PROVIDING FOR COMPENSATION TO STATES INCARCERATING UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS

SPEECH OF

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 2008

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of this important legislation, which will help State and local governments in Colorado by reimbursing them for the costs of holding aliens charged with crimes.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, or SCAAP, was originally created to provide financial assistance to States and localities for costs they incur as a result of incarcerating criminal aliens. However, now they are only reimbursed for a portion of these expenditures.

H.R. 1512 amends the law to reflect the original intent of Congress, namely to provide financial assistance to States and localities for costs they incur as a result of incarcerating aliens who are either charged with or convicted of a felony or two misdemeanors.

The SCAAP program was created in 1994. It is administered by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, BJA, part of the Justice Department's Office of Justice Programs OJP. The Department of Homeland Security aids BJA in administering the program by verifying the immigration status (or lack of status) of those for whom States seek reimbursement.

Current law authorizes the appropriation of $950 million annually over the 2008–2011 period for SCAAP. For fiscal year 2007, the authorization level for the program was $850 million, and the Congress appropriated about $400 million. In 2007, however, States and localities applied to SCAAP for reimbursements totaling over $950 million.

In 2003, the Department of Justice reinterpreted the statute establishing SCAAP so that reimbursement is made only if: (1) the criminal alien is convicted of a felony or two misdemeanors; and (2) the arrest and conviction occurred in the same fiscal year. The result has been a drastic reduction in the amount of reimbursements received by Colorado and other States.

H.R. 1512 restores SCAAP as it was originally intended by permitting States and localities to be reimbursed for the costs of incarcerating aliens who are either ''charged with or convicted'' of a felony or two misdemeanors, regardless of the fiscal year of the incarceration and conviction.

I have long supported making this overdue change, which will help many Colorado jurisdictions, and I urge approval of this essential measure.

MACOMB COUNTY SCHOOLS EARN BLUE RIBBON STATUS

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2008

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this week the Michigan Board of Education designated five schools across the entire State as Blue Ribbon Exemplary Schools. You might ask why this is significant. Well, I will tell you why.

The Blue Ribbon is the most prestigious education award in the state and it distinguishes schools for their excellence in leadership, teaching, curriculum, student achievement, parent involvement and community support.

Well, I am proud to inform you that 2 of these schools reside in the 10th Congressional District.

Powell Middle School Bulldogs in Romeo and Malow Junior High Mustangs in Shelby Township rightfully earned this prestigious distinction. The Bulldogs and Mustangs under went a rigorous examination process which even included on sitevisits from state education officials.

Under the leadership of Principal Jeffrey LaPerriere, Powell became the first school in the Rome Community School District to receive this honor. On the other hand, Malow Principal Robert Hock continued Utica Community School District's strong Blue Ribbon tradition by becoming the 22nd school to get the award.

I commend all the teachers, parents and students for their steadfast commitment and dedication to achieve such a remarkable accomplishment! This is a great day for all Macomb County schools so congratulations on a job well done!

LAWRENCE SUMMERS EXPLAINS WHY ''A STRATEGY TO PROMOTE HEALTHY GLOBALISATION MUST RELY ON STRENGTHING EFFORTS TO REDUCE INEQUALITY AND INSECURITY''

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2008

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, it has been common for those who support increased trade without any accompanying policies to address the impact on foreign and domestic workers to dismiss arguments for such policies as mere protectionism, lacking any economic justification.

In the Financial Times, Monday May 5th, one of the leading economists in the country, former Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers, refutes this effort to dismiss our concerns. As former Secretary Summers says, some of the ''opposition to trade agreements and economic internationalism more generally, reflect a growing recognition by workers that what is good for the global economy and its business champions was not necessarily good for them, and that there were reasonable grounds for this belief.''

Lawrence Summers has been and is a strong supporter of increased trade. But unlike many others who have stuck with a far less sophisticated analysis, ignoring contemporary reality, Secretary Summers explains why the current globalized economy means that trade can have a negative impact on some workers in higher wage countries. As he notes, ''in an open economy, where investments in innovation, brands, a strong corporate culture or even in certain kinds of equipment can be combined with labour from anywhere in the world, workers no longer have the same stake in productive investment by companies as it becomes easier for corporations to combine their capital with lower priced labour overseas. . . . Moreover businesses can use the threat of relocating as a lever to extract concessions. . . . Inevitably the cost of these concessions is borne by labour.''

Madam Speaker, the economic explanation given by Secretary Summers is not meant by him as an argument against trade, but rather as an argument for accompanying continued expansion of trade with appropriate public policies that deal with some of these effects, and recognize that while trade has overall beneficial effects for the economy, the distribution of the costs and benefits are far from uniform. And the New York Times for Tuesday, May 6th, illustrates the economic reality that gives rise to the political opposition to increased trade and internationalization that Secretary Summers notes—as the Times article of that date noted, ''In inflation adjusted terms . . . weekly wages have slipped by 1.3 percent since late 2006.''

Madam Speaker, I strongly urge leaders in the business community and others who would like to see further progress towards internationalization to read and understand Secretary Summers' economic analysis, and the very thoughtful public policy recommendations he includes that stem from this analysis. And because I can think of no more important contribution to the debate about economic policy in America, I ask that Secretary Summers' very important essay be printed here.

[From the Financial Times, May 5, 2008]

A STRATEGY TO PROMOTE HEALTHY GLOBALISATION

(By Lawrence Summers)

Last week, in this column, I argued that making the case that trade agreements improve economic welfare might no longer be sufficient to maintain political support for economic internationalism in the U.S. and other countries. Instead, I suggested that opposition to trade agreements, and economic internationalism more generally, reflected a growing recognition by workers that what is good for the global economy and its business champions was not necessarily good for them, and that there were reasonable grounds for this belief.

The most important reason for doubting that an increasingly successful, integrated global economy will benefit U.S. workers (and those in other industrial countries) is the weakening of the link between the success of a nation's workers and the success of both its trading partners and its companies. This phenomenon was first emphasised years ago by Robert Reich, the former U.S. labour secretary. The normal argument is that a more rapidly growing global economy benefits workers and companies in an individual country by expanding the market for exports. This is a valid consideration. But it is also true that the success of other countries, and greater global integration, places more competitive pressure on an individual economy. Workers are likely disproportionately to bear the brunt of this pressure.

Part of the reason why U.S. workers (or those in Europe and Japan) enjoy high wages is that they are more highly skilled than most workers in the developing world. Yet they also earn higher wages because they can be more productive—their effort is complemented by capital, broadly defined to include equipment, managerial expertise, corporate culture, infrastructure and the capacity, for innovation. In a closed economy anything that promotes investment in productive capital necessarily raises workers'