



Legislative Bulletin.....May 9, 2006

Contents:

H.R. 4204 — American River Pump Station Project Transfer Act of 2005

H.R. 5311 — Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act

S. 1382 — A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian Tribe

H.R. 1499 — Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act

H.R. 4912 — Rural Health Care Capital Access Act of 2006

H.R. 4902 — Byron Nelson Congressional Gold Medal Act

H. Res. 627 — Congratulating Chris Carpenter on being named the Cy Young Award winner for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season

H.R. 5037 — Respect for America's Fallen Heroes Act

H.R. 3829 — Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veteran Affairs Medical Center Designation Act

Summary of the Bills Under Consideration Today:

Total Number of New Government Programs: 0

Total Cost of Discretionary Authorizations: \$7.034 million over five years

Effect on Revenue: reduces revenue by \$10 million over five years

Total Change in Mandatory Spending: \$0

Total New State & Local Government Mandates: 0

Total New Private Sector Mandates: 0

Number of Bills Without Committee Reports: 6

Number of Reported Bills that Don't Cite Specific Clauses of Constitutional Authority: 1

**H.R. 4204 — American River Pump Station Project Transfer Act of 2005 —
*as reported (Doolittle, R-CA)***

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on May 09, 2006 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 4204 would authorize the transfer of the land meant for the Auburn Dam on the American River in California from the Bureau of Reclamation back to the Placer County Water Authority.

Additional Information: In order to build the Auburn Dam on the American River north of Sacramento, California, the federal government purchased the land containing the Placer County Water Authority's pumping station, and demolished the station. Construction of the dam was halted 30 years ago due to an earthquake and Congress has no plans to complete the dam.

Since 1990, the Bureau of Reclamation has been required to spend between \$225,000 and \$450,000 a year to install, uninstall, and re-install seasonal water pumps to help the county water authority meet its water needs. However, according to the Bureau, the pumps are unreliable and inadequate for that purpose, and expensive. Because the American River's water level rises during the winter, the pumps must be removed and re-installed when the water levels return to their spring levels.

By contract, the federal government is required to build Placer County another pumping station. Congressional approval is needed for the transfer of land and pumping station back to Placer County. The cost of the pumping station is to be borne by the Bureau of Reclamation, with some funds coming from Placer County and the State of California. The funds for the construction of the pumping station are assumed to come from the Bureau of Reclamation's budget, because the bill authorizes no new expenditure.

Committee Action: H.R. 4204 was introduced on November 2, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Resources. The bill was marked up on March 29, 2006, and it was reported to the House by unanimous consent on April 25, 2005 (H. Rept. 109-430).

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO estimates that the bill would have no significant impact on the federal budget and that the Bureau of Reclamation would save between \$225,000 and \$450,000 in annual maintenance costs for the seasonal water pumps.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No, the bill reduces federal land holdings in the State of California.

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

Constitutional Authority: The Committee Report, H. Rept. 109-430, cites constitutional authority for this legislation in Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution, but fails to cite a specific Clause.

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: Marcus Kelley; marcus.kelley@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717

H.R. 5311 — Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area Act — *as introduced* (Johnson, R-CT)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

A similar bill, H.R. 938, passed the House by voice vote on May 16, 2005. An identical bill to the introduced version of H.R. 938 (H.R. 1798), was considered in the 108th Congress by the Committee on Resources and a mark-up was held (H. Rept. [108-365](#)). The provisions of H.R. 1798 were inserted into H.R. 280, which passed the House by voice vote on November 18, 2003. The Senate took no action on the H.R. 280 in the 108th Congress. *See Summary and Committee Action sections for further information.*

Summary: H.R. 5311 would establish the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in Connecticut and Massachusetts.

Specifically, the bill designates the Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area, Inc. as the Area's management entity. This management entity would: (1) submit a management plan, for approval by the Secretary of the Interior, which would include policies, strategies, and recommendations for conservation, funding, management, development, and interpretation of the Area; and (2) assist local governments, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in implementing the plan. The bill would prohibit the entity from using federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property.

Private Property Provision: Sections 9 and 10 of the bill include the following provisions to protect the rights of private property owners:

Sec. 9: No privately owned property shall be preserved, conserved, or promoted by the management plan for the Heritage Area until the owner of that private property has been notified in writing by the management entity and has given written consent for such preservation, conservation, or promotion to the management entity. Any owner of private property included within the boundary of the Heritage Area shall have their property immediately removed from the boundary by submitting a written request to the management entity.

