



REP. TOM PRICE, M.D. (R-GA), CHAIRMAN
PAUL TELLER, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
424 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

rsc.price.house.gov

ph (202) 226-9717 / fax (202) 226-1633

Legislative Bulletin.....June 8, 2009

Contents:

- H.R. 1736** - International Science and Technology Cooperation Act of 2009
- H.R. 1709** - STEM Education Coordination Act of 2009
- H.Res. 492** - Supporting the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week
- H.Res. 356** - Expressing support for the designation of February 8, 2010, as "Boy Scouts of America Day", in celebration of the Nation's largest youth scouting organization's 100th anniversary
- H.Res. 435** - Celebrating Asian Pacific American Heritage
- H.Res. 420** - Celebrating the symbol of the United States flag and supporting the goals and ideals of Flag Day
- H.R. 885** - Improved Financial and Commodity Markets Oversight and Accountability Act
- H.R. 466** - Wounded Veteran Job Security Act

**H.R. 1736—International Science and Technology Cooperation Act
(Baird, D-WA)**

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1736 requires the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to create a new committee under the National Science and Technology Council to facilitate international research and training activities with the purpose of strengthening technology enterprise, improving economic and national security, and supporting U.S. foreign policy goals.

Additional Background: According to the committee, in 2008 a series of recommendations for increased coherence and coordination of federally sponsored international science and engineering activities that serve both a domestic mission and a foreign policy mission was issued by the National Science Board (NSB). The recommendations were to primarily coordinate international science and technology activities at federal agencies coordinating with the Department of State to focus on the international component of national R&D priorities. The Clinton administration established a similar commission to what H.R. 1736 would create in the 1990's, but the Bush administration eliminated it in 2001.

Committee Action: On March 26, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Science and Technology. On April 29, 2009 the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by voice vote.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is provided.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, “implementing H.R. 1736 would cost about \$3 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. That amount includes the costs to coordinate activities, provide reports, and hire new staff for the OSTP. The bill would have no effect on direct spending or revenues.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: Yes, the bill creates a new committee under the National Science and Technology Council.

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

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: According to House Report, 111-128, H.R. 1736 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: The Science and Technology Committee, in House Report 111-128, cites constitutional authority in Article I Section 8. House Rule XIII, Section 3(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: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720

H.R. 1709—STEM Education Coordination Act of 2009 (*Gordon, D-TN*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 1709 requires the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) to create a new committee under the National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) with the purpose of coordinating federal education programs related to science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). Specifically, the bill requires the committee to specify and prioritize objectives; describe how agencies will evaluate their programs; describe the role of each agency in achieving objectives; and establish and maintain an inventory of federally sponsored STEM education activities, including documentation on program assessments and rates of participation by minorities and requires the Director of OSTP to encourage and monitor the efforts of the NSTC committee.

Additional Background: In 2006, the Department of Education reviewed federal STEM education programs and conclude that ‘despite decades of significant federal investment in science and math education, there is a general dearth of evidence of effective practices and activities in STEM education.’ A key recommendation was to create a committee on STEM Education, under the NSTC to be responsible for coordinating STEM education programs across federal R&D agencies and the Department of Education.

Committee Action: On March 26, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Science and Technology and Education and Labor. On April 29, 2009, the Science and Technology committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by voice vote. On June 2, 2009, the Committee on Education and Labor discharged the bill.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is provided.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, “implementing H.R. 1709 would cost about \$2 million annually, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. That amount includes the costs to prepare strategic plans, coordinate activities among the affected agencies, and hire new staff for the OSTP. The bill would have no effect on direct spending or revenues.”

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: Yes, the bill creates a new committee under the National Science and Technology Council.

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

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: According to House Report, 111-130, H.R. 1709 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: The Science and Technology Committee, in House Report 111-130, cites constitutional authority in Article I Section 8. House Rule XIII, Section 3(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: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720

H.Res. 492—Supporting the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week (*Carnahan, D-MO*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Res. 492 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Supports the goals and ideals of High-Performance Building Week;
- “Recognizes and reaffirms our Nation's commitment to High-Performance Buildings by promoting awareness about their benefits and by promoting new education programs, supporting research, and expanding access to information;
- “Recognizes the unique role that the Department of Energy plays through the Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy's Building Technologies Program, which

works closely with the building industry and manufacturers to conduct research and development on technologies and practices for building energy efficiency;

- “Recognizes the important role that the National Institute of Standards and Technology plays in developing the measurement science needed to develop, test, integrate, and demonstrate the new building technologies; and
- “Encourages further research and development of high-performance building standards, research, and development.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “The High-Performance Buildings Congressional Caucus Coalition has declared the week of June 15 through June 19, 2009, as ‘High-Performance Building Week’;
- “The House of Representatives has recognized the importance of high-performance buildings through the inclusion of a definition of high-performance buildings in the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007;
- “The construction of buildings and their related infrastructure consume approximately 60 percent of all raw materials used in the United States economy;
- “Buildings account for 39 percent of United States carbon dioxide emissions a year approximately equaling the combined carbon emissions of Japan, France, and the United Kingdom;
- “High-performance buildings promote higher student achievement by providing better lighting, a more comfortable indoor environment, and improved ventilation and indoor air quality;
- “High-performance residential and commercial building design and construction should effectively guard against natural and human caused events and disasters, including fire, water, wind, noise, crime, and terrorism;
- “The United States should continue to improve the features of new buildings, and adapt and maintain existing buildings, to changing balances in our needs and responsibilities for health, safety, energy efficiency, and usability by all segments of society.”

