

Appropriations for FY1998: Legislative Branch

Updated December 11, 1997

(name redacted)
Specialist in American National Government
Government Division

Appropriations are one part of a complex federal budget process that includes budget resolutions, appropriations (regular, supplemental, and continuing) bills, rescissions, and budget reconciliation bills. The process begins with the President's budget request and is bounded by the rules of the House and Senate, the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (as amended), the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and current program authorizations. In addition, the line item veto takes effect for the first time in 1997.

This report is a guide to one of the 13 regular appropriations bills that Congress passes each year. It is designed to supplement the information provided by the House and Senate Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations. It summarizes the current legislative status of the bill, its scope, major issues, funding levels, and related legislative activity. The report lists the key CRS staff relevant to the issues covered and related CRS products.

NOTE: A Web version of this document with active links is available to congressional staff at <http://www.loc.gov/crs/products/apppage.html>

Appropriations for FY1998: Legislative Branch

Summary

The House and Senate in recent years have devoted considerable attention to developing a legislative branch budget that achieved greater efficiency and increased savings. Legislative funding proposals continue to receive close scrutiny this year. While the legislative budget is not particularly large (0.15% of the total federal budget), many Members believe that there are places to trim expenses. To some Members there is symbolic importance in assuring the legislative branch budget is lean at a time when policymakers are actively pursuing elimination of the federal deficit. Efficient and cost effective government is a longstanding goal of the Congress.

The Appropriations Committees and internal oversight committees of both chambers continue to seek ways to save money by eliminating certain legislative activities, merging offices with similar activities, downsizing staff, and reducing administrative costs. Majority and minority leadership in both houses have promised to streamline their operations further by using fewer staff when possible, eliminating certain legislative support services, and privatizing more legislative services.

Since this report was last updated, data related to FY1998 appropriations may have changed through supplemental appropriations or rescissions, entitlement revisions, or scorekeeping adjustments. These changes will be reflected in a subsequent report.

Key Policy Staff

Area of Expertise	Name	CRS Division	Telephone
Appropriations Process	James Saturno	Government Division	72381
Appropriations Process	(name redacted)	Government Division	78646
Committee Funds and Staff	(name redacted)	Government Division	78651
Legislative Funds and Operations	Paul Dwyer	Government Division	78668
Legislative Funds and Operations	Lorraine Tong	Government Division	75846
Legislative Operations and Administration	(name redacted)	Government Division	78304
Legislative Staff, Mail and Operations	John Pontius	Government Division	76733

Contents

Most Recent Developments	7
Introduction	7
Status	8
Developments This Year	9
Major Issues That Drove	
Discussions on the FY1998 Bill	12
Funding Level Issues	12
Flat Budget	13
Modest Increase Proposals	13
Budget Decrease	14
Technology Funding	15
House and Senate Legislative Information Systems	15
House System	15
Senate System	16
Anticipated Expenses of Internet Use	17
House Legislative Resource Center	17
Computer File Security	17
Project 2000	18
Telecommunications Upgrade Issue	18
House and Senate Committee Funding	18
Joint Committee on Taxation	19
Architect of the Capitol Issues	19
Architect of the Capitol FY1998 Budget	19
Funding for Special Projects	19
Botanic Garden Budget	20
Privatization of Functions	20
Other Issues Under Consideration	20
Capitol Police Issues	20
Capitol Police Budget	20
Combining Payrolls of House and Senate Capitol Police	21
Security	21
Members' Allowance Issues	21
House Members' Representational Allowances	21
Drug Testing of House Employees	22
Capitol Visitors Center Funding	22
House Financial Accounting System	22
Senate Consolidated Financial Management System	22
Support Agency Issues	22
Library of Congress Budget	22
Library of Congress Security	23
Government Printing Office: Reduction in Printing Costs and Staff	23
General Accounting Office: Reduction of Budget, Privatization of Audits, and Authorization for Staff to Take Testimony	24
Major Funding Trends	25
Guide to Determining Legislative Budget Trends	25

Current Legislative Budget Trends	26
For Additional Reading	31
CRS Issue Briefs	31
CRS Reports	31
Appendix	32

List of Tables

TABLE 1. Status of Legislative Branch Appropriations	8
TABLE 2. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1993 to FY1997	26
TABLE 3. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1998	27
TABLE 4. Senate Items, FY1998	29
TABLE 5. House of Representatives Items, FY1998	30
TABLE 6. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1993-FY1997	32
TABLE 7. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1993-FY1997	33

Appropriations for FY1998: Legislative Branch

Most Recent Developments

The President signed H.R. 2209, the FY1998 Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, into P.L. 105-55 on October 7, 1997. Both houses agreed to the conference report on September 24, 1997. Since the bill had not been signed into law by October 1, the beginning of FY1998, legislative branch funding for October 1 - October 7, 1997, was governed by a continuing resolution, H.J.Res. 94, which generally funded legislative branch programs at the FY1997 level (P.L. 105-46, signed September 30, 1997).

P.L. 105-55 provides \$2.249 billion in new budget authority, an increase of 2.1% over the FY1997 legislative branch budget authority. This budget authority represents a compromise between the House-passed version of \$2.172 billion and the Senate-passed version of \$2.284 billion.¹ Conferees increased the House version by \$77 million, or 3.5%, and decreased the Senate version by \$35 million, or 1.5%.

Introduction

Since the late 1970s, the legislative branch appropriations bill has been divided into two titles. Title I, Congressional Operations, contains budget authorities for activities directly serving Congress. Included in this title are the budgets of the House, Senate, Joint Items (joint House and Senate activities), Congressional Budget Office, Architect of the Capitol (except Library Buildings and Grounds), Congressional Research Service within the Library of Congress, and congressional printing and binding within the Government Printing Office.

Title II, Related Agencies, contains budgets for activities not directly supporting Congress. Included in this title are the budgets of the Botanic Garden, Library of Congress (except Congressional Research Service), Library Buildings and Grounds within the Architect of the Capitol, Government Printing Office (except congressional printing and binding costs), and the General Accounting Office. Periodically since FY1978, the legislative bill has also contained additional titles for such purposes as capital improvements and special one-time functions.

Total budget authority in the FY1998 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act is \$2.249 billion. Title I budget authority is 70% of the total, and Title II budget authority is 30%. Additionally, there are legislative budget authorities that are not included in the regular legislative branch appropriations annual act or subsequent supplemental appropriations acts. These include permanent budget authorities, trust fund budget authorities, and other budget

¹ By custom, the House-passed version does not contain funding for internal Senate activities, and vice versa. However, these House and Senate figures reflect budget authorities for the internal activities of the other house for comparison purposes.

authorities.² Tables providing detailed information on the various funds in the bill as well as a breakdown of staffing appear at the end of this report.

Although most legislative branch budget authority is contained in the annual and supplemental legislative branch appropriations bills, additional permanent budget authorities are also available to the legislative branch. Budget authorities appropriated permanently are available as the result of previously enacted legislation and do not require annual action.³

Other legislative funding appears in the form of trust funds. Trust funds are monies held in accounts that are credited with collections from specific sources earmarked by law for a defined purpose. Trust funds do not appear in the annual legislative branch bill since they are not budget authority. They are included in the *Budget* either as budget receipts or offsetting collections.⁴

The *U.S. Budget* also includes some non-legislative entities within the legislative branch budget. These entities are funded in other appropriations bills. These non-legislative entities are placed within the legislative budget section by the Office of Management and Budget for bookkeeping purposes.⁵

Status

TABLE 1. Status of Legislative Branch Appropriations

Subcommittee Markup		House Report	House Passage	Senate Report	Senate Passage	Conference Report	Conference Report Approval		Public Law
							House	Senate	
House	Senate						House	Senate	

² Other budget authorities are those of some non-legislative entities within the legislative branch budget which are actually funded in other appropriations bills.

³ Permanent budget authorities are cited by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) in the annual *U.S. Budget*. In FY1997, the following legislative activities were funded by permanent budget authorities: House and Senate Member pay; use of foreign currencies; international conferences and contingencies; and Library of Congress payments to copyright owners. Total FY1997 permanent budget authority for the above activities was \$337 million.

⁴ FY1997, total trust fund authority is \$31 million. This includes Library of Congress gift and trust fund accounts (\$27 million); U.S. Capitol Preservation Commission trust funds (\$1 million); Architect of the Capitol gifts and donations (\$2 million); and John C. Stennis Center for Public Service Training and Development trust funds (\$1 million). Source is House Appropriations Committee.

