Immigration: House Passes Bill To Increase High-Skilled Worker Visas

By an overwhelming majority of 389-15, the House on November 29, 2011 passed HR 3012, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act of 2011. The bill eliminates the per-country numerical limitation for employment-based immigrants, and increases the per-country numerical limitation for family-sponsored immigrants.

The 1990 Immigration Act set an annual limit of 140,000 legal permanent resident visas for employment-based immigration and set a cap that held each foreign country to seven percent of the total of the visas offered. This has basically locked out of visas many skilled workers from such countries as India and China, because it puts them on the same basis as applicants from much smaller countries, such as Iceland. Studies have shown that applicants from India and China can wait as long as 70 and 20 years, respectively, to be granted employment based visas. The bill does not increase the overall limit of 140,000 employment-based visas, so backlogs in these applications are expected to continue.

The bill will also increase the country-based cap on visas for family members from seven to 15 percent. As with the employment-based visas, the current 226,000 annual cap on family visas will not increase.

H.R. 3012 also eliminates the current law that requires reducing annual Chinese (PRC) immigrant visas to offset status adjustments under the Chinese Student Protection Act.

Supporters of the legislation hope that a Senate counterpart, S. 1857, will be considered in the near future.

Education: House Subcommittee Examines Affordability of Higher Education

The House Education and the Workforce Subcommittee on Higher Education and Workforce Training held a hearing on November 30, 2011 titled Keeping College Within Reach: Discussing Ways Institutions Can Streamline Costs and Reduce Tuition. The hearing focused on the causes of rising college
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tuition and the ways some institutions are lowering costs. According to the Committee, tuition costs have risen drastically in the last decade, with in-state tuition and fees increasing by 8.3 percent at public four-year institutions in the last year alone.

Witnesses included: Ms. Jane V. Wellman, Executive Director, Delta Project on Postsecondary Costs, Productivity, and Accountability, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Ronald E. Manahan, President, Grace College and Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana; Mr. Jamie P. Merisotis, President and Chief Executive Officer, Lumina Foundation for Education, Indianapolis, Indiana; and Mr. Tim Foster, President, Colorado Mesa University, Grand Junction, Colorado.

Ms. Wellman testified that there has been "growing economic stratification between institutions." He stated that although public schools are enrolling more students, their access to funding – including state and federal sources as well as endowments – is not growing at the same rate as in private institutions, which are seeing more funding but less growth in enrollment. She also testified that although there were tuition increases since 2008, the year from 2008-2009 saw tuition increases that covered less than half of decreases from state or governmental revenue, and this cost-shift did not result in more spending. Ms. Wellman also cited the growing cost of employee benefits due to the rising cost of healthcare as the single most reason that institutional spending is rising.

Dr. Manahan testified to Grace College and Seminary's efforts to increase efficiency and productivity. He highlighted their efforts to thoroughly review all programs, which included an examination and offered solutions that were all implemented successfully. He also stated that the organization also explored operational efficiency, began offering 3-year degree programs for all undergraduate majors, created a 2-year degree program to be offered in urban areas, and collaborated with other 2- and 4-year institutions, among other efforts.

Other issues discussed included:
- Discussion of the need to cut tuition and improve productivity, in order to improve equity and accessibility, especially in populations that are the fastest growing and most vulnerable.
- Discussion about regulations that burden institutions and the need to seek out innovation and flexibility measures that enable institutions to serve students well, and trust that the "market" (students and prospective students) will keep these institutions accountable.
- The use of performance funding, or targeting incentives for colleges and universities to graduate more students with quality degrees and credentials in less time at a lower cost.

For more information, please visit: [http://edworkforce.house.gov/](http://edworkforce.house.gov/).

**Taxes: House Judiciary Explores Constitutionality of Remote Sales Tax Collection**

The House Judiciary Committee held a hearing titled “Constitutional Limitations on States' Authority to Collect Sales Taxes in E-Commerce,” on November 30, 2011.

Witnesses included: Patrick Byrne, Chairman & CEO, Overstock.com, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT; Tod Cohen, Vice President and Deputy General Counsel of Global Government Relations, Intellectual Property, Regulatory and Asset Protection, eBay Inc., San Jose, CA.; Hon. Luke Kenley, Senator, Indiana Senate, Indianapolis, IN, on behalf of Streamlined Sales Tax Governing Board, Inc.; and Paul Misener, Vice President of World-Wide Public Policy, Amazon.com, Inc., Washington, DC.
The hearing focused on constitutional limitations on state and local governments to tax Internet sales transactions. Chairman Lamar Smith explained that the Supreme Court has held that a state lacks the necessary substantial nexus over a retailer for the purposes of collecting taxes, if that entity that has no physical presence in the state. He said the hearing was intended to address two questions: “First, whether Congress should exercise its Commerce Clause power to enact sales tax reform legislation. And second, if Congress should act, how we can do so in a manner that does not increase administrative and compliance burdens on America’s small businesses.”

Chairman Smith noted that three bills have been introduced in the House that could give states the right to collect taxes. One of those bills is the Marketplace Equity Act, H.R. 3179, introduced by Reps. Steve Womack (AZ) and Jackie Speier (Hillsborough).

Mr. Cohen argued that small business web-based retailers would be put at a disadvantage vis a vis large retail operations with both a physical presence in a state or locality and an Internet-based sales platform. He testified: “The Internet sales tax bills that have been introduced in this Congress would change the playing field in a way that would apply sales taxes to small business retailers in the same manner as giant retailers. This change in law would mean that consumers would face a new tax cost on goods purchased from small remote retailers, but the consumer would not gain benefits tied to presence. This means that the shopper will be less likely to buy from small retailers on the Internet. The real world effect will be to disadvantage small business retailers, a segment of retailers that is already losing market share under the status quo. This is why these bills are anti-small business.” He argued for a small business exemption, if Congress does enact legislation regarding remote sales tax collection.

Mr. Cohen stated that eBay strongly supports H.Res. 95, introduced by Reps. Dan Lungren (Gold River) and Zoe Lofgren (San Jose). The resolution opposes new tax collection requirements for small online businesses and entrepreneurs, and calls for policies to maintain the principle that small businesses with less presence should not be held to the same standard as large retail businesses with significant presence.

State Senator Kenley strongly supported federal legislation to allow states and localities to collect sales taxes on Internet transactions. He stated: “the US Supreme Court made it clear that a state’s ability to employ an effective sales tax was going to depend on the authority granted by Congress under the Commerce Clause. I come before you today to ask you to exercise that authority.” He countered each argument made by opponents to such legislation. For instance, he argued that some opponents “argue that it is impossible to collect [taxes]. Every retailer today looks to automate everything that can be automated. Sales tax collection software exists, it works and it is affordable. Computer technology and supply chain management have radically changed retailing. In many ways the Internet is the perfect environment in which to collect sales taxes because sales tax collection can be automated.”

Regarding the impact on small businesses, he stated that the real burden is on those businesses trying to compete against a business that doesn’t have to add the sales tax to its price. He also noted that each of the bills introduced so far protect small businesses by excluding the smallest, by requiring states to simplify their laws and processes, and by requiring states to provide software.

For more information, go to: http://judiciary.house.gov.

Housing: House Committee Examines the FHA Single Family Insurance Fund

On December 1, 2011, the House Financial Services Committee held a hearing titled Perspectives on the Health of the FHA [Federal Housing Administration] Single-family Insurance Fund. Witnesses included: The Honorable Shaun Donovan, Secretary, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Mr. Mathew Scire, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, U.S. Government Accountability Office; Dr. Andrew Caplin, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, New York University; Mr. Henry V. Cunningham, Jr., CMB, President, Cunningham and Company, on behalf of the Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA); Mr. Patrick Sinks, President and Chief Operating Officer, Mortgage Guaranty
Insurance Corporation, on behalf of the Mortgage Insurance Companies of America; Mr. Moe Veissi, President, National Association of Realtors (NAR); and Ms. Sarah Rosen Wartell, Executive Vice President, Center for American Progress.

Secretary Donovan that the FHA’s FY2011 report to Congress, The Annual Report to Congress Regarding the Financial Status of the FHA Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund Fiscal Year 2011, an independent actuarial report, shows that the FHA “remains resilient” and that the “FHA’s new books of business have been of extremely high quality.” The Secretary further noted that while the FHA served more than 770,000 home buyers, of whom a significant portion are first time buyers or minority homeowners, and insured more than $236 billion in mortgages in FY2011, it remains “committed to shrinking the government footprint in the market” as private lenders return. Most important, he testified that the report “made clear that under base-case economics the [Mortgage] Fund will remain positive, and its prospects for the future are good.” More specifically, the report also found that “base-case projections estimate that the capital ratio will reach 2 percent again in 2014, sooner than was projected in last year’s report,” a good sign.

Mr. Cunningham testified that the MBA appreciated the FHA’s vital role in providing liquidity to the nation’s distressed housing markets and the traditional counter cyclical role it is playing in promoting economic recovery. He stated that the MBA is “grateful for the steps the agency has taken to place itself on surer financial footing and avoid the need for taxpayer funding,” but that there is still a “real risk that it could require taxpayer support.” Although the MBA believes that many of the changes the FHA has already made have positioned the program to fare better in the years ahead, he stated that additional changes could further bolster the fund and offered that MBA would work with Congress and the FHA to ensure the agency continues to provide home buyers with safe, affordable mortgage financing, while also encouraging the return of private capital that will take some of the strain off the FHA’s programs.

Mr. Veissi testified that the NAR “feels strongly about the importance of the FHA mortgage insurance program and believes the FHA has shown tremendous leadership and strength during the current crisis.” He cited the FHA’s audit, which found that it had “‘positive’ reserves, meaning they have adequate resources to cover all claims and expenses resulting from their portfolio,” and praised the changes the FHA has made in recent years to ensure its solvency. He also cautioned the FHA and Congress about making “changes that artificially increase the costs of home ownership in order to fund other government programs and disenfranchise families who wish to purchase a home.”

For more information, visit: http://financialservices.house.gov/.

Natural Disasters: House Committee Marks Up Reauthorization of Hazards Reduction Programs

On December 1, 2011, the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee favorably reported H.R. 3479, the Natural Hazards Risk Reduction Act of 2011, to the House floor.

The bill reauthorizes several federal natural hazards reduction programs and is composed of three titles: Earthquakes, Wind, and Interagency Cooperation. Earthquake-specific sections of the bill include reauthorization changes to the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program, the Post-Earthquake Investigations Program, as well as the authorization of appropriations.

As written, the National Earthquake Hazards Reduction Program will be administered by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as well as the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and the National Science Foundation (NSF). Other provisions include language to support public education and outreach and the establishment of an Advisory Committee on Earthquake Hazards Reduction.

The bill also creates an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Natural Hazards Risk Reduction, chaired by the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology and composed of the heads of FEMA; USGS; the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; the NSF; the Office of
Science and Technology Policy; the Office of Management and Budget; and the head(s) of any other Federal agency the chair considers appropriate.

The bill authorizes the following annual amounts for fiscal years 2012-2014 for implementation of the Earthquake program:

- FEMA - $6,400,000
- USGS - $57,700,000
- NSF - $53,800,000
- NIST - $4,100,000

Rep. Zoe Lofgren (San Jose) offered an amendment to increase NIST’s authorizations for the Post Earthquake Investigations Program to over $7 million per year. It was defeated by a vote of 11-20. An amendment by Rep. Lynn Woolsey (Petaluma) was also defeated, 12-21. It would have substantially increased appropriations for FEMA, USGS, NSF, and NIST to implement the Earthquake program.

For more information, go to: http://science.house.gov.

**Health:** House Committee Backs Repeal of Long-Term Care Program

The House Energy and Commerce Committee approved legislation on November 30, 2011 that would repeal the long-term care Community Living Assistance Services and Supports (CLASS) program. Passed by a vote of 33-17, H.R. 1173 would terminate the already suspended program that was created in 2010 as part of the Affordable Care Act.

The CLASS program was designed to provide a $50 daily cash benefit to workers who paid into the fund previously and who need financial assistance while receiving long-term care. Although the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) worked for over a year and a half to implement the program, it could not devise a method to do so that fulfilled the law’s requirements of being voluntary, self-sustaining and fiscally sound over a period of 75 years. HHS formally announced that it could not implement the program in October 2010.

During the mark up, some members supported using the framework of the CLASS program to reform and build a workable model, arguing that total repeal of the program without a replacement was undesirable and irresponsible. Other members cited a Congressional Research Service memo sent to the Committee in November, which stated that without formal repeal, the Secretary of HHS could face legal ramifications.

An amendment by Rep. Lee Terry (NE) to temporarily save funding for the National Clearinghouse for Long-Term Care Information was passed by a voice vote. It would remove permanent funding for the Clearinghouse, replacing it with an authorization for fiscal years 2013-2015. Rep. Lois Capps (Santa Barbara) offered an amendment to Rep. Terry’s proposal, which would have kept mandatory appropriations through fiscal year 2015. It was defeated by a vote of 16-30. Several other amendments were also defeated.

A spokesperson for House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (VA) said he hopes to bring the bill to the House floor no later than the first few weeks of the new year. It is predicted that the bill will pass in the House but face challenges in the Senate.

For more information, visit: http://energycommerce.house.gov.

**Transportation:** House Committee Examines DOT's New Service Rule

The House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform held a hearing on November 30, 2011 to examine a new service rule promulgated by the Department of Transportation (DOT). The hearing was titled *The Price of Uncertainty: How Much Could DOT's Proposed Billion Dollar Service Rule Cost Consumers This Holiday Season?*.

Witnesses included: The Honorable Anne S. Ferro, Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; Mr. Ed Nagle III, President and CEO, Nagle Companies; Mr.
Glen Keysaw, Executive Director of Transportation/Logistics, Associated Food Stores, Inc.; Mr. Robb MacKie, President and CEO, American Bakers Association; Mr. Frank Miller, Director of Logistics, Badcock & More; Dr. Jesse David, Senior Vice President, Edworth Economics; and Mr. Henry Jasny, Vice President and General Counsel, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety.

Ms. Ferro testified on the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's (FMCSA's) efforts to reduce the risk and prevalence of fatigue-related truck crashes through improvements in the hours of service (HOS) regulations. She described to the Committee the FMCSA's recent rulemaking to amend the HOS rules, citing that regulation of drivers' work hours has been implemented since 1995 and continually updated in partnership with the industry. Although overall crashes have declined between 2007-2009, Ms. Ferro testified that there has been no parallel decrease in fatigue-related crashes.

She testified that the new rule would:
1. Limit drivers to either 10 or 11 hours of driving time following a period of at least 10 consecutive hours off duty.
2. Limit the standard "driving window" to 14 hours, while allowing that number to be extended to 16 hours twice a week.
3. Limit actual duty time within the driving window to 13 hours.
4. Only permit drivers to drive if 7 hours or less had passed since their last off-duty or sleeperberth period of at least 30 minutes; in other words, certain drivers would be required to take a 30-minute break but with flexibility as to when that break would occur.
5. Retain the 34-hour restart for calculations of the maximum weekly on-duty time, subject to certain limits: the restart would have to include two periods between midnight and 6 a.m. and could be started no sooner than 168 hours (7 days) after the beginning of the previously designated restart.
6. Revise the definition of "on-duty" to allow some time spent in or on the CMV to be logged as off duty.
7. Revise the oilfield operations exception to clarify the language on waiting time and to state that waiting time would not be included in the calculation of the driving window.

Ms. Ferro also testified on the economic impact of the proposed rule, stating that the "regulatory option that included a 10-hour limit on driving time during the work day would impose costs of approximately $1 billion per year with annual safety and economic benefits of approximately $1.4 billion," while "the regulatory option that included an 11-hour limit on driving time during the work day would impose costs of approximately $520 million per year with annual safety and economic benefits slightly greater than $1 billion." Therefore, she testified, "taken as a whole, the regulatory option that included a 10-hour driving time limit was cost-beneficial, based on the Agency's analysis of the crash data and research." Mr. Jasny testified in support of the rule.

Mr. Nagle, however, testified that for his company the new rule means that his drivers would only be able to work 50 instead of 60 hours per week, a move that could decrease revenues by as much as 17 percent and increase costs to shippers by 20 percent. He also called the rule requiring drivers to have two consecutive nights of rest between 12:00 a.m. and 6:00 a.m. "egregious," saying it and the whole bill "flies in the face of reason" and was "predominately influenced by Teamster Union LTL daytime-only drivers that represent less than 10 percent of the industry."

Mr. Keysaw testified that the new rule would increase consumer food prices by 3 percent and "mean shortages of grocery items on store shelves, and in some cases, unavailability of products during the peak shopping days." He summarized that his industry strongly supports the current HOS regulations and they should be retained. It does not support the proposed new HOS rule and has "formally asked DOT and its Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration to withdraw it because we have not been shown any compelling research, data or any other reason to justify finalizing this proposed rulemaking." Mr. Miller testified in agreement, asking the DOT to maintain its current rule.
Mr. MacKie argued: "Many of FMCSA’s new approaches rely on misapplication of available data, use of outdated information, or lack empirical support entirely. FMCSA also makes a number of errors in its calculations which serve to further overstate its findings." Dr. David expressed similar concerns.

For more information: http://oversight.house.gov/.

**Natural Disasters: House Committee Holds Hearing On SBA's Recovery Loans**

On November 30, 2011, the House Small Business Committee held a hearing titled Disaster Assistance: Is the SBA Meeting the Recovery Needs of Disaster Victims?

The purpose of the hearing was to examine the Small Business Administration’s long-term disaster recovery assistance programs and focused on its implementation of the Small Business Disaster Response and Loan Improvements Act of 2008 while also examining the changes made in the disaster loan program since Hurricane Katrina. Witnesses included Mr. James Rivera, Associate Administrator, Office of Disaster Assistance, U.S. Small Business Administration, and Mr. William Shear, Director, Financial Markets and Community Investment, U. S. Government Accountability Office.

Topics discussed included:
- The GAO's statement in 2009 that they were not comfortable that SBA could meet the challenges of another disaster on the scale of Hurricane Katrina, which occurred in 2005. Also discussed was a report from the GAO that showed that laws passed in 2008 are not yet fully implemented by the SBA.
- Improvements to the SBA's disaster program, including the addition of 1,400 processing desks in Texas and the establishment of a 300-desk surge center in Sacramento. Also improvements to staffing, including surge capability, and the SBA exceeding its processing time goals in 2011 were highlighted.
- Successes and challenges in response to Hurricane Irene and Tropical Storm Lee.
- Discussion of the SBA's implementation of efforts to address three of the five recommendations presented by the GAO in a 2009 report meant to examine and address shortcomings in the Disaster Loan Program. Two recommendations remain unaddressed.

For more information, visit: http://smallbusiness.house.gov/.

**Education: California Budget Project Reports on CA Education Spending**

The California Budget Project released a fall 2011 report titled *A Decade of Disinvestment: California Education Spending Nears the Bottom*, which compares education spending in California to such spending in other states. According to the report, California education spending levels rank near the bottom in several different measures compared to the rest of the US.

Despite Proposition 98, California spending lags behind that of other states and the gap is growing. The report states: “The gap between California spending per student and the rest of the US grew more than fourfold during the past decade ... the gap in spending per student widened to $2,856 in 2010-2011, an increase of more than 310 percent.” The report shows that 2010-2011 General Fund spending on education was “lower as a share of the state’s economy than in 35 of the prior 40 years” and despite relief money from the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the funding that schools had access to, relative to other states, fell to a “historic” low by the end of the decade. The report states that this is in part due to the fact that the state’s schools rely on state funding for the majority of their dollars.

