Santa Clara County supervisors pass immigration resolution

San Jose Mercury News (California)

April 11, 2006 Tuesday

Copyright 2006 San Jose Mercury News All Rights Reserved

The Mercury News

Found on BayArea . com

Length: 456 words

Byline: Bay City News Service

Body

A day after some 25,000 people marched for immigrants' rights in downtown San Jose, the <u>Santa Clara County</u> Board of <u>Supervisors</u> narrowly <u>passed</u> a <u>resolution</u> that opposes criminalizing undocumented immigrants and those who help them. Instead, the board adopted a <u>resolution</u> that supports legalization for immigrants who have lived in the United States for five years or more.

"I am honored to introduce this **resolution**," **Supervisor** Pete McHugh said today.

McHugh noted that immigrants built <u>Santa</u> <u>Clara</u> <u>County</u> and that the <u>county</u> values all its residents regardless of documentation.

The <u>resolution</u>, which retained the support of three of the five-member board, comes more than three months after the U.S. House of Representatives <u>passed</u> H.R. 4437, which proposes classifying convicted illegal immigrants as felons and criminalizing those who knowingly assist undocumented immigrants to live or stay in the United States.

The U.S. Senate, however, shot down that proposal and late last week presented another hotly contested bill, the fate of which remains in limbo as Senators embarked on a two-week break Monday. That bill, which has retained the support of immigrants and labor leaders, offers a path to citizenship for millions of illegal immigrants and creates a guest worker program. Both bills focus on strengthening border control, though the House bill, with its scheme to build hundreds of miles of fence between the Mexico-U.S. border, is deemed far more restrictive.

At today's meeting, <u>supervisors</u> McHugh, Jim Beall and Liz Kniss voted in favor of the <u>resolution</u>, while <u>Supervisor</u> Don Gage opposed. <u>Supervisor</u> Blanca Alvarado, who placed the <u>resolution</u> on the board agenda, was absent.

Gage said he voted against the <u>resolution</u> because it hadn't gone through the proper procedures before appearing on the board's agenda, and not because he's anti-**immigration**.

``We're already objecting to something that we haven't seen the final product on," he said.

Kniss said she supported the *resolution* ``in concept," but called for additional deliberations.

"I think this is just the kind of issue we need to refer to the Legislative Commission," she said.

Beall seconded Kniss' concern, saying the *county*'s commissions need to properly analyze each *resolution* before placing it on the board's agenda, and that from now on there would be no rushed issues.

Santa Clara County supervisors pass immigration resolution

McHugh disagreed, saying he didn't think anyone inside the board chambers was unaware of the *immigration* debate taking place throughout the country.

"I think it's important that we speak up . . . and go on the record," he said.

Copyright © 2006 by Bay City News, Inc. -- republication, re-transmission or reuse without the express written consent of Bay City News, Inc. is prohibited.

Classification

Language: ENGLISH

Publication-Type: Newspaper

Subject: ILLEGAL IMMIGRANTS (91%); LEGISLATIVE BODIES (91%); <u>IMMIGRATION</u> (90%); US CONGRESS (90%); <u>COUNTIES</u> (89%); <u>COUNTY</u> GOVERNMENT (89%); CITIZENSHIP (78%); TERRITORIAL & NATIONAL BORDERS (78%); LEGISLATION (78%); BOARDS OF DIRECTORS (78%); FOREIGN LABOR (78%); US FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (76%); BORDER CONTROL (74%); TALKS & MEETINGS (73%); FELONIES (69%)

Organization: US HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES (56%)

Geographic: SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, CA, USA (93%); SAN JOSE, CA, USA (79%); UNITED STATES (94%); MEXICO (79%); NORTH AMERICA (79%)

Load-Date: April 12, 2006

End of Document