RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments i) to respect the rights of all children, in the United States and its territories, including those rights articulated under the United States Constitution and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and ii) not to discriminate against any child based on the child's citizenship or immigration status or the immigration or citizenship status of the child's parents.

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association opposes efforts: i) to restrict or deny any child in the United States equal access to public education, health care, foster care, or social services on the basis of the child's citizenship or immigration status or the immigration or citizenship status of the child's parents and, ii) to require that persons providing such services verify immigration status.

FURTHER RESOLVED, That the American Bar Association urges respect for the Constitutional rights to due process and civil liberties that apply to all persons in the United States.
L Introduction
At a time when the American Bar Association (ABA) has placed a high priority on promoting children’s interests, proposals have emerged around the country to deny certain children access to essential services. The basis for the denial of these services is a condition over which the children have no control: the immigration or citizenship status of the children or of their parents.

Several states have already adopted, or are considering, laws to deny immigrant children access to basic services. For example, California voters recently adopted Proposition 187, which prohibits persons “reasonably suspected” of having violated immigration laws from receiving public education, non-emergency health care, and public social services. The broad scope of Proposition 187 includes all public social services and thus covers virtually all government assistance for children, such as child welfare services, emergency response to abuse and neglect, and foster care benefits. Under Proposition 187, teachers, doctors, nurses, social workers, and other service providers become immigration enforcement agents and are required to conduct an “immigration check” on every person who applies for the restricted service.

Denial of these services will significantly harm individual children and society at large. It will also unreasonably burden the employees who must implement the restrictions, diminishing their ability to deliver essential services to all children — citizen and non-citizen alike. Moreover, denying these services is contrary to the United States Constitution, to international treaties, such as the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (which the ABA has urged the United States to ratify), and to numerous ABA policies.

II. Involvement of the American Bar Association
A. The ABA’s commitment to children at risk
The proposed resolution builds on the ABA’s history of promoting the legal rights of

1 Under California law, child welfare services means “public social services which are directed toward the accomplishment of any or all the following purposes: protecting and promoting the welfare of all children, including handicapped, homeless, dependent, or neglected children; preventing or remediating, or assisting in the solution of problems which may result in, the neglect, abuse, exploitation, or delinquency of children; . . .” (emphasis added Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 16501 (a). By prohibiting “public social services” to undocumented children, Proposition 187 eliminates fundamental protections, including emergency response services for victims of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation.)
children. The ABA's emphasis on protecting children at risk is reflected in a variety of resolutions, reports, and committees that the Association has approved in recent years. The House of Delegates has adopted over thirty-five resolutions specifically addressing the needs of children in society. These resolutions cover a gamut of important issues, such as: increasing child welfare services in abuse and neglect cases; improving education resources to prevent juvenile crime; providing health care to all children in need; maintaining welfare programs to meet the basic essentials of life; and supporting the comprehensive statement of children's rights in the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

In addition, the House of Delegates adopted a resolution urging the legal profession to respond to the needs of children, to preserve children's legal rights, and to assist in the implementation of programs "to meet the health and welfare needs of children." This resolution noted the obligation of lawyers to articulate "the needs of children who have no effective voice of their own in government." Significantly, none of these resolutions have ever made any distinction on the basis of a child's immigration or citizenship status. To the contrary, the language of these resolutions is inclusive and designed to protect the rights of all children.

The ABA has also funded and otherwise supported staff and several committees that work to protect the interests of all children. The mission of the ABA Center on Children and the Law is "to improve the quality of life for children through advancement in law, justice, and public policy." In July 1993, the Presidential Working Group on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children and Their Families issued a report emphasizing ABA advocacy on behalf of all children and urging essential services for all families in need.

The Steering Committee on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children, created in August 1993, is charged with facilitating the ABA's efforts to implement the recommendations in the July 1993 report. The Task Force on Children of the ABA Section of Litigation has assisted lawyers in representing all children.

---

6 Bar Association and Attorney Action (Feb. 1984).
8 America's Children at Risk (July 1993). This report recommends, among other things, that "[f]ederal, state and local governments should work to improve educational opportunities for all children." [emphasis added] p. 27, and that the federal government should "enact and implement a universal health care plan." p. 35.
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who face, among other things, the denial of critically-needed public services. The Young
Lawyers Division -- at both the national and affiliate level -- has also placed a high priority
on promoting the interests of children.90 None of these ABA groups has ever limited its
advocacy on behalf of children because of a child's immigration status. Similarly, volunteers
at many state and local bar associations are responding to children's legal needs, without, to
our knowledge, distinguishing among children based on immigration status.

