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Abstract

This appendix describes the rules employed, and the bases for these rules, to (1) determine what House authorizing committees possessed jurisdiction over the programs and agencies funded by subsections of House appropriation bills from FY 1994 to FY 2004 (2) and measure the prevalence of limitation riders within these subsections. As such, it is supplemental material to research on how the appropriations process is employed to manage congressional committees and as policy making vehicles.
Appendix A—Matching Appropriations Language to Committees Jurisdictions

To identify the committees with jurisdiction over programs and agencies funded by the twelve major appropriation bills passed annually by Congress from 1993 (FY 1994) to 2002 (FY 2003) it was necessary to (1) disaggregate the bills sufficiently so that authorization committees could be assigned correctly and (2) identify and analyze sources documenting what committees possessed jurisdiction over these disaggregated units of appropriations bills.

Creating Appropriations Subsections

It is essential to recognize that the twelve annual spending bills were disaggregated by their congressional authors into separate titles. For example, the annual “Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies” (hereafter, LHE) bill provided for funds under “Title I—Department of Labor,” “Title II—Department of Health and Human Services,” “Title III—Department of Education,” and “Title IV—Related Agencies.”

Given the diversity of jurisdictions funded by this bill, it would obviously be inaccurate to assign the programs and agencies funded by the bill as falling under one committee’s jurisdiction. One way of overcoming this problem would be to disaggregate each appropriation bill into titles and assign each title to the congressional committee with jurisdiction over the programs and agencies funded within it. For many titles, this decision rule would work well. For example, using the rules described below for identifying what portions of appropriation bills fall within the jurisdictions of House committees, I observed that all of the programs and agencies funded within “Title III—Department of Education” fell within the jurisdiction of the House’s Education and Workforce Committee. However, the programs and agencies funded by some titles do not fall exclusively within one committee’s jurisdiction. For example, using the rules described
below, “Title IV—Related Agencies” of the LHE bill, funds programs and agencies within the jurisdictions of multiple committees.

Given that programs funded individual titles could not be grouped into single jurisdictions, I had to disaggregate bills to subsections within titles. To create these subsections, I relied on the headings within the titles. Many titles are subdivided into numerous headings. For example, “Title I of the FY 1999 LHE bill began with the heading, “Employment and Training Administration.” These headings were often followed by subheadings. To create the subsections, I disaggregated each title of each bill by headings. Therefore, the “Employment and Training Administration” heading included all language below that heading until the next heading began.

I followed this procedure for all twelve bills for FY 1999, creating a database of subsections for appropriation bills for that year. Next, I identified each subsection in each of the eleven bills for the other years. Unsurprisingly, there were slight changes to all of the bills over the ten year period which I examined. Some subsections present in the FY 1999 bills were not present in other years’ bills; additionally, there were some subsections present in the other years’ bills that were not present in the FY 1999 bills. When I discovered subsections not in the FY 1999 bills, I added them to the database. When a subsection present in the FY 1999 bills was absent from the other years’ bills, I did not create a row in the database for that subsection in those years. This process yielded a database for which the unit of analysis was the subsection-year (with an observation, i.e., row, for each subsection in each year that it was present) containing information about the page numbers and line numbers on which the subsections began and ended within each appropriation bill and each title. There were 420 subsections in the FY 1999 bills. These subsections were present for either all ten years or some combination of
years, totaling 3,813 subsections from FY 1994 to FY 2003. Additionally, there were 145 different subsections present in the other years that were not present in FY 1999, totaling 372 subsections over the ten year period. In total, I catalogued 4,181 subsections from the period. To repeat by way of emphasis, it was necessary to create these subsections because it would have been invalid to create a unit of analysis at any higher level of aggregation. Any such level would have inappropriately assumed that all of the programs and agencies being funded in the level (bill/title) fell under one House authorizing committee’s jurisdiction.²

Identifying Authorizing Committees

To identify the congressional committees with jurisdiction over the language in the subsections, it was essential to consider the dual nature of committee jurisdictions. King (1997) documents that, although House committees’ jurisdictions are “statutory” in that they are specified by House Rule X, jurisdictions nevertheless evolve. When a bill that addresses a jurisdictionally ambiguous issue is introduced that does not fall within any committee’s statutory jurisdiction, the House parliamentarian refers it to the committee whose jurisdiction is closest to the issue. By precedent, the issue becomes part of the committee’s “common law” jurisdiction. When the House amends Rule X, it typically does so to reflect precedents. As such, the bill referral process largely drives the composition of committee jurisdictions (King 1997). Nevertheless, the House sometimes changes committee jurisdictions in ways not reflected by bill referral precedents, as occurred when portions of the House Commerce Committee in early 1995 when the House’s new Republican majority amended Rule X (King 1997, 72-73). These considerations mandate a process accounting for both origins of jurisdictions.

To identify the committee with jurisdiction over each subsection, I identified the committees that were referred laws cited either directly or indirectly within the subsections.
Since committees are referred bills within their statutory and common law jurisdictions, identifying the committees of referral was tantamount to identifying the committees with jurisdiction over the programs and agencies funded by the subsections.

To identify the laws providing authority, citations to public laws and the United States Code, explicitly cited as authority for the programs and agencies funded within the subsections, were examined. Citations to laws provided direct references to the laws conferring legal authority on programs and agencies funded. Indirect citations to laws were made by citations of the U.S. Code, since each section of the code itemizes the public laws contributing to its content.

The bill language cited sections of U.S. Code and public laws using a variety of methods. Indirect Code citations were made by: (1) a citation to a single section of the code, e.g., “43 U.S.C. 422a.”; (2) a citation to a string of sections, e.g., “42 U.S.C. 7152, 7153, 7157, 7165, 7171, and 7173;” (3) a citation to a block of sections, e.g., “42 U.S.C. 7152-7160;” and (4) a citation to a chapter and/or subchapter of a title within the code, e.g., “Title 42, Chapter 84,” or “Title 42, Chapter 84, Subchapter IV.” Direct public laws citations were made by: (1) a citation to a single public law using its public law number, e.g., “P.L. 97-425;” and (2) a citation to a public law using its popular name, e.g., the “Museum and Library Service Act of 1996.”

In examining citations, I struck a balance between obtaining enough information to accurately identify the committees with jurisdiction and the need to finish coding every subsection of every title of every appropriations bill. Therefore, I examined a maximum of five citations in each subsection. For subsections present in FY 1999, I examined citations made in the FY 1999 bills. FY 1999 was examined because it falls during the middle of this study’s time period, making it most likely that the other years will be similar to it. For subsections not present in the FY 1999 bills, I examined the citations made in the most recent year that the subsection
existed. Although it would have been optimal to examine all of the subsections for all years, it would have precluded completion of the study.

When subsections contained no citations to the U.S. Code or public laws, I attempted to identify the source of the legal authority for the subsections’ programs and agencies. To do so, I searched the electronic version of the U.S. Code available on the Government Printing Office’s webpage for the year when the appropriation legislation was written, the 1994 edition, Supplement 3 (The Code as of Jan. 1, 1998.). Occasionally, however, citations in appropriations bills were not in this version of the Code because changes to the code were made between Jan. 1, 1998, and when the appropriation bill was written. In these cases, I searched the 1994 edition, Supplement 4 (The Code as of Jan 1, 1999). In “searching,” I typed the title of the subsection’s heading into the search box on the website. I then examined the search results to ascertain whether one of the results contained a reference, be it to a chapter, subchapter, or section of the Code that providing authority for the subsection’s programs. This strategy worked well for subsections the headings for which were names of agencies.

When neither of the above strategies yielded citations, I relied on the statutory jurisdictions in House Rule X to assign the committees of jurisdiction. This strategy is inferior to relying on bill referral, because it does not capture common law changes to jurisdictions. Nevertheless, matching the substance of committee jurisdictions defined by House Rule X to the substance of the programs guaranteed that the subsections were categorized consistently with authorizing committees’ statutory jurisdictions.

In examining citations, I ascertained which House committees were referred the public laws cited directly or indirectly as legal authority for the programs and agencies funded by the subsections. I then used this information to code which House committee had jurisdiction over
the programs and agencies funded by the appropriations subsections. The following steps were employed to catalogue the public laws and U.S. Code citations. When a citation was to a single section of the Code:

(i) In the appropriate version of the U.S. Code, I searched for that section using the GPO’s search engine and catalogued the ten most recent laws changing the section. The ten most recent laws were catalogued because the most recent referrals identify the committee(s) with jurisdiction over the section.

When a citation was to a string of sections in the Code, I repeated step (i) for each section, stopping after the fifth section that was cited. I also repeated step (i) when a citation was made to a block of Code sections, stopping after the fifth section. When a chapter or subchapter of the Code was cited, I repeated step (i) for the first five sections of the chapter/subchapter. When laws were cited directly, I simply catalogued them. When the name, rather than number, of a law was cited:

(ii) I referred to the index of “Popular Names of Acts in the U.S. Code” available on Cornell University’s webpage. This index provides information about the acts itemized, including public law numbers and their location in the U.S. Code. Using this index, I identified the portion of the Code referred to by popular name citation. Sometimes the names index cited a specific section of the code. Then, I employed step (i) to catalogue the public laws providing authority for the U.S. Code citation. Sometimes, the names index led to a chapter/subchapter within a title of the Code. In these instances, I used step (i) for the first five subsections in the chapter/subchapter.

Following these rules resulted in cataloguing between 0 and 50 laws as the source(s) of authority for subsections. To identify the House committees to which these laws were referred, I
relied on two sources. First, I searched the “Public Laws Data” made available by the Center for American Politics and Public Policy through its “Policy Agendas” website. These data contain information on House committees that served as the primary and secondary reporting committees for laws from 1948 to 1998. I recorded the committee as having been referred the law if it was designated in the database as the primary reporting committee (if a bill is reported by a committee, it must have been referred to it). This database, however, does not provide information on committees unless they report the bill that becomes law. Additionally, the database does not provide House committee information if the law was associated with the Senate version of the bill. It could be the case (and it frequently was), then, that a law was referred to a House committee but there is no record of it in the Center’s database. Since referral is what provides a committee with jurisdiction over a program/agency, when no House committee was identified as having reported a law by the public law database, I searched for the law on the Library of Congress’s Legislative Information page, Thomas, identifying the committee that was referred the bill and recording it. If I could not identify the committee that was referred the law using either source, I coded the committee with jurisdiction over the law as missing. Additionally, when using Thomas and multiple committees were listed as having been referred the bill with no way of distinguishing which committee was the primary bill, I coded the committee with jurisdiction as missing. Finally, since the database contains information back to 1948, and since Thomas contains information back to 1973, I could not use these sources to identify the committee of referral for laws passed earlier than these dates.

I considered a subsection to be under the primary “common” law jurisdiction of a House committee if that committee was referred a majority, and no other committee was referred over 25%, of the public laws examined from the subsection. The logic behind this rule is as follows.
Given the fragmentation of policy jurisdictions emphasized by King (1997), it should be unusual to observe subsections in which only one committee was referred the laws providing authority. Additionally, for some subsections, the citations available in the subsections allowed for only a small number of laws to be examined. In these cases, any rule requiring that a percentage of laws any greater than a majority is necessary to assign the subsection to a committee would mean that even a single law having been referred to a different committee would preclude designation of a jurisdiction. Therefore, this majority-25% rule allows for the assignment of primary common law jurisdictions when a committee contributes more to the authority of a subsection than any other committee. At the same time, however, the rule prevents the assignment of a primary law jurisdiction when examination of public laws shows that another committee also contributed substantially. The reason for choosing a ceiling for the referral of laws to other committees that, if exceeded, prevents the assignment of a common law jurisdiction comes from the realization that, due to time considerations, an exhaustive review of all the laws contributing to the legal authority of the program and agencies funded by subsections is not conducted in this coding process. As a result, it is possible that another draw from the relevant laws could produce a different committee as the primary committee with common law jurisdiction. This is very unlikely, however, if only a small percentage of the laws examined in a subsection were referred to other committees. It is also very unlikely if a sizeable portion of laws were referred to different committees but that no one committee received a sizeable percentage of referrals. What was needed, then, was a ceiling making it unlikely that a second committee would have been coded as possessing primary common law jurisdiction if another draw had been taken. The 25% figure was chosen for two reasons. First, for subsections with many law citations, it is very unlikely that any committee with 25% of the referrals or fewer could become the committee with
primary common law jurisdiction in another draw. Second, for subsections with few citations, having the ceiling any lower would preclude the designation of a primary committee, since even one referral would elevate the percentage of referrals to that committee over the ceiling. In cases for which these rules did not result in a primary committee designation, I relied on committees’ statutory jurisdictions to assign the subsection to a committee.

