

June 26, 2000

Prepared by the staff of the Conservative Action Team

*For additional information contact Neil Bradley at 202-226-2273
or Sheila Moloney at 6-2075*

The following measures may be voted on by the House on Monday, June 26:

H.R. 3048 — PRESIDENTIAL THREAT PROTECTION ACT

Cost to the Taxpayer: CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 4201 would have no significant impact on the federal budget. New fines authorized under the Act could generate revenue to the Crime Victims Fund which then could be spent, but the amounts involved are expected to be less than \$500,000 a year.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The bill does the following:

- 1) Expands the authority of the Secret Service to protect the immediate family of candidates for President or Vice-President (current law only allows for the protection of the spouse of the candidate).
- 2) Expands the authority of the Secret Service to investigate threats against former Presidents who are no longer receiving protection.
- 3) Authorizes the Secret Service to conduct security operations at events of “national significance” as determined by the President or his designee.
- 4) Authorizes the establishment of a National Threat Assessment Center within the Secret Service.
- 5) Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to issue administrative subpoenas related to imminent threats against those individuals protected by the Secret Service which would require the production of records and other materials relevant to an investigation. An individual subpoena under this Act may petition a U.S. District Court to set aside or modify the subpoena.

Constitutional Authority: The Committee cites Article I, section 8, clause 18 (make all laws necessary and proper).

H.R. 4718 — THREE-MONTH EXTENSION OF CHAPTER 12 OF TITLE II (FARMER BANKRUPTCY)

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO has previously found that similar legislation while affecting direct spending and revenue, had no significant impact on the federal budget.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: No. The bill extends Chapter 12 of Title 11 (related to bankruptcy filing of farmers) for three additional months to October 1, 2000.

Constitutional Authority: The Committee has previously cited Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (establish uniform rules of bankruptcy).

Other Information: The bankruptcy reform bill pending in Conference would permanently extend this

section of the bankruptcy code.

S. 1515 — RADIATION EXPOSURE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENTS

(Passed the Senate November 19, 1999)

Cost to Taxpayer: CBO estimates that implementing the bill would result in additional discretionary spending of about \$750 million over the 2000-2005 period (\$650 million in compensation payments to victims and \$100 million in HHS grants).

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes, the bill increases the number of persons eligible for compensation payments under the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act by

- C Adding more qualifying occupations relating to uranium production,
- C Increasing the number of states covered and extending the time period considered for radiation exposure,
- C Adding more diseases which may qualify individuals for compensation,
- C Decreasing the level of radiation exposure that is necessary to qualify, and
- C Making certain medical criteria less stringent for potential claimants.

CBO estimates that about 9,600 persons would file claims over the next five years and that about 60% would receive payments of \$50,000 (for those down-wind of nuclear tests), \$75,000 (for those on-site at nuclear tests), or \$100,000 for other individuals, including those working mines).

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of HHS to make grants for programs to 1) screen individuals for cancer, 2) provide referrals for follow-up services, 3) develop and disseminate public information, and 4) assist applicants in the documentation of compensation claims.

Constitutional Authority: No committee report was filed and no Constitutional authority is cited in the bill.

H.R. 3417 — COMPLETE ORDERLY WITHDRAWAL OF NOAA FROM THE CIVIL ADMINISTRATION OF PRIBILOF ISLANDS, ALASKA

Cost to the Taxpayers: CBO estimates that implementing the bill would cost about \$67 million over the next five years (subject to appropriations).

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The bill authorizes \$28 million in direct payments to the Pribilof Islands. Funds are to be used at the discretion of the recipient and may be used as the non-federal match for other federal grants. The bill also authorizes such sums as may be necessary (estimated at \$9 million) for construction of a solid waste management facility. In addition, the bill provides \$10 million annually through 2003 for environmental cleanup by the NOAA. The bill terminates any future federal government responsibility to provide economic development assistance beyond what is provided for other communities. The bill also terminates the federal government's responsibilities to remediate contamination of the properties once current clean-up is completed.

Constitutional Authority: The Committee cites Article I, Section 8 (but no specific clause) and Article IV, Section 3 (related to governing the territory of the United States).