B. The ABA's immigration policies

The ABA has been actively involved in reviewing national immigration law since the 1940s
and has always supported legal immigration and fair processes for immigrants. It has
supported immigration reforms to unite families, to foster economic growth, to promote
cultural diversity, and to provide legal status to law-abiding aliens residing in the U.S.
unlawfully. The Association also favors temporary protected status for nationals of countries
experiencing civil unrest and other extraordinary conditions, and the protection of substantive
and procedural rights of immigrants and asylum applicants, including administrative review
and access to meaningful representation at all stages of the adjudication processes.

By resolution in February 1983, the House of Delegates established a Coordinating
Committee on Immigration Law to coordinate all immigration and refugee activities among
the various ABA entities and to advocate ABA policies in Washington. That Committee has
reviewed the policy proposed here and approved it.

Historically, ABA positions on immigration policy have supported generous and expansive
consideration of immigrants, particularly those who have come to this country to reunite with
family members. For example, in 1989, the Association supported law which allowed

foreign nationals [to] seek lawful permanent resident status in the United States
on a humane and equitable basis that reflects the historic emphasis on both
family reunification and the economic and cultural interests of the United
States, [including] a special increase in visa numbers for the second preference
dependents of lawful permanent residents or other
relief for the immediate dependents of lawful permanent residents legalized
under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986....

In 1983, the Association recognized that even undocumented aliens need to "be dealt with
realistically and humanely," and, most recently (1993), adopted policy which urged the
creation of a "new non-immigrant visa category for household caregivers." This would not
only make new employment opportunities for immigrants but assure them decent and safe

90 See e.g., The American Bar Association Young Lawyers Division Responds to the Unmet Legal Needs of
Children: a compilation of projects pertaining to children's issues (Sept. 1994)
working conditions.

III. National immigration patterns

United States law gives preferential immigration status to aliens with a close family relationship with a U.S. citizen or legal permanent resident, aliens with needed job skills, or aliens who qualify as refugees. Eighty-seven percent of all immigrants who arrive on our shores come here legally, most to reunite with family members. Only 8.5 percent of our population is "foreign born" as compared with 16 percent in the early twentieth century when many of our grandparents and great-grandparents arrived on our shores.

According to The Urban Institute, "the education level of legal immigrants remains high and even rose during the 1980s." Self-employment is strong among immigrants, who tend to create more jobs than they take. Most national studies suggest that immigrants are not a fiscal burden - only 2.3 percent of non-refugee immigrants were reported to be using public benefits in 1989. Data indicate that among the undocumented immigrant population, the numbers are dramatically lower. These low figures contrast sharply with the amount of taxes paid by immigrants, the economic impact of immigrant-owned businesses and immigrant consumer spending.

IV. The government should respect the rights of immigrant children and not discriminate against them on the basis of conditions over which they have no control

The long-standing ABA tradition promoting the interests of all children, regardless of their immigration or citizenship status, has strong and direct support in constitutional and international law. The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The Plyler decision established a useful analytical framework for this resolution. Central to the Supreme Court's ruling was the premise that governments should not harm innocent children who are not responsible for their status. "Even if the State found it expedient to control the conduct of parents by punishing their children, legislation resting the issue of a parent's misconduct in his children does not comport with fundamental conceptions of the rights of children."

The long-standing ABA tradition promoting the interests of all children, regardless of their immigration or citizenship status, has strong and direct support in constitutional and international law. The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.

The resolution urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments to respect existing law. Such a resolution should not be necessary, but unfortunately it is. California's Proposition 187 flaunts the Constitution. Among other things, it prohibits public education to those children suspected of being undocumented in contravention of Plyler v. Doe, which holds that a state's denial of public education to undocumented children violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.
justice." The United Nations recognized this in its Convention on the Rights of the Child, which the ABA House of Delegates supported. The Convention states that children should be "protected against all forms of discrimination or punishment on the basis of the status . . . of the child's parents, legal guardians, or family members." The resolution also urges the government not to discriminate against children because of their immigration status or the status of their parents. This statement embodies the principles underlying Plyler and the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child and addresses proposals denying immigrant children services that are not protected by the Constitution. The resolution does not oppose enforcement of immigration law. It respects the federal government's authority, after compliance with existing constitutional and statutory protections, to deport or exclude children who do not have appropriate immigration status.

