

PROPOSED FALL BACK TO SHORE/CHAIRESZ RESOLUTION ON SANCTUARY
Opponents to the sanctuary resolution argue that it is setting a "dangerous precedent" and that it sends an erroneous message to Central Americans that they can come and be welcomed to Sacramento, when federal agents can and will arrest any undocumented person. Also, they have argued that the resolution will cause a mass exodus of Central Americans to Sacramento.

These arguements are more emotional then factual, more ideological and paranoid then realistic. But what they are able to do is appeal to the ugly side of each and everyone of us which causes us to be suspicious and develop an anti-immigrant attitude. The arguments they present are full of innuendo. They conjure up the image of people flooding Sacramento living off of welfare, speaking only their native language and taking jobs from American citizens. These are the real concerns that most people have and which opponents have exploited effectively.

Many of these arguments have never been substantiated by any of the opponenets nor have any real efforts been made to establish a legitimate and credible basis for these arguments. Opponents have calculated that if you talk enough about the xenophobic aspects and if you exaggerate as much as possible, people will agree with their position. No opponent has specifically stated how the resolution establishes a "super dangerous precedent" nor how it "turns its back on federal immigration laws".

There is nothing in your resolution that instructs city employees to violate any known laws; it simply says that they shall not take the law into their own hands and make decisions about the status of individuals they are providing services to. Where there are laws which require more scrutiny or referral to INS for immigration checks, city employees must comply and it is clearly stated in the resoluuion. There is no turning back on U.S. immigration laws.

Due to this capaign of mis-information, xenophobia and bigotry, your resolution is in jeopardy and your response must not and cannot be considered defensive, or extremist. Your position should be one that is baased on a reasonable and objective approach to very unreasonable, xenophobic and political criticism. You should argue and propose the following:

- ↓ That the Human Relations Commission undertake a ^{60 Day} ~~three-month~~ study to assess the implications the sanctuary resolution has had in Sacramento. Specifically, the Commission would examine (1) the degree to which Central Americans from El Salvador and Guatemala have immigrated to Sacramento and whether this pattern has increased since the resolution has passed, (2) whether those Central Americans coming recently have come due to their knowledge of said resolution and the expectation that they would be protected, (3) whether city employees are aware of this resolution and have their responsibilities or job attitudes changed

assess due to the passage of *assess* the resolution which caused them *Federal* not to comply with existing law or city ordinance/regulation, *by* (4) the level of use of federally funded programs Central American refugees in the Sacramento SMSA, and their pattern of employment and whether local, state and federal taxes are paid by these refugees, and (5) whether the unemployment rate in Sacramento has increased due to the presence of Central American refugees and if any institutions or groups have been adversely effected by the presence of Central American refugees from Guatemala and El Salvador.

This study would begin to put to rest some of xenophobic and ideological contentions by opponents of the resolution or prove them right. Regardless, by taking this position and proposing this middle-ground, you will be viewed as being fair, responsible and objective. Whatever the results of the study at least you've begun to pursue the fair approach to this issue by ATTEMPTING to ACT on FACTS and not on political and bigoted grounds. The City Council should take action once these facts are discovered.

Points which you should raise which underscore your concern area:

1) The Archbishop of San Salvador issued last week a press release indication that the right wing squads were harrassing and threatening church workers working with displaced persons/refugees in El Salvador. This underscores the atmosphere which refugees in El Salvador live with and its life-threatening circumstances.

2) The U.S. State Department announced in June 11, 1986 that it was extending Poland until Dec. 30, 1986. This has been the status since Dec. 23, 1981. Why not Guatemalans or Salvadorans? Mr. Chaivez stated in the Sacramento Bee that the city resolution is a violation of our Constitution "by not providing equal treatment to all groups". He should be more consistent and recognize the facts. The city resolution acknowledges the unfairness and inequity of U.S. policy as evidenced by this act by the U.S. State Department.