

## Union Calendar No. 314

113TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session }

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

{ REPORT  
{ 113-425

### R E P O R T

ON THE

### INTERIM SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

SUBMITTED BY MR. ROGERS, CHAIRMAN,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

together with

MINORITY VIEWS



APRIL 29, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on  
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

39-006

WASHINGTON : 2014

SBDV 2015-1

## COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky, *Chairman*

FRANK R. WOLF, Virginia	NITA M. LOWEY, New York
JACK KINGSTON, Georgia	MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey	PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, Indiana
TOM LATHAM, Iowa	JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama	ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
KAY GRANGER, Texas	JAMES P. MORAN, Virginia
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho	ED PASTOR, Arizona
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, Texas	DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
ANDER CRENSHAW, Florida	LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas	SAM FARR, California
KEN CALVERT, California	CHAKA FATTAH, Pennsylvania
TOM COLE, Oklahoma	SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida	BARBARA LEE, California
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania	ADAM B. SCHIFF, California
TOM GRAVES, Georgia	MICHAEL M. HONDA, California
KEVIN YODER, Kansas	BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas	TIM RYAN, Ohio
ALAN NUNNELEE, Mississippi	DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska	HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida	CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN, Tennessee	MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, Washington	WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York
DAVID P. JOYCE, Ohio	
DAVID G. VALADAO, California	
ANDY HARRIS, Maryland	
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama	
MARK E. AMODEI, Nevada	
CHRIS STEWART, Utah	

WILLIAM E. SMITH, *Clerk and Staff Director*

## LETTER OF SUBMITTAL

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
*Washington, DC, April 29, 2014.*

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I submit herewith the Committee's report on the interim sub-allocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2015.

This report follows the requirements of section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to an initial subdivision for two subcommittees of the allocation of fiscal year 2015 spending authority provided to the Committee on Appropriations by the House. That overall allocation is the level included in the House Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2015 as well as the level provided in section 101 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (H.J. Res. 59, P.L. 113-67).

However, when the Committee drafted this report it lacked the updated Congressional Budget Office baseline which will be used to score appropriations bills, making it difficult to develop sub-allocations for the remaining ten subcommittees. Once the Committee receives this updated baseline information it will fully allocate the overall allocation provided to it.

Sincerely,

HAROLD ROGERS,  
*Chairman.*



## Union Calendar No. 314

113TH CONGRESS }  
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT  
113-425

---

---

### REPORT ON THE INTERIM SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

---

APRIL 29, 2014.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of  
the Union and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. ROGERS, from the Committee on Appropriations,  
submitted the following

### R E P O R T

#### INTERIM SUBALLOCATION OF BUDGET ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report on the interim suballocation of budget allocations for fiscal year 2015.

This report follows the requirements of section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to an initial subdivision for two subcommittees of the allocation of fiscal year 2015 spending authority provided to the Committee on Appropriations by the House. The overall allocation provided to the Committee is the level included in the House Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for fiscal year 2015 as well as the amount provided in section 101 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (H.J. Res. 59, P.L. 113-67).

The Committee has adopted this interim procedure because of the special circumstances it faces as it begins the fiscal year 2015 appropriations process. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 signed into law in December of 2013 provided the House and Senate with a common discretionary top line for fiscal year 2015, allowing their respective Appropriations Committees to begin their work without waiting for the adoption of a new Budget Resolution conference report. In fact, this is the earliest the Committee has acted upon regular annual appropriations bills since fiscal year 1975.

In addition to the early start, the President's fiscal year 2015 Budget submission to Congress was a month late, which has delayed the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) from producing an updated baseline or its re-estimate of the President's budget. The updated baseline, which will ultimately be used by CBO to score appropriations bills, was not available at the time the Committee drafted this interim report or its first two appropriations bills. As the Committee lacks this critical information at this time, it would be difficult to develop the subdivisions for the remaining fiscal year 2015 appropriations bills. After the updated CBO baseline is available, the Committee will adopt a full set of 302(b) suballocations for all twelve subcommittees as expeditiously as possible.