V. All poor children need access to certain publicly-funded services

The Supreme Court found that depriving children of certain services irrevocably harms them and the community. Education is one of these critical services. Its deprivation has an "inestimable toll . . . on the social economic, intellectual, and psychological well-being of the individual." The central role that education plays in an individual's life and in society compelled the Plyler Court to recognize that all children, regardless of their immigration status, have equal rights of access to public schools. Similarly, the United Nations Convention recognizes "the right of the child to education."

Other basic services are also critical to a child's well-being: health care, and "protective measures" in cases of child abuse. The ABA has also supported health care and foster care services for all children in need. As with education, denial of these services not only harms

---

15 U.S. at 220.
17 The ABA has adopted numerous resolutions urging the federal government to enforce humanely and equitably its immigration laws. In 1983, the ABA recommended reform of immigration laws so that “[t]hose unlawful aliens who are now here be dealt with realistically and humanely . . . .” In 1989, the ABA supported legislation allowing “foreign nationals [to] seek lawful permanent resident status in the United States on a humane and equitable basis that reflects the historic emphasis on both family reunitication and the economic and cultural interests of the United States . . . .”
18 Plyler v. Doe, supra.
19 Even the dissenters in Plyler v. Doe recognized that, as a matter of public policy, education should be provided to all children. 457 U.S. 241 (Burger, dissenting) (“Were it our business to set the Nation’s social policy, I would agree without hesitation that it is sensible for an enlightened society to deprive any children — including illegal aliens — of an elementary education.”).
20 457 U.S. at 222.
22 Id., Article 24.
23 Id., Article 19.
the child, but also affects others. For example, withholding health care from immigrant children increases the incidence of contagious and infectious diseases throughout the community. It also raises the overall costs of health care as more people contract disease and/or victims are treated at a later, more advanced stage. So, too, with cases of abuse and neglect where failing to intervene may result in the infliction of even greater harm.

In opposing efforts to deny or restrict equal access to public education, health care, foster care or social services, the resolution is not intended to give immigrant children greater rights to services than other children in this country. Rather, it supports equal access to existing services essential for the child's development. The Plyler court's warning of the grave consequences of denying education applies with equal force to health care, nutritional services, foster care, and emergency protections from abuse and neglect.

VI. Verification of a person's immigration or citizenship status is a complex and burdensome process that is fraught with the potential for racial discrimination

Proposition 187 (i) prohibits anyone from receiving publicly-funded social services, health care, and education until the service provider has verified the recipient's immigration and citizenship status and (ii) requires that, if the provider "determines or reasonably suspects, based on the information provided to it, that the person is an alien [and] in violation of federal law," the provider is required to deny the benefits or services, report the individual to the federal immigration authorities and state law enforcement officials, and notify the individual that he or she must "obtain legal status or leave the United States." Public school officials are further required to verify the "legal status of each parent or guardian of each child" and give information about the parents to the Immigration and Naturalization Service if the school officials suspect that the parent has violated immigration law.

Requiring educators, medical personnel, and other service providers to verify the immigration status of their clients and pupils raises grave concerns that the procedures used will jeopardize the civil rights of minority citizens and lawful residents and further burden community and local government employees untrained in immigration laws and regulation. Immigration is a federal responsibility although Proposition 187 aims to extend its reach to state and local governments.

Children are already needlessly suffering in California even though federal and state courts have preliminarily enjoined the implementation of Proposition 187. The undocumented parents of twelve-year-old Julio Cano underestimated the seriousness of his illness and failed to take him immediately to the hospital because they feared deportation. In the absence of medical treatment, the boy died. P. Butdman, "Parents Blame Prop. 187 Fear in Son's Death," San Francisco Chronicle, p. A1 (Nov. 24, 1994).

Prop. 187, § 5 (codified at Cal. Welf. & Inst. Code § 10003.5 (c)) (emphasis supplied). This section covers public social services, but similar language appears in the sections covering health care and education. See Prop. 187, § 6 (codified at Cal. Health & Safety Code § 130 (c)); § 7 (codified at Educ. Code § 48215 (c)).

Prop. 187, § 7 (codified at Cal. Educ. Code § 48215 (d)).
Proposition 187’s mandate of on-the-spot unreviewable immigration decisions by lay personnel opens the way for determinations based on invidious factors such as an individual's name, accent, speech pattern or physical appearance. The irrevocable consequences of such decisions will then be borne by U.S. citizens, permanent residents, other foreign-born children who reside in the U.S. in other immigration categories, and undocumented children. The Constitution, however, requires procedural protections against the erroneous deprivation of critical services. In 1983, the ABA House of Delegates approved resolutions opposing the involvement of state and local police in the enforcement of the immigration laws and employer sanctions, because of the potential for discrimination against Latinos, Asians, and other "foreign-looking" citizens and legal residents.

