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SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS AND THE ORIGINATION CLAUSE: A TAX ON CROOKS?

INTRODUCTION

Since 1984, the federal government has collected a small monetary assessment from all convicted defendants for each federal crime committed. This "special assessment on convicted persons" ranges from five to two hundred dollars depending on the seriousness of the crime and the status of the criminal. Once collected by the sentencing court, the special assessments and any criminal fines are deposited into the Crime Victims Fund, a separate account in the United States Treasury. The Attorney General distributes the funds annually to eligible state programs that compensate and assist crime victims.

Recently, criminal defendants have attacked the constitutionality of the special assessment provision, Section 3013 of Title 18, under the origination clause of the Constitution. The origination clause requires that all bills for raising revenue originate in the House of Representatives, but permits the Senate to amend House-originated revenue bills. The Supreme Court has construed the term "raising revenue" narrowly so that many statutes that generate funds for specific government programs do not raise revenue under the origination clause. Nonetheless, if Section 3013 constitutes a revenue raising device, the legislation must have originated in the House rather than in the Senate to be constitutional.

2. All criminal fines collected upon conviction are deposited into the Crime Victims Fund, with the exception of the following: fines imposed pursuant to the Endangered Species Act and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981, fines collected for the railroad unemployment insurance account, the Postal Service Fund, the navigable waters revolving fund and certain fines for county public school funds. See 42 U.S.C. § 10601(b)(1) (Supp. V 1987).
3. See id. § 10601(a).
4. See id. § 10602-03.
5. U.S. Const. art. I, § 7, cl. 1; see, e.g., United States v. King, No. 891 F.2d 780, 781 (10th Cir. 1989) (Section 3013 constitutional); United States v. Newman, 889 F.2d 88, 91 (6th Cir. 1989) (same); United States v. Herrada, 887 F.2d 524, 527-28 (5th Cir.) (same), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-6282 (filed Dec. 15, 1989); United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d 36, 44 (3d Cir.) (same), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5727 (filed Oct. 2, 1989); United States v. Ashburn, 884 F.2d 901, 903 (6th Cir. 1989) (same); United States v. Griffin, 884 F.2d 655, 656 (2d Cir.) (same), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5493 (filed Sept. 2, 1989); United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 661 (9th Cir. 1988) (Section 3013 unconstitutional), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).
6. The origin clause of the Constitution mandates that "[a]ll Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills." U.S. Const. art. I, § 7, cl. 1. To violate the origin clause, a statute must qualify as a revenue bill and originate in the Senate. See Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 657. A Senate amendment of a House revenue bill withstands constitutional challenge if it is germane to the House bill. See Flint v. Stone Tracy Co., 220 U.S. 107, 143 (1911).
7. See infra notes 30-45 and accompanying text.
8. See Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 657. Surprisingly courts first ask whether the bill at issue raises revenue. See, e.g., United States v. Herrada, 887 F.2d 524, 525 (5th Cir.),
The lower courts have disagreed about whether Section 3013 violates the origination clause. Although there is some dispute as to where Section 3013 originated, the controversy mainly focuses on whether the special assessment, which clearly raises money for the government, is the type of revenue measure covered by the origination clause. Some courts have asserted that although the collection of a special assessment raises money, the statute does not raise revenue within the meaning of the origination clause because its purpose is to help finance the Crime Victims Fund. Other courts have reasoned that Section 3013 does not implicate the origination clause because the special assessment is a penalty, not a tax. The Ninth Circuit has held that the provision violates the Constitution because it is a revenue-raising device that did not originate in the House of Representatives and is not a germane Senate amendment to a House revenue bill.

petition for cert. filed, No. 89-6282 (filed Dec. 15, 1989); United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d 36, 40 (3d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5727 (filed Oct. 2, 1989); United States v. Griffin, 884 F.2d 655, 656 (2d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5483 (filed Sept. 2, 1989); United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 657 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989). Thus they can avoid the more difficult question of where the legislation originated. The analysis in this Note follows the order of the courts that have decided the issue.

9. See infra notes 162-166 and accompanying text.


12. See United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 661 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989). Since then, the Ninth Circuit has vacated imposition of the
This Note argues that Section 3013 is constitutional. Part I sets the framework for an origination clause analysis by reviewing the reasons for its inclusion in the Constitution and analyzing the Supreme Court's interpretation of the clause. Part II explores the purposes behind the creation of the Crime Victims Fund and the special assessment provision. Part III examines the controversy among the circuits and the rationales used by courts considering the issue. This Note concludes that Section 3013 is constitutional because its purpose is to finance the Crime Victims Fund and not to raise general federal revenue.

I. THE ORIGINATION CLAUSE

A. The Framers

The origination clause engendered much controversy at the 1787 Constitutional Convention. The framers of the Constitution vested the power of origination in the House of Representatives as part of the Great Compromise that ended the controversy over state suffrage. Through the Great Compromise, the framers agreed to allow equal representation in the Senate for all states regardless of size in exchange for proportional representation in the House.

The origination clause reflected the belief of many delegates that the House should possess exclusive revenue-raising power. They believed such a restriction to be necessary because House members were "more immediately the representatives of the people, and it was a maxim that the people ought to hold the purse-strings." These delegates recommended that each House member represent 40,000 state inhabitants. This body, as the direct representative of the people, would have the power to originate all bills for raising or appropriating money. As a concession to the larger states, each state would exercise an equal vote in...
the Senate, but the Senate would have no power to alter or amend money bills.19

Although the framers adopted the Great Compromise on July 16, 1787,20 the origination clause language was later modified to reduce the House’s exclusive power.21 The final version granted the House exclusive power to originate revenue-raising bills, both houses authority to appropriate money22 and the Senate power to amend House-originated revenue bills.23

B. Supreme Court Cases

Ironically, the provision that provoked such debate and “had seriously threatened to break up the Convention” has not often been used to strike down statutes.24 The Supreme Court has decided only five origination clause cases.25 All these challenges failed, either because the bill at issue did not raise revenue26 or because the provision was a permissible Senate amendment to a germane House-originated revenue bill.27 Only two lower courts have nullified laws for origination clause violations.28 The paucity of cases is largely due to the Supreme Court’s narrow view of what types of bills raise revenue in the manner contemplated by the origi-

---

21. See id. at 669-71.
24. Id.
27. See Rainey, 232 U.S. at 317; Flint, 220 U.S. at 143.
nation clause. In United States v. Norton, the Supreme Court held that the act establishing a postal money order system was not a revenue law even though fees on the sale of money orders were deposited into the United States Treasury. Focusing on Congress’ intent in enacting the provision, the Court reasoned that the term “revenue law” was restricted to laws “made for the direct and avowed purpose of creating revenue or public funds for the service of the government.”

