### HOW YOUR NEW TAXES WILL FUND NEW PORK

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The White House and Congress have put the finishing touches on their so-called deficit reduction plan, which promises to include the largest tax increase in American history. Although the plan is expected to raise taxes some \$250 billion to \$300 billion, it projects to lower the deficit, currently estimated by the Office of Management and Budget at \$285 billion for fiscal year 1993, to just \$230 billion in fiscal 1998. The record-breaking tax increase supposedly is needed because spending cannot be cut deeper without hurting sensitive social safety net programs. Since all other spending has been cut to the bone, Washington insiders argue, tax hikes must be a significant portion of any effort to lower the deficit.

#### They are wrong.

While supporters of the massive tax hike argue that American families must tighten their belts for the good of deficit reduction, the House of Representatives has been busy passing spending bills laden with the kinds of programs most taxpayers associate most with fiscal irresponsibility. Some of the projects recommended for funding in the annual spending bills that either have passed or are now being considered by the House include:

- ✓ \$9 million for the National Textile Center;
- ✓ \$17 million for the United States Travel and Tourism Administration;
- ✓ \$405,000 for the World Tourism Organization;
- ✓ \$1.5 million for the Chicago Urban Forestry program;
- ✓ \$2.5 million for the construction of a parking garage in Burlington, Iowa;
- ✓ \$100 million for Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems research;
- √ \$20 million for a rural electrification project in Latin America;
- ✓ \$250,000 to promote tourism in New Mexico.

In short, Washington is asking taxpayers to cut back so Congress can continue spending as usual. Even a cursory analysis of this year's appropriation bills shows that Congress has done little to eliminate all the pork barrel projects, the local projects with no national interests, and the programs with a long history of failure. Nor has Congress stopped its practice of micromanaging the executive branch. So despite all the rhetoric of deep spending cuts, the same profligate behavior that largely created the deficit in the first place continues unabated.

#### **BUSINESS-AS-USUAL BUDGETING**

When President Clinton first introduced his budget plan to Congress, he stressed tough budget cuts as well as large tax increases. But since then, Washington has shown little inclination to cut spending. Indeed, lawmakers have gone to great lengths to confuse taxpayers into believing that the Clinton plan is balanced equally between tax hikes and spending cuts. Various accounting devices have been used to create this confusion.

- **Example #1:** The tax bills recently passed by the House and Senate each contained some 25 increases in taxes or user fees which lawmakers dubbed "spending cuts."
- **Example #2:** Lawmakers call an increase in program spending a "cut" simply because they have reduced the program's rate of growth by a small amount.
- Example #3: Lawmakers are taking credit for cutting some \$44 billion from discretionary programs cuts already required under the terms of the 1990 budget agreement. In other words, spending cuts taxpayers paid for three years ago are being claimed a second time in this year's agreement.
- Example #4: Like the 1990 budget agreement, the tax plans passed in the House and Senate put caps on the annual growth rate of total discretionary spending. Over five years, these caps are expected to "save" roughly \$66 billion from the higher levels Congress had planned to spend. But since these caps affect annually appropriated spending, the "savings" from these measures cannot be banked until Congress actually makes the necessary policy changes, which may never happen. Worse yet, Congress may at any time raise the level of the caps for "technical and economic" reasons, denying taxpayers the promised savings. This has happened each year since the 1990 agreement became law.

Even if all the questionable "spending cuts" are in place, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that federal spending still will increase by some \$338 billion over the next five years—from \$1.443 trillion this fiscal year to \$1.781 trillion in fiscal 1998.

A brief review of the spending bills now working their way through the House shows that despite all the rhetoric about belt-tightening and making tough choices, Congress is moving ahead in the same business-as-usual fashion that has led to budget deficits in 32 of the past 33 years. Instead of using tax hikes as a last resort to reduce the deficit, lawmakers are raising taxes on Americans mainly to protect their favorite programs or to fund new spending initiatives.

This budgetary bait-and-switch routine has a long tradition. Economists at Congress's own Joint Economic Committee found that, since 1947, every new doll:r of tax revenues has generated \$1.59 of new spending. Judging by the amount of tax dollars in these spending bills dedicated to pork, waste, and outmoded programs, Congress seems committed to continuing this tradition.

In simple terms, even in the face of record deficits and the overwhelming concern of taxpayers over the fiscal health of the government, Congress is unable to break the bad habits that created the problem in the first place. Among these habits are:

#### 1) Congress is addicted to pork barrel spending.

In order to demonstrate his or her effectiveness in Washington to the electorate back home, Members of Congress routinely "bring home the bacon" in the form of federal contracts, research projects, or grants. These projects, and the press they may generate, keep a Member visible before the voters between elections. This visibility can be a very powerful tool against potential rivals by assuring the political loyalty of recipient constituencies.

