

PROVIDING FOR COMPENSATION
TO STATES INCARCERATING UN-
DOCUMENTED 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 site visits 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 STRENGTHENING EF-
FORTS 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'

wages. In a closed economy, corporations have a huge stake in the quality of the national workforce and infrastructure.

The situation is very different 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. Companies, in turn, come to have less of a stake in the quality of the workforce and infrastructure in their home country when they can produce anywhere. Moreover businesses can use the threat of relocating as a lever to extract concessions regarding tax policy, regulations and specific subsidies. Inevitably the cost of these concessions is borne by labour.

The public policy response of withdrawing from the global economy, or reducing the pace of integration, is ultimately untenable. It would generate resentment abroad on a dangerous scale, hurt the economy as other countries retaliated, and make us less competitive as companies in rival countries continue to integrate their production lines with developing countries. As Bill Clinton said in his first major international economic speech as president, "the United States must compete not retreat".

The domestic component of a strategy to promote healthy globalisation must rely on strengthening efforts to reduce inequality and insecurity. The international component must focus on the interests of working people in all countries, in addition to the current emphasis on the priorities of global-corporations.

First, the U.S. should take the lead in promoting global co-operation in the international tax arena. There has been a race to the bottom in the taxation of corporate income as nations lower their rates to entice business to issue more debt and invest in their jurisdictions. Closely related is the problem of tax havens that seek to lure wealthy citizens with promises that they can avoid paying taxes altogether on large parts of their fortunes. It might be inevitable that globalisation leads to some increases in inequality; it is not necessary that it also compromise the possibility of progressive taxation.

Second, an increased focus of international economic diplomacy should be to prevent harmful regulatory competition. In many areas it is appropriate that regulations differ between countries in response to local circumstances. But there is a reason why progressives in the early part of the 20th century sought to have the federal government take over many kinds of regulatory responsibility. They were concerned that competition for business across states, and their ease of being able to move, would lead to a race to the bottom. Financial regulation is only one example of where the mantra of needing to be "internationally competitive" has been invoked too often as a reason to cut back on regulation. There has not been enough serious consideration of the alternative—global co-operation to raise standards. While labour standards arguments have at times been invoked as a cover for protectionism, and this must be avoided, it is entirely appropriate that U.S. policymakers seek to ensure that greater global integration does not become an excuse for eroding labour rights.

To benefit the interests of U.S. citizens and command broadpolitical support, US international economic policy will need to focus on the issues in which the largest number of Americans have the greatest stake. A decoupling of the interests of businesses and nations may be inevitable; a decoupling of

international economic policies and the interests of American workers is not.

EDWARD EARNEST FOSTER:
FIERCE ADVOCATE FOR VET-
ERANS

HON. JANE HARMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2008

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, representing the 36th district of California since 1992 has given me the opportunity to meet many veterans and learn their stories. One special veteran and friend, Ed Foster, has an incredible story—one I would like to share with my colleagues on the eve of his retirement from the Torrance Job Service Office.

Edward Earnest Foster enlisted in the Army at age 19, and served as a medic in the Korean war. As a medic, soldier and veteran, he has touched the lives of countless individuals. He has advanced the cause of veteran's rights throughout the South Bay, and I am not alone in expressing enormous gratitude for all he has done.

Ed received nine medals on his tours of duty in Korea, including a Purple Heart and the Bronze Star with a "V" for valor. With the same strength of character that got him those medals, he has fought on behalf of all veterans.

Locally, Ed's contributions have been invaluable. In his post at the State Employment Department's Torrance office, he has worked to make sure area veterans find the work and dignity they deserve.

Perhaps his most notable and lasting initiative is the "Visit a Vet" program, which promotes visits with veterans at VA hospitals to let them know they are not forgotten and thank them for their service. We should all heed his call of "let us not just think of our veterans on holidays but do it all year long."

Ed Foster is a tireless advocate for veterans everywhere, and a wonderfully dedicated man. He represents, to me, what it means to serve one's country for a lifetime. Ed retires this month at the young age of 76. On behalf of the entire community, I say thank you, on behalf of a grateful nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE "INTERNET FREEDOM AND NON-DISCRIMINATION ACT OF 2008"

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 8, 2008

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, today I am introducing the "Internet Freedom and Nondiscrimination Act of 2008," legislation that establishes an antitrust remedy for anti-competitive and discriminatory practices by broadband service providers. I am joined by Representative LOFGREN.

Over the last ten years, the Internet has gone from its infancy through a period of exponential growth. Today, it is estimated that over 1.3 billion people use the Internet—that is almost 20 percent of the world's population. In the last 7 years alone, the worldwide use of the Internet has jumped 265 percent.

The Internet has become the dominant venue for the expression of ideas and public discourse. From social networking to get-out-the-vote drives, the Internet is now a leading tool for speech and action. Web sites like Facebook, MySpace, LinkedIn, and Monster have changed the way people of all ages connect socially and professionally. Political candidates raise more money online with each election cycle. Newspaper Web sites and independent blogs have revolutionized the ways in which news and media are disseminated and consumed. And the Internet has opened up new performance venues to emerging artists and entertainers. In these and many other ways, the technological innovation in communication made possible by the Internet has made it among the most powerful outlets for creativity and free speech.

However, some of the Internet Service Providers, which control 96 percent of the residential market for high-speed Internet access, and are either monopolies or duopolies in most areas of the country, have proposed to give favored treatment to some Internet content and disfavored treatment to other content. Under these proposed business models, what treatment you get will be determined by how much you pay or, potentially, whether the Internet service provider approves of the content or whether the provider has a financial interest at stake. Under these regimes, many of the innovations and ideas that we have enjoyed on the Internet may never have occurred. We would never have had a Google search engine or YouTube videos if "pay to play" had been our national policy. To be sure, if we go in this direction, it will stifle both future technological innovation and free speech.

Rather than attempt regulation of the industry, we believe an antitrust remedy is the most appropriate way to deal with the problem. The antitrust laws exist to correct distortions of the free market, where monopolies or cartels have cornered the market, and competition is not being allowed to work. The antitrust laws can help maintain a free and open Internet.

The "Internet Freedom and Nondiscrimination Act of 2008" amends the Clayton Act to require that broadband service providers interconnect with the facilities of other network providers on a reasonable and nondiscriminatory basis. It also requires them to operate their network in a reasonable and nondiscriminatory manner so that all content, applications and services are treated the same and have an equal opportunity to reach consumers. The bill expressly preserves the ability of broadband service providers to manage their network, so long as it is done in a nondiscriminatory manner, and the bill allows the operators to give priority to emergency communications and take reasonable and nondiscriminatory measures to prevent violations of the law.

Americans have come to expect the Internet to be open to everyone and everything. The Internet was designed without gatekeepers for new content and services and without centralized control. If we allow companies with monopoly or duopoly power to control how the Internet operates, start-up companies might never be able to offer their products, network providers could have the power to choose what content is available, and the artists and thinkers of our time could find their speech censored.