The Court noted that the application of the origination clause “had been confined to bills to levy taxes in the strict sense of the words, and had not been understood to extend to bills for other purposes which incidentally create revenue.” Neither the act’s title—An Act To Establish a Postal Money-Order System nor its legislative history indicated that Congress intended the Act to raise revenue. Thus, because the Act’s purpose was to establish a postal money order system, it was not a revenue law even though all money and fees from the sale of money orders were deposited into the United States Treasury.

30. 91 U.S. 566 (1875).
31. The Court used the definition of revenue under the origination clause to determine whether the act was a revenue law. See id. at 568-69.
32. Norton, a clerk in the New York money order office, was indicted for embezzling funds from his office in violation of the act to establish a postal money order system. See id. at 566-67. The case turned on the applicable statute of limitations. See id. at 567. The statute of limitations for crimes against the United States was two years; if the crime alleged arose under a revenue law, however, another statute extended the statute of limitations to five years. The Court concluded that the longer statute of limitations did not apply because the act to establish a postal money order system was not a revenue law. See id. at 567-68.
33. Id. at 569 (quoting Justice Story in United States v. Mayo, 26 F. Cas. 1230, 1231 (C.C.D. Mass. 1813) (No. 15,755)).
35. 13 Stat. 76 (1864).
36. See Norton, 91 U.S. at 567-68. The express objective of the act was “to promote public convenience, and to insure greater security in the transmission of money through the United States mails.” Id.
Twin City Bank v. Nebeker\textsuperscript{37} involved an origination clause challenge to the National Banking Act. To further the National Banking Act's goals, Congress imposed a tax on the average amount of circulating notes of banking associations. Justice Harlan, writing for the Court, refused to formulate a test or define revenue bills because "[w]hat bills belong to that class is a question of such magnitude and importance that it is the part of wisdom not to attempt, by any general statement, to cover every possible phase of the subject."\textsuperscript{38} The majority opinion, however, emphasized the National Banking Act's main purpose of creating a national currency.\textsuperscript{39} The Court noted that the tax provided a "means for effectually accomplishing" this purpose and that "[t]here was no purpose . . . to raise revenue to be applied in meeting the expenses or obligations of the Government" through the Act.\textsuperscript{40} Despite Justice Harlan's disclaimer about general formulas, courts have focused upon this language and the Norton analysis to support an inquiry into Congress' purpose in enacting a statute.\textsuperscript{41}

A few years later, in Millard v. Roberts,\textsuperscript{42} the Court upheld the constitutionality of acts that imposed property taxes in the District of Columbia to finance a railroad terminal and to support the elimination of railroad grade crossings.\textsuperscript{43} The Court relied on Twin City Bank and, without adding to the analysis,\textsuperscript{44} concluded that "[w]hatever taxes are imposed are but means to the purposes provided by the act."\textsuperscript{45}

The two most recent Supreme Court cases,\textsuperscript{46} decided in 1911 and 1914, differ from Norton, Twin City Bank and Millard. The later decisions rest on findings that a particular act was a constitutional Senate amendment to a revenue bill that properly originated in the House. They do not explore the meaning of revenue bills under the origination clause.

The plaintiffs in Flint v. Stone Tracy Co. contended that a corporation tax law was unconstitutional because it did not originate in the House.\textsuperscript{47} The Court held that the tax was constitutional because the Senate, in enacting the bill, had properly exercised its power to amend a House revenue bill.\textsuperscript{48} Three years later, in Rainey v. United States,\textsuperscript{49} the Court

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{37} 167 U.S. 196 (1897).
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Id. at 202.
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Id. at 203.
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} See infra notes 86-91 and accompanying text.
  \item \textsuperscript{42} 202 U.S. 429 (1906).
  \item \textsuperscript{43} See id. at 435-38.
  \item \textsuperscript{44} The Court stated that "[i]n answer to the contention the case of Twin City Bank v. Nebeker . . . need only be cited." Id. at 436 (citation omitted).
  \item \textsuperscript{45} Id. at 437.
  \item \textsuperscript{46} See Rainey v. United States, 232 U.S. 310 (1914); Flint v. Stone Tracy Co., 220 U.S. 107 (1911).
  \item \textsuperscript{47} See Flint, 220 U.S. at 142.
  \item \textsuperscript{48} See id. at 143. The legislative history revealed that the House had introduced a general revenue bill that imposed an inheritance tax. The Senate then permissibly substituted the corporation tax for the inheritance tax. See id. The substitution did not violate
\end{itemize}
upheld a tariff act imposing an excise tax upon the use of foreign-built pleasure yachts.\textsuperscript{50} Wary of questioning "an enrolled and duly authenticated Act of Congress," the Court declined to divine whether the Senate amendment was related to the purpose of the House bill and adopted the holding of the lower court.\textsuperscript{51}

The Supreme Court has not decided an origination clause challenge since 1914.\textsuperscript{52} Lower courts have followed the Supreme Court's lead and

the origination clause because the "amendment was germane to the subject-matter" of a revenue bill that had properly originated in the House. \textit{Id.}

The \textit{Flint} decision has recently been the basis for denying numerous constitutional challenges to the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 ("TEFRA"). \textit{See Texas Ass'n of Concerned Taxpayers, Inc. v. United States, 772 F.2d 163, 168 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 476 U.S. 1151 (1985); Armstrong v. United States, 759 F.2d 1378, 1382 (9th Cir. 1985); Wardell v. United States, 757 F.2d 203, 204 (8th Cir. 1985); Heitman v. United States, 753 F.2d 33, 35 (6th Cir. 1984) (per curiam); Rowe v. United States, 583 F. Supp. 1516, 1519 (D. Del.), aff'd mem., 749 F.2d 27 (3d Cir. 1984); Kloes v. United States, 578 F. Supp. 270, 272 (W.D. Wis. 1984); Pub. L. No. 97-248, 96 Stat. 324 (1982). These courts relied on \textit{Flint} to hold that TEFRA is a permissible amendment to a House revenue bill because it is germane to the subject matter of the bill even though it increases rather than decreases revenue.

