

STATEMENT OF ALICE M. RIVLIN

DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Before the

TASK FORCE ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 3, 1978

Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Task Force

This morning I have been asked to provide an overview of the President's 1979 budget as it relates to the needs of our nation's cities. Such a review may seem premature in as much as the President has promised to submit to the Congress in early spring the Administration's urban policy initiative which could entail modifications to the 1979 budget. Despite this situation the proposed budget is worth reviewing because the President has stated that this budget as submitted reflects efforts by the Administration to meet urban needs and because one cannot develop and evaluate proposals for change without a clear understanding of current policies.

The fiscal policy implied by the overall spending and revenue totals, the choice of particular fiscal instruments, the priorities reflected in specific expenditure and tax proposals all must be considered to determine the likely impact of the budget on cities.

The Cities and the Economy

While all Americans have a stake in an effective fiscal policy--one that will create jobs without generating inflationary pressures--the residents of our larger and older cities may be more concerned than others since the hardships imposed by weak performance of the national economy are not distributed evenly throughout the country. Blacks and youths, the two segments of the population that were hit hardest by the recent recession, comprise a large proportion of the total population of many central cities. In the third quarter of 1977, the unemployment rate in central cities was 8.6 percent, down from the 10 percent rate at the worst point in the recession, but still clearly much too high. Many urban businesses are hard hit as well. When there is a slackening in national demand, older and less efficient plants are usually the first to curtail operations. As the economy recovers, these plants are often the last to resume production. Such plants are more often found in the older cities of the Northeast and Midwest.

Unemployment and inadequate demand for business output not only cause hardship for individuals but also create budgetary difficulties for state and local governments. As

unemployment increases, the demand for services for the unemployed and the poor go up. At the same time, revenue collections are likely to go down reflecting reduced levels of economic activity. Faced with this situation and unable to sustain deficits, state and local governments are often forced to raise taxes or cut services. These actions make it more difficult for the federal government to achieve its goal of increasing the rate of economic growth.

Inflation too is a problem for state and local governments. The cost of providing public services goes up as employees demand salary adjustments to keep pace with the cost of living. Also, governments like other consumers face price increases for fuel and materials used in the production of public services.

Local governments--cities, counties, and school districts--are most hurt by inflation for two reasons. They rely more heavily on property taxes which, unlike the income and sales taxes that provide most of the revenue raised by state governments, tend, at least in the short run, to be relatively unresponsive to changes in income and prices. Second, because local governments actually provide most public goods and services the impact of price changes on their budgets is both more immediate and more direct.

Federal and state governments are shielded to some extent from inflationary pressures inasmuch as grants comprise a portion of their budgets. When spending in grants programs fails to keep pace with inflation, it is largely local governments who must cut back services or increase taxes.

According to CBO's most recent economic forecast, if current policies are continued there is likely to be a slowdown in economic growth toward the end of 1978 and in 1979. The two factors contributing to this slowdown are the fiscal drag implicit in a current policy budget that has receipts increasing at a faster rate than expenditures and an expected weakening in major components of non-federal demand.

In response to similar forecasts, the Administration has made tax cuts the centerpiece of economic policy in its 1979 budget proposals. To maintain real growth in GNP in the 4.5 to 5 percent range and to reduce unemployment below 6 percent by the end of 1979, the President is proposing tax cuts of \$25 billion and spending increases of \$6 billion--1.2 percent more than current policy.

Concern for the condition of cities and their residents may lead the Congress to favor more rapid economic growth or the use of alternative measures to achieve the President's goals. If the Congressional goal is a higher rate of growth and a faster reduction in unemployment, then it should consider further increases in total spending, changes in spending patterns or additional tax reductions.

There are several employment-stimulating expenditure programs that can have stronger effects on employment growth than do tax reductions and can be more easily targeted toward cities. These include support for public service employment, antirecession financial assistance, and local public works projects. In a study published last year, CBO concluded that dollar for dollar, these types of spending programs were more effective in creating jobs than a tax cut. CBO expressed reservations, however, about the administrative feasibility of increasing spending programs enough to accomplish the same total growth in employment that could be achieved by a tax cut.

