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## Overall Budget Trends

- In 2005, Washington spent $\$ 2,470$ billion, raised $\$ 2,154$ billion, and ran a $\$ 317$ billion budget deficit.
- Tax revenues strongly correlate with economic growth. With the help of recent tax relief, economic growth pushed 2005 tax revenues up by $15 \%$.
- Spending increased by $8 \%$ in 2005 and is up $33 \%$ overall since 2001.
- The $\$ 317$ billion budget deficit represents $2.6 \%$ of GDP. More importantly, the public-debt-to-GDP ratio stands at $38 \%$, which is actually below the level at any point in the 1990s.

Federal Budget, 1990-2005
(Nominal \$Billions)

| Year | Discretionary <br> Spending | Entitlement <br> Spending | Net Interest <br> Spending | TOTAL <br> SPENDING | TOTAL <br> REVENUE | SURPLUS/ <br> DEFICIT |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 5 0 1}$ | $\$ 568$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 8 4}$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 2 5 3}$ | $\$ 1,032$ | $\mathbf{- \$ 2 2 1}$ |
| 1991 | $\mathbf{5 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 5 5}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 6 9}$ |
| 1992 | $\mathbf{5 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 0 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 9 0}$ |
| 1993 | $\mathbf{5 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{6 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 1 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 5 5}$ |
| 1994 | $\mathbf{5 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{7 1 8}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 2 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 3}$ |
| 1995 | $\mathbf{5 4 5}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 1 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 3 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 6 4}$ |
| 1996 | $\mathbf{5 3 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 8 7}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 4 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 8}$ |
| 1997 | $\mathbf{5 4 7}$ | $\mathbf{8 1 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 5 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2}$ |
| 1998 | $\mathbf{5 5 2}$ | $\mathbf{8 5 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 4 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 6 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{6 9}$ |
| 1999 | $\mathbf{5 7 2}$ | $\mathbf{9 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 4}$ |
| 2000 | $\mathbf{6 1 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 5 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 2 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 8 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 2 5}$ | $\mathbf{2 3 6}$ |
| 2001 | $\mathbf{6 4 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 9}$ | $\mathbf{2 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 7}$ |
| 2002 | $\mathbf{7 3 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 7 1}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 0 1 1}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 5 8}$ |
| 2003 | $\mathbf{8 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 1 7 9}$ | $\mathbf{1 5 3}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 7 8 3}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 7 4}$ |
| 2004 | $\mathbf{8 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 3 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 6 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 2 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{- 4 1 3}$ |
| 2005 | $\mathbf{9 6 3}$ | $\mathbf{1 3 2 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 8 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 4 7 0}$ | $\mathbf{2 , 1 5 4}$ | $\mathbf{- 3 1 7}$ |

Total spending is the sum of discretionary, entitlement, and net interest spending. Spending breakdowns for 2005 are preliminary estimates.


Source: Both the table and chart are based on Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data.

## Overall Spending

- Federal spending has grown twice as fast under President Bush as under President Clinton.
- Federal spending has increased by $33 \%$ since 2001 , from $\$ 1,863$ billion to $\$ 2,470$ billion.
- In 2005, inflation-adjusted federal spending neared $\$ 22,000$ per household, the highest level since World War II.
- For 2005, the federal government spent $\$ 21,956$ per household, overall, taxed $\$ 19,147$ per household, and ran a budget deficit of $\$ 2,809$ per household.


Source: Office of Management and Budget (OMB).


Source: Heritage Foundation Calculations based on Office of Management and Budget (OMB) spending data and U.S. Census Bureau population data.

## What About Defense and 9/11?

Defense and 9/11-related costs certainly played a role in this spending spree, albeit a smaller role than is commonly reported. From 2001 through 2003, spending expanded by $\$ 296$ billion, of which:

- $\$ 100$ billion ( $34 \%$ ) went for defense;
- $\$ 32$ billion ( $11 \%$ ) went for 9/11-related costs such as homeland security, international assistance, rebuilding New York, and compensating victims; and
- $\$ 164$ billion ( $55 \%$ ) went to new federal spending totally unrelated to defense and $9 / 11$.

Spending outside of defense and 9/11-related items jumped $11 \%$ from 2001-2003, its fastest growth in a decade.



Source: Heritage Foundation calculations based on data from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO).

## Where Is All the Money Going?

Apart from defense and homeland security, lawmakers enacted:

- A 2002 farm bill estimated to cost $\$ 180$ billion over 10 years, or $80 \%$ more than the baseline level;
- A 2003 Medicare drug bill estimated to cost $\$ 724$ billion in its first ten years and as much as $\$ 2$ trillion over the following decade;
- The 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, which is most responsible for the $100 \%$ increase in education spending from 2001 through 2005;
- $\$ 20$ billion in federal assistance to states; and
- $\$ 20$ billion in new spending from expansions of the refundable Earned Income Tax Credit and Child Tax Credit.

Lawmakers have made no serious progress balancing new spending with savings elsewhere in the budget. Note that this spending occurred at a time when net interest payments dropped $\$ 26$ billon due to low interest rates. Net interest costs will soon increase as interest rates return to normal levels.

Federal Spending By Category, 2001-2005
(Nominal \$Millions)

| Spending Category | Total Outlays |  | 2001-2005 Increase |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2001 | 2005 | Amount | Percentage | Avg. Annual |
| Social Security | \$432,958 | \$519,686 | \$86,728 | 20\% | 4.7\% |
| National Defense | 304,882 | 500,770 | 195,888 | 64\% | 13.2\% |
| Medicare | 217,384 | 295,432 | 78,048 | 36\% | 8.0\% |
| Income Security Programs | 152,640 | 211,929 | 59,289 | 39\% | 8.6\% |
| Medicaid | 129,374 | 188,497 | 59,123 | 46\% | 9.9\% |
| Federal Retirement \& Disability | 80,972 | 94,312 | 13,340 | 16\% | 3.9\% |
| Education | 35,203 | 70,520 | 35,317 | 100\% | 19.0\% |
| Health Research and Regulation | 42,896 | 69,035 | 26,139 | 61\% | 12.6\% |
| Veterans Benefits | 45,039 | 68,161 | 23,122 | 51\% | 10.9\% |
| Highways \& Mass Transit | 35,804 | 43,694 | 7,890 | 22\% | 5.1\% |
| Justice Administration | 30,205 | 40,657 | 10,452 | 35\% | 7.7\% |
| Unemployment Benefits | 30,242 | 38,066 | 7,824 | 26\% | 5.9\% |
| International Affairs | 16,493 | 31,961 | 15,468 | 94\% | 18.0\% |
| Natural Resources \& Environment | 25,623 | 30,960 | 5,337 | 21\% | 4.8\% |
| Farm Subsidies | 26,253 | 30,504 | 4,251 | 16\% | 3.8\% |
| Training, Employment, Social Services | 21,940 | 25,734 | 3,794 | 17\% | 4.1\% |
| General Science, Space \& Technology | 19,784 | 24,021 | 4,237 | 21\% | 5.0\% |
| Community \& Regional Development | 11,773 | 20,141 | 8,368 | 71\% | 14.4\% |
| General Government | 14,260 | 18,855 | 4,595 | 32\% | 7.2\% |
| Air Transportation | 13,975 | 17,951 | 3,976 | 28\% | 6.5\% |
| Housing \& Commerce | 5,739 | 10,653 | 4,914 | 86\% | 16.7\% |
| Water Transportation | 4,668 | 6,841 | 2,173 | 47\% | 10.0\% |
| General Retirement \& Disability | 5,761 | 6,611 | 850 | 15\% | 3.5\% |
| Energy | 9 | 1,441 | 1,432 | 15911\% | 255.7\% |
| Undistributed Offsetting Receipts/Other | -47,011 | -76,432 | -32,421 | 69\% | 14.0\% |
| Net Interest | 206,167 | 180,000 | -23,167 | -11\% | -2.9\% |
| Total Spending | 1,863,033 | 2,470,000 | 606,967 | 33\% | 7.3\% |

[^0]
## Discretionary Spending

- From 2001 through 2005, discretionary outlays surged $48 \%$ ( $36 \%$ after adjusting for inflation), from $\$ 649$ billion to $\$ 969$ billion.
- Lawmakers had leveled off discretionary spending increases in the 1990s.