Sec. 10: Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require any private property owner to allow public access (including Federal, State, or local government access) to such private property; or modify any provision of Federal, State, or local law with regard to public access to or use of private property. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the owner of any private property located within the boundaries of the Heritage Area to participate in or be associated with the Heritage Area.

Sunset Provision: The authority of the Secretary to provide assistance under this Act terminates 15 years after enactment of this Act.

Note: A similar bill, H.R. 938, passed the House on May 16, 2005. H.R. 5311 only includes Title I of H.R. 938. Titles II, III, and IV of H.R. 938 were not included in this bill, which would have established other National Heritage Areas around the country.

To view the RSC Legislative Bulletin on H.R. 938, please visit:

<http://www.house.gov/pence/rsc/doc/LB%205-16-2005%20suspensions2.pdf>.

Additional Background: Congress has established 27 National Heritage Areas around the country, in which conservation, interpretation, and other activities are managed by partnerships among federal, state, and local governments and the private sector. The National Park Service provides technical assistance, as well as financial assistance, for a limited number of years following designation.

The National Park Service defines a National Heritage Area as follows:

A National Heritage Area is a place designated by the United States Congress, where natural, cultural, historic and recreational resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These patterns make National Heritage Areas representative of the national experience through the physical features that remain and the traditions that have evolved in the areas. Continued use of the National Heritage Areas by people whose traditions helped to shape the landscapes enhances their significance.

National Heritage Areas are a new kind of national designation, which seeks to preserve and celebrate many of America's defining landscapes.

<http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/FAQ/INDEX.HTM>.

NOTE: No legislative criteria exist for designating a National Heritage Area.

Most of the 27 existing National Heritage Areas are located in the eastern third of the United States. To see what and where they are, visit this webpage:

<http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/VST/INDEX.HTM>.

Congress authorized National Heritage Areas as follows:

- 1 in 1984
- 1 in 1986
- 2 in 1988
- 2 in 1994
- 11 in 1996
- 6 in 2000
- 1 in 2003
- 3 in 2004

For more information on National Heritage Areas, visit this website:

<http://www.cr.nps.gov/heritageareas/>

Possible Conservative Concerns: In the past, conservatives have objected to National Heritage Areas because such designations usually lead to restrictive federal zoning and land-use planning. That is, residential and commercial private property owners are often prevented from doing what they want on their own property because of federal concerns that the historic landscape would be disrupted.

As J. Peyton Knight of the American Policy Center told the House Resources Committee's Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands in 2003, nearly every Heritage Area has a management plan or statement of purpose that calls for restrictive zoning regulations, under the auspices of more environmental protection, more open space and more historic preservation. This typically results in more infringements upon the property rights of landowners located within the boundaries of Heritage Areas.

Furthermore, Mr. Knight pointed out that National Heritage Areas provide another reason for groups subsisting on federal funds to ask for even more federal funds: If the Heritage Areas program is allowed to proliferate, experience shows that it will become not only a funding albatross, as more and more interest groups gather around the federal trough, but also a program that quashes property rights and local economies through restrictive federal zoning practices. The real beneficiaries of a National Heritage Areas program are conservation groups, preservation societies, land trusts and the National Park Service; essentially, organizations that are in constant pursuit of federal dollars, land acquisition, and restrictions to development. Americans for Tax Reform testified to the Parks Subcommittee in 2003 that the National Park Service is already facing a multi-billion dollar maintenance backlog and thus will not practically be able to take on any new maintenance requirements.

Administration Position: Although an Administration viewpoint is unavailable for this legislation, the National Park Service, in testimony before the Parks Subcommittee in 2003 (for H.R. 280), recommended **defer[ing] action on any individual national heritage area designation or study until generic national heritage area legislation is enacted.** (*emphasis added*)

To read the full statement, visit this webpage:

<http://resourcescommittee.house.gov/108cong/parks/2003oct16/tiller.htm>.

Committee Action: H.R. 5311 was introduced on Monday, May 8, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Resources, which took no official action.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score of H.R. 5311 is unavailable. The bill authorizes \$10 million for the Heritage Area under this Act, of which no more than \$1 million may be used in any one fiscal year. The bill stipulates that these federal funds may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of assistance provided under this Act.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: It would add one new National Heritage Area, as described above.