The jobs impact of these employment-oriented grant programs are highly dependent on whether state and local governments simply substitute federal grant dollars for

their own revenues. To the extent that they do, the net impact of these programs might be either similar to or smaller than a general tax cut of the same magnitude. If federal grant dollars allow state and local governments to tax at rates lower than they would have otherwise, then the impact of the program should be roughly equal to a federal tax cut albeit with some delays. If, however, grant funds are used to build surpluses or to reduce borrowing for major construction, then the net employment impact would be substantially less, or even negative.

How state and local governments respond to grant programs probably depends on their fiscal situations. State and local governments as a group incurred operating account deficits during the recession: \$2.9 billion in 1974 and \$6.2 billion in 1975. Since most state and local governments are legally constrained from borrowing to cover the cost of current operations, many were forced to deplete reserves, cut expenditures and raise taxes. The longer a recession lasts, the greater the number of governments that deplete their reserves and the greater the incidence and magnitude of restrictive actions. Under these circumstances, it is reasonable to conclude that state and local governments would respond to federal funds by mounting programs that could not otherwise have been supported and

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES
 CALENDAR YEARS 1973-1977 (Dollars in Billions)

	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977*
Total Revenues	193.5	210.4	235.7	264.7	294.4
Total Revenues in 1972 Dollars	180.3	177.7	181.8	192.1	200.3
Own-Source Revenues	152.9	166.4	181.1	203.7	226.8
Own-Source Revenues in 1972 Dollars	142.5	140.6	139.7	147.9	154.2
Expenditures	180.5	202.8	229.8	246.3	265.3
Expenditures in 1972 Dollars	168.2	171.4	177.2	178.8	180.4
Surplus/Deficit-- All Funds	13.0	7.6	5.9	18.4	29.1
Surplus/Deficit-- Operating Accounts Only	4.1	-2.9	-6.2	3.9	13.6

Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, National Income Accounts.

* Data for 1977 are estimated using incomplete information for the fourth quarter.

that additional federal funds would have a substantial net impact on state and local spending and employment.

Since 1976, however, the financial status of the state and local sector has greatly improved. Surpluses, which have been recorded in operating accounts since the latter half of 1976 approached \$13.6 billion in 1977. Own source revenues have increased steadily between 1975 and 1977; growth in real terms was 5.9 percent in 1976 and is expected to be 4.3 percent in 1977. While expenditure growth has been restrained in both 1976 and 1977, most projections show substantial increases in 1978.

In these circumstances a larger portion of federal grant dollars are likely to substitute for spending that would take place anyway and the net employment impact is likely to be relatively small. Many individual governments however, are still experiencing fiscal difficulties and they continue to be likely to use federal dollars in ways that produce substantial employment impacts. Because of this unevenness in fiscal condition and its impact on effectiveness of countercyclical grants, both the level of funding and geographic targeting of these grants are important issues facing the Congress.

Priorities Reflected in the Budget

To determine the priority assigned to urban needs in the President's budget proposal, one should review the status of both direct expenditure and tax expenditure programs and consider both ongoing programs and proposed legislative changes.

Spending for Grants to State and Local Governments

In examining the direct expenditure budget, I will limit my comments to the programs that provide grants to state and local governments. Other programs affect cities and their residents but their impacts are indirect and cannot easily be deduced by simple examination of budget totals and legislative proposals.

Some grant programs are more important to cities than others and yet it is impossible to isolate any one set and call it the "budget for cities." Almost every grant program provides support to some cities and almost no program provides support exclusively to cities.

The budget proposed by the President is essentially a current policy budget and thus its impact on cities is likely to be little different from recent budgets. It includes few major initiatives and few increases in spending beyond those necessary to maintain current service levels in the face of inflation. The President's budget includes outlays of \$85 billion in all grant programs in fiscal year 1979. This is a 5.9 percent increase over the President's estimate of \$80.3 billion for 1978. If expected price changes are taken into account, grant outlays in 1979 are expected to decrease by 0.6 percent in real terms.

In assessing these outlay changes it is important to remember that this proposal for a year of restrained growth follows a year in which large increases in grant outlays took place. Between 1977 and 1978 grant outlays are estimated by the President to increase by approximately 15 percent. Furthermore, the 1978 base includes a number of countercyclical programs, in which one might have expected expenditure cutbacks in response to improved economic conditions. Instead outlays for antirecession grant programs are projected by the budget to be 4.4 percent higher in 1979 than 1978. An increase of 8.1 percent is requested

in grant programs such as AFDC and Medicaid that provide benefits to individuals. Outlays for all other grant programs combined are projected to increase by 5.0 percent.

OUTLAYS FOR GRANT PROGRAMS BY MAJOR PURPOSE, VARIOUS YEARS
(Dollars in Billions)

	Total	Grants for Payments to Individuals	Other	Programs Enacted to Stimulate the Economy*
1970	24.0	8.9	15.2	--
1971	28.1	10.8	17.3	--
1972	34.4	13.4	20.4	0.6
1973	41.3	13.1	27.7	1.0
1974	43.3	14.0	28.7	0.6
1975	49.7	16.1	33.2	0.4
1976	59.0	19.5	37.4	2.2
TQ	15.9	5.1	10.2	0.6
1977	68.4	23.0	40.7	4.7
1978**	80.3	25.1	46.5	8.6
1979**	85.0	27.2	48.8	9.0

SOURCE: CBO calculations based on Table H-5, Special Analyses Budget of the United States, Fiscal Year 1979.

* Includes Emergency Employment Assistance, Job Opportunities Program, Temporary Employment Assistance, Anti-recession Financial Assistance and Local Public Works.

** President's estimates.

The aggregate increases proposed by the President are not evenly distributed among all budget functions. Funding changes and program initiatives of particular importance to cities are proposed in several areas.

Education. Outlays for elementary and secondary education grant programs are expected to increase by 14.6 percent in 1979 to \$5.9 billion. The fiscal year 1979 request for budget authority is \$7.9 billion. An increase of \$644 million in budget authority is requested for Title I grants--enough to offset price increases in the base program and to initiate a new program that provides funds to school districts with especially high concentrations of poverty children. A substantial increase is also requested for the Education for the Handicapped program.

Employment and Training. The budget includes \$11.1 billion in outlays and \$10.9 billion in budget authority for employment and training grant programs in 1979. The most important aspect of the President's budget in this area is the decision to fund 725,000 public service employment jobs--the same number as will be supported at the end of fiscal year 1978. All jobs would be funded under Title VI of the CETA program rather than through Title II and VI as in past years. This will result in some shifts in the allocation of job slots among geographic areas.

The President has requested budget authority for 1979 for youth training and employment programs which, when combined with previously available funds, will permit operation of these programs at the peak level achieved in 1978, but not allow expansion.

The budget also includes a request for \$400 million, \$250 million of which would be used in 1979, for new but unspecified, training programs designed and operated by private industry. While listed as a new initiative, this program appears similar to the current Skill Training Improvement and Help Through Industry Retraining and Employment programs. Both of these were funded in 1977 and 1978 but no new budget authority is requested to continue them in 1979.

Social Services. The budget calls for \$4.9 billion in outlays and \$6.2 billion in budget authority for social service grant programs in 1979. The only major increase in this area is for child welfare services intended to improve foster care and adoption services. The budget also calls for continuation of the \$200 million added to the Title XX program in 1978 for child care services. However, no change is requested with respect to the \$2.5 billion ceiling that was legislated in 1972. Thus, states that are utilizing

their full Title XX allotments can receive no funding increases. For some states, including several where large cities are located, this ceiling has meant reductions in real levels of federal support for several years.

Community and Regional Development. The President's budget includes \$6.3 billion in outlays for grant programs in this area, a reduction of 6.7 percent from 1978 levels. The reduction in outlays is largely attributable to two programs. Spending in urban renewal will be lower than in 1978 as projects under the old program are closed out. Also, spending in the local public works program starts to phase down as no new budget authority is requested for this countercyclical program.

The President has requested \$5.3 billion in new budget authority for community and regional development grant programs, an increase of 5.3 percent over 1978. This will fully fund the Community Development Block Grant program, and provide some increases for the Economic Development Assistance grant programs. Increases requested in the budget for the regular EDA program are substantial. A supplemental appropriation of \$117 million is asked for 1978, thereby increasing the program by one third. A further increase of \$128 million is requested in 1979. Most of the

increment is scheduled to be used for business development grants and loans, and for economic and trade adjustment assistance. Cities are expected to benefit disproportionately (relative to past funding patterns) from these increases; their funding would double from \$100.4 million under the current appropriation for 1978 to \$205 million in 1979.

General Purpose Fiscal Assistance. This function includes an estimated \$9.5 billion in outlays and \$16.5 billion of budget authority in 1979. In fiscal year 1978, outlays and budget authority are estimated in the budget to be \$9.7 billion and \$9.6 billion respectively. The fiscal year 1979 outlay figure is \$280 million lower than 1978's, largely because outlays in the antirecession financial assistance program are expected to decline with improvements in the national unemployment rate. Budget authority, on the other hand, shows a significant increase due to the proposal for subsidies for taxable municipal bonds.

The authorization for the antirecession financial assistance program expires at the end of fiscal year 1978. Since a significant portion of some city budgets are funded by this program, serious local budget difficulties may occur if it is allowed to lapse. The President has indicated that

he will propose legislation either extending the existing program or substituting a new program which would continue the flow of funds to hard pressed cities. The budget authority request of \$1.04 billion for antirecession financial assistance, while below 1978 levels, is \$310 million more than would be required for an extension of the existing program given the Administration's unemployment projections.

Budget authority of \$7.1 billion and outlays of \$99 million are requested to finance a new program of subsidies for taxable municipal bonds. If the program is enacted, state and local governments could issue taxable securities and receive a federal subsidy equal to 35 to 40 percent of interest costs. Thus a direct interest subsidy would be substituted for the indirect subsidy currently provided as a result of the tax exempt status of municipal bonds. This is important to cities because it may broaden the market for municipal securities and thereby lower the costs of borrowing.

Another program of importance to at least one city is the New York City Seasonal Financing Loan Program. Authority to make loans to the city ends on June 30, 1978. While no funds are included in the budget, the President has indicated that he would recommend additional funds if he

were convinced it was the only way to insure continued fiscal solvency for New York City.

Health. The 1979 budget includes \$14.1 billion in outlays for health grant programs of which \$12 billion is for Medicaid; total outlays in 1978 are expected to be \$12.9 billion.

The President has proposed several budget initiatives and program changes to improve child health and avoid unwanted pregnancies among teenagers. Health assessment and screening services would be extended to an additional 1.7 million low-income children and teenagers not currently eligible for Medicaid. Medicaid eligibility would also be extended to include all low-income expectant mothers. These increases in eligibility will probably increase the requirements for state and local medicaid funds. Funding increases are also proposed for community based health services programs.

Income Security. Outlays for grant programs in the Income Security function are expected to be \$14.8 billion in 1979, an increase of 5.9 percent over 1978 levels. The most important Presidential proposal in this area is welfare reform. It does not show up in 1979 budget totals

but would have important impacts in later years. In addition to the aid which would be provided to some city residents by the new Program, some fiscal relief would be provided to city governments--directly, if they currently contribute to the costs of categorical programs, or indirectly if state governments respond to their reduced welfare costs by increasing state aid to cities.

Most housing assistance programs appear in this budget function. Substantial increases in outlays are shown in 1979 as a number of new housing units built under the Section 8 program move from the construction stage to occupancy and start receiving rent subsidies. New funding is requested in 1979 sufficient to make commitments to subsidize an additional 400,000 units for low-income families. This represents a small increase over the 380,240 new commitments expected in fiscal year 1978. Included in the budget is a proposal for a new Section 8 moderate rehabilitation program and a significant expansion in the substantial rehabilitation program. This new emphasis on rehabilitation is also reflected in a proposed increase in the Section 312 direct rehabilitation loan program found in the Community and Regional Development budget function.

Transportation. The Administration's budget includes outlays of \$10.4 billion in transportation grant programs. This represents an increase of 9.2 percent over 1978 levels. New budget authority requested for grants in this function equals \$11.3 billion. The Administration is proposing major legislation reauthorizing highway and public transportation programs through 1982. Included in the proposals are a number of changes, mostly administrative rather than budgetary in nature, that could be important to cities.

The proposed highway legislation includes a program of urban formula grants which would be distributed directly to local governments and would replace the existing urban system program. The new program would broaden eligibility to include any road or street not currently in the interstate or primary system, whereas previously, urban grants could only be used for roads designated as part of the federal aid system. The proposed changes are important for cities because they reduce the role of state agencies and increase the discretion allowed to local officials. Little change in funding levels is involved in the proposal.