Source: Both charts are based on Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data.

## Discretionary Spending, Broken Down

- Discretionary spending increases have not been contained to defense, homeland security, and Hurricane Katrina relief, but have grown across the board.
- Since 2001, all other discretionary spending has increased by $33 \%$ ( $22 \%$ after adjusting for inflation).


Nominal Discretionary Spending Since 1990
(\$billions)

| Year | TOTAL | Defense | Homeland <br> Security | Katrina <br> (estimate) | Remaining <br> Discretionary |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 0}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 1}$ | 300 | 6 |  | 195 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 1}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 3}$ | 320 | 6 |  | 207 |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 2}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 4}$ | 303 | 7 | 224 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 3}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 9}$ | 292 | 7 | 240 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 4}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 1}$ | 282 | 8 | 251 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 5}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 5}$ | 274 | 8 | 263 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 6}$ | $\mathbf{5 3 3}$ | 266 | 8 | 259 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{5 4 7}$ | 272 | 8 | 267 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 8}$ | $\mathbf{5 5 2}$ | 270 | 9 | 273 |  |
| $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ | $\mathbf{5 7 2}$ | 276 | 9 | 287 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 1 5}$ | 295 | 10 | 310 |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 4 9}$ | 306 | 10 |  | 333 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ | $\mathbf{7 3 4}$ | 349 | 13 |  | 372 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{8 2 4}$ | 405 | 20 |  | 399 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 4}$ | $\mathbf{8 9 6}$ | 454 | 23 |  | 419 |
| $\mathbf{2 0 0 5}$ | $\mathbf{9 6 3}$ | 492 | 27 |  | 442 |

Sources: Both the chart and table were created by the Heritage Foundation using Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and Congressional Budget Office (CBO) data. Katrina spending and pre-2001 homeland security spending are Heritage Foundation estimates.

## Entitlement Spending

- Entitlements consume nearly $60 \%$ of all program spending and a record $10.8 \%$ of GDP.
- Entitlement spending is projected to nearly double over the next decade. Medicare is expanding by $9 \%$ annually, Medicaid by $8 \%$ annually, and Social Security by $6 \%$ annually.
- The Medicare drug entitlement is estimated to cost $\$ 724$ billion over the next decade and as much as $\$ 2$ trillion over the following decade. Lawmakers created this entitlement in 2003 without any plan to pay for it.
- The Medicare drug entitlement is a universal entitlement that will go to all seniors regardless of need. By contrast, simply extending and expanding the Medicare Drug Discount Card, which targets needy seniors, would cost between $\$ 5$ billion and $\$ 10$ billion annually.


Source: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data adjusted for inflation by the Heritage Foundation.
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## Entitlement Spending: Long-Term Trends

- The total cost of Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid is projected to leap from $8.4 \%$ of GDP in 2005 to $18.9 \%$ of GDP by 2050.
- Federal program spending is projected to reach $27.6 \%$ of GDP by 2050 , while net interest spending will consume an additional $9 \%$ to $46 \%$ of GDP (depending on whether massive deficit spending increases interest rates).
- Unless Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are reformed, lawmakers face three options:
A) Raise taxes every year until taxes are 60 percent ( $\$ 11,000$ per household) higher than today;
B) Eliminate every federal program except Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid by 2045; or
C) Do nothing and watch the federal debt expand so much that even a minor interest rate response would induce a spiral of rising debt and interest rates, threatening the entire economy.



