talk to us, they won’t report crimes when they’re victims or witnesses.”).

<sup>11</sup> The San Jose, CA Police Department recently released a statement approving the San Jose City Council’s policy of putting community policing before immigration enforcement. Here is the selection of the City Council’s policy quoted and approved by the Police Department:

*The City of San Jose has a strong interest in assuring that legal and undocumented immigrants do not fear interacting with their local governmental authorities. In past years, the City has seen how the reluctance of immigrants to interact with local authorities can critically undermine the health and safety of our community. For example, the failure of victims to report crimes, the reluctance of witnesses to cooperate with the police, or the unwillingness of parents to take children to school or to a health clinic, can have grave impacts on the well-being of all of San Jose’s residents, including U.S. citizens.*

<http://www.sjpd.org/inews/viewPressRelease.asp?ID=430>

<sup>12</sup> Lacayo, “One Year Later,” at 5 (quoting Utah Attorney General Mark Shurtleff: “local law enforcement resources should focus on criminal activities, not civil violations of the federal code.”)

enforcement-only approaches can do to community policing, whereby police work with the community and enlist their help to root out crime. As Kenneth E. Lavalley, Police Chief of Lowell, Massachusetts, put it: “When immigrant residents of Lowell are afraid to report crimes because they worry that contact with my officers could lead to deportation, criminals are allowed to roam free and the entire community suffers as a result.”<sup>14</sup> Fear erodes the important element of trust between the police and the communities they serve. The erosion of trust impacts immigrant women particularly harshly.<sup>15</sup> It renders them helpless in the face of domestic violence.

The federal enforcement-only programs (such as the 287(g) and Secure Communities programs)<sup>16</sup> that this package of legislation mandates in Pennsylvania will: (1) undermine community good will and policing efforts; (2) deport large numbers of immigrants who have no criminal history whatsoever or who have committed only traffic offenses; and (3) create a potential for racial profiling and pre-textual arrests by local police, whose behavior pursuant to these programs is inadequately monitored by the federal government.<sup>17</sup>

Under these federal-state partnerships, local officers act as they see fit, arresting who they want and issuing immigration detainers to who they want, regardless of whether their selections accord with *federal* priorities for public safety and national security. The Migration Policy Institute found substantial variance in the degree to which 287(g) programs in different jurisdictions actually netted serious criminals, from 70% in Las Vegas to under 10% in Colorado.<sup>18</sup> Through May 2011, more than half (59%) of all immigrants arrested by ICE through the Secure Communities program have either no convictions or are guilty only of misdemeanors and traffic offenses; one-third have never been convicted of anything.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Immigration Policy Center Special Report: *Debunking the Myth of “Sanctuary Cities:” Community Policing Policies Protect American Communities* (April 2011): 6  
[http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Community\\_Policing\\_Policies\\_Protect\\_American\\_042611\\_update.pdf](http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Community_Policing_Policies_Protect_American_042611_update.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Immigration Policy Center Special Report: *Debunking the Myth of “Sanctuary Cities:” Community Policing Policies Protect American Communities* (April 2011): 6  
[http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Community\\_Policing\\_Policies\\_Protect\\_American\\_042611\\_update.pdf](http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/docs/Community_Policing_Policies_Protect_American_042611_update.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> Witness, for example, the February 10, 2011 testimony of Antonia Peña, a volunteer with Casa de Maryland, before an Ad Hoc Congressional Hearing hosted by Representative Raúl Grijalva (D-AZ). Ms. Peña recounted the story of her friend, Maria, a Salvadoran mother living in Maryland who is now in removal proceedings because she called the police for help against a domestic attack. See U.S. Congress. Ad Hoc Congressional Hearing hosted by Representative Raúl Grijalva. “Emerging Issues in Ending Violence Against Immigrant Women.” Testimony of Antonia Peña, Volunteer with Casa de Maryland. February 10, 2011. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rep-raul-grijalva/immigrants-need-the-viole\\_b\\_822424.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rep-raul-grijalva/immigrants-need-the-viole_b_822424.html); <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zuLHUJa6Pf0> Such stories of victims being further victimized by the immigration system are not hypothetical. They are real and documented.

<sup>16</sup> H.B. 798 Section 2(b) requires all state arresting authorities to comply with and support, “to the full extent permitted by law,” federal immigration enforcement; H.B. 799 requires state agencies to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department of Justice to gain authority to enforce federal immigration law on the state level; H.B. 789(2)(c) prohibits state arresting authorities from preventing the sharing of information with the federal government; H.B. 801 Section 1(g) does the same.

<sup>17</sup> Migration Policy Institute, *Delegation and Divergence: A Study of 287(g) State and Local Immigration Enforcement* (January 2011) [“MPI, *Delegation and Divergence*”] <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/287g-divergence.pdf> ; National Day Laborer Organizing Network et. al., *Restoring Community: A National Community Advisory Report on ICE’s Failed “Secure Communities” Program* (August 2011) [NDLON, “*Restoring Community*”] ; Benjamin A. Cardozo School of Law, *Briefing Guide to Secure Communities* [http://www.cardozo.yu.edu/uploadedFiles/Cardozo/Profiles/immigrationlaw-741/NDLON\\_FOIA\\_Briefing%20guide.final.pdf](http://www.cardozo.yu.edu/uploadedFiles/Cardozo/Profiles/immigrationlaw-741/NDLON_FOIA_Briefing%20guide.final.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> MPI, *Delegation and Divergence*, at 19.

<sup>19</sup> NDLON, *Restoring Community*, at 5.

Moreover, even outside the parameters of federally-authorized enforcement partnerships, this package of legislation explicitly enables racial profiling by permitting local officers to check the immigration status of anyone lawfully stopped who “should reasonably be suspected of being unlawfully present in the United States.”<sup>20</sup> It then requires that any convicted, unlawfully present individual be transferred to federal custody (and permits individuals not yet convicted to be so transferred), regardless of whether ICE wishes to detain the individual.<sup>21</sup> The legislative package further requires police to detain individuals who cannot immediately produce documentation establishing their lawful presence in the United States.<sup>22</sup>

Such reckless, unconstrained local immigration enforcement will harm citizens and lawful permanent residents as well as undocumented immigrants, making everyone’s safety more precarious. Homeless, poor, rural, and elderly citizens may find it difficult to locate and produce documentation of their citizenship or immigration status. If one of these individuals has never before had cause to be fingerprinted, citizenship or legal residence may be impossible for the federal government to determine. According to H.B. 798, a status inquiry must be made so long as it does not “significantly expand” the period of detention; “significantly” is a very open-ended qualification.

On June 23, 2011, the Philadelphia City Council voted 17-0 to end the city's participation in the Secure Communities program. This legislative package would prevent – and *sanction* – the city for its policy of less-than-full enforcement.<sup>23</sup> Is this the best reaction to a municipality that has carefully considered and weighed the needs of its community members?

But the problems do not stop here. Significantly, the intent of this package of legislation is to make it hard if not impossible for an undocumented immigrant to live<sup>24</sup> and work in the Commonwealth even after the federal government deliberately chooses, consistent with its own set of enforcement priorities, not to remove him and to temporarily close his case.<sup>25</sup> Under H.B. 798, the determination of an individual’s “citizenship or immigration status” becomes part of his or her permanent criminal record, which can be considered by any state or local agency or board before issuing a business license, permit or registration. An undocumented immigrant may be allowed to remain in this country but will still not be able to obtain a permit to sell hot dogs in Philadelphia to support his family. This individual will then be forced to generate economic activity – perhaps even start his own business – in some other state.

Undocumented immigrants in Pennsylvania are not responsible for any generalized “lawlessness”<sup>26</sup> in our communities, and for the bill’s drafters to make such unsubstantiated claims merely contributes to a poisonous rhetoric that stereotypes undocumented individuals as criminals. Simply residing in the United States without an immigration status is not a crime. It is a civil violation, but it is also something that the majority of undocumented individuals cannot do anything about, despite their fervent desire to

---

<sup>20</sup> H.B. 801, Section 1(c).

