# **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES STAFF ANALYSIS**

BILL #: HB 567 Illegal Immigration

SPONSOR(S): Schenck and others

TIED BILLS: IDEN./SIM. BILLS: SB 1532

	REFERENCE	ACTION	ANALYST	STAFF DIRECTOR
1)	Military & Local Affairs Policy Committee		Fudge	Hoagland
2)	Governmental Affairs Policy Committee			
3)	Economic Development & Community Affairs Policy Council		·	
4)				
5)				

# **SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

Current federal law prohibits any Federal, State, or local law from prohibiting or restricting any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of an individual.

The bill prohibits any person, agency, county, or municipality from restricting any governmental entity or official from maintaining or exchanging any information regarding the immigration status of an individual.

This document does not reflect the intent or official position of the bill sponsor or House of Representatives. STORAGE NAME: h0567.MLA.doc

**STORAGE NAME**: h0567.MLA.dog **DATE**: 3/10/2009

#### **HOUSE PRINCIPLES**

Members are encouraged to evaluate proposed legislation in light of the following guiding principles of the House of Representatives

- Balance the state budget.
- Create a legal and regulatory environment that fosters economic growth and job creation.
- Lower the tax burden on families and businesses.
- Reverse or restrain the growth of government.
- Promote public safety.
- Promote educational accountability, excellence, and choice.
- Foster respect for the family and for innocent human life.
- Protect Florida's natural beauty.

#### **FULL ANALYSIS**

#### I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

## A. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Current federal law prohibits any Federal, State, or local law from prohibiting or restricting any government entity or official from sending to, or receiving from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service information regarding the citizenship or immigration status of an individual. Likewise, no person or agency may prohibit or restrict a Federal, State, or local government entity from doing any of the following with respect to information regarding the immigration status, lawful or unlawful, of any individual:

- (1) Sending such information to, or requesting or receiving such information from, the Immigration and Naturalization Service.
- (2) Maintaining such information.
- (3) Exchanging such information with any other Federal, State, or local government entity.<sup>23</sup>

## **Effect of Proposed Changes**

The bill requires cooperation with federal officials regarding the immigration status of individuals. No person, agency, county, or municipality may prohibit any governmental entity or official from maintaining or exchanging any information regarding the immigration status of an individual.<sup>4</sup>

## **B. SECTION DIRECTORY:**

<sup>2</sup> 8 U.S.C. § 1373(b)

STORAGE NAME: h0567.MLA.doc

**DATE**: 3/10/2009

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 8 U.S.C. § 1373(a)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The California Attorney General opined that a city may not prohibit its officers and employees from cooperating in their official capacities with Immigration and Naturalization Service investigation, detention, or arrest procedures relating to the civil provision of the federal immigration laws. 75 Ops.Cal.Atty.Gen 270 (1992).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The immigration status of an individual appears to be a public record, because there is no specific exemption. The Public Records Act is liberally construed in favor of open government, while exemptions are narrowly construed. *See Christy v. Palm Beach County Sheriff's Office*, 698 So.2d 1365, 1366 (Fa. 4th DCA 1997).

Section 1: Creates s. 111.076, F.S., prohibits restrictions on public employees reporting immigration status.

Section 2: Creates s. 125.582, F.S., prohibits county governments from restricting reporting of immigration status.

Section 3: Creates s. 166.04935, F.S., prohibits municipal governments from restricting reporting of immigration status.

	ininigration status.		
	Section 4:	Provides an effective date of July 1, 2009.	
		II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT	
A.	FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:		
	1. Revenues: None.		
	<ol><li>Expenditure</li><li>None.</li></ol>	es:	
В.	B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:		
	1. Revenues: None.		
	<ol><li>Expenditure</li><li>None.</li></ol>	res:	
C.	DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR:  None.		
D.	None.		
		III. COMMENTS	
A.	. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:		
	1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:		
	an action re	ole because this bill does not appear to: require cities or counties to spend funds or take quiring the expenditure of funds; reduce the authority that cities or counties have to raise the aggregate; or reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with cities or counties.	
	2. Other:		
	None.		
B.	RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY:		
	None.		

STORAGE NAME: h0567.MLA.doc

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS:

**DATE**: 10567.MLA 3/10/2009

Section 1 of the bill refers to "a person or agency", but those terms are not defined within the Chapter. The bill could be clarified to refer to "agency of the state" or "state agency" as defined in 111.071(4), F.S., or "elected public officer" as defined in 111.012(1)(b), F.S.

# IV. AMENDMENTS/COUNCIL OR COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE CHANGES

STORAGE NAME: h0567.MLA.doc PAGE: 4 3/10/2009

DATE: