THE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE
Rep. Steve Scalise, Chairman
Paul Teller, Executive Director
202.226.9717
rsc.scalise.house.gov

Legislative Bulletin.....September 17, 2013

Contents:

H.R. 1003 –To improve consideration by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission of the costs and benefits of its regulations and orders (Conaway, R-TX)

Order of Business: H.R. 1003 is scheduled to be considered on the floor on September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires a two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: H.R. 1003 amends the Commodity Exchange Act (CEA) (7 U.S.C. 19(a))[1] by revising the considerations that the Commodity Futures Trading Commission (CFTC) must analyze when assessing the costs and benefits of a proposed regulation. The legislation designates that the CFTC, through the Office of the Chief Economist, shall assess the qualitative and quantitative costs and benefits of the proposed regulation or order under the following considerations:

- protection of market participants and the public;
- efficiency,competitiveness, and financial integrity of futures and swaps markets;
- the impact on market liquidity in futures and swaps markets;
- price discovery;
- sound risk management practices;
- available alternatives to direct regulation;
- the degree and nature of the risks posed by various activities within the scope of its jurisdiction;

[1] Section 15(a) of the Commodity Exchange Act

- the costs of complying with the proposed regulation or order by all regulated entities, including a methodology for quantifying the costs;
- whether in choosing among alternative regulatory approaches, those approaches maximize net benefits (including potential economic, environmental, and other benefits, distributive impacts, and equity; and
- other public interest considerations.

Under current law, the CEA defines requirements for the CFTC to consider the costs and benefits of the Commission actions. However, in each proposed rule, the CFTC claims that the requirement to weigh the costs and benefits of a regulation "does not require the Commission to quantify the costs and benefits of an order," but only requires that the Commission "consider" the costs and benefits of its activities.[2] The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act expanded the CFTC's authority over the derivatives markets and made it the principle regulator of the swap markets. The rules put forth by the CFTC will have far-reaching impacts on the economy; however under the current legal application, it will not be required to measure the costs and benefits of their actions.

Additional Background: A similar bill, H.R. 1840, was offered last Congress. The bill was marked up and approved by the Committee, but the House did not act on the bill.

Committee Action: Representative Michael Conaway (R-TX) introduced H.R. 1003 on March 6, 2013, and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. The Committee on Agriculture held a hearing considering the bill on March 14, 2013, and held a mark-up on March 20, 2013. The bill was reported favorably out of the committee by voice vote. The bill was amended after reporting out of the committee.

Administration Position: At time of press, no Statement of Administration Policy has been released.

Cost to Taxpayers: The Congressional Budget Office estimated on April 1, 2013,[3] that the bill would cost $28 million over the 2014-2018 period, assuming appropriation of the funds necessary to enact the legislation.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? Yes. CBO estimates that the CFTC would need an additional 25 positions to handle the additional analysis called for in this bill. Note, however that the bill seeks to restrict the agency from issuing regulations only when it can establish that the benefits justify the costs. This potentially limits the scope of government regulation.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? According to CBO, the bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates

[2] See this GAO report, November 2011, "Dodd-Frank Act Regulations: Implementation Could Benefit from Additional Analyses and Coordination" for further analysis.
[3] The bill was slightly amended following this date. However the amended provisions are unlikely to change the basis under which the CBO justified its analysis of the bill's cost.

as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Does the Bill Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

Constitutional Authority: The Constitutional Authority Statement accompanying the bill upon introduction states, "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under Article I, section 8, clause 3, that grants Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states." The Constitutional Authority Statement for this bill can be viewed here.

RSC Staff Contact: Jackie Rivera, Jackie.Rivera@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-0707, and Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 2449–To authorize the President to extend the term of the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Civil Uses of Nuclear Energy for a period not to exceed March 19, 2016 (Royce, R-CA)

Order of Business: H.R. 2449 is scheduled to be considered on September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: H.R. 2449 authorizes the President to extend for up to two years the current Agreement for Cooperation with respect to civil uses of nuclear energy between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Korea. The present Section 123[4] agreement was signed in 1973 and is set to expire in March 19, 2014. The agreement allows U.S. companies to export commercial nuclear materials, technologies, and services to the Republic of Korea and establishes nonproliferation conditions and controls.

Additional Background: On April 24, 2013, the State Department issued a statement announcing that the United States and the Republic of Korea would seek a two-year extension of the current Section 123 agreement, as they continued to negotiate the details of a successor agreement. According to the statement, "An extension would ensure there is no lapse in ongoing cooperation and would maintain stability and predictability in our joint commercial activities."

Committee Action: Representative Ed Royce (R-CA) introduced H.R. 2449 on June 20, 2013. The bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The committee held a mark-up session on July 24, 2013, and reported the bill favorably by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: At time of press, no Statement of Administrative Position was available.

---

[4] Under Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2153), the United States cannot engage in nuclear energy activities with another country without an agreement on nuclear cooperation. More information on the technical elements of the nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and the Republic of Korea can be found in this CRS report.

Cost to Taxpayers: The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing the two-year extension would cost less than $500,000 over the 2014-2018 period. The estimate is based on the cost of issuing export licensing and the continuation of certification and reporting requirements.

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? According to CBO, the bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Does the Bill Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

Constitutional Authority: The Constitutional Authority Statement accompanying the bill upon introduction states, "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States." The statement can be found here.

RSC Staff Contact: Jackie Rivera, Jackie.Rivera@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-0707, and Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 301 – To provide for the establishment of a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia (Wolf, R-VA)

Order of Business: H.R. 301 is scheduled to be considered on September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: H.R. 301 would establish a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia with the Department of State. This individual will be appointed by the President, not subject to Senate confirmation, and shall have the rank of ambassador. This individual shall represent the U.S. to foreign governments, intergovernmental organizations and agencies of the U.N. regarding maters of religious freedom in the Near East and South Central Asia. The individual is prohibited from holding any other position within the federal government as long as they are the Special Envoy.

The duties of the Special Envoy shall include:

- Promote the right of religious freedom of religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia, denounce the violation of such right, and recommend appropriate responses by the United States Government when such right is violated.
- Monitor and combat acts of religious intolerance and incitement targeted against religious minorities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia.

- Work to ensure that the unique needs of religious minority communities in the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia are addressed, including the economic and security needs of such communities.
- Work with foreign governments of the countries of the Near East and the countries of South Central Asia to address laws that are inherently discriminatory toward religious minority communities in such countries.

H.R. 301 directs that funding for this legislation shall be derived from existing funds available for "Diplomatic and Consular Programs," and shall not exceed $1,000,000 for each fiscal year 2014 through 2018. This amount will be used to hire staff, conduct investigations, and for travel expenses. The Secretary of State is allowed to eliminate positions within the Department (that are not authorized or required by law) for the purpose of offsetting this cost. This legislation prohibits additional funds from being authorized to "Diplomatic and Consular Programs" in order to offset funding for this legislation.

This legislation directs the Special Envoy to give priority to program, projects and activities for Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. H.R. 301 contains a sunset date of October 1, 2018.

Additional Background: A similar bill, H.R. 440, was offered in the 112th Congress and passed the House by a 402-20 vote. The RSC Legislative Bulletin for H.R. 440 can be viewed here.

Committee Action: Representative Frank Wolf (R-VA) introduced H.R. 301 on January 15, 2013. The bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. On March 15, 2013, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations, the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, and the Subcommittee on Middle East and North Africa, which took no further action.

Administration Position: At time of press, no Statement of Administrative Position was available.

Cost to Taxpayers: At time of press, no Congressional Budget Office report was available. However, the legislation prohibits additional funds from being authorized and directs the Department of State to offset costs.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? Yes. The legislation creates a Special Envoy to Promote Religious Freedom of Religious Minorities in the Near East and South Central Asia with the Department of State.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates? The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Does the Bill Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

Constitutional Authority: The Constitutional Authority Statement accompanying the bill upon introduction states, "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states: 'The Congress shall

have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof" Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the United States Constitution, which states: '[The President] shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose Appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law: but the Congress may by Law vest the Appointment of such inferior Officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the Courts of Law, or in the Heads of Departments.'" The statement can be found here.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576 and Jackie Rivera, Jackie.Rivera@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-0707.

S. 793 – Organization of American States Revitalization and Reform Act of 2013
(Sen. Menendez, D-NJ)

Order of Business: S. 793 is scheduled to be considered on September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: S.793 directs the Secretary of State to submit to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs a multiyear strategy to reform the Organization of the American States (OAS) within 180 days of the bill's enactment. The strategy must:

- Identify a path toward the adoption of necessary reforms that prioritize and reinforce the OAS's core duties of strengthening peace and security, promoting representative democracy, resolving regional disputes, assisting and monitory elections, fostering economic growth and development cooperation, facilitating trade, combating illicit drug trafficking and crime, and supporting the Inter-American Human Rights System;
- Outline an approach to secure the adoption of results-based budgeting process that strategically prioritizes and reduces current and future mandates and to provide for transparent hiring, firing, and promotion practices;
- Reflect the input and coordination of other Executive Branch agencies, where appropriate;
- Identify a path toward the adoption of necessary reforms that would result in an assessed fee structure in which no member state would pay more than 50 percent of OAS's yearly fees while minimizing any negative financial impact on the OAS and its operations within five years after the date of enactment.

The legislation states as findings that a "purpose of the Organization of American States is to promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the principle of nonintervention." The legislation likewise reaffirms the support of the United States for the purposes presented in the Charter of the Organization of the American States, the Inter-American Democratic Charter, and the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man. Furthermore,

the legislation clarifies that, "Congress supports the Organization of American States as it operates in a manner consistent with the Inter-American Democratic Charter."

Additionally the legislation includes a sense of Congress affirming, the following:

(1) "the Organization of American States (OAS) should be the primary multi-lateral diplomatic entity for regional dispute resolution and promotion of democratic governance and institutions;"

(2) the OAS is a valuable platform from which to launch initiatives aimed to benefit the countries of the Western Hemisphere;

(3) the Summit of the Americas institution and process embodies a valuable complement to regional dialogue and cooperation;

(4) the Summit of the Americas process should be formally and more effectively integrated into the work of the OAS, the Inter-American Development Bank, and other Members of the Joint Summit Working Group, and the OAS should play a central role in overseeing and managing the Summit process;

(5) the OAS General Assembly and the Summit of the Americas events should be combined geographically and chronologically in the years in which they coincide;

(6) the OAS has historically accepted too many mandates from its member states, resulting in both lack of clarity on priorities and loss of institutional focus, which in turn has reduced the effectiveness of the organization;

(7) to ensure an appropriate balance of priorities, the OAS should review its core functions no less than annually and seek opportunities to reduce the number of mandates not directly related to its core functions;

(8) key OAS strengths lie in strengthening peace and security, promoting and consolidating representative democracy, regional dispute resolution, election assistance and monitoring, fostering economic growth and development cooperation, facilitating trade, addressing migration, combating illicit drug trafficking and transnational crime, and support for the Inter-American Human Rights System;

(9) the core competencies referred to in paragraph (8) should remain central to the strategic planning process of the OAS and the consideration of future mandates;

(10) any new OAS mandates should be accepted by the member states only after an analysis is conducted and formally presented consisting of a calculation of the financial costs associated with the mandate, an assessment of the comparative advantage of the OAS in the implementation of the mandate, and a description of the ways in which the mandate advances the organization's core mission;

(11) any new mandates should include, in addition to the analysis described in paragraph (10), an identification of the source of funding to be used to implement the mandate;

(12) the OAS would benefit from enhanced coordination between the OAS and the Inter-American Development Bank on issues that relate to economic development;

(13) the OAS would benefit from standard reporting requirements for each project and grant agreement; and

(14) the OAS would benefit from effective implementation of--

(A) transparent and merit-based human resource standards and processes; and

(B) transparent hiring, firing, and promotion standards and processes, including with respect to factors such as gender and national origin.

(15) it is in the interest of the United States, OAS member states, and a modernized OAS to move toward an assessed fee structure that assures the financial sustainability of the organization and establishes, not later than five years after the date of enactment of this Act, that no member state pays more than 50 percent of the organization's assessed fees."

Lastly, the legislation directs the Secretary of State to build support for reforms and budgetary burden sharing among OAS member states and observers and to promote donor coordination among member states. The Secretary of State shall also offer Congress a quarterly briefing on the progress made by OAS to implement the reforms detailed in the legislation.

Additional Background: The Organization of the American States includes 35 independent countries of the Western Hemisphere and is the oldest multilateral regional organization in the world. Since its foundation, the United States has seen the OAS as a vehicle to advance economic, political, and security objectives in the Western Hemisphere. However, over the past decade, the ability of the United States to advance its policy initiatives within the OAS has declined as Latin American and Caribbean government have adopted more independent foreign policies. Regardless, the U.S. continues to be the largest member contributor to the OAS, providing $67.5 million in FY2012. When excluding voluntary donations to specific funds, the U.S. contribution of $49.6 million in FY2012 to the regular fund constitutes over 58% of OAS funding.[5]

In November of 2012, Senators John Kerry, Robert Menendez, Richard Lugar, and Marco Rubio sent a letter to the OAS permanent council, stating that it was ""sliding into an administrative and financial paralysis" that will condemn it to "irrelevance." In June 2013, Secretary of State Kerry led the U.S. delegation to the annual general assembly of the OAS, where he reportedly pressed upon the need for major reforms in its bureaucracy and a return to its core mission of promoting human rights and democracy.

Committee Action: Senator Robert Menendez introduced S.793 on April 24, 2013 and the bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. On June 13, 2013 the Committee reported the bill favorably without amendment. On July 8, 2013, the bill was agreed to in the Senate without amendment by Unanimous Consent. The bill was received by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on July 9, 2013, and marked-up on July 24, 2013. The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported the bill favorably, as amended, by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: At time of press, no Statement of Administrative Position was available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The Congressional Budget Office estimates that implementing S.793 would have discretionary costs of less than $500,000 a year, or $1 million over the 2014-2018 period, subject to appropriations.

[5] For more background and analysis of issues surrounding the Organization of American States, see this CRS report.

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? According to CBO, the bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

Does the Bill Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

Constitutional Authority: Senate Rules do not require a statement of constitutional authority to accompany legislation upon introduction.

RSC Staff Contact: Jackie Rivera, Jackie.Rivera@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-0707, and Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 1410 – Keep the Promise Act of 2013 (Franks, R-AZ)

Order of Business: The legislation is expected to be considered September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires a two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: H.R. 1410 prohibits class II and class III gaming (commonly referred to as gambling) on tribal land within the Phoenix metropolitan area.

The legislation contains the following findings:

- "In 2002, the voters in the State of Arizona approved Proposition 202, the Indian Gaming Preservation and Self-Reliance Act.
- "To obtain the support of Arizona voters to approve Proposition 202, the Indian tribes within Arizona agreed to limit the number of casinos within the State and in particular within the Phoenix metropolitan area.
- "This Act preserves the agreement made between the tribes and the Arizona voters until the expiration of the gaming compacts authorized by Proposition 202."

Additional Information: Similar legislation, H.R. 2938, passed the House of Representatives on June 19, 2012, by a roll call vote of 343-78-2. The RSC Legislative Bulletin for H.R. 2938 can be viewed here.

The below information has been provided by the sponsor's office:

> The Tohono O'odham Nation (TON) is trying to game on lands that were purchased in the Phoenix metropolitan area at the very same time they were in negotiations with other tribes and the State, to craft a gaming compact agreement. These actions are contrary to the public commitments that TON made between 2000 and 2002 to the 16 other Indian tribes in Arizona, the State, and the voters of Arizona when it supported passage of Proposition 202, a state referendum to limit casino gambling in the Phoenix metropolitan area. Thus, the bipartisan cosponsors of H.R. 1410 are simply trying to keep

all of the parties, including the TON, to its publicly stated commitment to the people of Arizona, not to engage in gaming in the Phoenix metropolitan area.

H.R. 1410 halts a precedent that may lead to an expansion of off-reservation casinos and dangerous changes to the complexion of tribal gaming in other states across the country. Tribes across the nation, including many of the other Arizona tribes that played an integral role in the 2002 gaming compact, strongly support this legislation due to the impact this situation could have on tribal gaming enterprises nationally.

It is important to note that the bill would not seek to take any lands away from TON, or prevent those lands from being held in trust status. Consistent with the intent of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act and Proposition 202, it merely restricts the ability of tribes to game on the very lands on which they agreed they would not game.