Funding new pork barrel projects while preaching fiscal restraint is nothing new. During the 1990 budget agreement, the last time taxpayers were told that a tax hike could close the deficit, these members still found room in the budget to fund: \$122,000 for a beach erosion project in Santa Barbara, California; \$2.7 million for a catfish farm in Stuttgart, Arkansas; \$3.6 million for an urban gardening program; \$960,000 for an Air Force child development center in Michigan; \$995,000 for a performing arts center in North Miami Beach, Florida; and \$2.6 million for maintenance work at the Sam Rayburn Reservoir in Texas.

The appendix to this study lists dozens of such projects gleaned from this year's House appropriations bills.

 Congress cannot content itself with managing issues that are purely national or federal in scope. Instead, it funds too many activities that should be the sole responsibility of state and local governments.

Each year, Congress funds hundreds of programs and projects that are purely local in nature and should not be the concern of a national legislative body. Congress could make great strides toward real deficit reduction if it asked if each federal program truly serves the national interest. Should taxpayers in Florida, for example, pay part of the \$6.8 million needed for a railroad crossing project in Lafayette, Indiana. Or should residents of Des Moines, Iowa, subsidize a \$2 million flood control project at the Sam Rayburn Reservoir in Texas? Is it really a national priority to spend \$7 million for the Dulles Park-and-Ride in Fairfax County, Virginia, or \$2.5 million to refurbish the Boston Public Library? The costs and benefits of such projects should be considered and borne by local taxpayers.

Some of the purely local projects funded in this year's appropriations bills include:

- √ \$250,000 for the Toledo Farmer's Market;
- ✓ \$200,000 for dredging in Milwaukee Harbor in Wisconsin;
- ✓ \$300,000 for construction at the Lake O' The Pines in Texas;
- ✓ \$98,000 for a carp control study at Metzger Marsh in Ohio; and

- √ \$1.5 million to North Carolina to "further development of the state's geographic information system."
- 3) Congress routinely funds projects and programs that benefit private companies and industries. These firms should be making the commercial decision whether or not to finance these projects on their own.

Many expensive projects in the federal budget are justified by Members as benefiting society as a whole, "consumers," or the "general public." Closer inspection, however, reveals that the primary beneficiaries of these tax dollars are wealthy interest groups, trade associations, or corporations. In previous years, for example, Congress has given over \$5 million to the U.S. Fruit and Vegetable Laboratory in Washington state even though the Appropriations Committee recognizes that "Washington, Oregon, and Idaho have annual fruit sales of approximately \$1,000,000,000."

Members have a duty to tell taxpayers why their standard of living should be lowered so that public funds can be spent to improve the bottom line of well-connected commercial enterprises.

Among the many such items in this year's appropriations bills:

- ✓ \$9 million for the National Textile Center and \$1.6 million for the Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation;
- √ \$33 million for enhanced oil recovery research;
- ✓ \$14.9 million for "law school clinical experience";
- ✓ \$250,000 for "Generic Commodity Promotion Research and Evaluation"; and
- **✓ \$200 million** for the Market Promotion Program, which subsidizes overseas advertising for large U.S. corporations.
- 4) Congress refuses to delay or postpone costly projects until a time when taxpayers can afford them.

When households and businesses face financial difficulties, they put off major purchases until their budget situation improves. For example, a family might wait until next year to purchase a new car, or a business may try to get a few more miles out of the old delivery truck.

Not Congress. The appropriations bills contain tens of billions of dollars of land purchases, construction projects, and new acquisitions that any reasonable taxpayer would consider a lux-ury in light of this year's \$285 billion budget deficit. Congress should delay these projects until the budget is in balance.

Some of the projects scheduled for funding in this year's appropriations bills that could be delayed include:

- ✓ \$248,000 for the William O. Douglas Outdoor Education Center;
- √ \$61 million in land acquisition funds for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service;

- √ \$7.1 million in land acquisition funds for the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation;
- ✓ \$51 million for a new U.S. Courthouse in Hammond, Indiana;
- ✓ \$10 million for a U.S. Courthouse in Kansas City, Missouri;
- ✓ \$2.4 million for a parking garage in Burlington, Iowa; and
- ✓ \$12 million for a federal building in Scranton, Pennsylvania.

### 5) Congress throws good money after bad by continuing to fund programs with a long history of failure or financial problems.

The culture of government assumes that problems at agencies can always be solved with more money, rather than with better management. So rather than place a program under closer scrutiny or simply close it down, Congress will pour millions more taxpayer dollars into the failed program.

For example, the Farmers Home Administration (FmHA) since 1935 has loaned over \$172 billion to farmers and rural communities. But according the report accompanying the Agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal 1994, "the unpaid principal on all FmHA loans as of September 30, 1992, totals \$56 billion." Based upon FmHA's past performance, it is likely that a sizeable portion of this total, and the interest due on it, will never be repaid.

