



Legislative Bulletin.....May 7, 2003

Contents:

- H.R. 100**—Servicemembers Civil Relief Act
- H.Con.Res. 96**—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers’ Memorial Service
- H.Con.Res. 53**—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby
- H.R. 866**—Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act
- H.R. 874**—Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act
- H.Res. 213**—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public service employees should be commended for their dedication and service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week
- H.R. 766**—Nanotechnology Research and Development Act
- H.Res. 148**—Committee Funding Resolution

H.R. 100— Servicemembers Civil Relief Act (Smith, Chris)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 100 amends and modifies the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, which provides for financial protection and temporary suspension of certain judicial proceedings and the maintenance of certain rights for servicemen on active duty. The amendments made in H.R. 100 would apply to any case not finalized by the date of enactment.

- Title I: establishes that military servicemen, reservists called up, and those on active duty, may suspend judicial proceedings that they are involved in.
- Title II: For default judgments against servicemen, courts shall grant stays of proceedings for a minimum of 90 days. For civil suits, the court may stay the action for not less than 90 days, and additional stays may be requested. If refused, the court is required to appoint counsel to represent the serviceman (in his absence). For fines and penalties under contracts, the bill stipulates that penalties shall not accrue while on active duty. If the person on active duty is a co-defendant, proceedings may go forth against the other parties. The bill exempts the time of service from any statute of limitations, except it specifies that it does not apply to IRS laws (for example, the time requirement for qualifying for the capital gains tax exemption for home sales is not affected by H.R. 100).

Interest Rate Cap on Debts Incurred. If a serviceman had (or jointly with his spouse had) an interest rate higher than 6% on debts he incurred before he entered the military, interest shall not be assessed higher than 6% per year during military service. Interest at a rate higher than 6% “is forgiven” (in other words, the mortgage company or the credit card company cannot charge an active duty serviceman more than 6% interest, regardless of the interest agreed to in their contract.) A court may grant a creditor relief from this 6% limitation if, in the opinion of the court, the ability of the serviceman to pay interest upon the obligation or liability at a rate in excess of 6 percent per year is not materially affected by reason of the serviceman’s military service.

- Title III-Except by court order, a landlord may not evict a renting serviceman or his family during the period of military service, as long as the rent does not exceed \$1,700 per month in 2003 (adjusted annually). This is an increase over the current-law amount of \$1,200 per month. Violation of this is subject to a federal misdemeanor or imprisonment of not more than one year. A court may stay an eviction notice, and may grant the landlord such relief as equity may require. The Secretary concerned may garnish a serviceman’s pay to fulfill this court order. Similar procedures are established for servicemen who lease, for those who have mortgages, and for those who have liens for storage.
- Title IV-**Life Insurance.** Under current law, a serviceman may apply to the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) for protection to prevent a life insurance policy from being terminated for nonpayment of the premiums. If VA determines the serviceman is entitled to protection, then it will guarantee the payment of the premiums and attempt to collect any amounts paid by VA from the serviceman. Section 402 would increase the maximum value of a life insurance policy that is eligible for protection from cancellation for nonpayment of premiums from \$10,000 to an amount not exceeding \$250,000 or equal to the Servicemen’s’ Group Life Insurance limit (which is currently \$250,000), whichever is higher.
- Title V: The bill stipulates that a property may not be sold to pay for a tax assessment, except by court order. A court may stay such order for not more than 180 days after the serviceman is released. The rights to federal land such as mining and mineral leasing may not be forfeited due to military service. Certain conditions are laid out in H.R. 100 if the serviceman is disabled in the line of duty. Servicemen under 21 years of age are entitled under the changes in the bill to the same rights as those over 21.

Income Taxes. Federal, state or local taxes due during or before deployment shall be deferred not more than 180 days after release from military service, if the ability to pay is affected by the military service. No penalty may be assessed due to these circumstances. The bill also limits a state's ability to increase the tax liability of a servicemember's spouse.

The bill has various other administrative items, including the power of attorney while a serviceman is declared missing; premium payment suspension for professional liability protection for providers of health-care or legal services who are called up (i.e. malpractice

insurance); health insurance reinstatement without a waiting period (as long as the condition has not been determined by the VA to be a disability incurred or aggravated in the line of duty); and maintaining voting rights.

Committee Action: The bill was introduced on January 7, 2003 and reported by voice vote from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with amendment on April 30, 2003.

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 100 would cost \$2 million in 2004 and \$4 million over the 2004-2008 period, subject to appropriation. H.R. 100 contains both an intergovernmental unfunded mandate (of \$20 million annually mostly in lost income tax revenue) and a private-sector unfunded mandate, but CBO estimates that the costs would not exceed the thresholds (\$59 million and \$117 million in 2003, respectively) as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

CBO notes that almost all of the cost would result from payments made by VA to guarantee life insurance protection. According to VA, the costs of providing this additional protection would be \$186,000 a year for every 10,000 reservists called to active duty. According to DOD, as of April 9, 2003, there were over 220,000 reservists mobilized to fight the war with Iraq and support the global war on terrorism. CBO estimated that the number of reservists on active duty will decline to about 100,000 in 2004 and about 15,000 by 2008. If the number of reservists called to active duty were to remain at current levels over the 2004-2008 period, then the estimated costs would be correspondingly higher. CBO also estimates that VA's cost to administer this guarantee would increase somewhat--but by less than \$100,000 a year.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: The bill amends current law and adds new provisions regarding military personnel on active duty.

Constitutional Authority: The VA Committee's House Report 107-698 (for H.R. 3802 last year) finds constitutional authority in Article I, Sec. 8, Clause 1 (provide for the common defense); Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 11 (to declare war) and Art. I, Sec. 8, Cl. 12 (to raise and support armies).

RSC Staff Contact: Sheila Moloney, Sheila.Moloney@mail.house.gov; (202)-226-9719

H.Con.Res. 96— Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (LaTourette)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Con.Res. 96 would authorize The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary to sponsor the 22nd annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service on the Capitol Grounds on May 15, 2003 (or on such other date as the Speaker of the House and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration may jointly designate), in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2002.

The event must be free to the public and arranged so as not to interfere with the needs of Congress. The sponsor, which would be authorized to erect a stage, sound equipment, and other related devices, would assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the races.

Committee Action: On March 18, 2003, the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management (of the Transportation & Infrastructure Committee) marked up the resolution and forwarded it to the full Committee by voice vote. On April 9, 2003, the full Committee marked up and reported the resolution favorably by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: Because the resolution would require that the FOP assume responsibility for all expenses and liabilities associated with the event, passage would result in no significant cost to the federal government.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: No.

Constitutional Authority: The Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, in House Report 108-086, cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but does not cite a specific clause.

RSC Staff Contact: Sheila Moloney, Sheila.Moloney@mail.house.gov; (202)-226-9719

H.Con.Res. 53—Authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby (*Hoyer*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Con.Res. 53 would authorize the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to sponsor public soap box derby races on the Capitol Grounds on June 21, 2003, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration may jointly designate.

The races must be free to the public and arranged so as not to interfere with the needs of Congress. The Association, which would be authorized to erect a stage, sound equipment, and other related devices, would assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the races.

Additional Background: This 59-year-old annual event offers motor-less racing competition for youngsters aged nine to 16 who build their own cars.

Committee Action: On March 19, 2003, the Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, and Emergency Management (of the Transportation & Infrastructure

Committee) marked up the resolution and forwarded it to the full Committee by voice vote. On April 9, 2003, the full Committee marked up and reported the resolution favorably by voice vote.

Cost to Taxpayers: Because the resolution would require that the Association assume responsibility for all expenses and liabilities associated with the event, passage would result in no significant cost to the federal government.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: No.

Constitutional Authority: The Transportation & Infrastructure Committee, in House Report 108-086, cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but does not cite a specific clause.

RSC Staff Contact: Paul Teller, paul.teller@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9718

H.R. 866—Wastewater Treatment Works Security Act (Young of Alaska)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill. On October 7, 2002, the House passed an identical bill (H.R. 5169) by voice vote. The Senate did not consider the bill before the end of the 107th Congress.

Summary: H.R. 866 would establish a new federal grant program to enhance the security of wastewater treatment works. Specifically, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would be authorized to make **\$200 million** in grants to the states, localities, or intermunicipal/interstate agencies for the purpose of:

- Assessing the vulnerability of wastewater works;
- Reducing any such vulnerabilities; and
- Enhancing security at wastewater works (with suggested security items listed in the bill).