<sup>21</sup> H.B. 801, section 1(d).

<sup>22</sup> H.B. 798, Section 2(a).

<sup>23</sup> See, e.g., H.B. 798, H.B. 355, H.B. 801, and H.B. 810.

<sup>24</sup> H.B. 858 Section 4(2): “A political subdivision of this Commonwealth may enact any ordinance: ... Restricting the rental of housing to an alien unlawfully present in the United States.”

<sup>25</sup> Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc., “DHS and DOJ's August 18, 2011 Announcement on Prosecutorial Discretion: What it May Mean for Your Client,” <http://cliniclegal.org/news/1108/dhs-and-doj-s-august-18-2011-announcement-prosecutorial-discretion-what-it-may-mean-your->

<sup>26</sup> H.B. 738, Section 2(1) “Legislative Intent:” “Illegal immigration is causing economic hardship and lawlessness in this Commonwealth.”

legalize their status. Immigrants do not fail to become citizens because they are lazy or are inclined to criminality. Poverty, war, and desperation in their home countries drive them here. Then our federal government provides no way for the majority of them to attain a legal status. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has explained at length why there is no line on which undocumented immigrants can await their turn.<sup>27</sup>

Perhaps the Catholic Bishops of the state of Florida said it best: undocumented immigrants in America “are not so much breaking the law, as being broken by the law.”<sup>28</sup> From the Church’s perspective, the federal legal immigration system already does damage to the family unit. Passing laws in the Commonwealth that make it harder for undocumented individuals *who pose no threat to public safety* to live and work here compounds the harm to that family unit. We ask that the Commonwealth refrain from making a difficult situation worse.

Nor is it true that undocumented immigrants are “causing economic hardship” in the Commonwealth, as the bill states.<sup>29</sup> To the contrary, “attrition through enforcement” would likely have a devastating effect on Pennsylvania’s economy, forcing consumers, business owners, property owners, and taxpayers out of the Commonwealth. According to the Immigration Policy Center, the 2009 purchasing power of Pennsylvania’s Hispanics totaled \$12.7 billion (an increase of 491.2% since 1990); Asian buying power totaled \$11.5 billion (an increase of 398.9% since 1990).<sup>30</sup> Hispanic-owned businesses made up 2.3% of Pennsylvania’s businesses in 2007 (the last year for which data is available), according to the 2010 U.S. Census; Asian-owned businesses made up 2.6%.<sup>31</sup> Sending these consumers and job-creators out of the Commonwealth is a terrible idea.

---

<sup>27</sup> See United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Migration and Refugee Services, Migration Policy and Public Affairs, Issue Briefing Series, Issue #1, “Why Don’t They Come Here Legally?” <http://www.justiceforimmigrants.org/documents/issue-brief-why-dont-they-come-here-legally-final.pdf> See also Bishop John C. Wester, “Answering Tough Questions About Immigration: U.S. Bishops Advocate Mending Broken System and Improving Economic Development in Poor Countries,” *Our Sunday Visitor* (May 16, 2010). Bishop Wester addresses the following question: “What don’t the bishops understand about ‘illegal’? Why disrespect the rule of law?” He answers that undocumented immigrant workers “come illegally because there are insufficient visas under the current system to come here legally.” He then advocates an earned path to legalization because it would both restore the rule of law (by establishing a waiting line where none existed before and requiring payment of a civil fine as befits the violation) and protect human dignity. U.S. bishops want neither amnesty nor open borders, he argues:

*The U.S. bishops’ prescription ... is to bring the 11 million undocumented out of the shadows, register them with the government, require them to pay a fine and any taxes owed, and require them to learn English and work as they wait in the back of the line for a chance at citizenship. This is not ‘amnesty,’ which is generally defined as granting a benefit without anything in return. ... The U.S. Bishops would also support an increase in the family-based and employment-based visas so that immigrant families could migrate to the United States in a safe, legal and controlled manner, and not be subject to the abuse of human smugglers or to death in the desert.*

<sup>28</sup> Florida Catholic Conference, Florida Bishops’ Statement on Immigration, January 1, 2011

<http://www.justiceforimmigrants.org/documents/florida-bishops-immigration-statement-2011.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> H.B. 738, Section 2(1): “Legislative Intent:” “Illegal immigration is causing economic hardship and lawlessness in the Commonwealth.”