Committee Action: On June 2, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Science and Technology, which took no subsequent public action.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

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 Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.Res. 492.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.Res. 356—Expressing support for the designation of February 8, 2010, as "Boy Scouts of America Day", in celebration of the Nation's largest youth scouting organization's 100th anniversary (Hall, R-TX)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Res. 356 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Supports the designation of ‘Boy Scouts of America Day’ in celebration of its 100th anniversary.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “Boy Scouts of America was incorporated by Chicago publisher, William Boyce, on February 8, 1910, after learning of the Scouting movement during a visit to London;
- “On June 21, 1910, a group of 34 national representatives met, developed organization plans, and opened a temporary national headquarters in New York;
- “By 1912, Scouts were enrolled in every State;
- “In 1916, Congress granted Boy Scouts of America a Federal charter;
- “Membership since 1910 totals more than 111,000,000 scouts and is found in 185 countries around the world;
- “More than 1,000,000 adult volunteer leaders selflessly serve young people in their communities through organizations chartered by the Boy Scouts of America;
- “February 8, 2010, would be an appropriate day to designate as ‘Boy Scouts of America Day’ in celebration of the Boy Scouts of America's 100th anniversary;
- “Boy Scouts of America endeavors to develop American citizens who are physically, mentally, and emotionally fit, have a high degree of self-reliance as evidenced in such qualities as initiative, courage, and resourcefulness, have personal values based on religious concepts, have the desire and skills to help others, understand the principles of the American social, economic, and governmental systems, take pride in their American heritage and understand our Nation's role in the world, have a keen respect for the basic rights of all people, and are prepared to participate in and give leadership to American society.”

Committee Action: On April 29, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On May, 6, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

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 Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there's no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.Res. 356.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.Res. 435—Celebrating Asian-Pacific American Heritage (Honda, D-CA)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Res. 435 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Recognizes that the incredible diversity of different racial and ethnic groups, including Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders, is a source of strength for the United States;
- “Recognizes that the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community is influential and crucial to the society and culture of the United States;
- “Reaffirms its commitment to the goals and ideals of Asian/Pacific-American Heritage Month; and
- “Celebrates the contributions of Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders to the United States.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “This year marks first time the United States is led by a President with close Asian ties, including President Obama's childhood in Indonesia and Hawai'i, and the President has made unprecedented outreach efforts to the Asian-American and Pacific Islander community;
- “The selection of May as the month for Asian/Pacific-American Heritage Month was significant due to two historical events that occurred in May: first, May 7, 1843, when the first Japanese immigrants arrived in the United States, and second, May 10, 1869, when,

with substantial contributions from Chinese immigrants, the first transcontinental railroad was completed;

- “Section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific-American Heritage Month, and requests the President to issue each year a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Asian/Pacific-American Heritage Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;
- “According to the Bureau of the Census, an estimated 14,900,000 United States residents identify themselves as Asian alone or in combination with one or more other races, and an estimated 1,000,000 United States residents identify themselves as Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander alone or in combination with one or more other races;
- “The Presidential Cabinet includes a record three Asian-Americans: Energy Secretary Steven Chu, Commerce Secretary Gary Locke, and Veterans Affairs Secretary Eric Shinseki; and
- “Asian/Pacific-American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, history, and concerns of Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders:”

Committee Action: On May 13, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On June, 4, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

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 Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.Res. 435.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.Res. 420—Celebrating the symbol of the United States flag and supporting the goals and ideals of Flag Day (Latta, R-OH)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Res. 420 would resolve that the House of Representatives:

- “Celebrates the United States flag and supports the goals and ideals of Flag Day.”

The resolution lists a number of findings including:

- “Flag Day is celebrated annually on June 14, the anniversary of the official adoption of the American flag by the Continental Congress in 1777;
- “On June 14, 1777, in order to establish an official flag for the new Nation, the Continental Congress passed the first Flag Act, which stated, ‘Resolved, That the flag of the United States be made of thirteen stripes, alternate red and white; that the union be thirteen stars, white in a blue field, representing a new Constellation’;
- “The second Flag Act, signed January 13, 1794, provided for 15 stripes and 15 stars after May 1795;
- “The Act of April 4, 1818, which provided for 13 stripes and one star for each State, to be added to the flag on July 4 following the admission of each new State, was signed by President James Monroe;
- “In an Executive order dated June 24, 1912, President William Howard Taft established the proportions of the flag and provided for arrangement of the stars in 6 horizontal rows of 8 each, a single point of each star to be upward
- “In an Executive order dated January 3, 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower provided for the arrangement of the stars in 9 rows staggered horizontally and 11 rows of stars staggered vertically;
- “On June 14, 1894, the Governor of New York ordered that the American flag be displayed at all public buildings in the State, prompting many State and local governments to begin observing Flag Day;
- “President Woodrow Wilson proclaimed the first nationwide Flag Day in 1916;
- “In 1947, President Harry S. Truman signed legislation requesting National Flag Day be observed annually;
- “June 14, 2009, is recognized as Flag Day.”