⁵ The FY1997 *U.S. Budget* included non-legislative entities under two headings: (1) "U.S. Tax Court" and (2) "Other Legislative Branch Agencies - Legislative Branch Boards and Commissions." Included in the latter category were Prospective Payment Assessment Commission; Physician Payment Review Commission; Gambling Impact Study Commission; and a subcategory for "Other Legislative Branch Boards and Commissions." The *U.S. Budget* does not give information on the budget authorities of entities in this subcategory. To obtain a more accurate picture of the legislative budget, the budget authorities for non-legislative entities should be subtracted from the total legislative budget authority provided in the *U.S. Budget*. The FY1998 *U.S. Budget* shows a FY1997 total legislative budget authority of \$2.526 billion, including permanent budget authority, trust funds, and non-legislative entities. After removing non-legislative entities, the total is \$2.484 billion, including permanent budget authority and trust funds. Additionally excluding permanent budget authority and trust funds, the total is \$2.129 billion. The figure of \$2.129 billion is an estimate in the *U.S. Budget*, hence, the figure differs from the budget authority in the FY1997 bill of \$2.169 billion.

6/24/97	7/15/97 ^a	7/22/97 H.Rept. 105-196	7/28/97	7/15/97 S.Rept. 105-47	7/16/97	9/18/97 H.Rept. 105-254	9/24/97 (309-106)	9/24/97 (90-10)	P.L. 105- 55 10/7/97
---------	----------------------	-------------------------------	---------	------------------------------	---------	-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------------	----------------------------

a. Markup was held by the full Appropriations Committee.

Developments This Year

On February 6, 1997, President Clinton submitted his FY1998 budget of \$2.39 billion for legislative branch operations, an increase of 9.9% over the FY1997 level of \$2.17 billion.⁶ In February 1997, the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations completed hearings on the FY1998 legislative branch budget requests. The Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations completed its hearings in June 1997.

In June 1997, both houses passed an FY1997 supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1871, which was signed into P.L. 105-18 on June 12, 1997.⁷ The Act provided \$33.5 million for emergency repair of the Botanic Garden conservatory.

On June 18, 1997, the House Appropriations Committee approved its 302b budget allocation for FY1998 legislative branch budget authority of \$2.339 billion.⁸ On June 19, 1997, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved its allocation for new legislative branch budget authority of \$2.439 billion.

On June 24, 1997, the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations completed markup of the FY1998 bill. It approved \$1.712 billion in budget authority (excluding Senate activities). This amount was 0.6% less than the FY1997 budget authority (excluding Senate activities).

On July 15, 1997, the full Senate Appropriations Committee completed its markup of the bill and reported S. 1019 (S.Rept. 105-47). The Committee approved \$1.538 billion in new budget authority (excluding House activities). This amount was an increase of 3.5% (or \$51.6 million) over the FY1997 budget authority (excluding House activities). With House provisions included, new budget authority in the bill was 3.7% more than the FY1997 level.⁹

⁶ This figure represents requests for budget authorities of entities funded in the annual legislative appropriations bill. This figure does not include permanent budget authority. It also does not include budget for certain legislative related entities included in the President's budget that actually are funded in other appropriations bills. These entities are included under legislative activities in the *U.S. Budget* for administrative purposes. The President's FY1998 budget including these entities and permanent appropriations is \$2.754 billion.

⁷ For language in P.L. 105-18 that is relevant to the legislative branch see Representative Robert Livingston, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, June 12, 1997, p. H3766. These same provisions were originally included in the prior version of the FY1997 supplemental bill, H.R. 1469, which was vetoed by the President on June 9, 1997.

⁸ Section 302B allocations are required under federal budget law. Each year, the Appropriations Committees are required to determine the new budget authority allocations for the upcoming fiscal year for their subcommittees. In turn, the subcommittees are to adhere to the allocations.

⁹ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1998*, report to accompany S. 1019, 105th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 105-47 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 3.

On July 16, 1997, the Senate passed S. 1019 by voice vote after agreeing to one amendment.¹⁰ The amendment, agreed to by voice vote, made \$500,000 available for a pilot program of studies of scientific and technological issues to assist Congress.

On July 17, 1997, the full House Appropriations Committee completed its markup of the House bill, and on July 22 reported H.R. 2209 (H.Rept. 105-196). The Committee approved \$1.711 billion in new budget authority (excluding Senate activities). This amount was a decrease of 0.6% from the FY1997 appropriations level, excluding Senate activities. When appropriations for Senate activities were added, new budget authority in the bill was a 0.9% increase over the FY1997 appropriations level.¹¹

On July 28, 1997, the House passed H.R. 2209 by a vote of 214-203.¹² There were no changes in the appropriations levels in the bill as reported. Two amendments were adopted and two rejected. Of the two accepted, the first allowed the House Chief Administrative Officer to donate surplus computer equipment to public schools in Washington, D.C. (voice vote). The second required that unexpended Member office funds be applied to deficit reduction (voice vote). Of the two amendments rejected, one reduced funds for the Joint Taxation Committee by \$283,000 for five additional staff positions (vote of 199-213). The second reduced workyears in the Government Printing Office by 350 (170-242).

The following day, July 29, 1997, the Senate passed H.R. 2209 after striking all after the enacting clause, except for House budget authority, and inserting the language of S. 1019.¹³ There was no actual vote taken on July 29, 1997. The Senate's passage of H.R. 2209 was pursuant to an agreement made during consideration of S. 1019 on July 16.

The agreement provided that when the Senate received the House bill it would (1) strike the language of H.R. 2209 after the enacting clause, except for appropriations to operate the House, and insert the language of S. 1019, (2) make S. 1019 ineffective and indefinitely postpone its consideration, (3) pass H.R. 2209 as amended, (4) insist on its amendment, and (5) authorize the Senate Chair to appoint conferees. This agreement was made because the Senate passed its bill before the House approved its companion measure.

On September 3, 1997, the House disagreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 2209 and agreed to a conference.¹⁴ The House rejected (202-208) a motion to instruct conferees to agree to Senate language providing for a 4.64% budget increase for the Joint Committee on

¹⁰ See Senator Robert Bennett, remarks in the Senate, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, July 16, 1997, pp. S7593-S7602.

¹¹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1998*, report to accompany H.R. 2209, 105th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 105-196 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 3.

¹² See Representative James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, July 28, 1997, pp. H5868-H5895.

¹³ See remarks of the Senate Presiding Officer, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, July 29, 1997, p. S8216, and p. S8222, *Daily Digest* summary of action.

¹⁴ Since the Senate passed its bill (S. 1019) before the House passed its companion measure, the Senate agreed to make S. 1019 ineffective upon passage by the House of its companion measure. Upon House passage of H.R. 2209, the language of S. 1019 automatically became an amendment to H.R. 2209.

Taxation. The House provided for an 8.0% increase for the Joint Committee, which allowed for five new professional staff members.¹⁵

On September 17, 1997, conferees began and completed consideration of H.R. 2209. On September 19, 1997, conferees issued their report (H.Rept. 105-254) with \$2.249 billion in new budget authority. This was a 2.1% increase over FY1997. The FY1998 conference figure represented a compromise between the House-passed version of \$2.172 billion¹⁶ and the Senate-passed version of \$2.284 billion.¹⁷ The House version was increased by \$77 million, or 3.5%, and the Senate was decreased by \$35 million, or 1.5%. On September 24, 1997, both houses agreed to the conference report.

Among other changes, conferees agreed to the following provisions.

(1) \$339.5 million for the General Accounting Office (GAO), a compromise on the \$23.2 million difference between the House and Senate. The new GAO budget is \$16 million more than that approved by the House and \$7.3 million less than the amount approved by the Senate. The new budget is a 2.1% increase over the FY1997 budget. The increase was provided primarily in recognition of the 25% cut in GAO's budget since FY1994.

(2) A level of funding for the Joint Committee on Taxation that allows for 2.5 new FTE staff positions, a reduction from the 12 positions requested by the Joint Committee, a reduction from the 5 positions approved by the House, and an increase from no new staff positions approved by the Senate. The budget agreed to in conference was \$5.8 million. The House bill provided \$5.9 million and the Senate, \$5.7 million. Conferees added a provision directing the Joint Committee to be as responsive to Members of Congress who do not serve on the tax committees. Conferees also directed that responses to all Members be responsive and timely and that implementation of this directive be watched by the conferees in the coming fiscal year.

(3) \$71 million for Capitol Police salaries as proposed by the House, instead of \$74 million approved by the Senate. Conferees agreed to fund 1,255 FTE staff positions as proposed by the House instead of 1,259 proposed by the Senate. Conferees agreed to House and Senate language providing for a cost of living adjustment but voted against the Senate's provision for parity pay for the Capitol Police of the Senate and House.

(4) A budget of \$164.7 million for the Architect of the Capitol, a 17.1% increase over the FY1997 budget.¹⁸ The increase reflected additional funds for capitol improvement projects and represented a 1.7% increase over the House-approved FY1998 budget of \$162 million and a 1.7% decrease from the Senate's \$167.5 million.

¹⁵ See Representative James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, Sept. 3, 1997, pp. H6755-H6758.

¹⁶ This figure represents \$1.711 billion in the House-passed bill and \$460.6 million for internal Senate activities. By custom, the House-passed version does not contain funding for internal Senate activities.

¹⁷ This figure represents \$1.575 billion in the Senate-passed bill and \$708.7 million for internal House activities. By custom, the Senate-passed version does not contain funding for internal House activities.

