



CENTER ON BUDGET AND POLICY PRIORITIES

820 First Street, NE, Suite 510, Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202-408-1080 Fax: 202-408-1056 center@cbpp.org www.cbpp.org

Revised February 11, 2004

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET CONTAINS LARGER CUTS IN DOMESTIC DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS THAN HAS BEEN REPORTED

OMB Documents Not Made Widely Available Show Domestic Discretionary Programs to be Cut \$50 Billion a Year by 2009

by Richard Kogan and David Kamin

The President's budget proposes much larger cuts in domestic discretionary programs than has been generally understood or been reported to date in the media. ("Discretionary" programs are those whose funding is determined by the 13 annual appropriations bills. The term excludes entitlements, such as Medicare or veterans' pensions.) By 2009, funding for domestic discretionary programs would be cut \$50 billion below the 2004 level, adjusted for inflation (i.e., below the Congressional Budget Office budget baseline). The large majority of domestic discretionary programs throughout the government would be cut, including popular programs that the Administration claims it is increasing based on its funding request for 2005. The cuts generally would start in years *after* 2005 and grow wider with each passing year.

There is a good reason that these cuts have been overlooked in the initial reporting of what is in the budget. The budget tables that would normally show these cuts are missing from the budget books that OMB issued on February 2. To find these cuts, one must have access to the 1,000-page OMB computer run that covers all budget accounts and underlies the budget.

What the Budget Proposes

The budget books show funding levels for discretionary programs only for fiscal year 2005. The Administration is proposing an increase of 0.5 percent in 2005 in funding for discretionary programs outside the Pentagon. It should be noted that this is not the same as saying that the budget contains an 0.5 percent increase in domestic discretionary programs; the part of the budget that would rise 0.5 percent — which is still a cut when inflation is taken into account — includes defense programs outside

The President's Budget: Proposed Cuts in Domestic Discretionary Funding Outside Homeland Security

	<i>Relative to the 2004 Funding Level, Adjusted for Inflation</i>		<i>Relative to the 2004 Funding Level, Adjusted for Inflation and Population Growth</i>	
	Cut in Billions of Dollars	Percent Cut	Cut in Billions of Dollars	Percent Cut
2005	-\$9	-2.3%	-\$13	-3.2%
2006	-\$21	-5.0%	-\$28	-6.7%
2007	-\$26	-6.3%	-\$37	-8.7%
2008	-\$36	-8.5%	-\$51	-11.5%
2009	-\$50	-11.5%	-\$69	-15.2%

the Pentagon and international programs. Both of those categories would increase *by more than 0.5 percent* in 2005. Domestic programs outside homeland security would rise less than 0.1 percent.

The OMB tables covering the years *after* 2005 show that once one gets past 2005, the proposed budget trajectory for domestic discretionary programs changes. Under the President's budget, most domestic discretionary programs throughout the government would be cut in 2006. The proposed funding levels for 2006 would generally be *below the 2004 and 2005 levels even before inflation is taken into account*. Even programs for which the Administration boasts it is seeking increases in 2005 — such as the National Institute of Health, Title I education, the Supplemental Food Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), and the low-income energy assistance program — would be cut in 2006.¹

Although the precise pattern of funding for 2007-2009 varies by program, in general, funding levels for those years would be roughly frozen at the 2006 levels, without adjustment for inflation. As a result, by 2009, funding for most domestic discretionary programs would be well below today's levels in inflation-adjusted terms.

- Over the next five years, the President's budget proposes to slice away gradually at domestic discretionary funding outside homeland security. By 2009, the overall funding for domestic discretionary programs outside homeland security would be \$50 billion — or 11.5 percent — below the level needed to keep up with inflation. (In other words, funding in 2009 would be cut \$50 billion below the 2004 levels, as adjusted for inflation — i.e., below the CBO baseline.)²
- Many analysts prefer to measure changes in discretionary funding in *real per capita* terms — that is, after adjusting for both inflation and population growth. This approach measures the level of funding needed to maintain current service levels per person. The budget would cut domestic discretionary funding outside homeland security by \$69 billion in 2009 — or 15.2 percent — on a real per capita basis.
- As noted, the majority of domestic discretionary programs would be cut. It will take more analysis to assess the impact of the proposed cuts in specific programs, but some effects are readily apparent. For example, the President's budget itself, in a table on page 361 of the *Analytical Perspectives* volume, shows that the number of children from low- and moderate-income families who receive child care assistance would be cut by 200,000 by 2009. Moreover, this table uses an assumption about the amount of welfare block grant funds that will be made

¹ OMB classifies about 6 percent or \$1.7 billion of NIH funding as “homeland security,” the amount for purposes categorized as biodefense, which HHS characterizes as basic research on microbial agents with bioterrorism potential, and applied research on diagnostics, vaccines, and therapies against bioterrorism. This portion of NIH funding continues to rise in every year; it is the remainder that is cut after 2005.