In January 1991, the Office of Management and Budget reported that in the farm loan portion of FmHA, "over \$4.5 billion in direct loans have been written off [over the past two years], with another \$1.7 billion expected in 1991 and 1992." Similarly, the General Accounting Office (GAO) found in 1991 that total losses from FmHA's housing loan programs were \$6.9 billion in fiscal 1989 and expected to grow in future years.<sup>2</sup>

Despite these disclosures, the House approved another \$3.3 billion for rural housing loans, \$3.6 billion for farm loans, and \$1.5 billion for rural development loans.

Similarly, Congress continues to extend loans through the Small Business Administration in spite of the program's high default rate and the lack of evidence that SBA loans have had a noticeable effect on small business development. As long ago as 1963, in an article on wasteful government spending, *Life* magazine described SBA as "an almost brand-new device for soaking up money and getting rid of it."

More recently, however, the GAO has been highly critical of SBA. According to GAO:

There has been no... recent assessment of the economic impact that has resulted from the billions of dollars in federal guarantees that SBA has provided to small businesses. Yet in fiscal year 1992, SBA almost doubled the value of the business loans that it guaranteed — from \$3.8 billion in

<sup>1</sup> Office of Management and Budget, Budget of the U.S.: Fiscal Year 1992, Part 2, p. 241-2.

<sup>2</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office, Financial Audit: Farmers Home Administration's Financial Statements for 1989 and 1988, GAO/AFMD-91-36, May 1991.

<sup>3 &</sup>quot;Now See the Innards of a Fat Pig," Life, August 16, 1963, p. 21.

fiscal year 1991 to \$6.4 billion in fiscal year 1992. Our work has shown that SBA's loss rate is greater than that of private lenders and that SBA has not adequately overseen the operations of lenders receiving government loan guarantees.

In spite of such reports, the House approved a total of \$751.9 million in fiscal 1994 spending for SBA; \$242.4 million of this is for subsidies for direct and guaranteed business loans.

6) Congress causes wasteful speriding within the executive branch through excessive micromanagement, prohibitions, and mandates.

It is hard to imagine any company being so foolish as to institute rules to stop their managers from saving money. Yet Congress does exactly that. For instance, Congress regularly sets lower limits on the number of employees that must staff certain agencies. These "employment floors," as they are known, prevent agency managers from making the most effective use of the employees they supervise, such as by shifting workers from one department to another.

Some examples from this year's appropriations bills include:

- **Example:** The Agriculture appropriations bill explicitly "provides employment floors for four of the major agencies of USDA and to the Food and Drug Administration...."
- **Example:** The Agriculture appropriations bill also "provides that none of the funds in this Act may be used by the Farmers Home Administration to employ or otherwise contract with private debt collection agencies to collect delinquent [loan] payments."
- **Example:** The Transportation appropriations bill "prohibits the use of funds for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political or Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation...."
- **Example:** The Transportation appropriations bill also "requires transfers of funds for certain activities to be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations for approval."
- **Example:** The Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies appropriations bill prohibits the "reprogramming of funds which...(4) relocates offices or employees; (5) reorganizes office, programs, or activities; or (6) contracts out or privatizes any function or activity presently performed by Federal employees...."

<sup>4</sup> U.S. General Accounting Office, Transition Series: Housing and Community Development Issues, GAO/OCG-93-22TR, December 1992, pp. 20-21.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For the second time in three years, taxpayers face a record tax increase in the name of deficit reduction. Many Americans might be willing to pay higher taxes if all of the waste and unnecessary spending were excised from the federal budget. But any objective review of the spending bills now working their way through Congress shows that Washington is not willing to tackle wasteful spending.

Indeed, these bills are laden with spending that benefits no one but very narrow or localized special interests. These bills also spend billions of dollars on programs with a long history of failure. And Congress continues to force the executive branch to waste money through excessive micromanagement.

Lawmakers who claim that tax hikes are needed to reduce the deficit because nothing more can be done to cut spending are wrong. The spending bills now clearing the House are solid proof that Congress has not even begun to cut the fat, let alone the bone.

Scott A. Hodge Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs

Joshua Brady and Pamela Raitt provided valuable assistance in the preparation of this study.

All Heritage Foundation papers are now available electronically to subscribers of Town Hall, the conservative meeting place, and "Nexts" the on-line data retrieval service. For information about Town Hall services please call 1 (800).

411-4147. On Nexts. The Heritage Foundation's Reports (HFRITS) can be found in the OMNI. CURRNT, NWLTRS, and CVT, group files of the NEXIS library and in the GOVT and OMNI group files of the GOVNWS library.