The proposed legislation also adopts uniform local matching requirements for highway and transit assistance.

The local match in non-interstate highway programs would be decreased from 30 to 20 percent, the same as the matching rate currently in effect for transit programs. The legislation would also change matching requirements pertaining to interstate transfers: it would extend the lower match (10 percent local funds) required in the interstate program to any highway or transit project substituted for withdrawn interstate highway segments.

New budget authority of \$2.8 billion is proposed for Urban Mass Transportation grant programs. The budget authority request includes funds for discretionary capital grants, which in the past have been funded by multi-year contract authority provided in 1973 and 1974. In general, the budget allows no increase for capital purposes but it includes a small increase for operating subsidies as called for in Section 5 of the current law.

Proposed reauthorizing legislation for the UMTA programs would increase the proportion of total funds that are to be distributed by formula rather than on a discretionary basis. The funds which are shifted into the formula grant program would still have to be used for capital purposes only.

Energy. The President's budget includes outlays of \$190 million in 1978 and \$548 million in 1979 for energy conservation grants--a substantial increase over 1977, when only \$6 million was devoted to this purpose. Cities would benefit from two of the Energy Conservation programs. The Residential and Commercial program would provide financial assistance to low-income families to insulate their homes. The State/Local Grants program would finance architectural and engineering studies of ways to reduce energy consumption in hospitals, schools, and local public buildings. No funds, however, may be used for the implementation of these energy savings plans.

Natural Resources and Environment. In the Natural Resources and Environment function, outlays are expected to equal \$5.6 billion in 1979, an increase of almost 14 percent over fiscal year 1978. The request for budget authority equals \$5.5 billion. Of particular importance to cities is the Environmental Protection Agency's construction grant program which provides funds for the construction of wastewater treatment facilities necessary to meet national water quality goals. Outlays in this program are expected to increase from \$4.1 billion in 1978 to \$4.7 billion in 1979. The President has requested an additional \$4.5 billion in budget authority to fund new projects.

Proposed Tax Law Changes that
Might Affect Cities

Federal priorities are reflected in the tax expenditure as well as the direct expenditure budget. The President has proposed a number of changes in the tax code, several of which may have an impact on cities.

Certain tax expenditures have made it somewhat easier for state and local governments to levy taxes or borrow money. The deductibility of state and local taxes, for example, may reduce the resistance of local voters to tax increases, while the tax exemption for municipal bond interest permits states and localities to borrow at lower interest rates. The President's tax reform proposals would end deductions for state and local sales and gasoline taxes (but not income and real property taxes). This is not likely to have a significant effect on state and local financing decisions, however, since most taxpayers receive little benefit from these deductions (77 percent now use the standard deduction and the tax saving is very small for the remainder who itemize).

It has been argued that a number of tax provisions--especially accelerated depreciation and the investment tax credit--have the effect of favoring new construction over the repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation of existing

property, and are thus biased against central city development. The President's tax proposals would eliminate accelerated depreciation for new commercial and industrial buildings, and reduce it for new residential buildings. However, he has also proposed to extend the investment tax credit--which now applies only to machinery and equipment--to new industrial and utility structures. This by itself could have a negative impact on cities, since new construction is more likely to take place outside city boundaries where land is cheaper and more easily assembled. In an attempt to alleviate this problem, the President proposed that the investment tax credit also be permitted for the costs of rehabilitating structures. Whether this would offset the potential anti-urban bias from extending the investment tax credit to new structures is uncertain at this point.

The President has also proposed abolishing the tax exempt status of industrial development bonds except for private industrial plants costing less than \$10 million located in "economically distressed" areas. A problem with this and similar geographically-targeted tax incentive proposals, however, is that it will be difficult to find an acceptable definition of distressed areas that is both defensible in principle and administrable in practice.

Pressures to expand the definition of eligibility will become hard to resist, and the "target" eventually may become so broad as to be no longer meaningful.

CONCLUSION

The budget submitted by President Carter is largely a current policy budget. It does not call for many spending increases and it relies primarily on tax reductions to stimulate the economy.

In reviewing the budget's impact on cities it must be remembered that budgets are shaped over a period of years and that the priorities reflected in this budget are those of past Administrations and Congresses as well as of this Administration and ultimately this Congress. If it is determined that urban needs have not received sufficient priority, budget changes can be made. But they will take time, for much of the budget is relatively uncontrollable in the short run. Only with advance planning and a multi-year commitment to reshape the budget can the budget be significantly altered to reflect changing priorities.