¹⁸ This figure does not include \$11.6 million for buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress.

On October 7, 1997, the President signed H.R. 2209 into P.L. 105-55. Since the bill had not been signed by October 1, the beginning of FY1998, funding for the legislative branch was governed during the interim by a continuing resolution that generally funded programs at the FY1997 level (H.J.Res. 94, P.L. 105-46, September 30, 1997).

Major Issues That Drove Discussions on the FY1998 Bill

The effort in recent years to trim the legislative budget continued during consideration of the FY1998 funding level. Early in 1997, Representative James T. Walsh, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, noted that cuts made in recent years in the budget for the House of Representatives have shown that the House can reduce its expenses and in so doing not hinder the capabilities of the House as an institution.¹⁹

Among issues that drove consideration of the FY1998 legislative branch appropriations bill were the following:

- How much to appropriate for the Architect's request to undertake several Capitol improvements;
- Whether legislative staff levels should be further reduced;
- Whether to agree to funds authorized for committee investigations of alleged campaign violations by the Administration and Congress;
- What appropriation needs were for technology development, including on-line information, electronic document printing, and a legislative information system;
- What functions of the Architect of the Capitol could be privatized;
- How much should funding be increased for security enhancement for the Capitol and other congressional buildings;
- What the funding levels for the primary congressional support agencies should be, including the Government Printing Office, the Congressional Budget Office, the Library of Congress, and the General Accounting Office; and
- At what level the Joint Committee on Taxation should be funded.

Funding Level Issues

Each spring, as members of the House and Senate Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations consider funding requests from legislative agencies, they are faced with three primary options: to maintain a flat budget; to provide a modest increase; or to approve a budget decrease. Statements by members of the subcommittees and the House leadership indicated early support for a modest increase in the FY1998 budget.

¹⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 4.

In 1997, the House and Senate agreed to slightly differing levels. On July 28, 1997, the House passed H.R. 2209 providing for a decrease of 0.6%, excluding Senate funds. Earlier, on July 16, 1997, the Senate passed its version of the FY1998 bill with a 3.5% increase over FY1997, excluding House activities.

Flat Budget. A flat budget typically provides new funds for mandatory cost increases, but denies any additional funding requests. A flat budget is usually difficult to achieve due to a number of factors. Among the factors affecting consideration of the FY1998 bill were the following:

- (1) the leadership's continued interest in increasing the electronic capabilities of the House and Senate;
- (2) increases in House and Senate committee funds; and
- (3) anticipated costs associated with repairs to the Capitol complex buildings.

Earlier in 1997, the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations stated his desire to hold the FY1998 budget as close to the FY1997 level as possible.²⁰ Chairman Walsh also stated that he was open to modifications if increases were found necessary to maintain the smooth operation of Congress.

On the Senate side, concern too was expressed that an FY1998 funding level be approved that would enable Congress to operate efficiently. It was also emphasized that Congress was already working at a reduced funding level. During the Senate hearings, Senator Robert Bennett, Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, commented that Congress had achieved significant reductions in its budget, particularly in committee staff.²¹ He added that the Subcommittee would need to exert care in looking at the needs of the legislative branch. Senator Byron Dorgan, another member of the Subcommittee, stated at the same hearing that he did not believe most people realized that the legislative branch had already been significantly downsized.²²

Modest Increase Proposals. By mid-summer, actions in the Senate and House indicated the likelihood of a modest increase. The Senate version of the FY1998 bill provided for new budget authority of \$1.538 billion, excluding House activities. This represented an increase of 3.5%, or \$51.6 million, above the FY1997 level. The House Appropriations Committee approved a reduction of 0.6%. As the bill was sent to conference, many observers felt it possible that the conferees would settle for a slight increase, which they did in approving a 2.1% increase.

Earlier indications of support for a modest increase were the FY1998 Section 302b allocations of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.²³ The House Appropriations Committee approved its allocations on June 18, 1997, allowing for an FY1998 new legislative

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Source is remarks of the chairman during a hearing held by the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations on May 4, 1997, on the FY1998 legislative branch budget.

²² Ibid.

²³ Section 302B allocations are required under federal budget law. Each year, the Appropriations Committees are required to determine the new budget authority allocations for the upcoming fiscal year for their subcommittees. In turn, the subcommittees are to adhere to the allocations.

branch budget authority of \$2.339 billion.²⁴ The Senate Appropriations Committee approved \$2.439 billion for its FY1998 new legislative branch budget authority on June 19, 1997.²⁵ The House allocation allowed for a 6.2% increase over the FY1997 budget authority of \$2.203 billion. The Senate allocation allowed for a 10.7% increase.²⁶

Another indication of support for a modest increase in the FY1998 legislative budget was the FY1998 budget request that Congress submitted to the President and was in turn presented by him in the *U.S. Budget* for FY1998. Usually, the *U.S. Budget* estimates are higher than the budgets Congress actually approves. Excluding Senate activities, the FY1998 House budget request for legislative branch activities was \$1.855 billion. Excluding Senate activities, the FY1997 budget authority was \$1.722 billion.²⁷ The FY1998 request was an increase of \$133 million, or 7.7% over the FY1997 appropriation for all legislative activities.²⁸

Although the increase was almost 8%, the FY1998 request was actually a decrease from the FY1995 appropriation level. The FY1998 request of \$1.855 billion was almost 1% less than the FY1995 appropriation level for legislative branch activities, again excluding those of the Senate, of \$1.869 billion.²⁹

Including Senate activities, estimates in the FY1998 *U.S. Budget* reflected an increase in the total legislative budget of 8.4% over the FY1997 appropriation. The FY1997 funding level was \$2.203 billion; the FY1998 estimate was \$2.387 billion. Both figures excluded permanent budget authority and trust funds.

Budget Decrease. The decrease of 0.6% approved by the House on July 28, reflected an earlier trend toward a decreased legislative budget. Although a decrease in the total FY1998 bill seemed unlikely with the Senate's 3.5% increase, both houses did approve a reduction for FY1997. The FY1997 legislative branch appropriations approved in the regular annual act provided for a budget of \$2.165 billion; the FY1996 budget was \$2.187 billion. This was a decrease of \$22 million, or 1.0%.

²⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Report of the Subdivision of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 1998*, 105th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 105-15 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 2.

²⁵ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 1998*, 105th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 105-31 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 4.

²⁶ As of September 19, the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations had reached a tentative agreement to increase the FY1998 legislative branch 302B allocation by \$4 million.

²⁷ Senate activities are funded in two places in the legislative branch appropriations bill: the Senate heading for operations of the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol heading for Senate office buildings and grounds.

²⁸ This figure was determined by subtracting Senate activities of \$441 million for Senate operations and \$40 million for Senate activities under the Architect of the Capitol from the total FY1997 legislative branch appropriation of \$2.203 billion.

²⁹ The figure \$1.869 billion was determined by subtracting Senate activities of \$461 million for Senate operations and \$48 million for Senate activities under the Architect of the Capitol from total FY1995 legislative branch appropriations of \$2.378 billion.

Technology Funding

House and Senate Legislative Information Systems. Both houses continued to take steps to reduce duplication of effort in tracking legislation, to upgrade legislative tracking systems, and to ensure that Congress achieves the needed reprogramming of its computers by the year 2000.³⁰ To accomplish most of this, the House and Senate continued to develop their legislative information systems that create and manage legislative data files. Earlier, both houses had directed the Congressional Research Service (CRS) to develop a data retrieval system with the technical support of the Library of Congress (LOC) and in collaboration with other legislative branch agencies, such as the General Printing Office (GPO).³¹

The House legislative information system is to be administered by the House Clerk, and the Senate system by the Secretary of the Senate. Both the Clerk and the Secretary continue to exchange information on developments of their own systems. In 1997, they reported to the House Oversight Committee and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration their recommendations regarding the electronic transfer of legislative data. Among other issues, their recommendations included transferals between the two houses and among all legislative entities.

The House and Senate legislative information systems are expected to reduce duplication through consolidation of existing legislative data services and to support the transition. The systems will be designed to complement the GPO Access Service, which was created by the 1993 GPO Information Enhancement Act.³²

House System. Beginning with FY1996, the House Oversight Committee and the House Clerk have worked jointly in developing the House legislative information system and continue to do so. In FY1996, the Committee directed the Clerk of the House to study methods for increasing electronic printing of House documents. The Committee further directed that subsequent proposals of the Clerk be coordinated with the GPO and all House entities requiring printing and storage of documents.

In testimony on February 4, 1997, the Clerk addressed progress on her plans drawn in response to these directives. In her FY1998 budget proposal, the Clerk requested a new House appropriations subheading for a proposed Document Management System (DMS). The DMS was to be funded in the subheading *Document Management System* under the heading *Allowances and Expenses* under the account *Salaries and Expenses* (of the House).

The primary purpose of the new subheading would be to assist in maintaining accountability of the system's costs. The proposed DMS, she explained, would provide a document management system for creating, tracking, editing, sharing, printing, and transmitting documents. The primary purpose of the System, the Clerk emphasized, was to

³⁰ See discussion on the need to reprogram computers by the year 2000 later in this section.