One reality of the rules through which committee jurisdictions are established still must be considered. As noted above, sometimes jurisdictions are reformed through changes to House Rule X. Although these changes usually reinforce common law jurisdictions created by referrals of jurisdictionally ambiguous bills (King 1997), sometimes this is not so. Therefore, when statutory reforms alter jurisdictions, relying on bill referrals will lead to inaccurate assignments of committees to subsections. During the period of this study, one major reform of the House committees’ statutory jurisdictions occurred in January 1995 when the new Republican majority reformed House committee jurisdictions as part of its “Contract with America” pledge. Described in more detail by King (1997, Ch. 3), a handful of the changes made during this reform contradicted previous statutory jurisdictions and common law precedents, precluding the use of referrals to identify these jurisdictions. I relied on King (1997, 72-73) to identify both the subsections affected and the committees that were granted statutory jurisdiction over the subsections by this reform. For these subsections, the (FY 1994-FY 1995) years prior to the 1995 rule change were coded according to the rules described above. However, the subsequent (FY 1996-FY 2003) were coded on the basis of the committees’ statutory jurisdiction, as identified by King (1997, 72-73).
Appendix B—Identifying and Assigning Limitation Riders

Identifying Limitation Riders in Appropriation Bills

Limitation Riders (LRs) were identified by searching the text of the “pdf” copies of appropriation bills available on Thomas for the words, “none” and “no.” When the language following these words specified that no appropriation of funds could be spent for reasons therein specified, the language was classified as a LR. Information on actions that LRs prohibited was also catalogued, since LRs were employed for a number of purposes. These purposes, as well as the rules employed to code whether or not each rider was aimed toward attaining them, are as follows:

1. **Prohibition of Laws**: Coded 1 if it forbade the application of a law or a section, or sections, of the U.S. Code.
2. **General Prohibition of Policy Choices**: Coded 1 if the language forbade the agency from taking an action that would influence public policy but without specifying a specific law or section of the U.S. Code; 0 otherwise. This category is subject to the most interpretation from a coding standpoint because, in the most general terms, public policy is everything that the government does. In this sense, every LR affects policy. However, this study is interested in how the appropriation process is employed to influence the substance how laws passed by Congress, and how decisions made by agencies, affect the programs over which agencies have jurisdiction. Some LRs are purely procedural, e.g., specifying no money above a specified ceiling can be spent on official receptions or that no money can be spent on furniture, and should not be classified as affecting policy. To be sure, imposing restrictions on administration can influence
policy, e.g., forbidding individuals from receiving their salaries if they implement a law or regulation. Given these considerations, LRs as affecting policy, if they

(i) specified that no funds could be used to perform a specific task in referring to a program.

(ii) forbade the use of funds for a specific program.

(ii) prohibited compensation of workers who perform tasks related to specific programs.

(iii) specified that no funds could be spent to employ more than a certain number of people to perform a task related to an agency’s programmatic duties.

(iv) prohibited funds from being spent for a specific use under an existing law or regulation.

(v) prohibited use of funds for programmatic purposes unless conditions were met.

(vi) prohibited use of funds could for purposes prohibited by, or contrary to, an existing law.

(vii) influenced how government funds could be used when provided through loans or grants to individuals or private/public entities.

(viii) forbade use of funds in certain geographic areas or forbade use of funds if production was not based in certain geographic areas.

(ix) forbade use of funds unless an agency maintained a presence in a geographic area(s).

(x) forbade use of funds to appeal decisions made by a court.