#### **APPENDIX**

The spending items contained in this appendix have been gleaned from the committee reports that accompany the House versions of the fiscal 1994 appropriations bills. Each year, Congress must pass, and the President must sign, thirteen appropriations bills to fund the discretionary programs in the federal budget. At the time of this writing, twelve of these bills have been reported out of the Committee on Appropriations — only the Defense bill remains to be completed. Of the twelve reported bills, all but the Transportation Appropriations bill have been approved by the House of Representatives.

The Senate has just begun its work on these bills. It remains to be seen, of course, what wasteful spending the Senate will approve.

### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH — HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Total Commi	ittee Agreement	\$1.7 billion
•	onal Printing	•
	icial Mail	
	owances and Expenses	•
	Official Expenses of Members	
	Furniture	\$1.7 million
	House Automobiles	
	Interparliamentary Receptions	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	PRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF COMME STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGEN	CIES
Total Commi	ttee Agreement	\$22.7 billion
DEPARTMEN	T OF COMMERCE	
Economic I	Development Administration	
Eco	pnomic Development Assistance Programs	\$223 million
	cluding provisions for:	
1)	development of the West Virginia High Technology Consortium Innovation Center:	
2)	a tri-county sewer extension project at Benedum Airport in Harrison Marion and Taylor Counties, WV;	•
3)	water and sewer project for an industrial development park in Lackawana County, Pennsylvania;	
4)	water and sewer project along Route 16 Corridor in Charleston, Illin	nois;
5)	rural development initiative for Northwest New Mexico;	
5) 6)	water and sewer infrastructure improvements for the City of Vienna	
•	•	ex; and

Small Business Administration	\$752 million\$243 million
Small Business Development Centers	\$71.2 million
International Trade Administration	\$221 million
National Textile Center	
Tailored Clothing Technology Corporation	\$1.6 million
Export Administration	\$34.7 million
United States Travel and Tourism Administration	
Technology Administration	\$4.5 million
National Telecommunications and Information Administration	\$62 million
Public Telecommunications Facilities, Planning and Construction	\$20 million
Information Infrastructure Grants	
Endowment for Children's Educational Television	\$1 million
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)	\$1.76 billion
National Marine Fisheries Service	\$221 million
Resource Information	
Oyster Disease Research	
Chesapeake Bay Studies	
Aquaculture	
Beluga Whale Committee	\$192,000
Fisheries Development Program	\$15.9 million
Fisheries Trade Promotion Activities	
Fish Oils	
Sea Grant College Program	\$40.7 million
Sea Grant-Zebra Mussel Research	
National Weather Service	
Agriculture and Fruit Frost Research	
•	
Ocean and Great Lakes Program	\$15 million
Zebra Mussel Research	\$911,000
RELATED AGENCIES	
	\$1.1 million
Competitiveness Policy Council	noillim noh?
Payment to Legal Services Corporation	• \$576 million
Maritime Administration	\$240 million
Operations and Training	\$76 million
Ready Reserve Force	\$300 million
Heady neserve Force	
DEPARTMENT OF STATE	<b>4700</b> W
United Nations and Affiliated Agencies	\$583 million
includes grants to:	<b>A</b> 4 <b>- -</b> • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
International Labor Organization	\$48.8 million
International Telecommunications Union	\$6.4 million

Universal Postal Union	\$1 million
Other International Organizations	2000 Hillion
Includes grants to: International Coffee Organization	000 000
International Cotton Advisory Committee	
International Jute Organization	
International Lead and Zinc, Study Group	
International Natural Rubber Organization	
International Office of Epizootics	
International Organization for Legal Metrology	
International Office of the Vine and Wine	
International Rubber Study Group	
International Tropical Timber Organization	
International Tropical Timber Organization International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources	
International Wheat Council	
Permanent International Association of Road Congresses	
World Tourism Organization	
-	ψτου,σοο
RELATED AGENCIES	
Payment to the Asia Foundation	
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad	
Japan-United States Friendship Commission	
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program	
Israeli-Arab Scholarship Program	
Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe	
East-West Center	
North/South Center, University of Miami	\$8 million
APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIO	R
AND RELATED AGENCIES	
Total Committee Agreement	16.1 billion
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	
Bureau of Land Management	\$595 million
Wild Horse and Burro Management	\$16.7 million
Land Acquisition	\$14.8 million
Oregon and California Grant Lands	.\$83 million
US Fish and Wildlife Service	
Resource Management	\$492 million
Fisheries	\$68 million
Junior Duck Stamp Program	\$100,000
Grants to States-Hunter Education	. <b>. \$2</b> 8 million