³¹ The Senate directed CRS and the Library to develop a retrieval system in the FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations bill. The language was contained in an amendment that was dropped in the Act, but maintained in the conference report. Subsequent to passage of the FY1997 bill, the Chairman of the House Oversight Committee directed CRS and the Library to ensure that the retrieval system being developed for the Senate also meets the requirements of the House. The chairman's directive was contained in a letter to the CRS Director dated Oct. 9, 1996.

³² The Government Printing Office went online in June 1994, providing bill texts, contents of the *Congressional Record*, and copies of federal regulations, among other documents.

allow the House to move from its dependency on the GPO for preparing, printing, and distributing House documents.³³

The DMS would also allow simultaneous electronic transmission of floor debates, committee hearings, and other legislative activities. Although development of the DMS would be costly, the Clerk anticipated that the electronic transfer of data will provide savings of about \$1 million a year to the House.³⁴ According to the Clerk, House *Rules* would need to be amended to enable development of the DMS.³⁵

In anticipation of the development of the DMS, the House report on the FY1998 bill contained language that directed the Congressional Research Service and the Library of Congress to "devote sufficient resources to accomplish the following during FY1998: (1) provide comparable functionality so that legacy retrieval systems can be retired by 12/31/98; (2) improve productivity of congressional staff by making significant progress in implementing previously identified high-priority functionality; and (3) improve the accuracy, usability, and timeliness of legislative information retrieval."³⁶

Senate System. In 1997 the Secretary of the Senate continued work begun in 1996 on the development and implementation of the Senate's legislative information service. The Secretary of the Senate was directed to develop a legislative information system for the Senate in the FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act.³⁷ The Act directed that the Secretary oversee the system's development and implementation, subject to approval of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. Like the House, the Senate system provides a means for creating, tracking, editing, sharing, and transmitting documents.

Earlier, in FY1995, the Library of Congress (LOC) was requested by the House Committee on Appropriations to analyze duplication of legislative information systems supporting Congress including those of the Senate and House. Pursuant to the Library's findings, the Committee directed LOC to prepare a plan for consolidating these overlapping services. Both the analysis and plan were developed by the CRS with the Library's support.

The FY1997 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act funded the Senate system by authorizing the Secretary to use unspent FY1995 monies previously appropriated for the Office of the Secretary of the Senate (and to remain available until September 30, 1998). The Secretary was also authorized to transfer, as he determines necessary, funds already appropriated to his office for the purpose of development of the Senate financial management system to the development of the legislative information system.

³³ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 1, 105th Cong., 1st sess., January 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 163.

³⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 43.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1998*, report to accompany H.R. 2209, 105th Cong., 1st sess., H.Rept. 105-196 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 8.

³⁷ P.L. 104-197, 110 Stat. 2398, Sept. 16, 1996, sec. 8, *FY1996 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act*.

Access to additional funding was provided in the FY1997 supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 1871), signed into law (P.L. 105-18) on June 12, 1997. The act authorized the transfer of \$5 million from other Senate accounts to the account Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and subaccount Secretary of the Senate.³⁸ The money is available through September 30, 2000. The transfer is subject to approval of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Anticipated Expenses of Internet Use. Technology advancement in the House and Senate and related costs were significant factors in pending congressional budgets. These costs will continue to play a role in budget considerations as more and more offices and committees join the Internet and expand their usage of it. For example, House Internet usage increased by 800% in 1995 and 1996.³⁹ Throughout the United States, Internet usage has more than doubled since July 1995.⁴⁰ It is anticipated that Congress will face significant expenses in expanding its technological capacity to meet the demands of increased constituent communications via the Internet.

It is expected that eventually, however, most expenses will be offset by savings. It is estimated that during the 105th Congress, savings will be almost \$750,000 for (1) replacement of the IBM mainframe by an IBM CMOS Enterprise Service (estimated \$505,000 savings), and (2) installation of a higher-reliability, direct-access storage system (estimated \$246,500 savings).⁴¹

House Legislative Resource Center. The Clerk restructured the House Legislative Resource Center, which opened in its new office in early 1997. Four offices handling legislative House archives were merged with the creation of the Center -- Office of Records and Registration, House Library, Historian, and Document Room. The Clerk stated in testimony before the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations that the new Center would enable a reduction in staff of 22 FTE positions.⁴² A principal task of Center staff is to develop simultaneous electronic relay of floor debates, committee hearings, and other activities. A major issue was what types of information should be maintained for use by the House only and not be made available to the public.

Computer File Security. The House continued to be faced with security problems related to unauthorized access to Members' computer files. One of its first steps was to employ a security officer in House Information Resources (HIR). Staff of HIR are funded in the budget of the Chief Administrative Officer. The Inspector General also remained involved in addressing these problems.

³⁸ For language in H.R. 1871 that is relevant to the legislative branch see Representative Robert Livingston, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, June 12, 1997, p. H3766. This provision was originally included in the prior version of the FY1997 supplemental bill, H.R. 1469, which was vetoed by the President on June 9, 1997.

³⁹ Testimony of Representative Vernon Ehlers on the CyberCongress initiative before the House Committee on Oversight on Feb. 11, 1997. Representative Ehlers is chairman of the House Computer and Information Working Group of the House Oversight Committee.

⁴⁰ Source is telephone conversation with spokesperson for the Nielson Media Research Group on March 12, 1997.

⁴¹ Letter to the editor from Representative Vernon Ehlers, Chairman of the House Computer and Information Working Group of the House Oversight Committee, in *Roll Call*, Feb. 17, 1997, p. 4.

⁴² U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 43.

Project 2000. At issue is the cost for reprogramming computer systems by the year 2000. This is necessary because most computers use a two-digit year system for purposes of dating. The system assumes 1 and 9 are the first two digits of the year. If not reprogrammed, computers using the two digit system will think the year 2000 - 00 - actually is 1900. The result would be data errors and possibly computer shutdowns. According to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), it will cost the federal government, including Congress, an estimated \$2.3 billion to make these adjustments. This figure is considered by the chairman of the House subcommittee with oversight responsibility, Representative Stephen Horn, to be low since he believes it does not include all expected labor costs for computer programmers.⁴³

Telecommunications Upgrade Issue. The FY1998 House budget includes \$3.3 million for new digital switches, new terminal equipment, and purchase and installation of new digital telephones. This system will allow teleconferencing and video conferencing available for communications with individuals and organizations in Members' congressional districts and elsewhere.

House and Senate Committee Funding

Both houses recently adopted resolutions authorizing committee funds essentially for the 105th Congress (calendar years 1997 and 1998). Part of the appropriations for these funds is provided in the FY1998 legislative appropriations bill.⁴⁴

The Senate resolution, adopted on February 13, 1997, provided for a 100% funding of the recurring 1996 level, plus cost of living adjustments for specific purposes and time periods.⁴⁵ The resolution was amended on March 11 to provide an additional \$4.35 million for the Committee on Governmental Affairs.⁴⁶ Funds were provided for a special investigation of illegal or improper actions related to the 1996 elections. A point of debate was whether to include both illegal and improper activities in the committee's investigation. Ultimately, both were included.

The House Oversight Committee reported on March 17, 1997, a funding resolution authorizing \$178.3 million for House committees (except for the Appropriations Committee). This was a 13% increase over the 104th Congress funding level of \$157.3 million. On March 20, the rule for consideration of the resolution was defeated on the floor primarily by those opposed to (1) the 13% increase; (2) the relatively large budget for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight to use in part for an investigation of campaign fund-raising by the White House; and (3) the inclusion of a special reserve fund for use by any committee with unanticipated expenses in the 105th Congress.

⁴³ Source is statement of Representative Stephen Horn during a hearing by the House Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology on the "Year 2000 Problem," Feb. 25, 1997. Representative Horn is chairman of the subcommittee.

⁴⁴ Other appropriations will come from the FY1997 and FY1999 legislative appropriations acts. This is because committee funds are authorized essentially on a two-year calendar basis, yet funded on an annual, fiscal year basis (Oct. 1 - Sept. 30).

⁴⁵ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, *Authorizing Biennial Expenditures by Committees of the Senate*, report to accompany S.Res. 54, 105th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 105-9 (Washington: GPO, 1971), p. 1.

⁴⁶ Senator Trent Lott, remarks in Senate, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, March 11, 1997, p. S2096.

On March 21, 1997, the House agreed to an interim funding authorization through May 2, 1997. The interim measure was needed since the current funding authorization was set to expire on March 31, 1997. With one exception, this interim resolution continued funding for committees at the same level as that for committees in January through March 1997 (9% per month of the previous session's total funding). The measure authorized funds for the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight for the entire 105th Congress. It provided the committee a budget of \$20 million, including a one-year authorization of \$3.8 million for a special investigation. The resolution also established a special reserve fund of \$7.9 million for the 105th Congress.⁴⁷

A new committee funding resolution was ordered reported by the Committee on House Oversight on April 28, 1997. The resolution authorized \$177.8 million for committees, except Government Reform and Oversight and Appropriations, for the 105th Congress. This figure was \$550,740 less than the original funding resolution the House voted against considering on March 20. It represented a 13% increase over previous funding. On May 1, 1997, the House agreed to the new resolution by a vote of 262-157.