<sup>30</sup> Immigration Policy Center, “New Americans in the Keystone State,” <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/new-americans-keystone-state>

<sup>31</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, State & County Quickfacts, Pennsylvania <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/42000.html> In fact, research has shown that, between 1995 and 2005, roughly half of all the startups in Silicon Valley were launched by immigrants. Wendy Kaufman, “Advocates Urge Easier Visa Policies to Boost Startups,” NPR News (August 23, 2011) <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/23/139798265/advocates-urge-easier-visa-policies-to-boost-startups?sc=tw&cc=share>

But these consumers and job-creators are also taxpayers. Even undocumented immigrants pay taxes – a lot of taxes – despite being ineligible for all federal benefits and many state benefits. Households headed by unauthorized immigrants in Pennsylvania paid \$135 million in state and local taxes in 2010, according to the Immigration Policy Center. Unauthorized workers also paid \$34.9 million in income tax revenue in the Commonwealth.<sup>32</sup>

Despite what some proponents of an enforcement-only approach suggest, it cannot be true that undocumented immigrants are “taking American jobs” while *simultaneously* draining scarce American resources in the form of public benefits.<sup>33</sup> The truth is that undocumented immigrants contribute more to the U.S. economy than they take out. In 2006, the Texas Comptroller’s office estimated that the absence of 1.4 million undocumented immigrants in the state would have meant a loss of \$17.7 billion in the state’s GDP. In fact, the difference between what these immigrants brought into the state and what they took out in terms of services amounted to \$424.7 million.<sup>34</sup>

Moreover, mass and indiscriminate removal of unauthorized workers from Pennsylvania as is contemplated by this package of legislation will not increase the number of jobs open to U.S. citizens in the Commonwealth. Even high-profile critics of comprehensive immigration reform admit that it is simply not true that deporting one unauthorized worker results in the employment of one U.S. citizen.<sup>35</sup> The economy as a whole – including available jobs – contracts when consumers, taxpayers, and employers leave the country (or the state).<sup>36</sup> During 2011, business leaders and companies in Utah, Arizona, Florida, Kansas, Indiana, and Tennessee, among other states, stepped forward to make the case that immigration is good for the economy.<sup>37</sup> Does it make economic sense for the Commonwealth to adopt a policy deliberately meant to “discourage and deter” the economic activity of anyone?<sup>38</sup>

For all of these reasons and more, eleven states roundly rejected Arizona SB 1070 copy-cat legislation – like the package of bills being considered by the Committee – during the 2011 session.<sup>39</sup> Of the twenty-five states that threatened to pass SB 1070 enforcement-only copy-cat bills at the beginning of the session, only four enacted them.<sup>40</sup>

On the other hand, state-wide compacts attesting to the need for immigration policies that support rather than destroy families have received significant public support in many states, including Pennsylvania. As described by the Lutheran Advocacy Ministry in Pennsylvania, the Pennsylvania Compact “seeks to bring together faith leaders, law enforcement and the business community to urge a more civil tone in immigration discourse while upholding values of human dignity and welcome

---

<sup>32</sup> Immigration Policy Center, “New Americans in the Keystone State,” <http://www.immigrationpolicy.org/just-facts/new-americans-keystone-state>

<sup>33</sup> Stuart Anderson, “Answering the Critics of Comprehensive Immigration Reform,” Cato Institute (May 9, 2011): 6.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, at 4.

