



## H.R. 2088—United States Grain Standards Act Reauthorization Act of 2015, as amended (Rep. Conaway, R-TX)

**CONTACT:** NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE 9, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES WHICH REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY FOR PASSAGE.

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H.R. 2088](#) would reauthorize and amend the [United States Grain Standards Act](#) through September 30, 2020 by authorizing annual appropriations for the [Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration](#) (GIPSA) under the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

**COST:** The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) [estimates](#) that implementing H.R. 2088 would cost \$106 million over the 2016-2020 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. The bill would affect direct spending, and pay-as-you-go procedures apply. However, CBO estimates that such effects would not be significant in any year.

**DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** H.R. 2088 would extend GIPSA's authority to collect and spend fees for certain grain inspection and weighing services. Section 2 would state that it is the policy of Congress to promote the marketing of high-quality grain responsive to the purchase specifications of domestic and foreign buyers, and to provide an accurate, reliable, consistently available and cost-effective official grain inspection and weighing system. This section would also remove the Secretary of Agriculture's discretionary waiver authority in emergency situations and provides that transfers of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation are not required to be officially weighed. The bill would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to authorize state agencies and private entities to perform export inspection and weighing services and would specify procedures whereby such activities would continue during disaster conditions or other disruptions. A state agency delegated authority by the secretary retains the ability to request a cancellation of authority for any reason within 90 days advance notice to the Department of Agriculture. The House Report (H. Rept. 114-133) accompanying H.R. 2088 can be found [here](#).

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This bill was introduced on April 29, 2015, and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture which reported it on May 29, 2015.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration policy is available.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

## H.R. 205—Mandatory Price Reporting Act of 2015 (Rep. Conaway, R-TX)

**CONTACT:** NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE 9, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES WHICH REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY FOR PASSAGE.

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H.R. 2051](#) would reauthorize U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) data reporting on cattle, swine, lambs, and other livestock prices through September 30, 2020. The current authorization would expire on September 30, 2015.

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

**DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** Section 2 of the bill would mandate the U.S. Department of Agriculture to continue reporting and publishing the required daily reporting information during a shutdown or emergency furlough as a result of a lapse in appropriations.

**COST:** The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) [estimates](#) that implementing H.R. 2051 would cost \$36 million over the 2016-2020 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. This bill would not affect direct spending or revenues, and pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

Section 3 would amend swine reporting requirements to include the total number and weighted average price of barrows and gilts purchased through negotiated purchases and negotiated formula purchases” to the list of information the Secretary of Agriculture is required to publish in a prior day report.

Section 4 would mandate that the Secretary of Agriculture to revise the pertinent parts of the lamb reporting regulations, not later than 180 days after the bill’s enactment, to modify the definition of the term “importer.” The modification would require that the Secretary include only importers that imported an average of 1,000 metric tons of lamb during the immediately preceding 4 calendar years.

Section 5 would require the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Economist and in consultation with cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants, to conduct a study on the program of information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lambs, and products derived from such livestock. The House Report (H. Rept. 114-132) accompanying H.R. 2051 can be found [here](#).

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This bill was introduced on April 28, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration policy is available.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The ability to regulate interstate commerce and with foreign Nations pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 includes the power to collect and report livestock market prices.

## H.R. 2394—National Forest Foundation Reauthorization Act of 2015 (Rep. Thompson, R-PA)

---

**CONTACT:** NICHOLAS RODMAN, NICHOLAS.RODMAN@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 6-8576

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE 9, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES WHICH REQUIRES TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY FOR PASSAGE.

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H.R. 2394](#) would reauthorize the National Forest Foundation Act.

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** No.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** No.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** No.
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?** No.

**COST:** The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) [estimates](#) that implementing H.R. 2394 would cost \$9 million over the 2016-2018 period. H.R. 2394 would not affect direct spending or revenues, and pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply.

**DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** H.R. 2394 would authorize the appropriation of \$3 million a year through 2018 to support the [National Forest Foundation](#), a nonprofit corporation established by federal law that awards grants to maintain and restore recreational resources, such as trails, watersheds, wildlife habitats, national forests, and grasslands.

Section 2 would extend the authority for authorization of appropriations at a level of \$3 million a year from Fiscal Years 2016 through 2018. The previous authorization level was \$1 million a year. The House Report (H. Rept. 114-138) accompanying H.R. 2394 can be found [here](#).

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This bill was introduced on May 18, 2015, and was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration policy is available.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3, Congress has the authority to regulate foreign and interstate commerce.

# H.R. 235—Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act (Rep. Goodlatte, R-VA)

CONTACT: JENNIFER WEINHART, JENNIFER.WEINHART@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 202-226-0706

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H.R. 235](#) would make permanent a moratorium on internet access taxes and multiple and discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce.