NOTE: The bill would not authorize grants to *private* wastewater treatment facilities. Grants also could not be used for personnel costs or operation or maintenance of facilities, equipment, or systems.

The federal share for the activities funded by the grants could not exceed 75%, and no single facility could receive more than \$150,000 in total grants.

The EPA Administrator would also be able to give (or award grants to nonprofits to give) up to **\$15 million** worth of technical assistance to small, publicly owned wastewater treatment works for assessing vulnerabilities, reducing such vulnerabilities, and enhancing security at their facilities.

H.R. 866 would also authorize \$1 million for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007 (**\$5 million** total) for the EPA Administrator to make grants to a nonprofit organization for the improvement of vulnerability self-assessment methodologies and tools for publicly owned treatment works.

Committee Action: The House Transportation & Infrastructure Committee marked up the bill on February 26, 2003, and reported it favorably by voice vote to the whole House.

Administration Position: On October 10, 2001, a month after the September 11th terrorist attacks, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment held a hearing on the security of water resources infrastructure. Testimony was given by the EPA and the FBI, among others. Both agencies testified in favor of bringing water resources infrastructure into a homeland security framework.

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO confirms that H.R. 866 would authorize \$216 million in FY2003 and a total of \$220 million over the FY2003-2007 period.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: Yes, the legislation would create several new federal grant programs.

Constitutional Authority: The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, in House Report 108-033, cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but does not cite a specific clause.

RSC Staff Contact: Paul Teller, paul.teller@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9718

H.R. 874— Rail Passenger Disaster Family Assistance Act of 2003 (Young (AK))

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Background: In the 107th Congress, the House passed similar legislation (H.R. 554) on February 14, 2001 (404-4 <http://clerkweb.house.gov/cgi-bin/vote.exe?year=2001&rollnumber=15>) and as part of the National Transportation Safety Board (NTSB) reauthorization. In the 106th Congress the House also passed by voice vote similar legislation (H.R. 2681). The Senate has failed to take up this legislation.

Summary: H.R. 874 would require the NTSB to offer assistance to the families of passengers involved in a rail accident that results in a major loss of life. New in this version (compared to the 107th version) is the requirement that the Secretary of Transportation establish a task force to report within a year to Congress recommended ways to improve family assistance and to more accurately count the number of passengers on board a train involved in an accident.

The bill also:

- 1) Requires all rail passenger carriers to submit to the Transportation Secretary and NTSB Chairman a detailed plan covering at least 15 categories outlined in the bill, including:
 - a) Establishment of a toll-free number with staff to man it,
 - b) An assurance that families will be consulted on any monuments and inscriptions,
 - c) An assurance that they will “provide reasonable compensation” to the non-profit organization that NTSB chooses to handle family outreach, and
 - d) An assurance that they will assist the family get to the accident location and provide for their physical care
- 2) Creates a new role for the NTSB to coordinate activities following railroad accidents, including gathering the names of passengers, and naming a nonprofit organization to head up family outreach; and
- 3) Establishes a new federal law that no attorneys may make any “unsolicited communication” with railroad accident victims or relatives “before the 45th day” after the accident. According to information provided to CBO by the legal community, state bar associations have a variety of regulations governing the action of attorneys after such disasters, but most do not prohibit such contact for a period as long as 45 days.

Also new in the 108th version is a provision detailing NTSB assistance if the NTSB has relinquished investigative priority to another federal agency.

Committee Action: The bill was introduced on February 25, 2003 and reported by voice vote from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on February 26, 2003.

Cost to Taxpayers: CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 874 would cost the federal government less than \$500,000 each year. The bill would impose intergovernmental mandates and private-sector mandates as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, but CBO estimates those mandates would not exceed the annual UMRA thresholds.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules: YES, see above.

Constitutional Authority: The T&I Committee’s House Report 108-039 (for H.R. 3802 last year) finds constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8 (Powers of Congress) but fails to cite a specific clause.