49. 232 U.S. 310 (1914).
50. \textit{See id.} at 315, 317.
51. \textit{See id.} at 317.

Both \textit{Flint} and \textit{Rainey} expressly left open the issue of whether the judiciary may examine the origination of an act once both houses of Congress have passed the act. \textit{See id.; Flint v. Stone Tracy Co., 220 U.S. 107, 143 (1911).}


The Fifth Circuit did hold that an origination clause challenge to TEFRA presented a nonjusticiable political question. \textit{See Texas Ass'n, 772 F.2d at 167. But see Armstrong v. United States, 759 F.2d 1378, 1381-82 (9th Cir. 1985) (challenge to TEFRA justiciable). However, that Circuit later distinguished the special assessment challenge from its Texas Association decision. \textit{See Herrada, 887 F.2d at 525 n.1. The court reasoned that because Congress had debated whether the TEFRA bill violated the origination clause, judicial inquiry might express a lack of respect due to the legislature. In the present challenge, Congress had not considered whether Section 3013 adhered to the origination clause so courts could properly review the issue. \textit{See id.}}

A full discussion of the political question doctrine is beyond the scope of this Note.

have found very few violations of the origination clause.  

II. THE VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1984

A. Legislative History

After a "decade long bipartisan effort of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary," 53 Congress passed the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984, 55 an extensive scheme to improve federal criminal laws and procedures. 56 In response to growing concern for crime victims, Congress included the Victims of Crime Assistance Act of 1984 (the "Victims Assistance Act") as Chapter XIV of the larger Crime Control Act. 57

Through the Victims Assistance Act, the Committee on the Judiciary intended to "provide limited Federal funding to the States, with minimal bureaucratic 'strings attached,' for direct compensation and service programs to assist victims of crime [and] . . . to improve Federal efforts which assist crime victims."  58 The Act was a response to the inadequacy of existing victim compensation and assistance efforts, 59 the need to encourage "welcome" participation of witnesses and the sentiment that the

hear the present issue in United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).

53. See, e.g., Sperry Corp. v. United States, 12 Cl. Ct. 736, 743 (1987) (Iran Claims Act did not violate origination clause because revenue raised was incidental to act's purpose of expediting settlement of claims against Iran and reducing cost of maintaining Tribunal), rev'd on other grounds, 853 F.2d 904 (Fed. Cir. 1988); rev'd on other grounds, 110 S. Ct. 387 (1989); Mulroy, 569 F. Supp. at 265 (deduction from milk sale price did not raise revenue but was means of regulating milk production under commerce clause); State ex rel. Tindal v. Block, 717 F.2d 874, 887 (4th Cir. 1983) (milk deduction to reduce overproduction found constitutional because primary purpose was regulation), cert. denied, 465 U.S. 1080 (1984). But see Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 656 (imposition of special assessments on convicted persons violates origination clause); Hubbard v. Lowe, 226 F. 135, 139 (S.D.N.Y. 1915) (Cotton Futures Act unconstitutional because it originated in Senate).

One district court expressed disdain for the Supreme Court's narrow construction of the term revenue. While acknowledging the statute's constitutionality under Supreme Court precedent, the court asserted that holding the special assessment unconstitutional would more properly reflect the intent of the framers of the Constitution. See United States v. Vines, 718 F. Supp. 895, 899 (S.D. Ala. 1989).


The Victims Assistance Act was approved "at a time when violent crime—and a widespread perception that the courts are too lenient on offenders—made victims more vocal in asserting their rights." Richburg, Justice Department Molds Program Aimed at Helping Crime Victims, Wash. Post, March 14, 1985, at A17, col. 4.

58. Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3607.

59. Although many states had victim assistance and victim compensation programs,
federal government should share the responsibility of assisting crime victims rather than place the entire financial burden on the states.60

To realize these goals, the Victims Assistance Act established a separate account in the United States Treasury, called the Crime Victims Fund (the "Fund").61 The Fund grants to eligible state crime victim compensation programs amounts equal to 35 percent of the program's disbursements for the previous year, excluding property damage awards.62 It also grants each state $100,000 for the financial support of eligible crime victim assistance programs.63 Congress hoped that the Victims Assistance Act would minimize conditions on federal aid.64

Congress placed much of the burden of financing the Fund upon convicted criminals because these "wrongdoers" were responsible for the victims' suffering.65 The sources of deposits include criminal fines, special assessments, forfeited appearance bonds and public donations.66

The bill originally did not provide for special assessments or donations.67 The prospect of expenditures to assist crime victims, however, worried members of the Committee on the Judiciary and prompted them to consider supplementary sources for the Fund.68 Responding to this concern, the Committee amended the bill by raising the maximum for criminal fines and improving fine collection procedures.69 In addition, the Committee authorized the imposition of special assessment fees they were underfunded—"plagued by a backlog of cases, a shortage of funds and a lack of publicity." Richburg, supra note 57, at col. 4.

Advocates of federal assistance argued that federal funds would allow states to implement much needed improvements, such as increases in the maximum allowance, removal of minimal damage requirements and coverage of property loss. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3609.

60. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3610.


The purpose of the Fund is to help finance state crime victim compensation programs and to enhance federal and state victim assistance programs. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3610.


63. See id. at § 10602(a)(1).

64. See id. at § 10603(a)(3)(A). Victim assistance programs are more service-oriented than compensatory in nature; they include crisis intervention services, programs to assist victims acting as witnesses in criminal justice proceedings and programs to aid victims in securing compensation benefits. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3616-17.

Congress was particularly concerned with funding programs designed to assist victims of sexual assault, spousal abuse and child abuse. See 42 U.S.C. 10603(a)(2)(A) (Supp. V 1987).

65. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3615.

66. See id. at 3611. The Fund, however, does not preclude public donations. The Senate Report states: "Money for the Fund would come exclusively from convicted criminals or public donations." Id. (emphasis added).


68. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3611.