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No**
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority? Yes** according to the CBO.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No**
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No**

**DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** The Internet Tax Freedom Act (ITFA) was enacted on October 21, 1998, as part of [P.L. 105-277](#). ITFA placed a moratorium on the ability of state and local governments to impose new taxes on internet access or impose multiple or discriminatory taxes on electronic commerce. That moratorium was extended in 2001, 2003, and again in 2004. It was extended on December 16, 2014 under [the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act of 2015](#). It is currently set to expire on October 1, 2015.

A similar bill ([H.R. 3086](#)) passed in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress by voice vote. The legislative bulletin for H.R. 3086 can be found [here](#).

Last year the Heritage Foundation published an Issue Brief that details the need for permanence of a moratorium on state and local internet access taxes. The Issue Brief can be viewed [here](#).

## **OUTSIDE GROUPS SUPPORT:**

[National Taxpayers Union](#)  
[National Association of Counties](#)  
[National League of Cities](#)  
[U.S. Conference of Mayors](#)  
[International City/County Management Association](#)  
[Government Finance Officers Association](#)  
[National Association of Telecommunications Officers and Advisors](#)  
[TechAmerica](#)

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This bill was introduced on January 9, 2015, and was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration position is available.

**COST:** A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) cost estimate is not available for this legislation. However, CBO estimates that a similar bill, [H.R. 3086](#), would not affect direct spending or revenues, pay-as-you-go procedures do not apply. In addition, CBO estimates that the bill would impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) totaling more than several hundred million dollars annually.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 1 of the United States Constitution, Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, including, but not limited to, Clauses 1, 3, and 18.

# H.R. 889—The Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act (Rep. Chabot, R-OH)

**CONTACT:** JENNIFER WEINHART, JENNIFER.WEINHART@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 202-226-0706

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H.R. 889](#) would clarify that works of art that are loaned by foreign governments are immune from decisions by federal courts and cannot be seized if the President of the United States determines that it is in the national interest to display the works of art.

**COST:** The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) [estimates](#) the bill would have no significant effect on the federal budget and enacting H.R. 889 would not affect

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** There are no major substantive concerns.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No**
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority? No**
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No**
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No**

**DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:** Under current law, a [provision](#) in the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act (FSIA) discourages foreign governments from lending government-owned works of art and objects of cultural importance to U.S. institutions. Specifically, this provision could potentially expose foreign governments to litigation in U.S. courts for which they would otherwise be immune. This legislation would address this issue by making a narrowly tailored change to FSIA, making it easier for U.S. museums and educational institutions to borrow artwork and other objects from foreign nations. The prohibition from seizure does not apply to works of art taken in violation of international law between January 30, 1993, and May 8, 1945, during the time of Nazi rule.

An identical bill ([H.R. 4292](#)) was passed in the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress by a vote of [388-4](#). A legislative bulletin for H.R. 4292 can be found [here](#).

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This bill was introduced on January 9, 2015 and was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration policy is available.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: The constitutional authority on which this legislation is based is found in article 1, section 8, clause 9; article 3, section 1, clause 1; and article 3, section 2, clause 2, of the Constitution, which grant Congress authority over federal courts.

# H. Res. 295—Supporting Local Law Enforcement Agencies in their Continued Work to Serve our Communities, and Supporting their Use of Body Work Cameras to Promote Transparency to Protect Both Citizens and Officers Alike (Rep. Green D-TX)

---

**CONTACT:** JENNIFER WEINHART, JENNIFER.WEINHART@MAIL.HOUSE.GOV, 202-226-0706

**FLOOR SCHEDULE:** SCHEDULED FOR CONSIDERATION ON JUNE, 2015, UNDER A SUSPENSION OF THE RULES

**TOPLINE SUMMARY:** [H. Res. 295](#) would express the sense of Congress regarding local law enforcement agency use of body worn cameras.

**COST:** A Congressional Budget Office (CBO) cost estimate is not available.

**CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:** Some have expressed concern that the use of body cameras by law enforcement infringes upon civil liberties. A Cato article discussing the issue can be found [here](#).

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government? No**
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority? No**
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch? No**
- **Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No**

**DETAILED SUMMARY:** H. Res. 295 would recognize law enforcement officers in their work to protect communities. It would also recognize the potential for body-worn cameras to be worn by all on-duty law enforcement officers while carrying out their duties, and to increase transparency. H. Res. 295 would also encourage state and local law enforcement agencies to consider the use of body-worn cameras and address policies and protocols to handle privacy and other concerns.

**COMMITTEE ACTION:** This resolution was introduced on June 3, 2015, and was referred to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

**ADMINISTRATION POSITION:** No statement of administration policy is available.

**CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:** House Rules do not require a constitutional authority statement for House resolutions.

---

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

###