Committee Action: H.R. 1410 was introduced on April 9, 2013, and was referred to the Natural Resources Subcommittee on Indian and Alaska Native Affairs. A markup was held on July 24, 2013, and the legislation was agreed to by a roll call vote of 35-5-1.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO estimates that implementing the legislation would have no significant impact on the federal budget. CBO's report can be viewed here.

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?: According to CBO, the prohibition on gaming activities would be an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) on the Tribe. Based on information from the Tribe about when, absent enactment of this bill, it expects to begin collecting revenue from the proposed casino and the uncertainty of future legal challenges to the project, CBO estimates that the cost of the mandate in the first five years after enactment would not exceed the annual threshold established in UMRA ($75 million in 2013, adjusted annually for inflation). H.R. 1410 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Does the Bill Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: The legislation does not contain earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits.

Constitutional Authority: Rep. Franks states "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3." The statement can be viewed here.

RSC Staff Contact: Curtis Rhyne, Curtis.Rhyne@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-8576.

H.R. 3092 — Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013, as amended (Guthrie, R-KY)

Order of Business: H.R. 3092, the Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013 is expected to be considered on September 17, 2013, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which requires a two-thirds majority vote for passage.

Summary: This bill strengthens current law to help prevent the abduction and sexual exploitation of children. Specifically, the bill requires the Administrator of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention to:

- "Provide technical assistance and training to State and local law enforcement agencies and statewide clearing houses to coordinate with State and local educational agencies in identifying and recovering missing children;"
- "Assist the efforts of law enforcement agencies in coordinating with child welfare agencies to respond to foster children missing from the State welfare system; and"
- "Provide technical assistance to law enforcement agencies and first responders in identifying, locating, and recovering victims of, and children at risk for, child sex trafficking."

In addition, the bill:

- Sets a cap on the amount of federal funds that may be used for compensation at the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.
- Changes the requirement that a national incidence study be conducted on missing and exploited children from every year to every three years.
- Creates greater oversight for grants awarded by the Department of Justice by requiring the Inspector General of the Department of Justice to conduct two audits between FY 2014 and FY 2018. Any grant recipients that are found to have an unresolved audit finding are barred from receiving a grant for two years. The bill prohibits the award of grants to nonprofit organizations that hold money in off-shore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying taxes.
- Sets a cap of $20,000 that can be spent on conferences unless specifically authorized by the Deputy Attorney General, an appropriate Assistant Attorney General, Director, or principle deputy director as designated by the Deputy Attorney General in writing prior to expenditure. The Deputy Attorney General is required to submit an annual report to the Committee on Education and the Workforce in the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary in the Senate on all conference expenditures.
- Prohibits any of the funds authorized in this act from being used to lobby for grant funds.

Additional Background: The Act will be cited as the E. Clay Shaw Missing Children's Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2013. Congressman Shaw represented Florida for 26 years and authored legislation to protected missing and exploited children. He died on Tuesday, September 10, 2013.

The bill authorizes $40 million for each of the fiscal years from 2014 through 2018. In FY 2009, $40 million was appropriated for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children and other missing and exploited children's activities. In FY 2010, $36 million was appropriated. In FY 2011, $35.7 was appropriated. In FY 2012, $35.8 was appropriated. This authorization replaces the last stated authorization of $40 million from FY 2008 under 42 U.S.C. 5773. Every year after FY 2008, current law (42 U.S.C. 5773 and 42 U.S.C. 5777) authorized "such sums as necessary". The new

authorization combines the current law authorizations from 42 U.S.C. 5773 and 42 U.S.C. 5777 under one authorization - 42 U.S.C. 5777 - and replaces "such sums" in current law to comply with House protocol.

Committee Action: The bill was referred to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. The Committee took no further action on the bill.

Administration Position: At time of press, no Statement of Administration Policy was available.

Cost to Taxpayers: At time of press, no Congressional Budget Office cost estimate was available.

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.

Does the Bill Contain Any Federal Encroachment into State or Local Authority in Potential Violation of the 10th Amendment?: No.

Does the Bill Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: No.

Constitutional Authority: According to the sponsor, "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States." Congressman Guthrie's statement in the Congressional Record can be viewed here.

RSC Staff Contact: Scott Herndon, Scott.Herndon@mail.house.gov, 202-226-2076

***NOTE**: RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.*

###