Construction
Cape Romain National Wildlife Refuge, South Carolina; Replace Visitors Center
Land Acquisition
National Biological Survey (New Agency)
Caddo Lake, Texas Study\$300,000
Fisheries Research\$2.6 million
Zebra Mussel Research\$1.5 million
National Park Service
National Recreation Preservation \$35.6 million
New Jersey Coastal Heritage Trail\$300,000
Ice Age National Scientific Reserve\$558,000
Johnstown Area Heritage Association\$110,000
William O. Douglas Outdoor Education Center
National Institute for the Conservation of Cultural Property
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts\$20 million
Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission\$250,000
Visitor Services\$227 million
Steamtown, USA in Scranton, Pennsylvania
Construction
Not included in the President's Budget:
Allegheny Portage Railroad, Pennsylvania; Lemon House Rehabilitation \$1.9 million
Boston National Historic Place, Massachusetts; Old South Meetinghouse \$2.7 million
Boston Public Library, Massachusetts; Rehabilitation
Cuyahoga Valley National Register, Ohio; Boston General Store \$2.5 million
Glacier National Park, Montana; Restore chalets\$600,000
Ice Age Scientific Reserve, Wisconsin; Exhibits\$500,000
James A. Garfield National Historic Site, Ohio; Site restoration
Mount Vernon Bicycle Trail, Virginia; Correct safety hazards\$450,000
Port Chicago, New Mexico; Memorial fabrication
Weir Farms National Historic Site, Connecticut; Restore structures
US Geological Survey\$584 million
West Louisiana/Texas Erosion\$1 million
West Central Florida Erosion
South Carolina\$1 million
Lake Erie Erosion

Louisiana Wetlands \$1 million Florida Big Bend Wetlands \$1 million Great Lakes Wetlands \$900,000 San Francisco Bay Wetlands \$500,000 Lake Pontchartrain Pollution \$200,000 Massachusetts Bay Pollution \$800,000 Florida Keys Pollution \$300,000 Bureau of Indian Affairs \$1.7 billion Programs \$1.5 billion Pre-law Summer Institute for American Indians administered by the American Indian Law Center at the University of New Mexico. \$200,000
Territorial and International Affairs
Administration\$82 million Republic of Palau Administration\$700,000 Republic of Palau Projects\$3 million
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Forest Service\$2.3 billion
International Forestry
State and Private Forestry\$155 million
Urban Forestry\$28 million
Chicago Urban Forestry\$1.5 million
Ohio Arbor Program\$500,000 Tacoma, Washington\$100,000
Bremerton, Washington
Port Orchard, Washington\$50,000
New York Greenspace Program\$500,000
San Francisco Greenspace Program\$500,000
Philadelphia Greenspace Program\$500,000
National Forest System\$1.2 billion Wild Horse and Burro Management\$800,000
Noxious Weed Control\$2.2 million
Land Acquisition
Caribbean National Forest, Puerto Rico\$450,000
Daniel Boone National Forest, Kentucky
Lake Tahoe Basin\$2 million  Little Beaver Creek Wildlife Reserve, Ohio\$2.2 million
Road Construction\$109 million
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Coal Liquification\$33 million
Enhanced Oil Recovery
Lighting and Appliances

Building Systems \$21 millior International Market Development \$704,000 Municipal Energy Management \$2 millior Energy Information Administration \$86 million
RELATED AGENCIES:
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities  National Endowment for the Arts
Commission of Fine Arts Salaries and Expenses\$805,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs
Salaries and Expenses
Salaries and Expenses
Salaries and Expenses\$49,000
National Indian Gaming Commission  Salaries and Expenses
Salaries and Expenses
APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
GENERAL GOVERNMENT AND CERTAIN INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
Total Committee Agreement\$22.7 billion
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
Transportation
Research Park, North Carolina; EPA facility\$8.8 million

### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES

Total Committee Agreement\$13.7 bill	lion
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	
Coast Guard	llion Ilion 000 000 Ilion
Federal Aviation Administration	lion lion lion
Federal Highway Administration \$19.7 bill Federal-Aid Highways Program \$17 bill Administrative Expenses \$296 mill Contract Programs \$166 mill Highway R&D \$40 mill Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems \$86 mill Long Term Pavement Performance \$10 mill National Highway Institute \$5.5 mill International Transportation \$500,0 Geographic Information Systems; Grant to North Carolina \$1.5 mill Railroad-Highway Crossings Projects \$12.8 mill	lion lion lion lion lion lion lion 000
Lafayette, Indiana \$6.8 mill Brownsville, Texas \$6.8 mill Intelligent Vehicle Highway System; Program Grants \$49.7 mill Advance; Chicago, IL \$6 mill GuideStar; Minnesota \$8.7 mill Gary-Chicago-Milwaukee Corridor \$2.5 mill Fast-Trac; Michigan \$20 mill CARAT; Charlotte, NC \$8 mill Houston, Texas \$2 mill Center for Suburban Mobility; George Mason University \$2.5 mill Baltimore-Washington Parkway \$16 mill	lion lion lion lion lion lion lion