69. See id.

70. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3611, 3620-25.
through Title II of the Victims Assistance Act\textsuperscript{71} and permitted public donations through Title III.\textsuperscript{72}

### B. Special Assessment Fees

The imposition of the "penalty" assessment or the "special"\textsuperscript{73} assessment under Section 3013 is the only source of deposits to the Fund challenged by defendants under the origination clause.\textsuperscript{74} The Senate introduced and passed Section 3013 as part of the Victims Assistance Act, but the House did not pass the bill.\textsuperscript{75} The Senate later added the Victims Assistance Act, including Section 3013, to a continuing appropriation resolution introduced by the House.\textsuperscript{76} The entire bill became law on October 12, 1984.\textsuperscript{77}

In the statute's original form, the fee assessed on individual defendants was $25 for each misdemeanor conviction and $50 for each felony conviction. Defendants other than individuals, such as partnerships or corporations, had to pay $100 for each misdemeanor conviction and $200 for each felony conviction.\textsuperscript{78} In both the original and current versions of the statute, this mandatory special assessment on all convicted persons is collected by the sentencing court "in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases."\textsuperscript{79}

Unfortunately, Section 3013 does not indicate that the money collected will be deposited into the Fund to accomplish the goals of the Victims Assistance Act. The statute defines an offense for the purposes of the section, specifies the amount to be assessed, the manner of collection and the duration of the obligation to pay,\textsuperscript{80} but does not indicate the destination of the funds collected. If the Senate passed Section 3013 without a specific purpose in mind, it is likely the statute would violate the origina-

\textsuperscript{71.} See id. at 3619.
\textsuperscript{72.} See id. at 3620.
\textsuperscript{73.} Although Section 3013 labels the mandatory fee collected from convicted persons a "special assessment," both the legislative history and the statute establishing the Crime Victims Fund describe the assessment as a penalty assessment. Compare 18 U.S.C. § 3013 (1988) ("special assessment on convicted persons") with 42 U.S.C. § 10601(b)(2) (Supp. V 1987) ("penalty assessments collected under section 3013 of title 18"); Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3619 ("penalty assessment fees to be imposed by the Federal courts upon defendants convicted of offenses.").
\textsuperscript{74.} See supra notes 9-12 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{75.} See infra notes 155-157 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{76.} See infra notes 158-160 and accompanying text.
\textsuperscript{78.} See 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (Supp. V 1987), amended by 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (1988). The 1988 amendment adjusts the amount imposed according to the degree of the misdemeanor committed. Individual misdemeanants must now pay $5 for a class C misdemeanor, $10 for a class B misdemeanor and $25 for a class A misdemeanor. Defendants other than individuals are assessed $25, $50 and $125, respectively. See 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (1988).
\textsuperscript{79.} Id. at § 3013(b).
ORIGINATION CLAUSE

A. Purpose Analysis

Because the origination clause applies only to revenue-raising bills, the first question is whether the special assessment provision raises revenue.\(^8\) The proper inquiry is whether Congress enacted Section 3013 to meet the general expenses and obligations of the government, or whether it passed the bill for non-revenue purposes which incidentally raise revenue.\(^8\) If Section 3013 was not enacted for the "direct and avowed purpose of creating revenue," but was passed "for other purposes which may incidentally create revenue,"\(^8\) the statute does not fall within the purview of the origination clause and the inquiry ends.\(^9\)

Supreme Court case law indicates that as long as the ultimate purpose of a government program is not to raise income for the government, "acts which establish government programs and also impose taxes or fees

---

81. While the legislative history of the Victims Assistance Act spans twenty pages, the Senate Report devotes only one paragraph exclusively to the imposition of special assessments. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3619-20.
82. See infra notes 102-104 and accompanying text.
84. See infra notes 112-114 and accompanying text.
85. See infra notes 122-125 and accompanying text.
86. "The analysis of an origination clause issue is straightforward and tracks the language of the clause. First, we must gauge whether the statute falls within the class of revenue raising bills covered by the clause." United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 657 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).
to defray the costs of those programs do not raise revenue within the meaning of the Origination Clause.\textsuperscript{90} Even if a bill levies a tax, it is not deemed a revenue raising bill if the taxing provision furthers a non-revenue raising objective of the bill.\textsuperscript{91}

Although a statute's explicit language is most important in determining its constitutionality,\textsuperscript{92} the language of Section 3013 gives little guidance about the purpose of the special assessment.\textsuperscript{93} The statute does not specify the purpose of the funds, nor does it indicate that the funds will be deposited into the Crime Victims Fund.\textsuperscript{94} However, Section 10601, the statute that created the Crime Victims Fund, refers to money collected under Section 3013.\textsuperscript{95} Section 10601 states that deposits into the Fund include "penalty assessments collected under section 3013 of

\textsuperscript{90} United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d 36, 41 (3d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5727 (filed Oct. 2, 1989); see, e.g., United States v. Herrada, 887 F.2d 524, 528 (5th Cir.) (Supreme Court cases "instruct us to consider the overarching purpose of an Act" in origination clause analysis), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-6282 (filed Dec. 15, 1989); United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 658 (9th Cir. 1988) (Supreme Court precedents "mandate an inquiry into the purposes of the special assessment legislation"), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989); United States v. Vines, 718 F. Supp. 895, 897 (S.D. Ala. 1989) (determinative constitutional question is "exactly what Congress' intended purposes were in enacting the special assessment provision"); Conner, 715 F. Supp. at 1330 (courts "must consider Congress' purpose in enacting the special assessment provision"); United States v. Valentine, 715 F. Supp. 51, 52 (W.D.N.Y. 1989) (necessary to examine Section 3013's aim).


\textsuperscript{93} See Herrada, 887 F.2d at 526; United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 658 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989); United States v. Conner, 715 F. Supp. 1327, 1330 (W.D.N.C. 1989); United States v. Michaels, 706 F. Supp. 699, 701 (D. Minn. 1989). The provision for collection in the same manner as for a criminal fine might "suggest that the assessment is analogous to a criminal fine, and thus is punitive," or it "may be interpreted as a purely procedural requirement." Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 658.

