



ENGROSSMENT[®] *

And, the Survey Says . . .

Legislative Intent Service, Inc. sent out an electronic Survey to our clients on January 5, 2009 to survey their satisfaction with the different services that we provide. Each one of the responders received a 25% off coupon for customized research for one bill. We thought you'd enjoy reading about some of the results of the survey.

The survey responders could be divided into four categories, with the most responses by far coming from attorneys, followed in second place by librarians, then paralegals, and then other assorted professionals in the legal field, such as officers of corporations, senior legal analysts, administrative assistants, and legal secretaries. Within the attorneys category, there were partners, owners, associates, and state attorneys.

The biggest range of research orders from our responding clients is in the one-to-five orders a year, followed closely by the six-to-eleven times a year category. Providing a quote prior to ordering was a very popular choice, ranging from absolutely important to somewhat important. In fact, the librarians were nearly tied in both categories of asking for a quote for "most" and "all" of the times.

It surprised us here at **LEGISLATIVE INTENT SERVICE, INC.** that a large group of responders have never logged onto our website to simply check to see if their bill was available for quick purchase at our **LegIntentSTORE** site. We have this and our points and authorities and sample motions available at www.legintent.com, and also coupons, newsletters, and FAQs, which might be useful to look at.

Most of the responders found that it was either extremely or very important to first communicate with an attorney before placing a custom research order, with most of the attorneys who responded indicating on the survey that it was "extremely important."

When our responding clients did visit our website, we found that the librarians were the more user friendly visitors when it came to navigating through our website. Attorneys seemed to focus in on the points and authorities far above any of the other choices.

Thank you again to everyone who responded to our January New Year's Survey – taking the time to answer our questions and even provide comments, all of which we appreciated. Your answers and comments will help us to improve our legislative history and intent research service for everyone.

HR 1 of 2009

LEGISLATIVE INTENT SERVICE, INC. provides federal legislative history research, so we thought for this Spring issue that we would take a look at one major federal bill: **HR 1 of 2009**. HR 1, which enacted the **American Recovery and Reinvestment Act** (also known as "the stimulus bill"), was signed into law on February 17, 2009 (Public Law 111-5) by President Barack Obama. This bill makes supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009. The purpose of this Act was stated very early on in this bill as follows:

- (a) *Statement of Purposes.* – *The purposes of this Act include the following:*
- (1) *To preserve and create jobs and promote economic recovery.*
 - (2) *To assist those most impacted by the recession.*
 - (3) *To provide investments needed to increase economic efficiency by spurring technological advances in science and health.*
 - (4) *To invest in transportation, environmental protection, and other*

infrastructure that will provide long-term economic benefits.

(5) To stabilize State and local government budgets, in order to minimize and avoid reductions in essential services and counterproductive State and local tax increases.

This is a massive bill with numerous provisions affecting topics that included agriculture buildings and facilities, the Omnibus Crime Control and Safety Street Act of 1968, water reclamation, smart grid regional demonstration initiative, small business loans, homeland security, National Park Service, the Administration for Children and Families, military construction and Veterans Affairs, transportation, tax relief, renewable energy incentives, financing tools, unemployment insurance, health information technology, Medicaid, state fiscal relief, and recovery accountability and transparency, just to name a few.

As we reviewed the Congressional Record for HR 1, we found a large number of proposed amendments for the above-noted topics and other issues and topics. As an example, we set forth below one brief colloquy from the Record on HR 1:

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of Senator FEINGOLD and Senator MCCAIN, who I know have a very important amendment. They have allowed me to come to the floor before them and speak about the amendment Senator SNOWE and I will be offering later.

I thank Senator FEINGOLD and Senator MCCAIN, and it is not my intention to give a lengthy speech at this point.

Last week, Americans were horrified to hear the news that Citigroup and other companies receiving taxpayer money from the Troubled Asset Relief Program were paying their employees billions and billions of dollars in bonuses.

Today, along with Senator OLYMPIA SNOWE, our colleague from Maine, I will offer a bipartisan amendment to this legislation that makes it clear it is not enough to say these Wall Street bonuses are wrong; they have to be paid back.

Taxpayers must be protected, and that is what the amendment Senator SNOWE and I are

offering will do. Our proposal gives the institutions that received Troubled Asset Relief Program money and paid these outlandish bonuses a simple choice: The institutions will pay back the cash portion of any bonus paid in excess of \$100,000 within 120 days of the amendment's enactment or those institutions would face an excise tax of 35 percent on what is not repaid to the Treasury.

The money can be repaid by buying back the preferred stock the Federal Government owns in these companies or in any other fashion the institution chooses. Senator SNOWE and I have had extensive legal review with respect to the constitutionality of this provision. We believe it passes constitutional muster. (*February 4, 2009, Senate Debate in the Congressional Record, page S1478*)

Representative David Obey of Wisconsin was the lead author of H.R. 1. At this time, he is serving as chair of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Economics of Scale

When it comes to ordering legislative history and intent research, we offer **three opportunities** for **saving money** on your legislative history research.

1) We have posted a **SPRING COUPON** up at our website for **20%** off three bills per month.

2) If you are an *established client*, you can receive a **50%** off discount by **referring a new client** to us.

3) **LegIntentSTORE** offers legislative histories for a reduced rate of **\$300 per bill**.

Free MCLE

We offer a State Bar approved 1.0 free **self-study exam** on legislative intent. To access this exam, go to: <http://www.legintent.com/onlinemcle.php>

CONTACT US!

Tom Stallard, Esq., owner,
tstallard@legintent.com

Maria Sanders, Esq.,
msanders@legintent.com

Dianne Schaumburg, Esq.,
dschaumburg@legintent.com