Surface Transportation Projects	\$305 million
Bristol Road Relocation	
State Road M-59 Corridor	\$34.5 million
Highway Safety Improvement Project	\$21 million
Urban Airport Access Road, Detroit	
Monroe Rail Consolidation	
Oakman Boulevard Study	
California	
Ontario Airport Access Road	\$9.8 million
Texas	•
Airport/Loop 375 Corridor Study	\$2 million
New York	
Cross-County Parkway, I-87 Study	\$750,000
Nebraska	
Lincoln Beltway Feasibility Study	\$500,000
Older Driver Research	\$500,000
National Advanced Driving Simulator	\$2 million
Intelligent Vehicle Highway System; Human Factors Research	•
Local Rail Freight Assistance	
Railroad Research and Development	\$20 million
High Speed Rail Safety	
Non-electric High Speed Locomotive	
R&D Facilities	·
Amtrak Subsidies	•
Federal Transit Administration	\$4.4 billion
University Transportation Centers	•
Chicago Central Area Circulator	
Los Angeles Metrorail	
San Francisco BART Extension	
Twin Cities Central Corridor	
Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority	
Construction	
Interest Payments	
Bus Facilities	
Cleveland, Ohio	·
Dallas, Texas	
· · ·	
Santa Barbara, California	
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	·
Erie Avenue Hub Project	
Midvale garage	·
Penn's Landing Passenger Facility	\$380,000

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Total Committee Agreement
Training and Employment Services: \$5 billion Glass Ceiling Commission \$744,000 National Center on the Workplace \$744,000 Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act Programs \$500,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Native Hawaiian Health Care \$3.5 million Dentistry Residencies \$3.7 million Physicians Assistants \$4.9 million Health Professions Data Systems \$643,000 Research on Certain Health Profession Issues \$1.1 million Nurse Practitioners/Nurse Midwives \$15.4 million Health Training Facilities Interest Subsidies \$415,000 Podiatric Medicine \$615,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Capital Expenses for Private School Students \$39 million Arts in Education \$8.9 million Law-Related Education \$5.9 million Vocational and Adult Education \$1.4 billion Basic Grants \$972 million Consumer and Homemaking Education \$34 million Tech-Prep Education \$104 million State Councils on Vocational Education \$8.9 million National Programs/Data Systems \$4.9 million
Federal Work-Study Programs \$586 million State Student Incentive Grants \$62 million Innovative Projects for Community Service \$1.4 million Cooperative Education \$13.7 million Law School Clinical Experience \$14.9 million Construction-Interest Subsidy Grants \$18 million Robert A. Taft Institute of Government \$319,000 Byrd Honors Scholarship \$18.9 million Douglas Teachers Scholarship \$14.7 million Teacher Opportunity Corps \$2.5 million Harris Graduate Fellowships \$20.4 million Javits Fellowship \$7.8 million Fund for Innovation in Education \$28 million Fund for the Improvement and Reform of Schools and Teaching (FIRST) \$9 million

#### **RELATED AGENCIES**

Corporation for Public Broadcasting	
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science	\$904 million
United States Institute of Peace	\$10.9 million
APPROPRIATIONS FOR FOREIGN OPERATIONS,	
AND RELATED PROGRAMS	
Total Committee Agreement	• \$12 Q billion
_	-
International Financial Institutions	\$5.5 billion
Export-Import Bank	•
Trade and Development Agency	
World Bank	•
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development	
Environmental Priorities	
UN Environment Program	•
AID Office of Energy	
Elephant Conservation	•
Multilateral Assistance	
African Development Fund	
African Development Foundation	
Development Fund for Africa	
African Rural Electrification	\$5 million
Population Programs	\$506 million
Population Development Assistance	•
UN Fund for Population Assistance	
Foreign Military Financing	
International Development Association	
International Finance Corporation	
Inter-American Development Bank	
Asian Development Bank	
Agency for International Development (AiD)	
Operating Expenses	•
Development Assistance Fund	
Latin American Rural Electrification	
Public Administration and Local Government	
Operating Expenses	•
Housing Guaranty Program Subsidies	
Loan Guarantees	\$110 million
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES	
Inter-American Foundation	\$30 million

(	Overseas Private Investment Corporation	\$7.5 million
	Subsidies	\$9 millior
	APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION	
Tota	al Committee Agreement	. \$10 billion
	elected States and Projects	
	Alabama	\$200 million
•	Air Force Child Development Center	\$2.7 million
	Air Force Quality Center	\$4.6 million
	Ft. McClellan Elementary School addition	\$2.7 million
	Road relocation	\$6.2 million
	Alaska	\$96 million
	2 child development centers	\$10 million
	New dining facility	
•	Arizona General purpose administrative facility	\$45 million
	New dining facility	\$4.7 million
-	Arkansas	
	New child development center	\$2.2 million
	New armory	\$3.2 million
(	California	\$103 million
	2 child development centers	\$8.6 million
	Conversion of a media center at McClellan AFB	
(	Colorado	
	Range control facility at Fort Carson	
	District of Columbia	\$7.4 million
	Florida	. \$3.4 million.
•	Bachelor enlisted quarters at Cecil Field NAS	noillim 212
c	Georgia	
	Expanding an ammunition storage area	\$3.1 million
	2 child development centers	
	Elementary school additions.	-
fi	llinois	
•	Rock Island Armory	
K	Kentucky	
	School additions	\$15 million
	Fort Knox Gymnasium additions	\$6 million
N	Maryland	\$206 million
	2 child development centers at the Edgewood Arsenal and Bethesda	<b>.</b>
	Navai Hospital	=
	Meeting center	•
N	levada	
	Land acquisition at Fallon Naval Air Station	≱1.0 millim