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

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

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: Derek V. Baker; derek.baker@mail.house.gov; 202-226-8585

S. 1382 — A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain land, to be held in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian tribe (*Sen. Cantwell, D-WA*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: S. 1382 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to accept the conveyance of certain parcels of land within the Puyallup Reservation and hold them in trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Indian tribe. The bill stipulates the exact boundaries of the land to be held in trust, but does not state the land’s size or acreage.

Additional Information: Under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution, the federal government has plenary authority to regulate commerce and trade with Indian tribes. Due to various treaties and executive orders over the last 229 years between the United States and Indian tribes, significant portions of land owned by Indian tribes have been held in trust by the federal government for the benefit of the tribes. According to CRS, Supreme Court decisions as early as 1831 have determined that Indian tribal lands are jurisdictionally not subject to state law, but afforded the protection of federal law. In keeping Indian land in trust, the federal government in effect shields this land from claims, taxes, regulations, and other actions levied against it by states. **Thus, holding Indian tribal land in trust by the federal government has become common practice and generally affords the highest form of protection against such actions, while still allowing the Indian tribe to exercise their rights over the land.**

A similar bill, H.R. 374, was introduced in the House and considered by the Resources Committee earlier this year (H. Rept. 109-422). In that Committee Report, the background and need for this legislation was stated as follows:

The purpose of this legislation is to expedite the fee-to-trust process to move the location of a tribal casino owned by the Puyallup Indian tribe in Washington State for the purposes of complying with an agreement to expand the Port of Tacoma in Washington. Although the Tribe could pursue the fee-to-trust process administratively through the Department of the Interior, the Department’s lengthy application process to place land into trust within the boundaries of a reservation risks possible delay on port construction.

By handling this process legislatively, the Tribe accomplishes its goal in a timely manner and allows the port project to begin immediately.

On November 16, 2004, the Port of Tacoma, the State of Washington, the Puyallup Indian Tribe and the cities of Fife and Tacoma all signed an agreement to pursue a major expansion of terminal facilities at the Port of Tacoma. The signed agreement amends the tribal gaming compact signed by the State and the Puyallup Tribe in 1996. The new agreement allows the Tribe to move its Emerald Queen Casino, which was affected by the construction of the new Port of Tacoma terminal facility, to a new location within the boundaries of the reservation. The agreement does not increase the number of gaming locations or type of games offered.

For additional information on the Puyallup Indian tribe, please click here: <http://www.u-s-history.com/pages/h1563.html>.

Committee Action: S. 1382 was introduced in the Senate on July 12, 2005, and passed the Senate by unanimous consent on October 24, 2005. It was referred to the House Committee on Resources, which took no official action.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score of S. 1382 is unavailable, but the bill does not authorize new 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.

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

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: Derek V. Baker; derek.baker@mail.house.gov; 202-226-8585

H.R. 1499 — Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act — *as amended* (Foxx, R-NC)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. A self-enacting rule will be introduced on the floor that amends the underlying bill text upon passage of the bill.

H.R. 1499 passed the House on May 23, 2005, and was referred to the Senate. The bill was amended by Senator Frist and passed the Senate by unanimous consent on November 15, 2005.

Summary: H.R. 1499 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to include combat zone compensation (otherwise excluded from gross income) as earned income for purposes of calculating the tax deduction for contributions to retirement savings plans.

This would allow members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone a deduction for contributions to their individual retirement plans even if the compensation on which the contribution is based is excluded from gross income.

The Senate amendment makes the following changes to the bill text:

The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, ~~2004~~ 2003.

Note: The sponsor has introduced a self-enacting amendment for H.R. 1499, whereby it will take affect on passage of the bill. According to the sponsor's office, this amendment is made at the behest of some senators. It will make wages earned in 2004 and 2005 eligible for the tax deduction, thereby increasing the pool of active-duty military personnel that can take advantage of this provision.

Committee Action: H.R. 1499 was introduced on April 6, 2005, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The bill passed the House on May 23, 2005, and was referred to the Senate. The bill was amended and passed the Senate by unanimous consent on November 15, 2005.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO score of H.R. 1499 is not unavailable, and while the bill does not authorize specific expenditures, it is expected to lower federal revenue due to the new tax deduction. A previous informal estimate indicated that this bill reduces revenues by \$1 million in the first year and by \$10 million over five years.