#####

GRANTS TO STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BY FUNCTION AND FOR SELECTED PROGRAMS IMPORTANT TO CITIES (DOLLARS IN BILLIONS)

Function & Program	Outlays			Budget Authority		
	1977	1978	1979	1977	1978	1979
270 Energy - All Grants	0.07	0.27	0.64	0.07	0.37	0.59
300 Natural Resources & Environment - All Grants	4.19	4.90	5.58	2.61	5.43	5.51
Abatement & Control	0.19	0.24	0.25	0.15	0.23	0.24
Construction Grants	3.53	4.14	4.66	1.98	4.50	4.50
400 Transportation - All Grants	8.30	9.56	10.44	4.81	8.34	11.28
Urban Highways	na	na	na	0.80	0.80	0.70
Urban Mass Transportation	1.62	1.91	2.16	0.46	0.48	2.78
450 Community & Regional Development - All Grants	4.50	6.70	6.28	10.21	5.00	5.27
Community Development Grants	2.09	2.58	2.80	3.25	4.00	4.15
Economic Development Assistance	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.22	0.21	0.25
Local Public Works	0.58	2.29	2.00	5.98	0	0
501 Elementary, Secondary & Vocational Education - All Grants	4.64	5.19	5.95	5.78	6.17	7.89
Elementary & Secondary Education	2.34	2.56	3.02	2.71	3.17	3.78
Child Development	0.47	0.57	0.65	0.51	0.66	0.72
Education for the Handicapped	0.12	0.24	0.40	0.32	0.47	0.80
Emergency School Assistance	0.24	0.28	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.33
Impact Aid	0.72	0.74	0.71	0.73	0.76	1.46
504 Employment and Training - All Grants	6.33	9.98	11.09	12.70	3.89	10.91
Employment & Training Assistance	2.94	4.15	3.98	4.85	2.83	3.79
Temporary Employment Assistance	2.34	4.76	5.96	6.85	0	5.96
506 Social Services - All Grants	4.38	5.23	4.90	4.66	5.11	6.22
Grants to States for Social Services & Child Welfare	2.53	2.70	2.84	2.71	2.52	2.86
Human Development Services	1.35	1.40	1.53	1.35	1.48	2.85

(CONTINUED) GRANTS TO STATE & LOCAL GOVERNMENTS BY FUNCTION AND FOR
PROGRAMS IMPORTANT TO CITIES (DOLLARS IN BILLIONS)

Function & Program	Outlays			Budget Authority		
	1977	1978	1979	1977	1978	1979
550 Health - All Grants	12.10	12.88	14.08	12.12	12.75	14.54
Medicaid	9.88	10.85	11.95	10.23	10.69	11.95
Health Services Adminis- tration Grants	0.74	0.81	0.90	0.81	0.89	1.41
600 Income Security - All Grants	12.61	13.99	14.81	27.83	34.13	28.38
Child Nutrition	2.62	2.64	2.61	2.81	2.50	6.85
Supplemental Food (WIC)	0.24	0.36	0.53	0.25	0.25	0.56
AFDC	6.35	6.71	6.85	6.31	6.54	6.85
Subsidized Housing	1.31	1.86	2.28	16.22	22.10	15.85
Public Housing Operating Subsidies	0.51	0.61	0.69	0.60	0.69	0.73
750 Administration of Justice - All Grants	0.71	0.65	0.57	0.58	0.51	0.52
LEAA	0.71	0.63	0.54	0.57	0.49	0.49
800 General Purpose Fiscal Assistance - All Grants	9.44	9.74	9.46	9.21	9.60	16.45
General Revenue Sharing	6.76	6.83	6.85	6.66	6.86	6.86
Antirecession Financial Assistance	1.70	1.57	1.05	1.57	1.40	1.04
Taxable Municipal Bond Option	--	--	0.10	--	--	7.09
All Other	1.06	1.20	1.22	1.15	1.20	1.30
TOTAL - ALL FUNCTIONS	68.40	80.29	85.02	91.73	92.50	108.86

SOURCE: Special Analysis Budget of the United States Government, FY 1979.

na - not available.