The statute as originally enacted read:

(a) The court shall assess on any person convicted of an offense against the United States—

(1) in the case of a misdemeanor—

(A) the amount of $25 if the defendant is an individual; and
(B) the amount of $100 if the defendant is a person other than an individual; and

(2) in the case of a felony—

(A) the amount of $50 if the defendant is an individual; and
(B) the amount of $200 if the defendant is a person other than an individual.

(b) Such amount so assessed shall be collected in the manner that fines are collected in criminal cases.


\textsuperscript{94} See supra note 93. One court noted that "the language fails to limit or even to describe the use of the collected funds" and concluded that "this lack of restriction suggests that the revenue raising aspect of the bill is not subsidiary to any enunciated function." Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 658.

The legislative history demonstrates that Congress, by imposing the special assessment, intended to defray the costs of the Crime Victims Fund in furtherance of the Victims Assistance Act’s overall purpose. Courts have agreed that if Congress had clearly confined Section 3013 to the purpose of supporting the crime victims program, the provision would not implicate the origination clause. Yet several factors have prevented universal acceptance of the statute’s constitutionality: the single reference in the legislative history to the special assessment constituting “new income” for the government; a cap on annual deposits into the Fund; and a sunset provision terminating deposits into the Fund after a certain date. Despite arguments that these factors indicate a congressional purpose to raise revenue, further analysis establishes that Congress did not impose these limitations to raise revenue to meet the general expenses and obligations of the government.

96. Id.


99. The Ninth Circuit, declaring the special assessment unconstitutional, conceded that its legislative history demonstrated that the special assessment was “in part” intended to defray the costs of the crime victims program. See United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 658 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989). It acknowledged that even if the goal of supporting a victim assistance program were attainable only by raising revenue, the statute might have passed constitutional muster “[h]ad the proceeds been clearly confined to this purpose.” Id.

100. One circuit court of appeals that upheld the constitutionality of the statute admitted that the cap on deposits and sunset provisions “are two limitations in the statute which arguably cut against the conclusion” that it reached. United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d 36, 43 (3d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5727 (filed Oct. 2, 1989). The court added, however, that “[w]hile these provisions merit further discussion, we do not believe they convert the Act into a revenue raising measure.” Id.

101. Congress intended to use the special assessment to support the program to aid crime victims. See id.; United States v. Conner, 715 F. Supp. 1327, 1331 (W.D.N.C. 1989). But see Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 659 (failure to restrict use of collected funds indicates intent to raise general federal revenue).
1. New Income

Section 3013's legislative history suggests that funds collected by the special assessment "will constitute new income for the Federal government." Arguably, this assertion manifests congressional intent to raise revenue for the government's general use through the special assessment. Absent any other indication of a non-revenue raising purpose, Congress' action would violate the origination clause.

However, the sentence preceding the "new income" statement in the legislative history reveals that Congress intended to use the special assessment for the permissible purpose of defraying the costs of the government program. The Senate report reads in full:

"The purpose of imposing nominal assessment fees is to generate needed income to offset the cost of the new programs authorized under [the Victims Assistance Act]. Although substantial amounts will not result, these additional amounts will be helpful in financing the program and will constitute new income for the Federal government."

In addition, the sections in the legislative history discussing public donations and increases in maximum fines state that Congress passed Section 3013 to offset the costs of the victims assistance program. The statement that the special assessment would constitute new income was included to allay the legislature's concerns regarding the cost of the victims assistance program; the language does not indicate congressional intent to raise revenue for the general use of the government.

Furthermore, deposits attributed to the special assessment represent only a small portion of the Fund's total deposits that include criminal

102. Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3620.
104. See supra notes 86-91 and accompanying text.
107. Like the amendment imposing special assessments, the provision for permitting public donations declared that it was added "in an effort to raise revenue to help finance the program." Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3620. The section that both increases maximum fines for federal criminal offenses and improves fine collection procedures stated that "[a]s with penalty assessments and public donations, this Title is intended to increase revenue to offset the costs of the program." Id.
108. Congress enacted Section 3013, increased criminal fines and permitted public donations in response to congressional concern about increasing expenditures to support the victims assistance program. See United States v. Ashburn, 884 F.2d 901, 904 (6th Cir. 1989); supra notes 69-72 and accompanying text.
109. A significant feature of the proposed Victims of Crime Assistance Act was that it would not materially increase the federal budget deficit; . . . [the Fund] was not to be created or maintained primarily through the appropriation of federal funds." United States v. Michaels, 706 F. Supp. 699, 701 (D. Minn. 1989).
fines and public donations. As one court pointed out, "Because the special assessment was expected to generate only a small fraction of the amount necessary to fund the project, it seems unlikely that the drafters hoped that the assessments would both fund the project and raise additional revenue for the government."

2. Cap on Deposits

Another source of concern is a $100 million limit on annual deposits into the Fund. Any money collected in excess of the $100 million cap is deposited into the general fund of the United States Treasury. At first glance, the ceiling sum appears problematic because it could generate money for the government’s general use. Critics of the statute argue that this refusal to place an ultimate limitation on the use of the funds demonstrates that the primary purpose of the special assessment is to raise revenue for the government’s general use.

The purpose of the ceiling sum, however, is not to syphon money raised by special assessments into the United States Treasury. The Committee on the Judiciary believed that the cap was a way to control the size of the crime victims program under the Victims Assistance Act. Although Congress’ reasons for requiring this control are unclear, it acted to ensure that as much of the Fund as possible went to crime victims. The Committee selected the cap as the least restrictive method of control

110. In fiscal year 1987, for example, special assessments constituted only 4 percent of total deposits into the Fund. See Victims of Crime Act of 1984: A Report to Congress by the Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Victims of Crime, April 1988, at 12. Federal courts assessed $8.6 million that year but collected only about $1.9 million. In fiscal year 1988, the courts assessed $3.9 million, of which $146,000 was collected. See National Criminal Justice Association, Justice Bulletin, Vol. 8, No. 12, at 6 (Dec. 1988).

111. Simpson, 885 F.2d at 44 (emphasis in original).


113. See id.


115. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3615-16.