Joint Committee on Taxation

Conferees agreed to a funding level for the Joint Committee on Taxation that allowed for 2.5 new FTE staff positions, a reduction from the twelve positions requested by the Joint Committee, a reduction from the five positions approved by the House, and an increase over the status quo position approved by the Senate. The budget agreed to in conference was \$5.8 million. The House bill provided \$5.9 million and the Senate, \$5.7 million. Conferees added a provision directing the Joint Committee to be as responsive to Members of Congress who do not serve on the tax committees as to those Members who do serve on the committees. Further, conferees directed that responses to all Members be responsive as well as timely and that implementation of this directive be watched by the conferees in the coming fiscal year.

Architect of the Capitol Issues

Architect of the Capitol FY1998 Budget. The Architect's FY1998 budget request was \$201.3 million, a 32% increase over the FY1997 funding level. The request contained a five-year capitol budget that included \$147.3 million for operating costs and almost \$54 million for capitol expenditures. The \$54 million capitol expenditure request covered 205 basically maintenance projects included in a five-year capitol plan.

Funding for Special Projects. Included in the Architect's five-year capitol project plan budget was \$3 million to repair the Capitol dome. On June 24, 1997, the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations approved \$1.5 million specifically for repairs to the dome.

Almost half of the Architect's FY1998 budget request for special projects was for technological purposes and compliance with regulations primarily mandated by laws made applicable to Congress, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act. Among the technology issues still involved is the adequacy of the current wiring systems in handling the growing number of Internet users, the need to reconfigure offices so they can accommodate new computer terminals as well as other necessary pieces of equipment, and how to replace out-of-

⁴⁷ On June 8, 1997, the House Oversight Committee for the first time authorized use of these funds. The Committee approved \$1.4 million for use of the Committee on Education and Workforce for oversight hearings on the American labor force.

date electronic systems for which replacement parts are difficult to locate. Among the issues regarding compliance with regulations of the Americans with Disabilities Act are accessibility to and within buildings of the Capitol complex.

On September 18, 1997, conferees on H.R. 2209 agreed to increase the Architect of the Capitol's budget by 17.1% over the FY1997 budget to \$164.7 million.⁴⁸ The increase reflects additional funds for capitol improvement projects and represents a 1.7% increase over the House-approved FY1998 budget of \$162 million and a 1.7% decrease from the Senate's \$167.5 million.

Botanic Garden Budget. Congress approved \$33.5 million for emergency repair and renovation of the conservatory of the Botanic Garden in the FY1997 supplemental bill (H.R. 1871). The bill was signed into law (P.L. 105-18) on June 12, 1997.⁴⁹ Early in 1997, the Architect requested \$35 million for such repairs in his testimony before the Appropriations Committees.

Privatization of Functions. During hearings on his FY1998 budget, the Architect stated that he would consider privatization of some services under his jurisdiction if feasible.⁵⁰ He indicated that he would continue to review recommendations contained in a recent study on privatization of services in the Architect's Office by the firm of Arthur Anderson.⁵¹

Other Issues Under Consideration. Other issues considered included the following:

- (1) consolidation of the Architect's trade shops;
- (2) consideration of the impact on retirement benefits of employees who have been dismissed due to privatization; and
- (3) consideration of a proposal to employ one superintendent to oversee both the House and Senate.⁵²

Capitol Police Issues

Capitol Police Budget. The FY1998 budget request of the Capitol Police was \$79.3 million, a 9.0% increase over the FY1997 funding level. The additional amount requested was

⁴⁸ This figure does not include \$11.6 million for buildings and grounds of the Library of Congress.

⁴⁹ For language in H.R. 1871 that is relevant to the legislative branch see Representative Robert Livingston, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, June 12, 1997, p. H3766. This provision was originally included in the prior version of the FY1997 supplemental bill, H.R. 1469, which was vetoed by the President on June 9, 1997.

⁵⁰ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 638.

⁵¹ During consideration of the FY1996 bill, the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations directed the acting Architect to initiate a move to privatize House custodial and maintenance services, to begin the process for privatization of the Ford Office Building, and to initiate a study for privatization of the Capitol Power Plant. In hearings on the FY1997 bill, the subcommittee reviewed the final plans for privatization of the Ford Building and continued to express its interest in privatizing more functions of the Architect's Office, including maintenance of all other House Office Buildings.

⁵² Presently, each House has its own superintendent.

to be spent on enhancing technology for the police force and increasing the pay of its members to make it comparable to other law enforcement agencies.⁵³

On September 18, 1997, conferees agreed to \$71 million for salaries of the Capitol Police as proposed by the House, instead of \$74 million approved by the Senate. Conferees agreed to fund 1,255 FTE staff positions as proposed by the House instead of 1,259 proposed by the Senate. Conferees agreed to House and Senate language providing for a cost of living adjustment but voted against the Senate's provision for parity pay for the Capitol Police of the Senate and House.

Combining Payrolls of House and Senate Capitol Police. Both the House and Senate Sergeants at Arms requested that the separate House and Senate police payrolls be combined into one.⁵⁴ Representative James Walsh, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, supported the proposal to transfer both payrolls to the National Finance Center, which is responsible for much of the government's payroll services.⁵⁵

Security. Both the House and Senate Sergeants at Arms requested additional funds for security enhancement in FY1998. The Sergeants at Arms have jurisdiction over members of the Capitol Police Force. In 1997, the House Sergeant at Arms continued to implement the recommendations contained in a House security study undertaken by the Capitol Police, the House Sergeant at Arms, and the Secret Service.

Senate security remains a major issue with the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.⁵⁶ Senate security enhancement actions include, among others, removal of out-of-date equipment, installation of wireless alarms in the Senate, and installation of closed-circuit security cameras.

Members' Allowance Issues

House Members' Representational Allowances. The House Chief Administrative Officer requested an increase of \$42 million over the FY1997 funding level for the Members' Representational Allowances. This adjustment was to meet increased expenses of annual pay adjustments, associated mandatory personnel costs, increased material costs, increased rental rates in district officers, and other additional expenses due to price changes. The House adopted an amendment to H.R. 2209 on July 28, 1997, requiring that unspent funds appropriated for Members' Representational Allowances be applied to payment of the deficit. This language was the same as that contained in the FY1997 Act.⁵⁷

⁵³ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). pp. 197-199.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 197-206.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 223.

⁵⁶ Statements made by the Senate Sergeant at Arms and chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations during hearings on operations of the Senate Sergeant at Arms Office on March 5, 1997.

⁵⁷ See *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, July 10, 1996, p. H7188-H7190. The FY1996 Legislative Branch Appropriations Act contains a provision added on the House floor directing that all unused funds in the Members' Representational Allowance be used solely for payment of the deficit. The provision is applicable to FY1996 funds only. Normally, unspent money
(continued...)

Drug Testing of House Employees

The House Committee on Oversight considered a proposal to adopt a House regulation authorizing Members to pay drug testing expenses from their official office expense funds. The funds are collectively referred to as the Members' Representational Allowances. Presently, Members must pay the expense with their personal funds. The costs, however, presumably would not be significant.

Capitol Visitors Center Funding

Pending before Congress was construction of a proposed Capitol Visitors Center at an estimated cost of \$125 million. The Visitors Center would be located on three levels beneath the Capitol's East Front Plaza. The source of funding is expected to be private donations and the Capitol Preservation Fund, which is administered by the Capitol Preservation Commission. To complete this project, Congress might find it necessary to appropriate federal funds until private funding is available. If used, federal funds most likely will be made available in the legislative branch act. Thus far, \$23 million appears to be available from the Capitol Preservation Fund. Oversight hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. During the course of the hearings, the committee chairman expressed concern with congressional encouragement of private funding while Congress was investigating 1996 campaign fundraising activities.⁵⁸

House Financial Accounting System

The House Chief Administrative Officer requested \$60 million for his office, an 8.1% increase over FY1997. The primary expenditure was for personnel costs, including funding for 37 new FTE positions. Of these, 25 FTEs were to be full-time employees of the House Finance Office who would work with the new Federal Finance System, which was installed in the House in 1996.

Senate Consolidated Financial Management System

The Secretary of the Senate requested funds to develop a consolidated financial management system for the Senate. His goal was to develop a paperless on-line system of purchase orders, voucher information, and supporting documentation that could be scanned.

Support Agency Issues

Library of Congress Budget. The Librarian of Congress requested \$387.6 million for FY1998, a 7.2% increase over FY1997. Most of the increase was for mandatory pay increases (\$10.7 million) and automation projects (\$6.1 million). The FY1998 House bill provided \$342.3 million; the Senate bill, \$351.4 million. The Library also proposed to increase staff by 37 positions to counter the large numbers of retirements expected within the

⁵⁷(...continued)

remains available for expenditure for three years, including the year for which originally appropriated. At the end of three years, this unused money simply reverts within the Treasury from the House account to the "General Fund" of the Treasury.

⁵⁸ Statements of Chairman John Warner before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration during oversight hearings on operations of legislative offices, on Mar. 5, 1997.

next few years.⁵⁹ The estimated cost of the staff succession program was \$1.9 million in FY1998.

Library of Congress Security. The Library currently is developing a comprehensive Security Management Plan to determine what is needed to enhance the Library's present security system. The plan will include recommendations on appropriations and personnel needed by the Library to implement the new system.

Government Printing Office: Reduction in Printing Costs and Staff. The Government Printing Office (GPO) requested \$114.5 million for FY1998, a 3.4% increase over FY1997. Most of the increase was for funds for Title I congressional printing and binding.

The major issue continued to be ways by which the agency could reduce its printing costs. Among proposals to accomplish this were (1) privatization of printing production,⁶⁰ (2) competitive bidding, resulting in an estimated saving of 30% in annual printing costs,⁶¹ (3) contracting of printing orders of less than \$1,000;⁶² and (4) reimbursement by federal agencies to GPO for printing costs.⁶³

The FY1998 House bill provided \$99.9 million, while the Senate bill appropriated \$111.3 million. On July 28, 1997, the House rejected an amendment to reduce GPO's FTE staff level by 350 (vote of 170-242).

A major effort of GPO continued to be the development of electronic data bases and electronic distribution of data for the House and Senate. In 1997, approximately 50% of all congressional documents were in electronic format.⁶⁴ To improve this figure, the House Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations requested the Public Printer to assist the House Clerk in development of the Document Management System (DMS).

⁵⁹ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 542. In CRS alone, 52% of the staff will be eligible to retire in 2006.

⁶⁰ Privatization proposals will be developed with the Joint Committee on Printing.

⁶¹ This proposal was an assumption in the House versions of the FY1996 and FY1997 Budget Resolutions. See the House Budget Committee's *Chairman's Mark* of May 10, 1995, of the FY1996 Budget Resolution, and U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget - Fiscal Year 1997*, report to accompany H.Con.Res. 178, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 104-575 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 143.

⁶² This proposal was contained in the House version of the FY1997 Budget Resolution. See U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget - Fiscal Year 1997*, report to accompany H.Con.Res. 178, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 104-575 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 253. The proposal also requires that federal agencies use credit cards for purchases of printing jobs costing less than \$1,000.

⁶³ Although this proposal was passed by the House in its version of the FY1996 legislative bill, the Senate disagreed stating that this proposal which would change 44 U.S.C. should be considered instead by the Joint Printing Committee.

⁶⁴ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 419.

Approximately 80% of government printing is contracted. Labor costs to the Government Printing Office (GPO) in calendar year 1996 were estimated to be 50% greater than comparable private printer costs.⁶⁵ In the FY1997 Act, Congress reduced the GPO staff level by 100 FTE positions to approximately 3,600, at an estimated savings of \$5 million.

General Accounting Office: Reduction of Budget, Privatization of Audits, and Authorization for Staff to Take Testimony. The Senate and House bills contained differing budget authorities for GAO. On July 16, 1997, the Senate passed its version of the FY1998 bill, S. 1019, providing \$346.8 million, a \$14.2 million over FY1997's level of \$332.5 million. This 4.6% increase in funding supported a staff level of 3,500 FTEs.⁶⁶

The House passed its version, H.R. 2209, on July 28, 1997, with provision for \$323.5 million, a reduction of \$9 million in new budget authority. The House made a total of \$330.9 million available to GAO by authorizing GAO to use \$7.4 million in FY1998 in offsetting receipts. This level of funding was to allow GAO to increase its staff level by 85 FTEs above the projected FY1997 FTE staff level.

GAO's budget request was \$361.4 million, an 8.7% increase over its FY1997 budget. In the last two fiscal years, however, GAO's budget and staff level has been reduced considerably. In calendar year 1995, in response to the congressional downsizing trend, the Comptroller General proposed a 25% reduction over the next two fiscal years (15% in FY1996 and 10% in FY1997).⁶⁷

The Comptroller's 1995 proposal was accepted by the House and Senate Subcommittees on Legislative Branch Appropriations. The actual FY1996 cut was 16.2%, a reduction from \$446.7 million in FY1995 to \$374.4 million in FY1996. The House and Senate versions of the FY1997 bill completed the 25% reduction. The Senate Budget Committee estimated that the reduction saves approximately \$250 million through FY2002.

Staff was also reduced. Since 1990, GAO staff has been reduced by approximately 35%.⁶⁸ As a result of the cuts, GAO most likely will continue the trend of contracting with

⁶⁵ U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget -- Fiscal Year 1997*, report to accompany H.Con.Res. 178, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 104-575 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 143.

⁶⁶ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1998*, report to accompany S. 1019, 105th Cong., 1st sess., S.Rept. 105-47 (Washington: GPO, 1997), p. 45.

⁶⁷ Continued reduction of GAO's budget was an assumption in both the House and Senate versions of the FY1997 Budget Resolution. See U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget - Fiscal Year 1997*, report to accompany H.Con.Res. 178, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., H.Rept. 104-575 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 250, and U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, 1997*, report to accompany S.Con.Res. 57, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 104-271 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 58.

⁶⁸ U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Budget, *Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, 1997*, report to accompany S.Con.Res. 57, 104th Cong., 2nd sess., S.Rept. 104-271 (Washington: GPO, 1996), p. 58.

private audit firms to conduct audits.⁶⁹ Additionally, to stay within budget, GAO plans to rely more on video-conferencing in lieu of on-site interviews.⁷⁰

Conferees agreed to a \$339.5 million budget for GAO, a compromise on a \$23.2 million difference between the House and Senate. The new GAO budget is \$16 million more than that approved by the House and \$7.3 million less than the amount approved by the Senate. The new budget is a 2.1% increase over FY1997 and reflects recognition of recent cuts.

Major Funding Trends

Guide to Determining Legislative Budget Trends. Interpretation of budget trends is determined primarily by three factors: selection of current or constant dollars to express budget authority (constant dollars reflecting the impact of inflation); selection of budget authority contained in annual appropriations bills with or without permanent budget authority (permanent budget authority not requiring annual approval by Congress); and selection of fiscal years to be compared.

Current dollar data reflect actual budget authority appropriated each year. Constant dollar data reflect the conversion of actual budget authority into equivalent 1997 dollars. For example, Congress appropriated budget authority of \$41,793,000 for the Senate in FY1968, excluding permanent budget authority. Converted into 1997 dollars, \$41,793,000 is \$194,433,526.

When comparing the growth of the Senate budget from FY1968-FY1997 in current dollars, the increase amounts to 955.7%. In constant dollars, the increase is 126.9%. The constant dollar figure indicates a budget growth after adjustment for inflation.

Differences also appear based on the choice of fiscal years used to compare budget authority. For example, a comparison of budget growth between FY1968 and FY1997 shows the following changes in total legislative budgets after adjustment for inflation: FY1968-FY1997, 85%; FY1972-FY1997, 9.9%; and FY1978-FY1997, -11.3%.⁷¹

Changes in the 1970s significantly affected Congress' budget. Implementation by Congress of the 1970 Legislative Reorganization Act increased both the budgets and staffs of congressional committees and support agencies. Costs of the 1970 act are reflected in increased budgets for Congress from FY1971 through FY1978. For example, the increase in total legislative budget authority from FY1969 (pre-1970 Reorganization Act) through FY1973 (a year of significant implementation of the 1970 Reorganization Act) was 64.5%.

The legislative budget during the 1970s reflected implementation of the 1974 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act, which created the House and Senate Budget Committees and the Congressional Budget Office. Significant funding also began for development of House and Senate computer capabilities. This growth in the legislative budget stabilized by FY1978 and has remained fairly level since that time.

⁶⁹ For example, GAO contracted with Booz-Allen and Hamilton for the Library's recent audit, with Price Waterhouse for the audits of the House of Representatives, and with other major auditing firms for other legislative branch audits.

⁷⁰ U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations for 1998*, hearings, part 2, 105th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 1997 (Washington: GPO, 1997). p. 362.

⁷¹ These figures are based on constant dollars without permanent budget authority.

Current Legislative Budget Trends. Between FY1978 and FY1997, total legislative budget authority, when adjusted for inflation, decreased by 11.3%. Budget authority for direct congressional operations in Title I decreased by 7% over this time.

Throughout the 12 years following FY1978 (FY1979-FY1990), total legislative budget authority remained lower than the FY1978 budget authority. The first increase over the FY1978 legislative budget occurred in FY1991, a 1.1% increase, using constant dollars. Budget authority increased again in FY1992 and FY1995 but decreased in FY1993, FY1994, FY1996, and FY1997. The change between FY1992 and FY1997 was a decrease of 14.3% in total legislative budget authority and a decrease of 12.7% in direct congressional operations contained in Title I.