[^2]
## Pork Projects

- Definition: Originally, lawmakers would fund government grant programs and then let federal and state agencies select individual grant recipients through a competitive application process. Now, Congress actually determines, within legislation, who will receive government grants by "earmarking" grant money to specific recipients. Earmarks are also known as "pork projects."
- Earmarking is considered a corrupting process. Many of these pork projects are bought and sold by lobbyists, who, for a generous commission, will ensure that a client gets a government grant without having to go through the regular channel of justifying the project to a federal agency. Perhaps coincidentally, lawmakers often receive hefty campaign donations from earmark recipients.
- In addition to regular annual appropriations earmarks, the recent highway authorization bill contained approximately 6,400 earmarks, with a total cost of $\$ 25$ billion.
- Recent pork projects have included the Rock \& Roll Hall of Fame, a therapeutic horseback riding program, a grant to combat teen "goth" culture in Blue Springs, Missouri, an indoor rainforest in Iowa, and Alaska's infamous "Bridge to Nowhere."
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## Nowhere To Cut?

- The federal government cannot account for $\$ \mathbf{2 4 . 5}$ billion spent in 2003.
- Federal auditors are currently examining all federal programs. Thus far, $\mathbf{3 8 \%}$ of all examined programs have failed to show any positive impact on the populations they serve. Yet lawmakers appropriated $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 4}$ billion to these programs in FY 2004.
- The Congressional Budget Office published a "Budget Options" book identifying $\mathbf{\$ 1 4 0}$ billion in potential spending cuts.
- The Defense Department wasted $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 0}$ million on unused flight tickets and never bothered to collect refunds even though the tickets were refundable.
- The federal government spends $\mathbf{\$ 2 3}$ billion annually on special interest pork projects such as grants to the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame or funds to combat teenage "goth" culture in Blue Springs, Missouri.
- Washington spends tens of billions of dollars on failed and outdated programs such as the Rural Utilities Service, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Economic Development Association.
- The federal government made at least $\mathbf{\$ 2 0}$ billion in overpayments in 2001. Current estimates are between $\$ 40$ billion and $\$ 100$ billion in annual overpayments.
- The Department of Housing and Urban Development's $\$ \mathbf{3 . 3}$ billion in overpayments in 2001 accounted for over $10 \%$ of the department's total budget.
- Over one recent 18 -month period, Air Force and Navy personnel used government-funded credit cards to charge at least $\mathbf{\$ 1 0 2 , 4 0 0}$ for admission to entertainment events, $\mathbf{\$ 4 8 , 2 5 0}$ for gambling, $\mathbf{\$ 6 9 , 3 0 0}$ for cruises, and $\mathbf{\$ 7 3 , 9 5 0}$ for exotic dance clubs and prostitutes.
- Examples of wasteful duplication include: $\mathbf{3 4 2}$ economic development programs; $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ programs serving the disabled; $\mathbf{1 3 0}$ programs serving at-risk youth; $\mathbf{9 0}$ early childhood development programs; $\mathbf{7 5}$ programs funding international education, cultural, and training exchange activities; and $\mathbf{7 2}$ federal programs dedicated to assuring safe water.
- The Advanced Technology Program spends $\mathbf{\$ 1 5 0}$ million annually subsidizing private businesses, and $40 \%$ of this goes to Fortune 500 companies.
- The Conservation Reserve program pays farmers $\mathbf{\$ 2}$ billion annually to not farm their land.
- Washington spends $\$ \mathbf{6 0}$ billion annually on corporate welfare, versus $\$ 43$ billion on homeland security.
- The Department of Agriculture spends $\$ \mathbf{1 2}$ billion to $\$ \mathbf{3 0}$ billion annually on farm subsidies, the vast majority of which go to agribusinesses and farmers averaging $\$ 135,000$ in annual income.
- Massive farm subsidies also go to several members of Congress, and celebrity "hobby farmers" such as David Rockefeller, Ted Turner, Scottie Pippen, and former Enron CEO Ken Lay.
- Congressional investigators were able to receive $\mathbf{\$ 5 5 , 0 0 0}$ in federal student loan funding for a fictional college they created to test the Department of Education.
- The Army Corps of Engineers has been accused of illegally manipulating data to justify expensive but unnecessary public works projects.
- Food stamp overpayments cost $\mathbf{\$ 6 0 0}$ million annually.
- School lunch program abuse costs $\mathbf{\$ 1 2 0}$ million annually.
- Veterans' program overpayments cost $\$ \mathbf{8 0 0}$ million annually.
- Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) overpayments cost $\$ 9$ billion annually.
- Better tracking of student loan recipients would save $\$ 1$ billion annually.
- Preventing states from using accounting tricks to secure additional Medicaid funds would save several billion dollars annually.
- Medicare contractors owe the federal government $\$ 7$ billion.
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## Underlying Data and 2006-2015 Budget Projections