	New Mexico	
	Child development center	-
	Civil Engineering Complex	
	North Carolina	
	Land acquisition	
	Ohio	
	Child development center	
	Pennsylvania	
	Armory expansion	
	South Carolina	
	Upgrading airfield lighting and pavement	•
	Tennessee	•
	Armories	
	New warehouse	•
	Virginia	
	School additions	. \$8.4 million
	Child development center	. \$3.8 million
	Washington	
	Mess hall addition	. \$1.7 million
	Child development center	\$4.4 million
		. фт.т і і і і і і і
		. <b>4</b> 7.4 ((minor)
т.	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	•
To		•
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million listrict of \$1.1 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$400,000
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement derail Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Diumbia, including approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments	\$700 million <b>istrict of</b> . \$1.1 million\$400,000
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million istrict of\$1.1 million\$400,000\$200,000\$491,000
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million istrict of . \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$261,000 \$2 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement derail Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Dilumbia, including approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  Admission to Statehood  Office of Grants Management and Development  Office of Tourism and Promotion  Office of Emergency Preparedness  Two-way radio.	\$700 million <b>istrict of</b> . \$1.1 million\$400,000\$200,000\$491,000\$2 million\$4.5 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement deral Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the District Contribution approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  Admission to Statehood  Office of Grants Management and Development  Office of Tourism and Promotion  Office of Emergency Preparedness  Two-way radio.  D.C. School of Law	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$261,000 \$261,000 \$4.5 million \$4.5 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$491,000 \$261,000 \$2 million \$4.5 million \$4.5 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$261,000 \$261,000 \$4.5 million \$4.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement deral Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Dolumbia, including approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  Admission to Statehood  Office of Grants Management and Development  Office of Tourism and Promotion  Office of Emergency Preparedness  Two-way radio.  D.C. School of Law  Commission on the Arts and Humanities  Commission for Women  Commission for Men	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$491,000 \$261,000 \$2 million \$4.5 million \$4.5 million \$3.5 million \$348,000 \$50,000
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  Ital Committee Agreement  Ideral Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Distribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Distribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Distribution including approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  Admission to Statehood  Office of Grants Management and Development  Office of Tourism and Promotion  Office of Emergency Preparedness  Two-way radio.  D.C. School of Law  Commission on the Arts and Humanities  Commission for Women  Commission for Men  Washington Convention Center	\$700 million istrict of \$1.1 million \$1.1 million \$200,000 \$200,000 \$261,000 \$261,000 \$4.5 million \$4.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million
Fe	APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA stal Committee Agreement deral Contribution represents 18.4% of the total budget authority of the Dolumbia, including approval for the following programs:  Advisory Neighborhood Commissions  Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments  Admission to Statehood  Office of Grants Management and Development  Office of Tourism and Promotion  Office of Emergency Preparedness  Two-way radio.  D.C. School of Law  Commission on the Arts and Humanities  Commission for Women  Commission for Men	\$700 million  istrict of  \$1.1 million \$400,000 \$200,000 \$261,000 \$261,000 \$4.5 million \$4.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million \$3.5 million

# APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

Total Committee Agreement	lion
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	
Agricultural Research Service	llion
Aflatoxin Research	
Computational Hydroscience	
Hawaiian Fruit Fly\$3.1 mil	
Kenaf\$150,	
Locoweed Research\$200,	
National Center for Physical Acoustics\$500,	
National Sedimentation Laboratory\$5.6 mil	
Peanut Research	
Potato Research\$11 mil	
Soybean-Based Ink\$516,6	000
Soybean Research\$525,6	
Sugarcane Research\$965,0	000
Sweet Potato Whitefly\$3.3 mill	lion
Warmwater Aquaculture Center\$507,0	000
Wild Rice Research	000
Not included in the President's Budget	
National Swine Research Center, Iowa	
National Center for Natural Products, MS\$4.3 mill	ion
National Center for Warmwater Aquaculture, MS\$931,0	
Plant Stress Lab, Texas Tech University\$1.1 mill	ion
Special Research Grants:\$50 mill	lion
None of the following grants were recommended in the President's Budget:	
Agribusiness Management\$75,	000
Agricultural Management Systems\$261,	000
Aquaculture Research\$2.3 mill	ion
Competitiveness of Agricultural Products\$800,(	000
Cool Season Legume Research\$387,0	000
Cranberry/Blueberry Disease and Breeding\$260,0	000
Dairy Goat Research\$75,	000
Dairy Research\$75,0	000
Food Marketing Policy Center\$393,0	000
Generic Commodity Promotions, Research and Evaluation	)00
New Uses for Agricultural Products\$140,0	
Regionalized Implications of Farm Programs\$348,0	000
Seafood and Aquaculture Harvesting, Processing, and Marketing	)00
Southwest Consortium for Plant Genetics and Water Resources	)00
Waste Utilization\$440,0	)00