<sup>35</sup> Testimony of Steven Camarota, Director of Research, Center for Immigration Studies, at U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement Hearing: “New Jobs in Recession and Recovery: Who Are Getting Them and Who Are Not” [http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear\\_03102011.html](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear_03102011.html)

<sup>36</sup> Testimony of Heidi Shierholz, Economist, Economic Policy Institute, at U.S. House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement Hearing: “New Jobs in Recession and Recovery: Who Are Getting Them and Who Are Not” [http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear\\_03102011.html](http://judiciary.house.gov/hearings/hear_03102011.html)

<sup>37</sup> ImmigrationWorks USA, 2011: *Another Round: Immigration Lawmaking in the States* (July 14, 2011): 2.

<sup>38</sup> H.B. 738, Section 2(5): “Legislative Intent”: “The provisions of this act are intended to work together to discourage and deter the unlawful entry, presence and economic activity, by persons unlawfully present in the United States.”

<sup>39</sup> Lacayo, “One Year Later,” at 6.

<sup>40</sup> ImmigrationWorks USA, 2011: *Another Round: Immigration Lawmaking in the States* (July 14, 2011): 1.

alongside concern for safety and economic well-being in the process.”<sup>41</sup> Judi Bernstein-Baker, Executive Director of Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society [HIAS] Pennsylvania, argued that bills like H.B. 738 will "create an atmosphere of hatred and fear and would drive away immigrants from our state, undermining any hope of [economic] recovery." She specifically cited the Pennsylvania Compact as a way to show state legislators like the members of this Committee that "immigrants are part of a solution to our state, not part of the problem.”<sup>42</sup>

Pope John Paul II spoke forcefully on the human rights and dignity of undocumented migrants. “The Church considers the problem of illegal migrants from the standpoint of Christ,” he said. “Today the illegal migrant comes before us like that ‘stranger’ in whom Jesus asks to be recognized. To welcome him and to show him solidarity is a duty of hospitality and fidelity to Christian identity itself.”<sup>43</sup> Undocumented migrants challenge our duty to all our brothers and sisters: “You shall treat the alien who resides with you no differently than the natives born among you; have the same love for him as for yourself; for you too were once aliens in the land of Egypt.” (Leviticus 19: 33 – 34).

Any attempt to circumscribe Commonwealth citizenship flies in the face of this duty.<sup>44</sup> How this country’s most basic laws count and recognize its citizens announces to the world what kind of values it holds. H.B. 857 limits state citizenship to those children born of at least one U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident (LPR) parent. In doing so, Pennsylvania is making a very strong statement about who the state welcomes and values as members. In addition to blatantly contradicting the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, this bill also fails to give effect to the inherent dignity of every human being.

We live in an imperfect and broken world, and when laws contradict the very heart of Christ’s message, we have a duty to advocate for change in those laws. The family is the fundamental building block of society. We ask that protection of the family, charity toward all regardless of immigration status, and a *factually-grounded* concern for public safety drive this Committee’s consideration of all measures.

Thank you for your time.

---

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.lutheranadvocacy.org/2011/04/28/shaping-the-conversation-on-immigration/> See also news coverage of Philadelphia City Councilman James Kennedy’s public hearing in July 2011 on the Pennsylvania Compact [http://articles.philly.com/2011-06-29/news/29717400\\_1\\_immigration-public-hearing-latest-census](http://articles.philly.com/2011-06-29/news/29717400_1_immigration-public-hearing-latest-census) See also Pennsylvania Council of Churches Ministry of Public Witness’s call to sign the Compact <http://pachurchesadvocacy.org/weblog/?p=8367>

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.hias.org/en/post/26/jewish-groups-forefront-pennsylvania-compact>

<sup>43</sup> Undocumented Migrants, Message of Pope John Paul II for World Migration Day, 1996. [http://www.vatican.va/holy\\_father/john\\_paul\\_ii/messages/migration/documents/hf\\_jp-ii\\_mes\\_25071995\\_undocumented\\_migrants\\_en.html](http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/messages/migration/documents/hf_jp-ii_mes_25071995_undocumented_migrants_en.html)

<sup>44</sup> H.B. 857; H.B. 474.