RSC Staff Contact: Sheila Moloney, Sheila.Moloney@mail.house.gov; (202)-226-9719

H.Res. 213—Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that public service employees should be commended for their dedication and service to the Nation during Public Service Recognition Week (*Davis of IL*)

Order of Business: The resolution is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.Res. 213 would resolve that the House:

- “commends America's Federal, State, and local government employees for their outstanding contributions to our country;
- “salutes this Nation's public service employees for their unwavering dedication and spirit;
- “honors those public service employees who have laid down their lives in service to this Nation;
- “calls upon a new generation of workers to consider a career in public service; and
- “encourages efforts to promote public service careers at all levels of government.”

The resolution also states that “over 20,000,000 men and women work in government service in every city, county, and State across the Nation and in hundreds of locations abroad.” Furthermore, “the United States is a great and prosperous nation, and public service employees have contributed significantly to its greatness and prosperity.”

Additional Background: May 5-11, 2003, has been designated Public Service Recognition Week to honor America's federal, state, and local government employees.

Committee Action: On May 1, 2003, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Reform but was not considered by the Committee.

Cost to Taxpayers: The resolution would authorize no expenditure.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: No.

RSC Staff Contact: Paul Teller, paul.teller@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9718

H.R. 766—Nanotechnology Research and Development Act (Boehlert)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, May 7th, subject to an open rule (H.Res. 219). The Chair is authorized to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. See below for a summary of amendments pre-printed in the Record.

NOTE: “Nanotechnology” refers to science and engineering aimed at creating materials, devices, and systems at the atomic and molecular level. This technology operates at a length scale of about one to 100 nanometers (which is about a thousandth of a millionth of a meter). To put that in perspective, this size is approximately 1/100,000 the diameter of the average human hair. Nanotechnology could have widespread applications in electronics, medicine, and information technology.

Summary: H.R. 766 would direct the President to establish a new National Nanotechnology Research and Development Program to “promote Federal nanotechnology research, development, demonstration, education, technology transfer, and commercial application activities as necessary to...ensure effective coordination of nanotechnology research and development across Federal agencies and across scientific and engineering disciplines.” In total, this legislation would authorize \$713 million in FY2004 and **\$2.36 billion** over the FY2004-2006 period.

The new program would be aimed at:

- Supporting long-term nanotechnology research through grants to investigators and the establishment of interdisciplinary research centers and advanced technology user facilities;
- Ensuring that the solicitation and evaluation of proposals under the program encourage interdisciplinary research;
- Expanding education and training of undergraduate and graduate students (including traditionally under-represented minorities) in interdisciplinary nanotechnology science and engineering;
- Accelerating the commercial application of nanotechnology innovations in the private sector; and
- Ensuring that societal and ethical concerns will be addressed as the technology is developed by establishing a research program to identify such concerns, by widely disseminating the findings, and by doing as much as possible to integrate this ethical research with nanotechnology research and development. “Societal and ethical concerns” would include environmental matters and the implications of the potential development of non-human intelligence. The amount of money spent researching these concerns would have to be annually reported to Congress.

The interdisciplinary research centers would have to address societal and ethical concerns about nanotechnology, to exchange technical information and best practices, to partner with states and the nanotechnology industry, to make use of existing expertise in their regions, and to accelerate the commercialization of nanotechnology.

The President would be required to designate an interagency committee to oversee the establishment of the program, its ongoing operations and findings, and its budget (as reported to Congress annually). Further, the interagency committee would have to develop a plan for utilizing existing federal programs, such as the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Research Program, in support of nanotechnology commercialization. The committee would consist of representatives from the National Science Foundation, the Energy Department, NASA, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the EPA, and any other agency that the President may designate.

Agencies participating in the nanotechnology program would each be required to establish a Science and Technology Graduate Scholarship Program to recruit and prepare students for careers in the federal government that require engineering, scientific, and technical training. Participating students would be required to work for the federal government for two years for every academic year for which a scholarship is accepted.

The President also would be required to either establish an advisory committee on nanotechnology (consisting of qualified non-federal representatives of research and academic institutions and industry) or designate an existing body (such as the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology) to serve in that capacity. The advisory committee would make assessments of and recommendations for the nanotechnology program to Congress and the President at least every two years.

The President would be directed to establish a National Nanotechnology Coordination Office, with full-time staff, to:

- provide technical and administrative support to the interagency committee and the advisory committee;
- serve as a point of contact on federal nanotechnology activities for government organizations, academia, industry, professional societies, and others to exchange technical and programmatic information; and
- conduct public outreach, including dissemination of findings and recommendations of the interagency committee and the advisory committee.