VII. The due process and the civil liberties rights of the Constitution apply to all persons in the United States

The fundamental civil liberties and due process protections of the Bill of Rights and Constitution apply to all "persons," not just citizens. Every person in the United States has the right to due process and equal protection; the criminal proceedings that afford a right to counsel; a jury trial and freedom from double jeopardy; freedom from cruel and unusual punishment; freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures; and freedom of speech, religion and association. These basic principles generally apply, regardless of one’s immigration status.

Among the most important sources of legal protection against governmental discrimination or abuse are the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the Constitution. They provide that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law, and that no person shall be deprived of the equal protection of the laws. The right to due process, equal protection and the other fundamental rights that are encompassed by these principles generally apply to all persons in the United States, including non-citizens.

The Supreme Court has stressed that "aliens, even aliens whose presence in this country is unlawful, have long been recognized as 'persons' guaranteed due process of law by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments." It has struck down numerous state or local laws that

---

and Fourteenth Amendments. It has struck down numerous state or local laws that discriminate on the basis of "alienage." Like laws that discriminate on the basis of race, national origin or gender, such laws are subjected to "strict scrutiny" review under the equal protection guarantee with the result that state laws that discriminate against legal resident aliens in the provision of benefits (welfare, scholarships, tuition grants, student loans) and in eligibility for employment (civil service positions, lawyers, notary publics) have been found unconstitutional. Approaches like the one established by Proposition 187 violate our most cherished constitutional principles in a variety of ways. Proposition 187 is a state law that, on its face, unabashedly discriminates on the basis of alienage. In addition, Proposition 187 requires that citizens and legal residents who qualify for education, health care or social services be denied them if the provider "reasonably suspects" that he or she may be undocumented. The burden, in other words, is shifted to the citizen or legal resident to prove to the service provider that he or she is not undocumented. Moreover, Proposition 187 puts the responsibility for making these judgments on the hands of people who are wholly untrained and inexperienced in immigration law enforcement. As a result, citizens and legal residents who are members of minority groups are being denied access to public services, as well as access to private health care, on the basis of invidious factors such as name, accent, speech pattern or physical appearance. Such arbitrary deprivation appears to violate the due process guarantees of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and is not expected to withstand judicial scrutiny. VIII. Conclusion. The vast majority of immigrants do not come to this country in order to obtain government services and benefits, according to government researchers, academicians and U.S. Supreme Court findings. In fact, undocumented immigrants tend not to seek the few services to which

21 Graham v. Richardson, 403 U.S. 365 (1971)(welfare benefits; Nyquist v. Mauclet, 432 U.S. 1 (1977)(educational assistance in higher education); Sugarman v. Dñas, 413 U.S. 634 (1973)(civil service); In re Griffiths, 413 U.S. 717 (1973)(admission to the Bar); Bemal v. Fainter, 467 U.S. 216 (1984)(notary public). The Court has permitted states to make distinctions based on alienage in limited realms, such as voting, elected office, policy-making position in the government, and certain jobs such as policy officer under a "political function" exception. Cabell v. Chavez-Salido, 454 U.S. 432 (1982)(peace officer); Plyer v. Copa, 435 U.S. 291 (1978)(policy officer). The Court has also held that the equal protection doctrine does not constrain the Congress to the same extent because of its exclusive responsibility for supervising immigration. Mathews v. Diaz, supra.
22 Mathews v. Diaz, 424 U.S. 319 (1976). Schemes like Proposition 187 are also in conflict with the federal immigration laws. By statute, an alien cannot be ordered to leave the U.S. without being provided a due process hearing before an immigration judge, with rights to both administrative and judicial review.

9
"dominant incentive for illegal entry . . . is the availability of employment." There is no rational basis for believing that a prohibition on services to immigrant children will stop illegal immigration. Instead, it will create a caste of children who are uneducated, unhealthy, and unprotected from abuse and neglect. This country can do better than penalizing innocent children for the inadequacies in our enforcement of federal immigration laws.

Building on the ABA's tradition of promoting children's interests, the proposed resolution clarifies what is implicit in current ABA policy and activities: all needy children in this country should receive services that are necessary to their health, education, and well-being. No justification for the denial of these services is substantial enough to outweigh the harm that discrimination based on immigration or citizenship status inflicts on children and society.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Hernandez, President
Hispanic National Bar Association

Catherine J. Ross, Chair
Steering Committee on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children

Nancy Patricia Lee, President
National Asian Pacific Bar Association

Rebecca J. Westerfield, Chair
Section of International Rights and Responsibilities

Myrna S. Raeder, President
National Association of Women Lawyers

Lloyd Lochridge, Chair
Coordinating Committee on Immigration Law
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GENERAL INFORMATION FORM

The General Information Form must be filled out completely in accordance with the following instructions: (Please note that there are 12 questions.)