**TABLE 2. Legislative Branch Appropriations,
FY1993 to FY1997**

(budget authority in billions of current dollars)^a

FY1993	FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997
2.275	2.271	2.378	2.184	2.203

- a. These figures represent current dollars, exclude permanent budget authorities, and reflect rescissions. The FY1997 figure includes a supplemental of \$33.6 million (P.L. 105-18, signed into law on June 12, 1997).

TABLE 3. Legislative Branch Appropriations, FY1998
(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1997 Enacted	FY1998 Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conf.
Title I: Congressional Operations					
Senate	441,208	487,850	-- ^g	460,622	461,055
House of Representatives	684,098 ^a	752,383	708,738	-- ⁱ	708,738
Joint Items	88,581 ^b	92,306	86,802	91,904	86,711
Office of Compliance	2,609	2,600	2,479	2,600	2,479
Congressional Budget Office	24,532	24,995	24,797	24,995	24,797
Architect of the Capitol, excluding Library Buildings and Grounds	140,674 ^c	173,877 ^g	111,031 ^g	130,324 ⁱ	164,656
Congressional Research Service, Lib. of Congress	62,641	66,830	64,603	65,134	64,603
Congressional Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	81,669	84,025	70,652	82,269	70,652
Subtotal, Title I	1,526,012	1,684,866	1,069,102 ^g	857,848 ⁱ	1,583,691
Title II: Other Legislative Agencies					
Botanic Garden	36,402 ^d	11,662	1,771	3,228	3,016
Library of Congress, except Congressional Research Service	269,117 ^e	290,376	277,687	286,224	281,821
Library Buildings and Grounds, Architect of the Capitol	9,753	15,755	10,073	14,699	11,573
Government Printing Office, except Congressional Printing and Binding	29,077	30,477	29,264	29,077	29,077
General Accounting Office	332,520	361,424	323,520	346,751	339,499
Subtotal, Title II	676,869	709,694	642,315	679,979	664,986
Grand Total	2,202,881 ^f	2,394,539	1,711,417 ^h	1,537,827 ^g	2,248,677

Source: Source for FY1997 enacted and FY1998 pending, except for Senate items, is U.S. Congress, House Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1998*, a report to accompany H.R. 2209, 105th Congress, 1st session, H.Rept. 105-196 (Washington: GPO, 1997), 50 pp., Representative James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, July 28, 1997, pp. H5868-H5895, and House Committee on Appropriations for FY1998 conference. FY1997 figures include provisions in H.R. 3610, Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Bill in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, September 28, 1996, p. H11778-H11779; and provisions in H.R. 1871, Supplemental Appropriations Bill in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, p. H3779. Source for FY1998 budget request for non-Senate items is the House Appropriations Committee. Source for FY1998 budget request for the Senate and FY1998 pending for Senate items is U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1998*, a report to accompany S. 1019, 105th Congress, 1st session, S.Rept. 105-47 (Washington: GPO, 1997), 59 pp.

- This figure reflects an additional appropriation of \$133,600 for a gratuity payment to the spouse of a deceased Representative (P.L. 105-18, signed June 12, 1997, FY1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act).
- This figure reflects an additional FY1997 appropriation of \$3.250 million in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208, signed Sept. 30, 1996).
- This figure reflects an additional FY1997 appropriation of \$900,000 in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208, signed Sept. 30, 1996).
- This figure reflects an additional appropriation of \$33.5 million for repair and renovation of the conservatory of the Botanic Garden (P.L. 105-18, signed June 12, 1997, FY1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act).

- e. In addition, the Library has authority in FY1997 to spend \$30,138,000 in receipts from the Copyright Office and
- f. This reflects an additional FY1997 appropriation of \$4.150 million in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208, signed Sept. 30, 1996). It also reflects an additional \$33.6 million in
- g. Senate budget authority is not included in the House bill as reported.
- i. House budget authority is not included in the Senate bill as reported.
In addition, the Library has authority in FY1998 to spend \$30,295,000 in receipts from the Copyright Office and the Cataloging Distribution Service.

TABLE 4. Senate Items, FY1998
(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1997 Enacted	FY1998 Request	House Bill ^a	Senate Bill	Conf.
Expense Allowances/Representation	86	86d	--	86	86
Salaries, Officers, and Employees	74,615	79,523	--	77,254	77,254
Office of Legislative Counsel	3,447	3,635	--	3,605	3,605
Office of Legal Counsel	936	966d	--	966	966
Expense Allowances for Secretary of Senate, et al.	12	12d	--	12	12
Contingent Expenses					
Senate Policy Committees	0	0	--	0	0
Inquiries and Investigations	69,561	75,300	--	75,600	75,600
Senate Intl. Narcotics Control Caucus	305	--	--	370	370
Secretary of the Senate ^b	1,511	1,511	--	1,511	1,511
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper ^c	65,931	78,163	--	64,400	64,833
Miscellaneous Items	6,791	7,905	--	7,905	7,905
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	208,000	231,736	--	228,600	228,600
Office of Fair Employment Practices	0	0	--	0	0
Settlements and Awards Reserve	0	0	--	0	0
Stationery (revolving fund)	13	13	--	13	13
Official Mail Costs	10,000	9,000	--	300 ^e	300
Subtotal, Contingent Expenses	362,112	403,628	--	378,699	379,132
Total, Senate	441,208	487,850	--	460,622	461,055

Source: Source for FY1997 appropriations enacted for the Senate and FY1998 budget request for the Senate and FY1998 pending for Senate items is U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Legislative Branch Appropriations, 1998*, a report to accompany S. 1019, 105th Congress, 1st session, S.Rept. 105-47 (Washington: GPO, 1997), 59 pp., and House Appropriations Committee for conference.

- a. The House does not consider budget authority for internal Senate operations.
- b. Office operations of the Secretary of the Senate also are funded under "Salaries, Officers and Employees" above.
- c. Activities of the Office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are also funded under "Salaries, Officers and Employees" above.
- d. Budget authority was not provided by the Office of Management and Budget in the FY1998 *U.S. Budget*.
- e. Most of this appropriation was transferred to "Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expenses Account."

TABLE 5. House of Representatives Items, FY1998
(in thousands of current dollars)

Entity	FY1997 Enacted	FY1998 Request	House Bill	Senate Bill	Conf.
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress	267 ^a	113	0	--	0
Salaries and Expenses ^b					
House Leadership Offices	11,592	11,916	12,293	--	12,293
Members' Representational Allowances ^c	363,313	405,450	379,789	--	379,789
Committee Employees ^d					
Standing Committees, Special and Select (except Appropriations)	80,222	90,310	86,268	--	86,268
Appropriations Committee	17,580	18,276	18,276	--	18,276
Subtotal, Committee Employees	97,802	108,586	104,544	--	104,544
Allowances and Expenses					
Supplies, Materials, Administrative Costs and Fed. Tort Claims	2,374	2,977	2,225	--	2,225
Reemployed Annuitants Reimbursements	71	71	0	--	0
Official Mail (Committee's, leadership, administrative and legislative offices)	1,000	1,000	500	--	500
Government Contributions	120,779	128,451	124,390	--	124,390
Miscellaneous Items	641	662	641	--	641
Subtotal, Allowances and Expenses	124,865	134,661	127,756	--	127,756
Salaries, Officers and Employees	86,259	91,770	84,356	--	84,356
Total, House	684,098^e	752,383	708,738	--	708,738

Source: Source for FY1997 enacted, FY1998 request, and FY1998 pending is U.S. Congress, House Appropriations Committee, *Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1998*, a report to accompany H.R. 2209, 105th Congress, 1st Session, H.Rept. 105-196 (Washington: GPO, 1997), 50 pp. and Representative James Walsh, remarks in the House, *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 143, July 28, 1997, pp. H5868-H5895. FY1997 figures include provisions in H.R. 3610, Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Bill in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, September 28, 1996, p. H11778-H11779 and provisions in H.R. 1871, Supplemental Appropriations Bill in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, p. H3779.

- a. This figure reflects an additional appropriation of \$133,600 for a gratuity payment to the spouse of a deceased Representative (P.L. 105-18, signed June 12, 1997, FY1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act).
- b. The appropriations bill has two House accounts: (1) Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress and (2) Salaries and Expenses. All the following entries for the House fall under the House account, Salaries and Expenses.
- c. This appropriation heading was new in the FY1996 bill. The heading represents a consolidation of (1) the former heading Members' Clerk Hire; (2) the former heading Official Mail Costs; and (3) the former sub-heading Official Expenses of Members, under the heading Allowances and Expenses.
- d. This appropriation heading was new in the FY1996 bill. The heading represents a consolidation of (1) the former heading Committee Employees; (2) the former heading Standing Committees, Special and Select; (3) the former heading Committee on Budget (studies); and (4) the former heading Committee on Appropriations (studies and investigations).
- e. The total House figure reflects an additional appropriation of \$133,600 for a gratuity payment to the spouse of a deceased Representative (P.L. 105-18, signed June 12, 1997, FY1997 Supplemental Appropriations Act).