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: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

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: Derek V. Baker; derek.baker@mail.house.gov; 202-226-8585

H.R. 4912 — Rural Health Care Capital Access Act of 2006 — *as reported*
(Ney, R-OH)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 4912 amends the National Housing Act, extending the exemption for limited-capacity hospitals by six years (from July 31, 2006 to July 31, 2011), regarding the required number of “patient days” required for certain categories of care (in order to receive loan guarantees).

Additional Information: According to CBO, in order for hospitals to qualify for a loan guaranteed by the Federal Housing Administration, the facility must assign “no more than 50 percent of total patient days (that is, essentially the number of days a person is in a hospital) to patients requiring care involving chronic convalescence and rest, drug and alcoholic rehabilitation, and mental issues.” However, certain hospitals with limited capacity (usually rurally located) are exempted from this requirement. Under current law, this exemption expires on July 31, 2006. This bill would extend the exemption until July 31, 2011.

Committee Action: H.R. 4912 was introduced on March 9, 2006 and was referred to the Committee on Financial Services, which considered it, held a mark-up, and reported the bill by voice vote on March 15, 2006.

Cost to Taxpayers: According to CBO, H.R. 4912 would increase offsetting receipts by \$1 million to \$3 million over the next five years. An increase in offsetting receipts is considered a reduction in discretionary spending.

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 Financial Services Committee, in Committee Report 109-424, finds constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (general welfare), and Clause 3 (regulating interstate commerce).

RSC Staff Contact: Joelle Cannon; joelle.cannon@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-0718.

H.R.4902 — Byron Nelson Congressional Gold Medal Act — *as introduced* — (Burgess, R-TX)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: The bill awards a Congressional Gold Medal to golfer Byron Nelson “in recognition of his significant contributions to the game of golf as a player, a teacher, and a commentator.” The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, and to strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal, at a price

sufficient to cover the cost of the gold medal. The bill authorizes funds from the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund to pay for the costs of the medals struck and requires that amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals shall be deposited into the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

Additional Information: According to the bill's findings, Byron Nelson was a top player in the sport of golf during the World War II era, winning 54 career victories, including a record 11 in a row in 1945, during his short 13-year career. Byron Nelson won 5 majors, including 2 Masters (1937 and 1942), two Professional Golf Association (PGA) Championships (1940 and 1945) and the U.S. Open (1939). In 1945, Byron Nelson accumulated 18 total victories, 11 of which were consecutive, while averaging 68.33 strokes per round for 30 tournaments. At the Seattle Open in 1945, Byron Nelson shot a record 62 for 18 holes and the world record 259, 29 shots under par for 72 holes. The World Golf Hall of Fame honored Byron Nelson in 2004. In 1944, he earned \$37,000, more than twice what any golfing professional had ever made. To see a list of Byron Nelson's golf winnings, see: <http://www.eds.com/news/events/byronnelson/downloads/nelsonscareerstats.pdf>

Byron Nelson was one of the first golf analysts on network television. Since 1983, the Byron and Louise Nelson Golf Endowment Fund has provided over \$1.5 million in endowment funds to Abilene Christian University in Abilene, Texas. He also has served as an honorary chairperson for the Metroport Meals on Wheels since 1992. There is a PGA tour event named after him, the EDS Byron Nelson Championship (EDS is headquartered in Plano, Texas). He currently lives in Texas.

Committee Action: H.R. 4902 was introduced on March 8, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Financial Services. The committee did not consider the bill.

Cost to Taxpayers: While a CBO cost estimate is unavailable, CBO previously has estimated that it costs \$30,000 to design a Gold Medal. In response to congressional inquiry, the Treasury Department noted that this figure was based on lower gold prices costing between \$6,000 to \$6,500 per medal. According to Treasury, each Congressional Gold Medal contains 14.5 troy ounces or 16 regular ounces of gold. As of May 8th, 2006, gold was trading for \$678.40 an ounce. **Thus, a medal authorized under current rates would include approximately \$10,854 worth of gold, and cost taxpayers approximately \$34,000.** Though H.R. 4902 authorizes the sale of duplicate bronze medals to offset the cost of the gold medals, the Treasury Department figures released in response to congressional inquiry show that most duplicate medals are not strong enough to offset the cost of the gold medal. In some cases, the Department reported, duplicate medal sales for individuals such as George Washington, Pope John Paul II, and Ronald Reagan, have offset their gold medal costs.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: The bill authorizes the creation of a new gold medal and duplicate bronze medals.