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS) would be required to conduct extensive evaluations of the nanotechnology program every three years and make any recommendations for changes to the program director. Further, the NAS would have to study (within three years) the technical feasibility of the manufacture of materials and devices at the molecular scale and (within six years) the need for standards, guidelines, or strategies for ensuring the development of safe nanotechnology.

Authorizations of appropriations for the provisions in this legislation would be as follows:

National Science Foundation

- \$350,000,000 for FY2004 (*already authorized in current law*)
- \$385,000,000 for FY2005
- \$424,000,000 for FY2006

Energy Department

- \$265,000,000 for FY2004
- \$292,000,000 for FY2005
- \$322,000,000 for FY2006

NASA

- \$31,000,000 for FY2004
- \$34,000,000 for FY2005
- \$37,000,000 for FY2006

National Institute of Standards of Technology

- \$62,000,000 for FY2004
- \$68,000,000 for FY2005
- \$75,000,000 for FY2006

EPA

- \$5,000,000 for FY2004
- \$5,500,000 for FY2005
- \$6,000,000 for FY2006

FY2004 total: \$713.0 million (*\$350.0 million of which is already authorized in current law*)

FY2005 total: \$784.5 million

FY2006 total: \$864.0 million

FY2004-2006 total: \$2.362 billion

Amendments Pre-Printed in the Congressional Record:

#1—Rep. Chris Bell (D-TX): Ensures that the nanotechnology program, in addressing societal and ethical concerns, includes toxicological and environmental impact studies.

#2—Rep. Chris Bell (D-TX): Ensures that the nanotechnology program includes research on the potential of nanotechnology to produce or facilitate the production of clean, inexpensive energy.

While not pre-printed in the Congressional Record, Rep. Eddie Bernice Johnson (D-TX) is likely to offer an amendment that would authorize the assembly of small panels of ordinary citizens to examine and advise researchers on important societal issues regarding nanotechnology.

Committee Action: On May 1, 2003, the Science Committee marked up, amended, and favorably reported H.R. 766.

Possible RSC Concerns: Some Members might be concerned about the high authorization levels and the creation of new scholarship programs in the bill.

Administration Position: On March 19, 2003, before the House Science Committee, the Associate Director for Technology at the Office of Science and Technology Policy testified that, “The Administration shares this Committee's belief in the importance of federal support for nanotechnology R&D and coordination of the research efforts that are funded.” The Director added, “Because of the complexity, cost, and high risk associated with nanotechnology research, the private sector is often unable to assure itself of short-to-medium term returns on R&D investments in this field. Consequently, industry is not likely to undertake the basic research investments necessary to overcome the technical barriers that currently exist. ... The Administration's commitment to furthering nanotechnology research and development has never been stronger.”

To read more about the Administration's position, including a detailed elaboration about the promises of nanotechnology, visit this website:

<http://www.house.gov/science/hearings/full03/mar19/russell.htm>

Cost to Taxpayers: The bill would authorize appropriations of \$713.0 million in FY2004 and \$2.362 billion over the FY2004-2006 period. However, the \$350 million specified for NSF's program for 2004 has already been authorized under current law. Further, the amounts specified above would not cover costs associated with the external advisory functions and studies, which would cost an average of about \$700,000 annually, according to CBO.

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules?: Yes. The new federal programs, offices, and committees are detailed above.

Constitutional Authority: The House Science Committee, in House Report 108-089, cites constitutional authority in Article I, Section 8, but fails to cite a specific clause.

RSC Staff Contact: Paul Teller, paul.teller@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9718

H.Res. 148— Committee Funding Resolution (Ney)

Order of Business: The resolution will be considered today, pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement.

Summary: The Resolution authorizes \$222.7 million in funding for the Standing Committees of the House (excluding Appropriations, which is funded in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill) for the 108th Congress. The Resolution authorizes a 9.41% increase over the previous Congress (\$203.5 million). On a per-year basis, the resolution provides roughly a 4.7% annual increase.

[See attached page for details.](#)

Does the Bill Create New Federal Programs or Rules: No.

Cost to the Taxpayer: The bill provides authority to spend \$222.7 million over two years, however, the actual funds are appropriated in the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.