LRs were not coded as affecting policy if they merely placed restrictions on the internal administration of agencies that had no clear implications for the substance of how agencies executed their authority under the law. Such provisions included LRs forbidding the use of funds to buy furniture or generators, forbidding the use of funds to make personnel decisions that did not pertain to the agencies’ programmatic duties, and so on.

(3) Prohibition of “Would-Be” Rules: Coded 1 if the language forbade agencies from issuing rules/regulations without identifying a specific rule/regulation; 0 otherwise.18
(4) **Prohibition of Specific Rules**: Coded 1 if the language forbade agencies from issuing specific rules (cited as proposed rules previously published in the Federal Register and giving a citation or cited as rules already in the Code of Federal Regulations); 0 otherwise.

(5) **Prohibition of Treaties**: Coded 1 if the language forbade any action by an agency or agencies from developing rules to comply with the conditions of a treaty; 0 otherwise. ¹⁹

(6) **Prohibition of Actions Violating the Law and/or Regulations**: Coded 1 if language forbade agencies from spending money in violation of laws and/or regulations; 0 otherwise.

To ensure reliability of the data produced using these rules, a second coder examined the 383 LRs that present in the FY 1994—FY 2003 Agriculture and Related Agencies bill. Using these rules, the coder determined whether each LR fell into each category. Table A1 demonstrates the reliability of these data, as the kappa statistic for each category was highly significant (p<.001). Although two categories of LRs—prohibitions on lobbying Congress and prohibitions on providing funds to non-federal entities to lobby agencies—were not present in these bills, and hence could not be checked for reliability, the highly significant reliability of the other categories makes it very likely that coding decisions placing riders into these categories were also reliable.

**Assigning Limitation Riders to Appropriation Subsections**

I followed the following rules to determine the subsections to which LRs applied:

(1) When a LR was located within a subsection, it applied to that subsection.

(2) When a LR located in a “General Provisions” section of a title referred to an agency/department/commission, or to a policy/program over which an agency had jurisdiction, it applied to the subsection in which that agency/department/commission was funded.
(3) When a LR located in a “General Provisions” section of a title stated that the provision applied to all of the provisions in the title, it was not coded as applying to any of the subsections. This was the case unless the title had only one subsection in it. In this circumstance, the LR was applied to it.

(4) When a LR located in the “General Provisions” section of an appropriations bill referred to an agency/department/commission, or to a policy/program over which an agency had jurisdiction, it applied to the subsection in which that agency/department/commission was funded. When a LR located in a “General Provisions” title stated that the provision applied to all of the provisions in the bill, it was not coded as applying to any subsection within the bill.

(5) When a provision in either a “General Provisions” section of a title or the “General Provisions” title of a bill referred to agencies or programs in more than one subsection, or when it referred to policies and programs in more than one different subsection, the following rules were applied. First, if it referred to more than one subsection but the subsections were all under the jurisdiction of one authorizing committee, then the LR was applied only to the first subsection, as it appeared in order in the bill. Second, if a LR referred to the agencies and policies of two subsections but the subsections were under the jurisdiction of different authorizing committees, the LR was applied to both subsections. There was never a LR that applied to the jurisdiction of more than two authorizing committees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Limitation</th>
<th>% Expected Agreement</th>
<th>% Agreement</th>
<th>Kappa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of Laws</td>
<td>62.07</td>
<td>91.12</td>
<td>.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Prohibition of Policy Choices</td>
<td>63.91</td>
<td>86.42</td>
<td>.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of “Would Be” Rules</td>
<td>99.22</td>
<td>99.74</td>
<td>.67*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of Specific Rules</td>
<td>98.96</td>
<td>99.48</td>
<td>.50*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of Treaties</td>
<td>98.45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of Actions Violating Laws/Regulations</td>
<td>89.63</td>
<td>99.48</td>
<td>.95*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *p<.001.
Endnotes

1 All of the appropriation bills also included a “General Provisions” title. In the case of the Labor bill, it was “Title V.” See below for how this section was treated.