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

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable. 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.”

RSC Staff Contact: Sheila Cole; sheila.cole@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9719.

H. Res. 627 — Congratulating Chris Carpenter on being named the Cy Young Award winner for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season — *as introduced (Carnahan, D-MO)*

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled for consideration on May 9, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution.

Summary: H.R. 627 resolves that “the House of Representatives congratulates Chris Carpenter on being named the Cy Young Award winner for the National League for the 2005 Major League Baseball season.”

Additional Information: The resolution’s findings state that: “Chris Carpenter of the St. Louis Cardinals was named the Cy Young Award winner for being the best pitcher in the National League during the 2005 Major League Baseball season;” that “during the 2005 season Chris Carpenter posted a record of 21 wins and 5 losses and an outstanding winning percentage of .808;” that “in 2005 Chris Carpenter had an earned run average of 2.83, one of the best in Major League Baseball;” and that “Chris Carpenter has demonstrated an outstanding ability to overcome injury and adversity and won the Player's Choice National League Comeback Player of the Year award in 2004.”

Committee Action: H. Res. 627 was introduced on December 27, 2006 and referred to the Committee on Government Reform. The bill was marked-up and reported to the House by unanimous consent on May 4, 2006.

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: Marcus Kelley; marcus.kelley@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717

H.R. 5037 — Respect for America’s Fallen Heroes Act — *as introduced (Rogers, R-MI)*

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 5037 would create a new federal crime, prohibiting demonstrators at federal cemeteries from protesting within 500 feet of the grounds an hour before and until an hour after military funerals unless a cemetery superintendent approves the demonstration. The bill makes demonstrators in violation of the provisions subject to a \$100,000 fine, which goes into the Crime Victims Fund, and imprisonment for up to a year. Finally, the bill's findings urge all states to enact similar prohibitions on demonstrations at military funerals. Several states have passed similar legislation protecting cemeteries and military funerals, and thirty or more states have at least considered such legislation.

Additional Information: More information on the Patriot Guard, a group of motorcyclists that screen mourners from protesters can be found at <http://www.mvleadvocate.com/web/isite.dll?1144851979718>.

Possible Conservative Concerns: While protests at military funerals have been widely denounced by conservatives, there is reason to believe this bill may have constitutional problems by limiting speech. In addition, in the past, conservatives have raised objections to buffer zones for abortion clinic protesters.

According to the sponsor, prohibiting protests on Veterans' Administration property, such as cemeteries, is constitutional under the Supreme Court's *Griffin v. Secretary of Veterans Affairs* case. Additionally, the sponsor cites *Grayned v. City of Rockford* as constitutional authority for time, place, and manner regulations for speech. The *Grayned* case used identical language to H.R. 5037 prohibit protests near school property.

Committee Action: H.R. 5037 was introduced on March 29, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Judiciary. Judiciary took no official action, but Veterans' Affairs referred the bill to the Subcommittee on Disability Assistance and Memorial Affairs on April 5, 2006. The subcommittee held hearings on April 6, 2006 and discharged the bill on April 24, 2006. The full committee did not consider the bill.

Cost to Taxpayers: A CBO estimates no significant cost to the federal government.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: Yes, the bill creates a new federal crime.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: Yes, CBO states there is a private-sector mandate, but that the mandate does not entail any significant cost.

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

RSC Staff Contact: Marcus Kelley; marcus.kelley@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717

H.R. 3829 — Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center Designation Act — *as introduced (Boren, D-OK)*

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled for consideration on Tuesday, May 9, 2006 under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 3829 designates the designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Muskogee, Oklahoma, as the Jack C. Montgomery Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

Additional Information: First Lieutenant Montgomery is a Congressional Medal of Honor recipient. He received the award for single-handedly assaulting and capturing three enemy positions in Italy. The evening after Montgomery took the three enemy positions, he was wounded by mortar fire while helping another unit repulse a counterattack. Mr. Montgomery died June 11, 2002.

Committee Action: H.R. 3829 was introduced on September 20, 2005 and referred to the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. On September 26, 2005, the bill was referred to the Subcommittee on Health. The bill was discharged from the subcommittee on May 4, 2006, the full Committee did not consider the bill.

Cost to Taxpayers: The only costs associated with a medical center 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: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Marcus Kelley; marcus.kelley@mail.house.gov; 202-226-9717

###