



COMMENT FOR THE RECORD

House Subcommittee on Constitution and Limited Government Hearing “The Adverse Effects of *Plyler v. Doe*”

To members of the House Subcommittee on Constitution and Limited Government. I want to express my strong support for the protections that are extended to K-12 school-age students in our country as a result of the U.S. Supreme Court decision in *Plyler v. Doe*.

Let me state upfront that my support for *Plyler* does not make me soft on illegal immigration. We are a nation of laws. As such, our pursuit of the enforcement and administration of justice remain tantamount to who we are.

Let me also state upfront that we are a nation of opportunities. This is why I support the enforcement of education laws such as *Plyler* — be it for citizens and non-citizens alike. As such, my support for *Plyler* principles makes me firm on fairness.

Classrooms remain the best place for students to spend their time every day – not courtrooms or detention centers. Learning from their peers and trusted adults, while gaining durable skills for life, is how we open doors for human flourishing. Doing so makes us safer. Blocking a schoolhouse door to children in need of an education *Plyler* makes possible does not.

This is my perspective. Others feel differently.

Challenges to *Plyler* are maturing across the nation. Their supporters claim that removing millions of illegal students from American classrooms will save billions of dollars to pay for the education of citizens’ children. This sounds fiscally conservative. I wish the logic were that simple. Money does not follow the child. Liabilities do. Meaning, a child denied a quality education has fewer long-term positive academic experiences, career achievement, and economic self-sufficiency.

Enforcing immigration laws within our country is one thing. Challenging the ability for children to remain in school is simply a step too far. Like it or not, we cannot hold those children accountable for circumstances beyond their control. Taxpayers fund schools either way. Schooling costs significantly less than alternatives our society must otherwise

bear. This includes incarceration, court supervision, emergency services, and government surveillance.

Our workforce depends on it. As employers nationwide face ongoing labor shortages, we need reliable pipelines of educated workers. Snatching children from school undermines this critical national need and weakens our economic competitiveness.

Challenging *Plyler* is simply the wrong target to approach in our latest immigration culture war. Keeping children in school protects public safety, strengthens our economy, and upholds the principles that our country leans on.

Thank you.

Gerard Robinson, Professor of Practice at the University of Virginia
March 17, 2026

Disclaimer. *Everything in this statement is solely the position of the author. Nothing in it represents the position of the University of Virginia, its schools, centers, and affiliated learning institutions.*