116. Instead of placing a ceiling sum on deposits, an earlier draft of the bill limited deposits into the Fund by requiring a percentage to be reverted into the Treasury’s general fund. See id. at 3611. Although criminal defendants challenging Section 3013 could have seized upon this earlier draft as evidence of congressional intent to raise revenue for the government’s general use, there is no indication that any have done so. A plausible explanation is that by substituting the ceiling sum for the percentage system, Congress manifested an intent to aid crime victims. In order to increase the amount available to aid crime victims, Congress substituted a limit on deposits for the complex percentage system. See id. “The Committee [on the Judiciary] believed a more equitable and fiscally responsible approach was to allow the entire Fund to be used for victims services, but to place a ceiling of $100 million on the Fund.” Id. That figure was deemed appropriate in
and that a more appropriate control on expenditures would be to place a maximum on the amount that would be deposited in the Fund.”

Since its enactment, the cap on deposits has been raised to increase aid to crime victims. In addition, Congress amended Section 3013 so that if deposits exceed the ceiling sum, less of the excess would go into the United States Treasury’s general fund. Moreover, of particular relevance to the origination clause purpose inquiry, Congress did not anticipate that deposits would reach, much less exceed, the cap. Because Congress did not expect deposits to exceed the cap, it could not have intended to raise revenue for the government’s general use.

comparison with two other crime assistance programs that also imposed caps on the dollar amount that could be collected to support the acts. See id.

The bill, as introduced, also required the state to return funds to which it was entitled but that it had not expended to the Treasury’s general fund. See id. at 3615. After much criticism, the provision was modified to give the director of each state’s compensation program the option of expending the funds for victim assistance or returning the funds to the Crime Victims Fund for redistribution in the next fiscal year. See id.

17. Id. at 3616.


19. In 1988, Congress amended the statute to provide that the first $2.2 million in excess of the ceiling sum would be used to cover administrative costs of the judiciary to collect criminal fines. 42 U.S.C.A. § 10601(c)(1)(A) (West Supp. 1989).


A Congressional Budget Office report stated that according to the Administration criminal fines would generate between $45 and $75 million in deposits into the Fund in 1984 under current law. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3627. Increasing the estimate to account for across-the-board fine increases, special assessments and public donations, the Committee on the Judiciary concluded that “deposits into the fund could conceivably range up to the $100 million ceiling imposed by the bill.” See id. The Congressional Budget Office report shows that Congress did not pass the Victims Assistance Act “for the purpose of filling government’s general-fund coffers.” United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d 36, 43 (3d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5727 (filed Oct. 2, 1989).

121. Subsequent history has proven Congress correct. In the Fund’s first four years, total revenue collected from criminal fines, special assessments and public donations did not exceed the ceiling sum. In fiscal year 1985, $68,312,955 was deposited into the Fund, well below the $100 million ceiling sum. See Victims of Crime Act of 1984: A Report to Congress by the Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime, April 1988, at 11 (on file at Fordham Law Review) [hereinafter Attorney General’s Report]. Congress increased the cap to $110 million for fiscal years 1986 through 1988. See 42 U.S.C.A. § 10601(c)(1). Deposits for those years totaled $62,506,345, $77,446,383 and $93,559,361, respectively. See Attorney General’s Report, supra, at 11; Table from United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office for Victims of Crime (Jan. 8, 1990) (on file at Fordham Law Review) [hereinafter Dep’t of Justice Table].

In fiscal year 1989, money collected exceeded the cap by approximately $8.5 million. Although Congress raised the ceiling sum to $125 million, potential deposits into the Fund totaled approximately $133.5 million. See Dep’t of Justice Table, supra. After deducting $2.2 million of excess funds to cover administrative judicial costs, only approximately $6.3 million remained for deposit into the United States Treasury’s general fund. See 42 U.S.C.A. § 10601(c)(1)(A) (West Supp. 1989).
3. Sunset Provision

Congress also imposed a "sunset" date after which no deposits could be made into the Fund. At that time, unless the legislature reevaluated the program and extended the sunset date, any unobligated deposits to the Fund would revert to the United States Treasury's general fund. Because Section 3013 does not provide a corresponding termination date for the collection of special assessments, it is conceivable that courts could continue to collect special assessments and instead of channeling them into the discontinued Fund, could deposit them into the Treasury.

Although it is unclear whether Congress intended to discontinue the collection of special assessments after the sunset date, there is little indication that Congress intended to use the sunset provision as a plan to help raise revenue for the general use of the government. The purpose of the sunset provision was to require Congress to "reevaluate the program and make any necessary improvements." That courts could continue to collect special assessments after the sunset date and deposit them into the United States Treasury's general fund is an incidental result of that date, not its principal function. Subsequent amendments extending the sunset date evidence that "the purpose of the original Act's sunset provision was to force Congress' hand, not to raise revenue."

In sum, neither the language of the statute nor its legislative history

---


123. Unobligated funds are monies that have been appropriated but remain uncommitted at the end of a fiscal period. See Webster's Third International Dictionary 2505 (1986).

124. See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3619.

125. Although there is no sunset date on the collection of criminal fines, such fines are not challenged under the origination clause.

126. Congress could easily clarify this confusion by amending Section 3013 to impose a corresponding sunset termination date on the collection of special assessments.


128. Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3619; see also United States v. Simpson, 885 F.2d at 44 (sunset provision intended to "force congressional reconsideration of the victim assistance program after several years of operation by cutting its funding").

129. See Simpson, 885 F.2d at 44.

130. Id. In 1988, Congress extended the original cut-off date of September 30, 1988 to September 30, 1994. See 42 U.S.C. § 10601(c)(2), amended by 42 U.S.C.A. § 10601(c)(2) (West Supp. 1989). Because the amendment was delayed a few weeks beyond the original sunset date, some funds that would have been deposited into the temporarily terminated Fund were placed in the general account of the United States Treasury. However, the legislature provided for their transfer into the Fund once it reexamined the program and extended the deadline on deposits. See Simpson, 885 F.2d at 44.

The Simpson court emphasized that the amendments were relevant only to demonstrate legislative intent and that it was "not suggesting that subsequent acts by Congress can cure an Act's violation of the Origination Clause." Id.
reveals a revenue-raising purpose. The special assessment to subsidize the Crime Victims Fund is comparable to the tax to fund a postal money order system in Norton, the tax to support the national currency in Twin City Bank and the tax to fund the building of railroad terminals in the District of Columbia in Millard. Although the mandatory assessment on all persons convicted of a crime raises revenue in the ordinary meaning of the word, it does not raise revenue for purposes of the origination clause because the assessment's primary purpose is to assist crime victims.