1. Briefly summarize the recommendation.

The American Bar Association urges federal, state, local, and territorial governments i) to respect the rights of all children, including those articulated under the United States Constitution and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and ii) not to discriminate against any child based on the child's citizenship or immigration status or the immigration or citizenship status of the child's parents.

The American Bar Association opposes efforts: i) to restrict or deny any child in the United States equal access to public education, health care, foster care, or social services on the basis of the child's citizenship or immigration status or the immigration or citizenship status of the child's parents and, ii) to require that persons providing such services verify immigration status.

The American Bar Association urges respect for the Constitutional rights to due process and civil liberties that apply to all persons in the United States.

2. Indicate whether the recommendation was approved or will be considered, the governing body of the submitting entity which has or will approve, and the date of such action. If the vote was taken other than at a regularly scheduled meeting of the governing body, describe the procedure.

The recommendation was approved, in principle, at the October 22, 1994 meeting of the Steering Committee on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children. At that time, the chair and a subcommittee were empowered to draft the specific language of a recommendation and report.

3. If this or a similar recommendation has been submitted previously to the House of Delegates or the Board of Governors, please include all relevant information - summary of the recommendation, when and before what group the recommendation was considered, and what action or position was taken on the matter.

N/A
4. Are there any existing Association policies which are relevant to this recommendation, and if so, how would they be affected by the adoption of this recommendation?
N/A.

5. Explain what urgency exists which requires that action on this matter be taken at this meeting. If deferral is acceptable, note the time by which action is necessary.

On November 8, 1994 California voters approved passage of Proposition 187, a legislative initiative that seeks to deny public education to undocumented immigrant children in violation of the Supreme Court's ruling in Plyler v. Doe. Further, Proposition 187 deputizes state and local government employees, such as teachers, librarians, and emergency care technicians, to conduct inquiries into the immigration status of those seeking their services. Since then, voters in other states have vowed to place similar referenda on their state ballots.

The ABA has long been a leader in interpreting immigration law, has supported legal immigration and processes for immigrants, and has opposed vesting federal immigration officer power in the hands of lay people through employer sanction laws. Lawyers, immigrants and national organizations are looking to the ABA to speak on this emerging crisis in immigration law.

6. If the recommendation is a legislative resolve, indicate the current status in the Congress.

At this point, there is no bill in Congress.

7. If adoption of the recommendation would result in expenditures, estimate the funds necessary, suggest the anticipated source for funding, and list the proposed expenditures of both direct and indirect costs. Indirect costs should include staff time, administrative overhead, etc.

N/A

8. Review the background of the proponents of the recommendation to determine if there are potential conflicts of interest. If such potential is found, list by name those proponents who have a material interest in the subject matter of the recommendation because of specific employment or representation of clients. Note all individuals who abstained from discussing or voting on the recommendation due to a conflict of interest.

N/A
9. List the sections, committees, bar associations or affiliated entities to which the recommendation has been referred, the date of the referral, and the response of each group, if known.

   Steering Committee on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children, October 22, 1994, Co-sponsor
   Hispanic National Bar Association, November 14, 1994, Co-sponsor
   National Asian Pacific American Bar Association, November 28, 1994, Co-sponsor
   Coordinating Committee on Immigration Law, December 8, 1994
   Section of Individual Rights and Responsibilities, December 22, 1994
   Young Lawyers Division, November 28, 1994
   Section of Urban, State and Local Government Law on December 22, 1994
   The State Bars of California, Florida, Illinois, New York, and Texas on December 22, 1994

10. Indicate the name, address and telephone number of the person who should be contacted prior to the meeting concerning drafting problems, additional referrals, background information, and any other questions about the report.

   James Morales
   National Youth Law Center
   114 Sansome Street, Suite 900
   San Francisco, California 94104
   415/543-3307

11. Indicate the name of the person who will present the report to the House and who should be contacted at the meeting when questions arise concerning its presentation and debate.

   Prof. Catherine J. Ross, Chair
   Steering Committee on the Unmet Legal Needs of Children
   Boston College Law School
   885 Centre Street
   Newton Centre, Massachusetts 02159
   617/552-4338

12. Indicate if there are any known proposed amendments at this time and the name, address, telephone, fax and ABA/Net number of the person to contact.

   N/A