பப	CIDL	CITY L CLIVE C	COLID	பப
¢	Appro	ved for Filing: J.L. V	Wilson	₫
		02-15-11 6:13 AM	C	

	IMMIGRATION JOINT RESOLUTION
	2011 GENERAL SESSION
	STATE OF UTAH
	Chief Sponsor: Ross I. Romero
	House Sponsor:
	LONG TITLE
	LONG TITLE
•	General Description: This is intracellution of the Legislature process Congress to reform an outdeted and
	This joint resolution of the Legislature urges Congress to reform an outdated and
	ineffective federal immigration system and recommends that implementation of state
	immigration regulation proposals on certain immigration issues be delayed until after
	January 28, 2013, to allow time for federal immigration reform to pass.
]	Highlighted Provisions:
	This resolution:
	 strongly urges the United States Congress to address federal immigration reform
a	and to incorporate an increased and complementary role for states for reasons of
٤	greater efficiency and coordination; Ŝ→ [and] urges that Utah's legislative leaders and Utah's
(congressional delegation formally meet collaboratively to discuss the proper role of each in
(developing and implementing immigration policy; and - \$
	 recommends that state immigration regulation proposals concerning immigration
(enforcement, state work permits, guest worker programs that go beyond the current
	federal program, business licenses, professional licenses, Driving Privilege Cards,
i	n-state tuition requirements, and variations on these issues be delayed until after
•	January 28, 2013, to allow federal immigration reform to take place.
	Special Clauses:
	None
	Be it resolved by the Legislature of the state of Utah:
	WHEREAS, the United States Constitution and United States Supreme Court decisions



S.J.R. 18 02-15-11 6:13 AM

28	fix primary immigration policymaking authority with the federal government;
29	WHEREAS, Utah must currently address pressing and higher priority issues of
30	education, the economy, job creation, health, and the environment;
31	WHEREAS, state immigration policies would violate the influential Utah Compact,
32	which emphasizes "Federal Solutions" as a principle;
33	WHEREAS, Utah immigration initiatives largely are problematic under the federal
34	preemption doctrine and the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution;
35	WHEREAS, state and local immigration laws have led to costly lawsuits and economic
36	drains in numerous states and localities;
37	WHEREAS, the unintended consequences of these laws are difficult to assess but
38	largely destabilizing to families, communities, and economies;
39	WHEREAS, Utah has an illegal immigrant population estimated at between 2% and 4%
40	of the state's population;
41	WHEREAS, state immigration enforcement could be unconstitutional and would
42	impose costs and perhaps unintended consequences of local and state law enforcement
43	agencies;
44	WHEREAS, state immigration enforcement would have limited effectiveness given
45	current federal prioritization established and coordinated by Immigration and Customs
46	Enforcement;
47	WHEREAS, establishing a Utah work permit would violate federal law prohibiting the
48	unlawful employment of unauthorized aliens and would violate the Supremacy Clause of the
49	United States Constitution;
50	WHEREAS, no waiver or federal approval for such a violation of federal law is
51	available in immigration law, nor is the defect otherwise curable;
52	WHEREAS, guest worker programs that sought to include illegal immigrants residing
53	in Utah would also violate federal law;
54	WHEREAS, Utah has no ability to adjust immigrant visa quotas to economic and
55	societal needs since that authority rests exclusively with the federal government;
56	WHEREAS, increased state regulation of business and professional licenses, even if for
57	the purpose of completing federal immigration law that prohibits illegal immigrants from
58	working, would impose costs on all businesses;

02-15-11 6:13 AM S.J.R. 18

59	WHEREAS, mandating a voluntary federal E-Verify system on Utah employers would		
60	impose added costs and administrative burdens on businesses;		
61	WHEREAS, attempts to revoke or limit the Driving Privilege Card would complicate		
62	processes for all applicants, similar to changes that increased waiting times for all applicants in		
63	2010;		
64	WHEREAS, the Driving Privilege Card has been shown effective in limiting the		
65	number of uninsured drivers on Utah roads;		
66	WHEREAS, a revocation of the Driving Privilege Card would result in less revenue for		
67	the state;		
68	WHEREAS, maintaining in-state tuition for qualifying students helps Utah develop a		
69	more educated populace and workforce;		
70	WHEREAS, restrictive Utah immigration laws could cause disruption in certain		
71	markets and industries;		
72	WHEREAS, restrictive Utah immigration laws could drive some small businesses out		
73	of business;		
74	WHEREAS, Utah immigration regulation efforts could further exacerbate societal		
75	tensions at a time when economic and community challenges call for greater integration and		
76	cohesion;		
77	WHEREAS, the Utah Legislature has previously adopted S.B. 167, Penalties for False		
78	Driver Licenses and Identification Cards (2005), S.B. 15, Workforce Services-Reporting		
79	Misuse of Personal Identifying Information (2007), S.B. 81, Illegal Immigration (2008), and		
80	H.B. 64, Deterring Illegal Immigration (2009), which address current state immigration		
81	regulation;		
82	WHEREAS, the Utah Compact is being used as a reference point for state immigration		
83	regulation by Colorado, Arizona, Texas, Nebraska, Indiana, Georgia, and Florida; Ŝ→ [and] ←Ŝ		
84	WHEREAS, federal immigration reform should include an increased and		
85	complementary role for states to play that will improve efficiency and coordination $\$ \rightarrow [\div] :$		
85a	WHEREAS, Utah's legislative leaders and Utah's congressional delegation have not		
85b	formally met collaboratively to discuss immigration reform; and		
85c	WHEREAS, it would be beneficial for both the Utah Legislature and Utah's		
85d	congressional delegation to better understand the proper role of each party in developing and		
85e	<u>implementing immigration policy:</u> ←Ŝ		
86	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Legislature of the state of Utah		
87	strongly urges the United States Congress to address federal immigration reform and to		
88	incorporate an increased and complementary role for states for reasons of greater efficiency and		
89	coordination.		

S.J.R. 18 02-15-11 6:13 AM

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislature of the state of Utah recommends
that state immigration regulation proposals concerning immigration enforcement, state work
permits, guest worker programs that go beyond the current federal program, business licenses,
professional licenses, Driving Privilege Cards, in-state tuition requirements, and variations on
these issues be delayed until after January 28, 2013, to allow federal immigration reform to
take place.
Ŝ → <u>BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislature of the state of Utah urges that</u>
meetings take place betweeen Utah's congressional delegation and Utah's legislative leadership
for the purpose of working colloaboratively to address the proper role of each in developing
and implementing immigration policy. ←Ŝ
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of
the United States, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United
States House of Representatives, and to the members of Utah's congressional delegation.

Legislative Review Note as of 2-14-11 4:50 PM

Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel

FISCAL NOTE

S.J.R. 18

SHORT TITLE: Immigration Joint Resolution

SPONSOR: Romero, R.

2011 GENERAL SESSION, STATE OF UTAH

STATE GOVERNMENT (UCA 36-12-13(2)(b))

Enactment of this resolution likely will not materially impact the state budget.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (UCA 36-12-13(2)(c))

Enactment of this resolution likely will not result in direct, measurable costs for local governments.

DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY UTAH RESIDENTS AND BUSINESSES (UCA 36-12-13(2)(d)) Enactment of this resolution likely will not result in direct, measurable expenditures by Utah residents or businesses.

2/18/2011, 11:51 AM, Lead Analyst: Allred, S./Attorney: JLW

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst