



## Legislative Bulletin.....April 26, 2005

### Contents:

- H.R. 1158** — To reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988
- H.R. 28**— High-Performance Computing Revitalization Act
- H. Con. Res. 96** — Recognizing the significance of African American women in the United States scientific community
- H.Con.Res. 41** – Recognizing the second century of Big Brothers Big Sisters, and supporting the mission and goals of the organization
- H.Res. 227** – Recognizing and honoring the contributions of American Indians to economic innovations and society
- H.R. 1236** – Mayor Tony Armstrong Memorial Post Office Designation Act
- H.R. 1524** – Ed Eilert Post Office Building Designation Act
- H.R. 902** — Presidential \$1 Coin Act of 2005
- H.R. 749** — Expanded Access to Financial Services Act of 2005
- H. Con. Res. 81** — Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the two-year anniversary of the human rights crackdown in Cuba

### Summary of the Bill Under Consideration Today:

**Total Number of New Government Programs: 0**

**Total Cost of Discretionary Authorizations: \$274 million over five years**

**Effect on Revenue: \$0**

**Total Change in Mandatory Spending: \$0**

**Total New State & Local Government Mandates:**

**Total New Private Sector Mandates: 0**

**Number of Bills Without Committee Reports: 3**

**Number of Reported Bills that Don't Cite Specific Clauses of Constitutional Authority: 0**

**H.R. 1158 — To reauthorize the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 —*as amended* (Hart)**

**Order of Business:** The bill, as amended, is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26<sup>th</sup>, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** The bill, as amended, reauthorizes the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 5108) for \$60 million (\$12 million a year) from FY 06 to FY10.

The bill adds “sheet and bar steels” and “technologies which reduce greenhouse gas emissions” to those items covered in the industrial energy conservation and competitive technology program, which was established to conduct scientific research and development of steel and aluminum technologies. It also requires a report beginning in FY06.

**Committee Action:** On March 8, 2005, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Science, which considered the bill and reported it to the full House on March 17<sup>th</sup>.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The bill, *as amended*, authorizes \$60 million over the 2006-2010 period, subject to appropriations

The program was originally authorized for \$2 million in FY89, \$20 million for FY90, \$25 million for FY91, \$17.968 million for FY92 and \$18.1 million for each of FY93-97.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** The bill reauthorizes a program whose authorization had expired.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** A committee report citing authority is unavailable.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Sheila Cole; [sheila.cole@mail.house.gov](mailto:sheila.cole@mail.house.gov), (202) 226-9719

---

---

## **H.R. 28—High-Performance Computing Revitalization Act (Bigert)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26<sup>th</sup>, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 28 would amend the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-194), which set the federal government's interagency research and development strategy for supercomputers, as follows:

- Updates the authorized activities of the High-Performance Computing Research and Development Program to account for changes in technology;
- Increases the interagency coordination responsibilities of the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP);
- Requires that the OSTP Director establish goals and priorities for federal high performance computing research, development, networking, and other such activities;
- Requires that the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee conduct periodic evaluations of the funding, management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the Program, and report its findings to Congress; and

- Spells out specific responsibilities under the Program for the National Science Foundation, the Energy Department, NASA, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the EPA.

**Additional Background:** CBO reports that about **\$1.9 billion was appropriated in FY2005 for non-defense research and development on high-performance computing** across six federal agencies.

High-performance computers are defined to include supercomputer systems; high-capacity and high-speed networks; special purpose and experimental systems, applications, and systems software; and the management of large data sets.

The High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-194) was a project of then-Senator Al Gore, Jr.

**Committee Action:** On January 4, 2005, H.R. 28 was referred to the Science Committee, which marked the bill up on March 17th. At the end of the mark-up session, the Committee reported the bill to the House by voice vote.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** Although the bill sets no specific authorization levels, CBO estimates that the bill would authorize \$220 million over the FY2006-FY2010 period, subject to appropriations. According to CBO, the agencies would need to increase spending to meet the bill's new goal of providing researchers with sustained access to high-performance computing systems. These high-end computer systems or leadership-class facilities will be available to civilian researchers for scientific and engineering breakthroughs. One is expected to be constructed under current law at the Energy Department, and CBO assumes that an additional facility will need to be constructed if this bill were enacted.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** Yes, the bill will necessitate the construction of an additional leadership-class computer facility.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** The Science Committee, in House Report 109-036, cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, yet fails to cite a specific clause. Clause 3 of House Rule XIII, Section d(1), requires that all committee reports contain a statement citing the *specific* powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the law proposed by the bill or joint resolution. [*emphasis added*]

**RSC Staff Contact:** Russ Vought, russell.vought@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8581

---

---

## **H. Con. Res. 96 — Recognizing the significance of African American women in the United States scientific community — *as introduced (Eddie Bernice Johnson)***

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled for consideration on April 26, 2005, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H. Con. Res. 96 resolves that Congress “acknowledge and recognize the significant achievements and contributions of African American women scientists, mathematicians, and inventors and supports the establishment of a special day on which these great minds may be honored and esteemed.”

**Additional Information:** According to the resolution, “African American women, once considered nontraditional participants in the United States scientific community, have become an indispensable part of the new technology society... and although women comprise approximately 25 percent of the 427,740 individuals employed in the United States workforce who hold a science and engineering doctoral degree, African American women comprise less than one percent of such individuals.”

The resolution also states, “it is crucial for the United States to continue to aggressively recruit more minority and women students into careers in science and technology.”

**Committee Action:** H. Con. Res. 96 was introduced on March 15, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Science. A Committee Mark-up session was held on March 17, 2005, but no Committee report is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution authorizes no expenditure.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Derek V. Baker; [derek.baker@mail.house.gov](mailto:derek.baker@mail.house.gov); 226-8585

---

## **H.Con.Res. 41 – Recognizing the second century of Big Brothers Big Sisters, and supporting the mission and goals of the organization — *as introduced (Schiff)***

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.Con.Res. 41 resolves that the House of Representatives “recognizes the second century of Big Brothers Big Sisters, supports the mission and goals of the organization, and commends Big Brothers Big Sisters for its commitment to helping children in need reach their potential through professionally supported one to one mentoring relationships with measurable results.” Additionally, the measure “asks all Americans to join in marking the beginning of Big Brothers Big Sisters’ second century and support the organization’s next 100 years of service on behalf of America's children, and encourages Big Brothers Big Sisters to continue to strive towards serving 1,000,000 children annually.”

**Additional Information:** In 1902, Ernest Coulter first organized the Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) movement in New York City. Coulter passed away in 1952, only 6 years before the organization received its charter from Congress. In 2004, BBBS celebrated its 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary and currently maintains 454 local agencies across the nation. According to the resolution, BBBS has served “over 220,000 children in 2004 and approximately 2,000,000 since its founding 100 years ago.” Additionally, the measure states that BBBS volunteers have contributed “over 10,500,000 volunteer

hours at an estimated value of \$190,000,000 in 2004.” According to the BBBS website, the organization’s mission is: “to help children reach their potential through professionally supported, one-to-one relationships with measurable impact.” Additional information regarding the BBBS mission and goals may be found at: <http://www.bbbsa.org/site/pp.asp?c=iuJ3JgO2F&b=14581>

According to numerous news articles published in July 2002, BBBS officially established that the national organization and its local affiliate’s mentor policy cannot exclude or turn away a mentor based upon “sexual orientation.” At the time, groups including Focus on the Family, Concerned Women for America, and the American Family Association expressed significant concern with this decision by BBBS. The Focus on the Family article may be found at <http://www.family.org/welcome/press/a0021495.cfm>.

**Government Funding:** According to the BBBS, the organization received \$5.7 million in government funding in 2004. Additionally, the report denotes BBBS received \$5.4 million in 2003. This information may be accessed at the following link:  
[http://www.bbbsa.org/atf/cf/{63E1B372-B066-4D25-9EF0-105DB2DE70A1}/2004\\_BBBSA\\_AuditedFinancialStatement.pdf](http://www.bbbsa.org/atf/cf/{63E1B372-B066-4D25-9EF0-105DB2DE70A1}/2004_BBBSA_AuditedFinancialStatement.pdf)

**Committee Action:** On February 1, 2005, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Government Reform Committee, which considered it and reported it to the full House by unanimous consent on April 13, 2005.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution authorizes no expenditure.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Joelle Cannon; [joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov](mailto:joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov), (202) 226-9717

---

## **H.Res. 227 — Recognizing and honoring the contributions of American Indians to economic innovation and society (T. Davis)**

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.Res. 227 resolves that the House of Representatives: “recognizes the valuable and significant contributions of Indian Americans to American society, honors the economic innovation attributable to graduates of the Indian Institutes of Technology, and urges all Americans to recognize the contributions of Indian Americans and have a greater appreciation of the role Indian Americans have played in helping to advance and enrich American society.”

**Additional Information:** According to the resolution, “the United States is deeply enriched by its Indian American residents, and the Indian American community and the graduates of the Indian Institutes of Technology (IIT) in the United States have made valuable and significant contributions to society in every profession and discipline.” Additionally, the measure states, “IIT graduates are highly committed and dedicated to research, innovation, and promotion of trade and international cooperation

between India and the United States.” The IIT is headquartered in Delhi, India and additional information may be found at: <http://www.iitd.ernet.in/index.html>.

**Committee Action:** On April 21, 2005, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Government Reform Committee, which took no official action.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution authorizes no expenditure.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Joelle Cannon; [joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov](mailto:joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov), (202) 226-9717

---

---

## **H.R. 1236 — To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 750 4th Street in Sparks, Nevada, as the “Mayor Tony Armstrong Memorial Post Office”—*as introduced* (Gibbons)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 1236 designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 750 4th Street in Sparks, Nevada, as the “Mayor Tony Armstrong Memorial Post Office.”

**Additional Information:** Mayor Tony Armstrong was born in Philadelphia on September 3, 1945. When Armstrong was only 15, his father passed away, and the future mayor enlisted in the Nevada Air National Guard. After being on active duty, Armstrong became a building inspector and eventually served on the Sparks City Council. Armstrong was elected Sparks Mayor in 1999, and reelected again in 2002. Mayor Armstrong died on June 29, 2005, only one day after receiving the “Raymond I. Smith Civic Leader of the Year” award from Reno-Sparks Chamber of Commerce. (Source: <http://nv.gov/2005.TonyArmstrong.htm>)

**Committee Action:** On March 10, 2005, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Government Reform Committee, which considered it and reported it to the full House by unanimous consent on April 13, 2005.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The only costs associated with a postal facility renaming are those for sign and map changes, none of which significantly affect the federal budget.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** Although no committee report citing constitutional authority is available, Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to establish Post Offices and post Roads.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Joelle Cannon; [joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov](mailto:joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov), (202) 226-9717

---

---

**H.R. 1524 — To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12433 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Ed Eilert Post Office Building"—*as introduced (D. Moore)***

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled to be considered on Tuesday, April 26th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** The bill designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12433 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the “Ed Eilert Post Office Building.”

**Additional Information:** First elected to public office in 1977, Ed Eilert, 65, served Overland Park, Kansas as a teacher, city council member, and mayor. Elected as a Republican to mayor in 1981, Eilert was re-elected five times. Eilert has been a Republican precinct committeeman, chaired, co-chaired or served as honorary chairman of numerous political campaigns, and was an unsuccessful candidate for the U.S. Congress, third district. In April 2005, with over 20 years of public service, Eilert retired from his position as Mayor of Overland Park.

(Source: [http://www.jccc.net/home/depts/003100/site/press\\_main/general\\_releases/05countian](http://www.jccc.net/home/depts/003100/site/press_main/general_releases/05countian))

**Committee Action:** On April 6, 2005, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Government Reform Committee, which considered it and reported it to the full House by unanimous consent on April 13, 2005.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The only costs associated with a postal facility renaming are those for sign and map changes, none of which significantly affect the federal budget.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** Although no committee report citing constitutional authority is available, Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution grants Congress the authority to establish Post Offices and post Roads.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Joelle Cannon; [joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov](mailto:joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov), (202) 226-9717

---

---

**H.R. 902 — Presidential \$1 Coin Act of 2005 (Castle)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled for consideration on April 26, 2005, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 902 would amend Federal monetary law to define new requirements for the redesign and issuance of circulating \$1 coins (stamped with the visage of former Presidents). It also directs the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins “emblematic of the spouse of each such President” during the same period in which the \$1 coins are issued.

According to the bill text, H.R. 902 seeks to improve demand for and thus circulation of the current one-dollar coin. The legislation directs the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign the one-dollar coin, beginning in 2007, issuing four different designs a year while continuing to issue the “Sacagawea-design” \$1 coin. Each Presidential design would depict the image and “pertinent information” about a President of the United States, in order of service. The reverse of the coin would depict an image of the Statue of Liberty.

Additionally, the legislation directs the Treasury Secretary to begin issuing, concurrently with the Presidential dollars, pure-gold bullion coins depicting the First Spouses. The bill also proposes a number of methods to increase the circulation of the dollar coin. Finally, as amended in Committee, the legislation incorporates the text of H.R. 767, calling for the issuance of one-cent coins in 2009 with four different reverse designs to commemorate the bicentennial of the birth of President Abraham Lincoln.

**Possible Conservative Concerns:** According to the U.S. Mint and the CBO, coins are cheaper to use than paper money, particularly since they stay in circulation thirty or forty years, while the average dollar bill wears out after just eighteen months. However, according to a PBS NewsHour report in 1997, surveys have shown that 75 percent of the public prefers a paper dollar to a coin and past efforts to encourage the public to use dollar coins have not been successful. In March of 2002, after supplies outpaced demand for the Sacagawea “Golden Dollar” \$1 coin, the U.S. Treasury halted production.

The CBO Cost Estimate for this bill stated, “Taking into account the experience of the 50 State Quarters program... and the public’s continued resistance to the use of dollar coins, CBO expects that the new \$1 Presidential coin would increase the public’s interest in collecting coins, but it would continue to face barriers to widespread circulating use.”

According to a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report, the Susan B. Anthony dollar coin (originally minted in 1979 and again 1999) also did not gain wide acceptance, primarily due to the fact that the dollar bill was still being used. In response to these past performances, H.R. 902 cites in its findings another GAO study and survey that found people “would actively seek the coin if an attractive, educational rotating design were to be struck on the coin.” Thus, this bill attempts to overcome past circulation shortcomings of the \$1 coins by using a rotating design of former presidents along with inscriptions around the edge of the coin.

According to a 1999 press release on U.S. Mint’s website, “To foster acceptance of the Golden Dollar, the Mint is undertaking an unprecedented consumer awareness and education campaign.” A Townhall.com reported that the U.S. Treasury spent \$62 million promoting the use of the Sacagawea \$1 coin. In 2001, the U.S. Mint still had 324 million Sacagawea coins in storage. While the bill does not specifically outline a process or provide funding for the promotion of the new \$1 coins, it states the following in the Sense of the Congress section:

*“in connection with the introduction of the \$1 coins under the Presidential \$1 Coin Program--*

*(A) the coins should not be introduced with an **overly expensive** taxpayer-funded public relations campaign; and”*



Because the bill does not define “overly expensive,” it is possible another ad campaign could be launched to promote these coins.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 902 was introduced on February 17, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Financial Services. The bill was reported out by the full Committee on April 13, 2005 by voice vote (H. Rept. [109-39](#)).

**Cost to Taxpayers:** CBO estimates that enacting this bill would decrease direct spending by \$6 million over the 2006-2015 period. Enacting the bill would not affect revenues.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** The Committee Report cited authority for this legislation under Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States), clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce), and clause 5 (relating to the power to coin money).

**RSC Staff Contact:** Derek V. Baker; [derek.baker@mail.house.gov](mailto:derek.baker@mail.house.gov); 226-8585

---

---

## **H.R. 749 — Expanded Access to Financial Services Act of 2005 (Gerlach)**

**Order of Business:** The bill is scheduled for consideration on April 26, 2005, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H.R. 749 would amend the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757 (12)) to allow federal credit unions to offer certain services to non-members under certain conditions. Nonmembers would have to pay a fee for the services and would have to otherwise be eligible for membership in the credit union. The types of services authorized would include domestic and international money transfers, money orders, check cashing, and traveler’s checks. Current law allows those types of services for members only.

**Committee Action:** H.R. 749 was introduced on February 10, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Financial Services. The bill was reported out by the full Committee on April 12, 2005, by voice vote (H. Rept. [109-38](#)).

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The Committee report for H.R. 749 adopts the CBO cost estimate as its own. CBO estimates that the cost of implementing this bill “would not be significant, and enacting this bill would have no effect on revenues.”

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**Constitutional Authority:** The Committee Report cited authority for this legislation under Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States) and clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

**RSC Staff Contact:** Derek V. Baker; [derek.baker@mail.house.gov](mailto:derek.baker@mail.house.gov); 226-8585

---

---

**H. Con. Res. 81 — Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the two-year anniversary of the human rights crackdown in Cuba — *as introduced (Menendez)***

**Order of Business:** The resolution is scheduled for consideration on April 26, 2005, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

**Summary:** H. Con. Res. 81 would “condemn the arrest of more than 75 journalists, labor union organizers, civic leaders, librarians, and human rights activists as political prisoners in March 2003, and the Cuban regime’s continuing crackdown against the internal opposition and the independent press.” The resolution also “demands that the Cuban regime release all political prisoners, legalize all political parties, labor unions, and the press, and hold free elections.”

**Additional Information:** The resolution also declares that the acts of the Cuban regime, including its widespread and systematic violation of human rights, violate the United Nations (UN) Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and that the rule of law should replace the rule of force in Cuba.

The resolution calls for the European Union and other countries and international organizations to pressure the Cuban regime to improve its human rights record. It also calls for UN member countries to vote against the Cuban regime’s membership in the UN Commission on Human Rights, and for passage of a Commission resolution that holds the Cuban regime accountable for its gross violations of human rights and civil liberties.

**Committee Action:** H. Con. Res. 81 was introduced on March 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on International Relations. A Committee Mark-up session was held on March 9, 2005, but no Committee report is available.

**Cost to Taxpayers:** The resolution authorizes no expenditure.

**Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?:** No.

**Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?:** No.

**RSC Staff Contact:** Derek V. Baker; [derek.baker@mail.house.gov](mailto:derek.baker@mail.house.gov); 226-8585

---

---

###

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.  
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.