Committee Action: On May 7, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On June, 4, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill reported by unanimous consent.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is available.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would not authorize any additional expenditures.

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 Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee

report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable for H.Res. 420.

RSC Staff Contact: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720.

H.R. 885—Improved Financial and Commodity Markets Oversight and Accountability Act (*Larson, D-CT*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 885 amends the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act) by elevating five financial regulatory agencies--the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the National Credit Union Administration, the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System--from `Designated Federal Entities' (DFEs) to `establishments'. This change primarily affects the process for appointment of Inspectors General (IGs) at the agencies by making these appointments subject to presidential appointment (with the advice and consent of the Senate), rather than being appointed by the agency head under current law.

Additional Background: According to the GAO, “the differences in the appointment and removal processes between presidentially appointed IGs and those appointed by their agency heads result in a clear difference in the level of independence of the IGs. A general tenet to keep in mind is that the further removed the appointment source is from the entity to be audited, the greater level of independence.”

Committee Action: On February 4, 2009, the bill was introduced and referred to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. On May 6, 2009, the committee held a mark-up and ordered the bill to be reported by voice vote.

Administration Position: No Statement of Administration Policy is provided.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 885 “would not have a significant impact on 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.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: According to House Report, 111-114, H.R. 885 does not contain any

congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of Rule XXI.

Constitutional Authority: The Oversight and Government Reform Committee, in House Report 111-114, cites constitutional authority in Article I Section 8. House Rule XIII, Section 3(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: Bruce F. Miller, bruce.miller@mail.house.gov, (202)-226-9720

H.R. 466 – Wounded Veteran Job Security Act (*Doggett, D-TX*)

Order of Business: H.R. 466 is scheduled to be considered on Monday, June 8, 2009 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 466 would expand Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) protections to include servicemembers and veterans who have an illness, injury or disability determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to have been incurred in or aggravated by military service.

The bill also allows the absent employee to use any vacation, annual, medical, or similar leave with pay accrued before the commencement of the treatment.

H.R. 466 provides that an employer shall not be required to retain an absent employee if: (1) the employer's circumstances have so changed as to make such retention impossible or unreasonable; (2) such retention would pose an undue hardship on the employer; or (3) the employment in question is for a brief, nonrecurring period without a reasonable expectation of continuing indefinitely or for a significant period.

The bill treats an absent employee, for purposes of employer-provided health care and pension benefit plans, in the same manner as a person absent by reason of military service.

Prohibits any employer discrimination or acts of reprisal against an absent employee.

Background: USERRA provides certain employment protections for those who serve, have served or apply to serve in the uniformed services.

According to [House committee report 111-118](#), “USERRA additionally provides that returning servicemembers be reemployed in the job they would have attained had they not been absent due to military service, with the same seniority, status and pay, as well as other rights and benefits determined by seniority.” Reasonable efforts must be to enable returning servicemembers to refresh or upgrade their skills to help them qualify for reemployment. Should the servicemember not qualify for a position they would have had if they had not been in the Armed Forces, they are provided with alternative reemployment.

This bill expands USERRA protections to cover servicemembers and veterans whose service connected disability requires extended medical care. According to the committee report, “On March 4, 2009, Representative Doggett testified before the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity that over 30,000 troops have been wounded as a result of their service in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Of these, over 8,000 have suffered from Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI) and over 1,200 have required amputation of a limb.” This bill would ensure that individuals with those injuries are guaranteed the same USERRA rights as those who were not injured.

Committee Action: H.R. 466 was introduced on January 13, 2009 and referred to the House Veterans Affairs Committee. The bill was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee by voice vote on March 19, 2009 as amended.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 466 would cost \$6 million over the 2010-2014 period. In addition, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 466 would reduce revenues by \$15 million over the 2010-2019 period and would have an insignificant effect on direct spending.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: Yes. It expands USERRA to cover individuals in the Armed Forces for a longer period of time in some cases.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: According to CBO, the requirements on employers to retain veterans as employees and to provide certain benefits would be intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). H.R. 466 would impose intergovernmental and private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA on employers of veterans who miss work for a period of time due to medical treatment for a service-connected injury. The bill would require employers to retain such veterans as employees, and grant them seniority and other rights and benefits as if they had not been absent.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: H.R. 466 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives

Constitutional Authority: [Committee report 111-118](#) sites Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

RSC Staff Contact: Natalie Farr; natalie.farr@mail.house.gov 202-226-0718.