For Additional Reading

CRS Issue Briefs

CRS Issue Brief 97029. *Supplemental Appropriations and Rescissions for FY1997*, coordinated by Steve Daggett.

CRS Reports

CRS Report 93-595. *Clerk Hire Authorizations for Senators and Representatives, 1884-1993*, by Frederick Pauls and Paul Dwyer.

CRS Report 96-595. *Legislative Branch Appropriations for FY1997*, by Paul Dwyer.

CRS Report 96-201. *Legislative Branch Budget Authority, FY1968-FY1996*, by Paul Dwyer, Lorraine Tong, David Huckabee, and Taeku Lee.

CRS Report 97-112. *Legislative Branch Employment, 1960-1997*, by Paul Dwyer, John Pontius, and Faye Bullock.

Appendix

**TABLE 6. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded
in Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1993-FY1997**
(Does not include Permanent Budget Authority --
Thousands of Current Dollars)

	FY1993	FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997
Title I: Congressional Operations^a					
Senate	445,000	444,365	460,581	426,919	441,208
House of Representatives ^b	672,000	686,452	728,736	670,561	684,098
Joint Items ^b	80,000	78,750	85,489	81,839	88,581
Office of Compliance	0	0	0	2,500	2,609
Office of Technology Assessment	21,000	21,315	21,320	6,115	0
Congressional Budget Office	23,000	22,317	23,001	24,288	24,532
Arch. of the Capitol, ex. Library Buildings and Grounds	155,000	150,223	157,190	142,970	140,674
Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress	57,000	56,718	60,084	60,084	62,641
Cong. Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	90,000	88,404	84,724	83,770	81,669
International Conferences: House and Senate	0	0	0	0	0
Total, Title I^b	1,543,000	1,548,544	1,621,125	1,499,046	1,526,012
Title II: Other Agencies^a					
Botanic Garden	5,000	3,008	3,230	3,053	36,402
Library of Congress, ex. CRS	253,000	249,813	262,866	264,616	269,117
Library Bldgs. and Grnds., Architect of the Capitol	10,000	9,974	12,483	12,428	9,753
Copyright Royalty Tribunal	*	128	0	0	0
Govt. Print. Off., ex. Congressional Printing and Binding	29,000	29,082	31,607	30,307	29,077
General Accounting Office	435,000	430,165	446,743	374,406	332,520
Total, Title II	732,000	722,170	756,929	684,810	676,869
Grand Total^{b, c}	2,275,000	2,270,714	2,378,054	2,183,856	2,202,881

See notes at end of Table 7.

**TABLE 7. Legislative Branch Budget Authority Funded in
Annual Appropriations Bills, FY1993-FY1997**

(Does not include Permanent Budget Authority --
Thousands of Constant Dollars)

	FY1993	FY1994	FY1995	FY1996	FY1997
Title I: Congressional Operations^a					
Senate	498,585	485,443	489,292	440,243	441,208
House of Representatives ^b	752,919	749,909	774,162	691,489	684,098
Joint Items ^b	89,633	86,030	90,818	84,393	88,581
Office of Compliance	0	0	0	2,578	2,609
Office of Technology Assessment	23,529	23,285	22,649	6,306	0
Congressional Budget Office	25,770	24,380	24,435	25,046	24,532
Arch. of the Capitol, ex. Library Buildings and Grounds	173,664	164,110	166,989	147,432	140,674
Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress	63,864	61,961	63,829	61,959	62,641
Cong. Printing and Binding, Government Printing Office	100,837	96,576	90,005	86,384	81,669
International Conferences: House and Senate	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, Title I^b	1,728,801	1,691,694	1,722,179	1,545,830	1,526,012
Title II: Other Agencies^a					
Botanic Garden	5,602	3,286	3,431	3,148	36,402
Library of Congress, ex. CRS	283,465	272,906	279,252	272,875	269,117
Library Bldgs. and Grnds., Architect of the Capitol	11,204	10,896	13,261	12,816	9,753
Copyright Royalty Tribunal	0	140	0	0	0
Govt. Print. Off., ex. Congressional Printing and Binding	32,492	31,770	33,577	31,253	29,077
General Accounting Office	487,381	469,931	474,591	386,091	332,520
Total, Title II	820,144	788,929	804,112	706,183	676,869
Grand Total^{b, c}	2,548,945	2,480,623	2,526,291	2,252,013	2,202,881

Sources: Source for FY1993 is U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Federal *Budget*, Appendix section, "Federal Programs By Agency and Account." Budget authorities for FY1994, FY1995, and FY1996 are from the House Appropriations Committee. FY1995 budget authorities were adjusted by CRS to reflect rescissions and a supplemental contained in P.L. 104-19, 109 Stat. 219-221, July 27, 1995, FY1995 Supplemental and Rescissions Act (H.R. 1944). FY1996 budget authorities were adjusted by CRS to reflect rescissions contained in P.L. 104-28, Sept. 28, 1996, FY1997 Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act (H.R. 3610). Total legislative budget authority for each year was derived by adding all entities from the *Budget* that correspond to entities in Titles I and II of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act. Entities found in the *Budget* but not found in the Act include trust funds, commissions, public enterprise funds, and other non-legislative branch entities (i.e. The U.S. Tax Court). These entities were excluded from these tables. The *Budget* also includes permanent appropriations (not found in the Act).

Budget authorities for FY1997 are from the House Appropriations Committee printed in the *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, Aug. 1, 1996, p. H9711-H9714, table titled, Legislative Branch Appropriations Bill, 1997 (H.R. 3754); provisions applying to legislative branch authority in H.R. 3610, Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations bill in *Congressional*

Record, daily edition, vol. 142, Sept. 28, 1996, p. H11778-H11779; and provisions applying to legislative branch budget authority in H.R. 1871, Supplemental Appropriations Bill in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, p. H3779.

FY1994 budget authority reflects rescissions contained in P.L. 103-211, Feb. 12, 1994, FY1994 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (H.R. 3759).

Excluded permanent appropriations were (in current dollars, in thousands), FY1993, \$323,000; FY1994, \$329,000; FY1995, \$343,000; FY1996, \$302,000; and FY1997, \$309,000.

Excluded trust funds were (in current dollars, in thousands), FY1993, \$11,000; FY1994, \$6,000; FY1995, \$16,000; FY1996, \$31,000.

For FY1993, budget authority figure is shown by OMB in millions of dollars. An asterisk indicates an appropriation of \$500 thousand or less. Beginning with FY1991, OMB began using asterisks for appropriations of \$500 thousand or less in the annual U.S. *Budget*. Budget authorities for FY1994, FY1995, and FY1996 are from House Appropriations Committee.

Formula for conversion to constant dollars is as follows: 1997 Consumer Price Index (CPI) number divided by each year's CPI number multiplied by that year's budget authority. The CPI index numbers used were 144.5 (1993), 148.2 (1994), 152.4 (1995), 157.0 (1996), and 161.9 (1997). These numbers were provided by the Congressional Budget Office.

- a. Prior to FY1978, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act contained numerous titles. Effective FY1978, Congress restructured the legislative bill to "more adequately reflect actual costs of operating the U.S. Congress than has been true in the past years" (H.Rept. 95-450, FY1978 Legislative Appropriations). As a result, the Act was divided into two titles. Title I, Congressional Operations, was established to contain appropriations for the actual operation of Congress. Title II, Related Agencies, was established to contain the budgets for activities not considered as providing direct support to Congress.

Periodically, the Act has contained additional titles for such purposes as capitol improvements and special one-time functions, which are not shown as separate entities on these tables. One such example is the initial funding of \$48 million for the newly established Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS) as part of the FY1987 Supplemental Appropriations Act. OMB included this budget authority within the affected individual legislative branch accounts for that year.

- b. FY1996 figures reflect rescissions in the Omnibus Consolidated Appropriations Act, FY1997 (P.L. 104-208, Sept. 28, 1996, H.R. 3610). Provisions applicable to legislative branch budget authority in P.L. 104-208 appear in *Congressional Record*, daily edition, vol. 142, Sept. 28, 1996, p. H11778-H11779.
- c. Grand totals reflect computer rounding and as a result may differ slightly from totals obtained by adding Titles I and II in this table.

EveryCRSReport.com

The Congressional Research Service (CRS) is a federal legislative branch agency, housed inside the Library of Congress, charged with providing the United States Congress non-partisan advice on issues that may come before Congress.

EveryCRSReport.com republishes CRS reports that are available to all Congressional staff. The reports are not classified, and Members of Congress routinely make individual reports available to the public.

Prior to our republication, we redacted names, phone numbers and email addresses of analysts who produced the reports. We also added this page to the report. We have not intentionally made any other changes to any report published on EveryCRSReport.com.

CRS reports, as a work of the United States government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.

Information in a CRS report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to members of Congress in connection with CRS' institutional role.

EveryCRSReport.com is not a government website and is not affiliated with CRS. We do not claim copyright on any CRS report we have republished.