- This page contains the underlying data for many of the charts and tables in this paper.
- The 2006-2015 budget projections begin with CBO's baseline projections, and then assume that:

1) The Bush tax cuts will be extended and the Alternative Minimum Tax fixed;
2) Discretionary spending (excluding Iraq and Katrina) will remain constant as a percent of GDP;
3) Iraq spending will continue to wind down; and
4) Hurricane Katrina-related spending will total $\$ 200$ billion (a ballpark estimate).

- Revenues are projected to expand by 4.3 percent annually, but annual spending will grow by 5.8 percent.
- These baseline totals assume no more terrorist attacks, natural disasters, entitlement expansions, or recessions. Historically, Congress spends well above this baseline.
- Combined nominal spending for Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid is projected to double by 2015.
- Runaway spending pushes the projected budget deficit to $\$ 873$ billion by 2015 and even higher thereafter.

Historical Budget Data and Future Budget Projections, 1990-2015 (\$billions)

|  | GDP | Reve nue | $\begin{gathered} \text { Spendi } \\ \text { ng } \end{gathered}$ | Sur plus <br> /Def icit | SPENDING BREAKDOWN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Discretionary |  |  |  |  | Entitlement |  |  |  |  |  | Inte rest |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTA } \\ \text { L } \end{gathered}$ | Defe nse | Ho mel and | Kat rina | Other Disc. | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTA } \\ \text { L } \end{gathered}$ | Soc. Sec. | Med icar e | Med icai d | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Kat } \\ & \text { rina } \end{aligned}$ | Other <br> Mand |  |
| 1990 | 5803 | 1032 | 1253 | -221 | 501 | 300 | 6 |  | 195 | 568 | 247 | 96 | 41 |  | 185 | 184 |
| 1991 | 5996 | 1055 | 1324 | -269 | 533 | 320 | 6 |  | 207 | 597 | 267 | 102 | 53 |  | 175 | 195 |
| 1992 | 6338 | 1091 | 1382 | -290 | 534 | 303 | 7 |  | 224 | 649 | 285 | 116 | 68 |  | 179 | 199 |
| 1993 | 6657 | 1154 | 1410 | -255 | 539 | 292 | 7 |  | 240 | 671 | 302 | 128 | 76 |  | 166 | 199 |
| 1994 | 7072 | 1259 | 1462 | -203 | 541 | 282 | 8 |  | 251 | 718 | 317 | 142 | 82 |  | 177 | 203 |
| 1995 | 7398 | 1352 | 1516 | -164 | 545 | 274 | 8 |  | 263 | 739 | 333 | 157 | 89 |  | 160 | 232 |
| 1996 | 7817 | 1453 | 1561 | -108 | 533 | 266 | 8 |  | 259 | 787 | 347 | 171 | 92 |  | 176 | 241 |
| 1997 | 8304 | 1579 | 1601 | -22 | 547 | 272 | 8 |  | 267 | 810 | 362 | 187 | 96 |  | 165 | 244 |
| 1998 | 8747 | 1722 | 1653 | 69 | 552 | 270 | 9 |  | 273 | 859 | 376 | 190 | 101 |  | 192 | 241 |
| 1999 | 9268 | 1827 | 1703 | 124 | 572 | 276 | 9 |  | 287 | 900 | 387 | 188 | 108 |  | 217 | 230 |
| 2000 | 9817 | 2025 | 1789 | 236 | 615 | 295 | 10 |  | 310 | 951 | 406 | 194 | 118 |  | 233 | 223 |
| 2001 | 10128 | 1991 | 1863 | 127 | 649 | 306 | 10 |  | 333 | 1009 | 429 | 214 | 129 |  | 236 | 206 |
| 2002 | 10487 | 1853 | 2011 | -158 | 734 | 349 | 13 |  | 372 | 1106 | 452 | 228 | 148 |  | 278 | 171 |
| 2003 | 11004 | 1783 | 2157 | -374 | 824 | 405 | 20 |  | 399 | 1179 | 471 | 246 | 161 |  | 301 | 153 |
| 2004 | 11554 | 1880 | 2292 | -413 | 896 | 454 | 23 |  | 419 | 1237 | 492 | 269 | 176 |  | 300 | 160 |
| 2005 | 12271 | 2154 | 2470 | -317 | 963 | 492 | 27 | 2 | 442 | 1327 | 519 | 295 | 184 | 0 | 329 | 180 |