wool Hesearch	\$250,000
Extension Service	\$429 millior
Agriculture Telecommunications Program	
Toledo Farmer's Market	
Promote Tourism in New Mexico	
Rural Center for the Study and Promotion of HIV/STD Prevention	\$250,000
OTHER AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS	
Commodity Credit Corporation	
Export Enhancement	· ·
Dairy Purchases	
Purchases of Other Commodities	\$834 million
Conservation Programs	•
Conservation Reserve Program	
Soil Conservation Service Operations	\$588 million
Additional assistance for pasture grazing in Central New York	
Hungry Canyon Erosion Project in Iowa	·
Rural Development Programs	
Rural Electrification Loan Authorizations	\$1.9 billion
Rural Telephone Bank Program	
Distance Learning and Medical Link Programs	\$10 million
Foreign Assistance Programs	
Foreign Agricultural Service	\$117 millien
Market Promotion Program	
New York Botanical Gardens	\$1.3 million
Packers and Stockyards Administration	
Advisory Committees	
_	
APPROPRIATIONS FOR ENERGY AND WATER DEVE	LOPMENT
Total Committee Agreement	\$22 billion
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS	
General Investigations	\$207 million
Tucson Drainage Area, Arizona	
Tucker Creek, Arkansas	\$475,000
Huntington Beach, California	\$275,000
Rancho Palos Verdes, California	\$80,000
Hillsboro Inlet, Florida	\$150,000
Illinois and Michigan Canal, Illinois	\$1 million
Indianapolis Central Waterfront, Indiana	\$4 million
Ohio River Shoreline Flood Protection, Indiana	\$400,00
Salt River Basin, Kentucky	\$300,000
Tampa Harbor, Florida	\$600,000

West Virginia Comprehensive  Jennings Randolph Lake, West Virginia  Milwaukee Harbor, Wisconsin  Zebra Mussel Control	\$400,000 \$200,000
Construction Red River Emergency Bank, Arkansas Sacramento River Flood Control, California Casino Beach, Illinois New York Harbor, Removal of Drift Lake Gaston Aquatic Vegetation Control, North Carolina and Virginia Anacostia River, Maryland and District of Columbia Lake O' The Pines, Texas North Miami Beach, Flood Protection, Florida	\$3.5 million \$400,000 \$820,000 \$1 million \$200,000 \$700,000
Operation And Maintenance  Tucson Diversion Channel, Arizona  Los Angeles River Recreation, California  Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor Model, California  Michigan City Harbor: Upstream Sediment Trap  Toledo Harbor, Ohio  Sam Raybum Dam and Reservoir, Texas  Wright Patman Dam and Lake, Texas	\$550,000 \$400,000 \$145,000 \$450,000 \$1 million \$2 million
Bureau of Reclamation General Investigations Construction Programs San Gabriel Basin Project, California Los Angeles Area Water Reclamation and Reuse Project, California Hungry Horse Dam, Montana	\$13 million\$464 million\$5 million\$5 million
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	
Energy Supply, Research and Development	\$247 million \$4 million
Geothermal and Hydropower  Electrical Energy Systems and Storage  Nuclear Energy Programs  Biological And Environmental Research  Magnetic Fusion  Power Marketing Administrations  Alaska Power Administration  Southeastern Power Administration  Southwestern Power Administration	\$49.9 million\$330 million\$416 million\$347 million\$360 million\$4 million\$4 million

Western Area Power Administration\$292 million
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
Appalachian Regional Commission
Interstate Commission on the Potomac River \$498,000 Susquehanna River Basin Commission \$606,000 Salaries and Expenses \$308,000 Contribution \$298,000
Tennessee Valley Authority Fund\$138 million
APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
Total Committee Agreement
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
Construction
DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
Annual Contributions for Assisted Housing
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
Research and Development \$353 million Zebra Mussel Research \$529,000 Drinking Water Research \$943,000 Clean Alternative Fuels Research \$487,000 Acid Deposition Research \$510,000
Abatement, Control and Compliance
OTHER INDEPENDENT AGENCIES
American Battle Monuments Commission