Concerns: Some Members have expressed concerns about approving an increase in funding for House Committees that exceeds what the Budget Resolution provides for overall discretionary spending (2.4% excluding war supplementals). Other Members, have expressed support for the resolution and point out that funding is still below the levels of the last Democrat-controlled Congress.

RSC Staff Contact: Neil Bradley x6-9717

	103rd	104th	105th	106th	107th	Proposed 108th	Change Since 107th	Change Since 103rd	Change Since 104th
Agriculture	9,373,350	7,406,899	7,656,162	8,414,033	9,607,006	10,327,531	7.50%	10.18%	39.43%
Financial Services	12,398,972	8,645,054	8,901,617	9,307,521	11,846,231	13,696,487	15.62%	10.46%	58.43%
Budget	13,944,308	9,912,000	9,940,000	9,940,000	11,107,043	11,869,572	6.87%	-14.88%	19.75%
Commerce	20,473,270	13,686,823	14,535,406	15,285,113	17,226,770	18,622,138	8.10%	-9.04%	36.06%
District of Columbia	5,122,224	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ed. & Workforce	13,645,650	9,621,539	10,125,113	11,200,497	13,573,886	14,673,371	8.10%	7.53%	52.51%
Gov't Reform	11,772,861	13,520,037	20,020,572	19,770,233	19,420,233	19,614,435	1.00%	66.61%	45.08%
House Admin	9,047,903	6,177,608	6,050,349	6,251,871	7,418,046	8,527,057	14.95%	-5.76%	38.03%
Intelligence	4,357,946	4,519,890	4,815,526	5,164,444	6,955,074	7,809,730	12.29%	79.21%	72.79%
Int'l Relations	14,311,349	10,028,093	10,368,358	11,313,531	12,672,626	14,552,695	14.84%	1.69%	45.12%
Judiciary	10,638,722	9,553,190	10,604,041	12,152,275	13,166,463	14,048,616	6.70%	32.05%	47.06%
Merchant Marine	9,400,104	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Armed Services	11,099,105	9,085,743	9,721,745	10,342,681	10,872,677	11,931,357	9.74%	7.50%	31.32%
Post Office	9,591,522	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Resources	9,697,709	9,588,953	9,876,550	10,567,908	11,601,260	13,509,424	16.45%	39.31%	40.89%
Rules	5,594,763	4,433,817	4,649,102	5,069,424	5,370,773	5,669,311	5.56%	1.33%	27.87%
Science	11,422,403	8,411,326	8,677,830	8,931,726	10,628,041	11,690,845	10.00%	2.35%	38.99%
Small Business	5,775,674	3,791,580	3,906,941	4,148,880	4,798,783	5,120,301	6.70%	-11.35%	35.04%
Ethics	2,117,012	1,981,150	2,456,300	2,632,915	2,871,091	3,071,250	6.97%	45.07%	55.02%
Transportation	11,893,752	10,878,981	12,184,459	13,220,138	14,479,551	16,461,893	13.69%	38.41%	51.32%
Veterans Affairs	5,258,373	4,220,605	4,344,160	4,735,135	5,142,263	5,486,795	6.70%	4.34%	30.00%
Ways & Means	16,328,446	10,219,358	11,036,907	11,930,338	14,748,888	15,976,288	8.32%	-2.16%	56.33%
Reserve Fund	0	0	7,900,000	3,000,000	0	0	*	*	*
TOTAL	223,265,418	155,682,646	177,771,138	183,378,663	203,506,705	222,659,096	9.41%	-0.27%	43.02%
Percent Change		-30.27%	14.19%	3.15%	10.98%	9.41%			
<i>Note: Republicans eliminated the Post Office, Merchant Marine and D.C. Committees folding jurisdiction into Armed Forces and Gov't Reform</i>									
COMPARISONS:	<i>Note: These offices are funded on a Fiscal Year basis</i>								
Leadership	22,114,000	23,385,000	27,177,000	30,288,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	36.96%
<i>Percent Change</i>		5.75%	16.22%	11.45%					
MRA	711,720,000	743,102,000	791,558,000	889,654,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	25.00%
<i>Percent Change</i>		4.41%	6.52%	12.39%					
Approps	45,575,000	35,586,000	40,681,000	43,630,000	NA	NA	NA	NA	-4.27%
<i>Percent Change</i>		-21.92%	14.32%	7.25%					