By submitting this interim report and beginning its work on appropriations bills at this time, the Committee will be in the best possible position to report all fiscal year 2015 appropriations bills to the House under regular order.

**INTERIM SUBALLOCATIONS TO TWO SUBCOMMITTEES FISCAL YEAR 2015 BUDGET AUTHORITY AND  
OUTLAYS**

[In millions of dollars]

Subcommittee	Discretionary		Mandatory	Total
	General Purpose	Overseas Contingencies		
<b>Legislative Branch: <sup>1</sup></b>				
All except Senate:				
Budget authority .....	3,326	.....	107	3,433
Outlays .....	3,604	.....	106	3,710
Senate items:				
Budget authority .....	932	.....	25	957
Outlays .....	728	.....	25	753
Total Legislative:				
Budget authority .....	4,258	.....	132	4,390
Outlays .....	4,332	.....	131	4,463
<b>Military Construction, Veterans Affairs: <sup>1</sup></b>				
Budget authority .....	71,499	.....	85,315	156,814
Outlays .....	77,455	.....	85,070	162,525
Interim total for two subcommittees:				
General Purpose:				
Budget authority .....	75,757	.....	85,447	161,204
Outlays .....	81,787	.....	85,201	166,988

<sup>1</sup> Estimates for outlays based on CBO's February baseline. Such estimates may change with final CBO scoring based on its updated April baseline.

### FULL COMMITTEE VOTES

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the House of Representatives, the results of each roll call vote on an amendment or on the motion to report, together with the names of those voting for and those voting against, are printed below.

There were no roll call votes.



## MINORITY VIEWS

Assembling appropriations bills is a serious and solemn responsibility. We should not go about it without a road map or compass. It is irresponsible for the Committee on Appropriations to mark up any bill until we see allocations for all twelve funding bills. However, the majority's interim allocations show the amount for the first two subcommittees only. We are in the dark about how much each of the remaining ten will have to spend or how over \$900 billion will be distributed.

The history of the Budget Act is instructive in explaining why these interim allocations are so unsatisfactory. Under the original Budget Act, appropriations bills were judged only by whether they exceeded the full Committee total. As a consequence, the first bills to be considered could spend as much as those subcommittees wanted; only the last few bills were ever in danger of exceeding the full committee total. The current 302(b) process was an innovation added to the 1974 Budget Act so that each bill could be judged on its own. By requiring a complete allocation from the start, anyone can see whether the first bills use too much of the available resources.

In other words, the whole purpose of section 302(b) is to ensure that the last piggy to the trough has enough to eat. The Committee needs to display the entire pie chart, not just two slices at a time.

The Chairman points to logistical impediments, noting that CBO hasn't scored the President's budget request. But an interim allocation could still divvy up the whole pie with a caveat that the amounts may change. We routinely amend allocations later in the year when additional information is available. The bottom line is these interim allocations hide over \$900 billion in budget authority.

When Democrats were in the majority, far, far smaller omissions were met with howls of protest. Our FY 2008 302(b)s allocated All of the budget authority among All of the subcommittees. However, on the outlay side only, we placed \$369 million—not billion—under the full committee with an explanation: CBO's outlay estimates for the subcommittees always change when they score each bill. The minority views asserted that this "budgetary sleight of hand" makes "offering an amendment a pointless exercise." Our FY 2010 302(b)s also distributed All of the budget authority among All of the subcommittees but again reserved several hundred million in outlays. The minority shrieked that Democrats were "designing schemes to hide the true costs from American taxpayers."

The current process is not regular order. When we return to regular order, when the majority provides a full allocation, we intend to offer a Democratic alternative. The debate will then be joined on our different values. Allocations are not just a set of numbers; they are a statement of our priorities.

The specific allocations for the Military Construction and VA bill, which is almost exactly at the President's request, and for the Legislative Branch bill, which is at this year's level, seem adequate.

Our concern is with the irresponsible process and precedent it sets.

NITA M. LOWEY.