² Funding levels used in this analysis have been adjusted to account for anomalies in the transportation and housing budgets. See the appendix of Richard Kogan, “The Omnibus Appropriations Act: Are Appropriations for Domestic Programs Out of Control?”, CBPP, February 1, 2004.

available for child care that is contradicted by data elsewhere in the budget. Once this discrepancy is corrected, the reduction in the number of child care slots climbs to about 365,000.³

While some of these cuts would create significant hardship, they would have only modest effects in reducing the deficit. Domestic discretionary spending outside homeland security makes up only one-sixth of the budget. The savings that would be achieved from the proposed cuts in domestic discretionary programs pale in comparison to the cost of the Administration's tax cuts. In 2009, the tax cuts enacted since 2001 and the new tax cuts included in the budget would cost either \$240 billion or nearly \$300 billion, depending on whether the cost of related relief from the Alternative Minimum Tax (to prevent the AMT from canceling out some of the tax cuts for million of filers) is included. In 2009, the cost of the tax cuts, including AMT relief, is almost six times the size of the \$50 billion in savings from the cuts in domestic discretionary programs outside homeland security.

In fact, the savings in 2005 through 2009 from all of the domestic discretionary cuts combined would be substantially less than the cost in those years of the income tax cuts just for the one percent of households with the highest incomes.

Should the Discretionary Spending Cuts be Taken Seriously?

People analyzing budgets often pay relatively little attention to funding levels that a budget proposes for discretionary programs for years after the coming year, since Congress only appropriates funds for these programs one year at a time. But this budget is different. The budget proposes to lock in place for each year through 2009 the overall discretionary funding levels and discretionary spending levels that the budget proposes. This would be done through the enactment of binding discretionary spending caps. The caps would tie the hands of future policymakers. If approved, they would make the proposed funding cuts likely to occur.

Under the Administration's "cap" proposal (which is outlined in Chapter 14 of the budget volume entitled "Analytical Perspectives"), there would be a single funding cap and a single spending cap for discretionary programs for each of the next five years. If policymakers exceeded the caps, the law would require across-the-board cuts in discretionary funding to ratchet discretionary funding and spending back to the caps.⁴

³ The Administration's table assumes that the funding that states allocate to child care programs under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant will remain constant. Yet elsewhere in the budget, the Administration shows (as CBO does, as well) that overall TANF expenditures will *fall* by \$2 billion — or 11 percent — between 2004 and 2009, even before adjusting for inflation. Experience with the TANF program confirms that when TANF expenditures are reduced, TANF expenditures for child care decline. Taking this decline into account yields an estimate that the number of children receiving child care assistance would be about 365,000 lower in 2009 under the Administration's budget than it was in 2004, and 445,000 lower than in 2003.

⁴ It should be noted that the discretionary spending caps were respected through much of the 1990's; they were widely flouted only after surpluses returned. The new fiscal environment would mean the caps would be likely to be enforced if enacted.

The caps would make it more likely that cuts of the magnitude the budget proposes in domestic discretionary programs would be enacted. In fact, the President's budget may *understate* the likely dimensions of the cuts in domestic discretionary funding outside homeland security if the caps are enacted. Defense, homeland security programs and domestic programs would all be under the same caps; the caps for each year would be set at levels equal to the total amounts the Administration's new budget shows for discretionary programs in that year. As a result, reducing the size of the President's proposed cuts in domestic discretionary programs outside homeland security, while still fitting within the caps, would entail cutting national security funding below the President's budget request. Given the current environment, this is unlikely to occur.

What is more likely is that the funding levels provided for defense in years after 2005 will be *greater* than the amounts shown for those years in the Administration's new budget. The findings of a major analysis the Congressional Budget Office issued last year indicate that the President's budget significantly understates likely defense costs in coming years.

CBO found that the amounts which the budget the Administration issued a year ago showed for defense in the "out-years" were significantly below the costs in those years of the Administration's own Future-Year Defense Plan, which serves as the Administration's multi-year defense blueprint. The levels the Administration's new budget shows for defense in years after 2005 continue this pattern and again understate the costs of the Administration's own multi-year defense plan, as estimated by CBO. This suggests the Administration may request higher levels for defense in future budgets than the levels shown in the Administration's current budget. Adding to this likelihood is the fact that the Administration's current budget leaves out all costs for continuing the war on terrorism after fiscal year 2004. CBO estimates the ongoing costs in this area, after operations in Iraq and Afghanistan are completed, at about \$30 billion a year.

If the proposed caps are enacted and higher amounts are provided for defense and anti-terrorism efforts in years after 2005 than the levels that the current budget shows, domestic discretionary programs outside homeland security will face larger cuts than those described here. Each additional dollar of funding for defense and fighting terrorism would mean an additional dollar of cuts in domestic programs.

Conclusion

The budget would lead to significant hardship even as it made the deficits larger than they would be in the absence of the proposals the budget contains. The budget would cut domestic discretionary funding outside homeland security by at least \$50 billion in 2009, reducing funding for many basic services like child care, low-income housing, and job training. But the budget also would make the tax cuts permanent and add new tax cuts on top. The cost in 2009 of the tax cuts that have been enacted and the new tax cuts that are proposed would be almost six times as great as the amount that would be saved by cutting domestic discretionary programs. The tax cuts just for the top one percent of households would cost more than would be saved from all of the domestic discretionary cuts.

A President's budget is about priorities. This budget gives short shrift both to domestic discretionary programs and to meaningful fiscal discipline.