Other Information: Supporters of the bill assert that federal assistance is necessary to complete the withdrawal of the NOAA from the administration of the Islands and to fulfill the goal of the 1983 Fur Seal Act Amendments to provide a stable diversified economy for the residents of the Islands. The Islands have a combined population of approximately 900 residents. In their dissenting views, Reps. George Miller, Frank Pallone, and Tom Udall question the need for financial assistance to the residents of St. Paul (780 residents) citing a per capita income of \$34,000. Regarding the aid to the residents of St. George (120 residents) they cite the lack of a harbor as the main reason for economic difficulties. The federal government has already spent \$19 million to construct a harbor on the Island. Reps. Miller, Pallone, and Udall indicate that construction of a harbor may be technically and economically infeasible.

S. 148—THE NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION ACT

(Passed the Senate April 13, 1999)

Cost to the Taxpayer: \$8 million per year for fiscal years 2000 through 2003 (\$32 million total), subject to appropriation, of which not less than 50% shall be *for projects outside of the US*. CBO estimated that implementing S.148 would cost \$30 million, if the bill had been enacted at the beginning of FY00. The bill outlines that the federal share of each project shall not be greater than 33%.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The bill establishes a new grant program in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for projects to promote the conservation of neotropical migratory birds in the United States and Caribbean and Latin American countries. Eligible entities include government agencies, international or foreign organizations, and private entities. The bill establishes a neotropical migratory bird conservation account in the U.S. Treasury, into which amounts donated to the government for this program as well as amounts appropriated by Congress will be deposited. After proposals are submitted, the Secretary of the Interior will determine the grant recipients. The Secretary must submit a report to Congress by Oct. 1, 2002 on the program's progress.

State and local governments are eligible to receive these grants, but to do so they must submit a proposal meeting certain criteria and pay at least 67% of the project costs.

Constitutional Authority: No committee report was filed and no Constitutional authority is cited in the bill.

H.R. 4408—ATLANTIC STRIPED BASS CONSERVATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Cost to the Taxpayer: The bill authorizes \$1 million to the Secretary of Commerce, and \$250,000 to the Secretary of the Interior, subject to appropriations, for each of fiscal years FY01-FY03 (\$3.75 million total). This reauthorization is a \$200,000 increase per year for the Secretary of Commerce.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The Atlantic Striped Bass Conservation Act was a three-year program set to expire in FY00. This bill reauthorizes the program for an additional three years. Under the Act, the term 'coastal State' means: Pennsylvania and each State of the United States bordering on the Atlantic Ocean north of the State of South Carolina; the District of Columbia; and the Potomac River Fisheries Commission established by the Potomac River Compact of 1958.

Constitutional Authority: No committee report was filed and no Constitutional authority is cited in the bill.

H.R. 4063 ROSIE THE RIVETER-WORLD WAR II HOME FRONT NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

Cost to the Taxpayer: The bill authorizes "such sums as may be necessary to carry out the preservation, interpretation, education, and other essential visitor services." No CBO cost estimate is available. If the Secretary of the Interior enters into cooperative agreements to acquire related artifacts, provide for preservation or "interpretation" of sites as representative of WWII Home Front, then expenditures must be matched dollar for dollar by non-Federal sources.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The bill establishes a national park in Richmond, California and authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to acquire a leasehold interest in the Ford Assembly Building and establish a WWII Home Front Education Center there, which shall include a distance learning program.

Constitutional Authority: No committee report was filed and no Constitutional authority is cited in the bill.

H.R. 1309- CHURCH PLAN PARITY AND ENTANGLEMENT PREVENTION ACT *(Passed the Senate Nov. 19, 1999)*

Cost to the Taxpayer: No CBO estimate is available and there is not an authorization in the bill.

Does the Bill Create New Government Programs or Regulations: Yes. The bill modifies ERISA to preempt some State laws relating to church welfare plans to clarify the status of church plans and address the problem of health insurance issuers refusing to do business with church plans because of concern that church plans could be classified as unlicensed entities. The bill clarifies that a church welfare plan is considered to be sponsored by a single employer that does not engage in the business of insurance for purposes of state insurance laws. Network providers and insurance companies may establish the same contractual relationship with a church plan as they are permitted to establish with any single employer plan covered under ERISA in that state. The bill also exempts church welfare plans from state licensing requirements while preserving state authority to enforce insurance law provisions that remain applicable to church plans.

Constitutional Authority: No committee report was filed and no Constitutional authority is cited in the bill.

*The views expressed in this Legislative Bulletin do not necessarily reflect the
views of all Members of the Conservative Action Team.*

The Conservative Action Team is a Congressional Member Organization of over 50
Republican House Members and is chaired by Representative John Shadegg (R-AZ).