| 2006 | 12967 | 2265 | 2660 | -395 | 1041 | 508 | 28 | 50 | 455 | 1408 | 546 | 329 | 192 | 15 | 326 | 211 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2007 | 13655 | 2348 | 2824 | -476 | 1095 | 536 | 29 | 50 | 479 | 1481 | 574 | 374 | 203 | 10 | 320 | 248 |
| 2008 | 14372 | 2455 | 2973 | -518 | 1121 | 550 | 31 | 35 | 505 | 1561 | 602 | 395 | 221 | 10 | 333 | 292 |
| 2009 | 15106 | 2581 | 3115 | -534 | 1146 | 555 | 32 | 28 | 530 | 1641 | 634 | 420 | 239 | 0 | 348 | 328 |
| 2010 | 15836 | 2711 | 3250 | -539 | 1155 | 565 | 34 |  | 556 | 1732 | 670 | 449 | 260 |  | 353 | 363 |
| 2011 | 16578 | 2835 | 3447 | -612 | 1202 | 585 | 36 |  | 582 | 1846 | 709 | 489 | 282 |  | 366 | 399 |
| 2012 | 17331 | 3000 | 3625 | -625 | 1257 | 611 | 37 |  | 608 | 1931 | 753 | 513 | 305 |  | 360 | 437 |
| 2013 | 18105 | 3147 | 3855 | -708 | 1313 | 639 | 39 |  | 636 | 2067 | 801 | 563 | 330 |  | 373 | 475 |
| 2014 | 18903 | 3303 | 4087 | -784 | 1370 | 666 | 41 |  | 664 | 2198 | 852 | 609 | 357 |  | 380 | 519 |
| 2015 | 19729 | 3467 | 4340 | -873 | 1429 | 694 | 42 |  | 693 | 2345 | 907 | 660 | 387 |  | 391 | 566 |

Source: Heritage Foundation calculations based on CBO data. Katrina-related spending projections are based on current rough estimates.

Brian M. Riedl is Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation.


[^0]:    Source: Heritage Foundation calculations based on Office of Management and Budget (OMB) data and 2005 preliminary estimates.

[^1]:    Source: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2004 Annual Report of the Boards of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance and Federal Supplemental Insurance Trust Funds, March 23, 2004, p. 109, at www.cms.hhs.gov/publications/trusteesreport; and Social Security Administration, 2004 Social Security Trustees Report, March 23, 2004, p. 2, at http://www.ssa.gov/OACT/TR/TR04/tr04.pdf.

[^2]:    Source: Both charts are from Heritage Foundation calculations to be released in a forthcoming paper.

[^3]:    Source: Both the chart and graph are from Citizens Against Government Waste, www.cagw.org.

[^4]:    Sources: See Brian M. Riedl, "How to Get Federal Spending Under Control," Heritage Foundation Backgrounder No. 1733, March 10, 2004, at http://www.heritage.org/Research/Budget/bg1733.cfm. The study explaining the failed $38 \%$ of programs can be found at Eileen Norcross, "An Analysis of the Office of Management and Budget's Performance Assessment Rating Tool," Mercatus Center, June 2005, at http://www.mercatus.org/governmentaccountability/article.php/1280.html.