The following are highlights of where California ranks in terms of spending, according to various measures for the year of 2010-2011:
- The state spent nearly $9,000 per student while the rest of the country averaged spending of $11,700 per student. Therefore, California ranks 46th in spending by this measure.
- The state ranks 47th in K-12 spending as a percentage of personal income, spending just 3.27% (the nation averages 4.29%). According to the report, this measure “reflects the size of a state’s economy and the resources available to support public services.”
- The state ranks last at 50th place in the number of K-12 students per teacher, at 20.5 students per teacher on average, compared to the 13.8 students per teacher on average in the rest of the US.
- The state ranks in 49th place in the number of K-12 students per guidance counselor, at 810 students per counselor on average, compared to the 433 students per counselor on average in the rest of the US.
- The state ranks last at 50th place in the number of K-12 students per librarian, at 5,489 students per librarian on average, compared to the 839 students per librarian on average in the rest of the US.
- The state ranks in 46th place in the number of K-12 students per administrator, at 301 students per administrator on average, compared to the 203 students per administrator on average in the rest of the US.

For more information, please visit: http://www.cbp.org/.

EDUCATION: PPIC SURVEY SHOWS CALIFORNIANS’ OPINIONS ON QUALITY AND COST OF STATE HIGHER EDUCATION

The Public Policy Institute of California recently released a survey detailing Californians’ opinions on the current status and future of the state’s public colleges and universities. The survey, titled PPIC Statewide Survey: Californians and Higher Education, showed that “most Californians say the state’s public higher education system is headed in the wrong direction” and they cite funding cuts, the state budget situation, and the resulting higher costs to students as major issues.

While generally satisfied with the quality of the education, the survey states that just 28 percent of those surveyed think the system is going in the right direction, while “61 percent say overall affordability of education for students is a big problem and an even greater 69 percent say the overall state budget situation is a big problem.” Furthermore, the survey shows that “Californians (74%) say there is not enough state funding for higher education, a view held by majorities across parties (82% Democrats, 71% independents, 58% Republicans).”

Despite this, 52 percent of residents are “unwilling to pay higher taxes to maintain current funding” while 45 percent would be willing to do so (likely voters are divided 49 percent yes, 49% no). Outside of raising taxes, “adults (69%) and likely voters (65%) are opposed to increasing student fees to maintain current funding.” The survey shows that “opposition to higher fees has increased since last year, by 7 points among all adults and 5 points among likely voters.” Furthermore, “about half of Californians (52%) favor admitting more out-of-state students—who pay higher tuition—to maintain current funding. But that support drops to 20 percent if it would mean admitting fewer students from California.”

In terms of costs to students, “65 percent of residents are very concerned about increasing tuition and fees” while over half “are very concerned about colleges and universities offering fewer classes or admitting fewer students.” According to the survey, “a strong majority of Californians (70%) say the price of college keeps qualified and motivated students from attending... Nevertheless, many residents (55%) say loans and financial aid are available to those who need it, while 40 percent disagree.” In addition, “a strong majority (75%) say students have to borrow too much money to pay for college. Across parties, regions, and demographic groups, adults concur.”

Other findings include:
- Approval ratings for the Community College, California State University (CSU), and University of California (UC) systems are positive, but the CSU and UC systems are rated down 10 and 8 percentage points, respectively, since 2007.
- “Most consider spending a high (29%) or very high (41%) priority,” which has increased 15 points since 2008. “And in the context of the state budget, most Californians (59%) favor more state spending on public colleges and universities even if this means less money for other state programs.”
- Most (58%) say a college education is “necessary for success in today’s work world, while 39 percent believe there are many ways to succeed without it.”
- “Three-fourths of residents say a racially diverse student body is very important (53%) or somewhat important (22%).”

For more information, please visit: http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=999.