B. Punishment Analysis

Several courts have reasoned that Section 3013 is constitutional because it is punitive. Some courts conclude that the special assessment is a punishment rather than a tax, without analyzing whether the bill fits the Supreme Court's narrow conception of raising revenue. Other courts properly use the punishment characterization to bolster their conclusion that Congress lacked a revenue raising intent when it passed the punitive measure. The Ninth Circuit correctly realized that the characterization of the special assessment as a punishment is not dispositive for an origination clause challenge. Section 3013 may be both a punitive measure and a revenue measure. Determining that the special assessment is punitive is relevant only to demonstrate that Congress lacked the intent to raise revenue; even if the assessment is a tax, it does not


133. See supra note 11 and accompanying text.


135. See, e.g., United States v. King, 891 F.2d 780, 783-84 (10th Cir. 1989) (statute's main purpose is to support crime victims program and to punish offenders); United States v. Ashburn, 884 F.2d 901, 903 (6th Cir. 1989) (statute's twin goals are punishment and victim compensation); Vines, 718 F. Supp. at 898 (statute's punitive purpose intended to further non-revenue raising purpose).


137. See, e.g., United States v. Smith, 818 F.2d 687, 690 (9th Cir. 1987) (although Section 3013 was undeniably intended to raise revenue, a "punitive measure designed to raise revenue is still a punitive measure").

In fact, although the Ninth Circuit held that the special assessment was a punishment for purposes of the seventh amendment in Smith, it later distinguished Smith to hold that Congress enacted the statute to raise revenue in violation of the origination clause. Compare Smith, 818 F.2d at 690 (seventh amendment does not require jury trial to impose assessment because it is punitive measure) with Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 657 (origination clause requires that Section 3013 originate in House because it is revenue raising measure).

138. "We note, however, that for purposes of determining whether the special assess-
raise revenue if it furthers a non-revenue raising purpose.\textsuperscript{139}

Even though a punitive purpose, to the extent it exists, supports this Note's position, precise analysis demands a concession that the better view is that Congress passed Section 3013 to finance the crime victims program. Factors indicative of a punitive purpose are the special assessment's similarity to a criminal fine\textsuperscript{140} and its imposition during sentencing as a direct consequence of conviction.\textsuperscript{141} Reference in the legislative history to "penalty assessment fines," "penalty assessment fees" and "penalties," rather than to special assessments, lends credence to the position that Congress intended Section 3013 to punish or penalize criminal defendants.\textsuperscript{142}

Aside from referring to the special assessment as a penalty assessment,
however, the legislative history "does not mention punishment as a purpose of the special assessment."\textsuperscript{143} The codified version of the statute does not contain the word "penalty," suggesting that Congress may not have considered the assessment to be a penalty.\textsuperscript{144} In addition, although the special assessment is collected in the same manner as a criminal fine, it differs from a fine because it does not vary in amount according to the specific nature of the offense committed.\textsuperscript{145} Thus, the assessment may be interpreted as a constitutional "tax on crooks and not a program of penalties."\textsuperscript{146}

To support classifying the special assessment as a penalty, some opinions rely on several courts of appeals that have held that the purpose of Section 3013 is penal and not revenue-raising for the purposes of the Assimilative Crimes Act.\textsuperscript{147} Other circuits, in construing the application

\textsuperscript{143} United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 659 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).

\textsuperscript{144} See id.


The amount assessed under Section 3013, as enacted, depended only upon whether the crime was a felony or a misdemeanor. The statute assessed $25 upon individual misdemeanants and $50 upon individual felons. See 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (Supp. V 1987), amended by 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (1988). Criminal fines, however, increased according to the degree of the felony or the degree of the misdemeanor.

The 1988 amendment weakens this argument. Section 3013 now increases the amount assessed according to the degree of the misdemeanor. There remains no gradation for felonies. See 18 U.S.C. § 3013(a) (1988).


Congress has the power to define a class upon which it imposes a tax. See Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 659. In this case, the legislature may have decided to levy a tax on the class of convicted persons, without a punitive purpose in mind. See id.

"The defendant's conviction happens to be the requisite event for the imposition of the tax, as the importation of goods is the event of imposition of custom duties; however, that does not make it part of the sentence." Hagen, 711 F. Supp. at 881.


The purpose of the Assimilative Crimes Act is to conform the punishment of persons convicted of state crimes on a federal enclave to that of the surrounding state. See United States v. Sharpnack, 355 U.S. 286, 292-93 (1958); King, 824 F.2d at 315; Mayberry, 774 F.2d at 1020. Mayberry and King held that the special assessment violated the purpose of the Assimilative Crimes Act by placing on defendants an additional burden that had no state law counterpart. See King, 824 F.2d at 316, 318; Mayberry, 774 F.2d at 1021-22.

Congress overturned Mayberry and King by adding to Section 3013 a subsection which provides that: "For the purposes of this section, an offense under section 13 of this title is an offense against the United States." 18 U.S.C. § 3013(d) (1988). The legislative history indicates that Congress intended to clarify the confusion by mandating the imposition of the special assessment upon all defendants convicted of federal offenses, including those convicted under the Assimilative Crimes Act. See H.R. Rep. No. 390, 100th Cong., 1st Sess. 3, reprinted in 1987 U.S. Code Cong. & Admin. News 2137, 2140 ("Because the
of the rule of lenity\textsuperscript{148} to Section 3013, have found no congressional intent to punish criminals through the assessment.\textsuperscript{149} Nonetheless, neither the decisions under the Assimilative Crimes Act nor those construing the application of the rule of lenity to the special assessment statute provide guidance for an origination clause challenge.\textsuperscript{150} As the Ninth Circuit observed, "These courts, in evaluating the purpose of Section 3013 in light of challenges that did not involve the origination clause, unsurprisingly failed to perform the purpose analysis mandated by the origination clause."\textsuperscript{151}

C. Origination of Section 3013

Upon concluding that a bill in fact does raise revenue, the second part of an origination clause analysis is whether the bill originated in the Senate.\textsuperscript{152} Because courts prefer to avoid review of the legislative process whenever possible\textsuperscript{153} and because the history of this particular bill is so complex, most courts have not delved into Section 3013's procedural past after determining that the bill did not raise revenue under the origination clause.\textsuperscript{154}

On May 1, 1984, Senator Heinz proposed the collection of a "penalty assessment" from convicted persons, as part of the proposed Victims Assistance Act.\textsuperscript{155} Although the Senate passed the bill on May 10, 1984,\textsuperscript{156} the House of Representatives did not pass the bill.\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{148} The rule of lenity provides that "penal statutes should be strictly construed against the government or parties seeking to enforce statutory penalties and in favor of the persons on whom penalties are sought to be imposed." 3 N. Singer, Sutherland Statutory Construction § 59.03, at 11 (4th ed. 1986) (citation omitted).

\textsuperscript{149} See United States v. Dobbins, 807 F.2d 130, 131 (8th Cir. 1986) (rule of lenity not applicable to special assessments because statute's purpose was to aid crime victims, not punish criminals), superseded by statute, 18 U.S.C. § 3013(d) (1988); United States v. Donaldson, 797 F.2d 125, 127 (3d Cir. 1986) (same), superseded by statute, 18 U.S.C. § 3013(d) (1988).

\textsuperscript{150} These decisions allow judges to impose a special assessment upon each guilty count. Although the statute is ambiguous in this regard, courts are not required by the rule of lenity to interpret its ambiguous terms in favor of the defendant. See Dobbins, 807 F.2d at 131; Donaldson, 797 F.2d at 127.

\textsuperscript{151} See United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 659-60 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).

\textsuperscript{152} Id. at 660.

\textsuperscript{153} See Field v. Clark, 143 U.S. 649, 672-74 (1892); United States v. Griffin, 884 F.2d 655, 655-56 (2d Cir.), petition for cert. filed, No. 89-5493 (filed Sept. 2, 1989).

\textsuperscript{154} See Griffin, 884 F.2d at 656.


\textsuperscript{156} See Senate Report, supra note 57, at 3609.

\textsuperscript{157} See United States v. Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d 654, 660 (9th Cir. 1988), cert. granted, 110 S. Ct. 48 (1989).
The House subsequently passed a continuing appropriations resolution, H.J. Res. 648, containing the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 as Title II. The resolution did not then include Chapter XIV, the Victims Assistance Act of 1984. When the Senate considered H.J. Res. 648, it amended the resolution and added eight more chapters, including Chapter XIV, which contained the special assessment. This modified version of H.J. Res. 648 became law on October 12, 1984.

Because the Senate proposed the addition of the special assessment provision to the continuing appropriations resolution, the Ninth Circuit concluded that Section 3013 impermissibly originated in the Senate. The origination of the statute, however, is not so clear-cut. Congressman Rodino had introduced a penalty assessment as part of the Victims of Crime Act of 1983, a House-originated bill that did not become law. The final version of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984 was


159. See id.


162. See Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 661 ("The special assessment provison was introduced in the Senate Judiciary Committee, it was first passed by the Senate and was only adopted by the House on later repassage of H.J.Res. 648."). But see United States v. Clark, 711 F. Supp. 736, 739 (S.D.N.Y. 1989) (Senate passed exact copy of bill that House originated).

The Munoz-Flores court correctly concluded that because the House's original version of the continuing appropriations resolution did not concern raising revenue for the Crime Victims Fund, the amendment did not fall within the Senate's power to amend House revenue bills. See Munoz-Flores, 863 F.2d at 661; see generally supra notes 46-51 and accompanying text (discussing Supreme Court precedent of germane amendments to House revenue bills).


The Rodino proposal reads, in relevant part:

Special Court Assessment Amendment

Sec. 402. (a) Chapter 201 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

Sec. 3013. Special assessment on convicted persons.

(a) The court shall assess on any person convicted of an offense against the United States-

(1) the amount of $50 in the case of a felony; and

(2) the amount of $25 in the case of a misdemeanor.

(b) Such amount so assessed may be collected in the manner in which fines are collected in criminal cases.


159. See id.
the result of negotiations between Congressman Rodino and the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.\textsuperscript{164} As a result, one court concluded that "because [the Senate's] amendment was legislation that had previously been introduced in . . . the House, there was no violation of the requirements of the Origination Clause."\textsuperscript{165} However, lack of judicial precedent setting forth guidelines to determine what constitutes origination of a bill under the origination clause makes it difficult to evaluate the effect of the Rodino proposal.\textsuperscript{166}

On balance, it appears likely that the bill originated in the Senate. Nonetheless, because Section 3013 does not raise revenue, the resolution of the origination issue does not affect the bill's constitutionality.

CONCLUSION

The Supreme Court has construed the term "raising revenue" narrowly so that only bills enacted for the direct purpose of providing funds for the government's general use must originate in the House of Representatives. Congress imposed the special assessment on all convicted persons as part of a program intended to provide relief to crime victims. Section 3013 is constitutional because Congress passed the special assessment for the non-revenue raising purpose of defraying the costs of this victim assistance program.

\textit{Marie T. Farrelly}


\textsuperscript{164} Congressman Rodino commented:

\begin{quote}
The other body early last August passed a modified version of the administration bill, and shortly after that I began negotiations with the administration and the leadership of the other body's Judiciary Committee. Those negotiations successfully resolved the differences among the three bills—H.R. 3498, the administration bill, and the bill passed by the other body. I introduced the compromise that we worked out—H.R. 6403—which was also included in the crime package amendments to H.R. 5690 that were approved by the House on Tuesday, October 2. The other body attached the compromise to the continuing resolution, and the House's conferees agreed to accept the language.
\end{quote}


\textsuperscript{165} \textit{Clark}, 711 F. Supp. at 740.

\textsuperscript{166} See United States v. Madison, 712 F. Supp. 1379, 1383 (W.D. Wis. 1989). The district court noted that:

\begin{quote}
Deciding this question requires resort to many different sources of legislative information, which in itself raises questions: whether it is proper for a court to look behind the designation of a bill as a House or Senate-originated bill, and if so, what kinds of reference materials may be consulted to determine the actual origination of a particular act or statute, and what standards govern the determination that Congress acted properly or not.
\end{quote}

\textit{Id.} at 1382.