2 This was the solution which I employed in earlier stages of this project.

3 One can tell the difference between headings and subheadings by examining the print type. For example, the headings within Title I of the Labor, HHS, and Education bill contained all capital letters with the first letter of each word larger in size than the subsequent letters. By way of distinction, the subheadings merely contained all capital letters with each letter equal in size. In other titles of other bills, headings and subheadings were distinguished differently; nevertheless, it was possible to distinguish headings from subheadings by varying print type in each title of each bill.

4 Each appropriation bill contained a “General Provisions” title, typically the last title in the bill. Provisions in these titles, however, do not appropriate funds for programs. Rather, they contain specifications on how funds can be used, including forbidding the use of funds for specific purposes, placing ceilings or floors on the amount of money that can be spent on programs, and even—not withstanding House Rule XXI—modifying the law. Therefore, these titles were not incorporated into the subsection database. Since these titles contained LRs, however, I searched them for LRs and assigned them to the appropriate subsections from the bill when creating the variable measuring LR use (see Appendix B).

5 In examining citations, I did not examine citations to public laws and sections of the U.S. Code that noted that funds were appropriated “notwithstanding” a law or a section of the code. An example of such citations that recurred across the bills and over the years involved references to 31 U.S.C. 3302, which governs how public officials handle public money. In these references, the bill language would specify that funds were appropriated “notwithstanding” that section of the code. Thus, the section was clearly not the source of the legal authority behind the programs and agencies being funded. Additionally, I also omitted examination of the many references to 5 U.S.C. 3109 in the bills across the years. This section governs how agencies hire and use consultants. Although the appropriation of the funds was subject to this section, the section was clearly not the source for the legal authority behind the programs and agencies being funded.

6 Many subsections, of course, had fewer than five; however, for those with more than five, I coded the first five citations made in the subsection. Some subsections had no citations. I discuss how I assigned such subsection to the jurisdiction of House committees below.

7 The website is “www.gpoaccess.gov/uscode/search.html.”

8 For example, this occurred when examining citations in “Title III—Department of Education” of the Labor, HHS, and Education bill because the “No Child Left Behind” act was passed during this window of time.

9 For example, there were no citations in the subsection, “Food and Drug Administration,” (FDA) in Title VI (Related Agencies) of the FY 1999 “Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies” bill. When this heading was queried, the first result was “21 U.S.C. 393.” This section, entitled, “Food and Drug Administration,” provides for the establishment of the FDA. Therefore, I used it as the source for the laws. However, this strategy did not work well when the subsection heading titles were not names of agencies.

10 Most laws had fewer than ten laws listed. However, when more than ten were listed, only the ten most recent were catalogued. Some Code sections contain scores of citations to laws.

11 The webpage is available at: “http://straylight.law.cornell.edu/uscode/topn/”.

12 Although it would have been most straightforward to catalogue the public law numbers provided in this source, doing so would have been potentially misleading because a reference to a popular name of an act is frequently not a reference to a single public law. For example, in “Title III” of the Labor, HHS, and Education bill, appropriation
authors referenced various titles of the “Public Health Service Act” repeatedly as authority for the programs funded therein. This act is anything but a single law. Rather, it is the product of an initial law and subsequent additions, amendments, and/or reauthorizations. Hence, it would have been inappropriate to simply catalogue one public law—even the initial law—as the source of legal authority for the programs and agencies funded by the subsections.

13 The website is available at: “www.policyagendas.org/datasets/index.html”.

14 *Thomas* is available at: “thomas.loc.gov”.

15 For these reasons, 10.35% of the 2,474 public law citations which I catalogued were coded as missing.

16 Citations to the House Appropriations and Budget committees were not included in these calculations because these committees cannot have jurisdiction over the programs and agencies funded in the appropriation bills. Additionally, citations to laws that made revisions to the U.S. Code without making substantive changes to the law are also not included in these calculations. A typical example of such a law is P.L. 103-272, the purpose of which was “To revise, codify and enact without substantive change certain general and permanent laws, related to transportation, as subtitles II, III, and V-X of title 49, United States Code, ‘Transportation’, and to make other technical improvements in the Code.” Such laws are referred to the House Judiciary Committee. Including them in the calculations would inappropriately increase the percentage of laws referred to that committee within certain appropriation subsections.

17 Language stating that “none of the funds” appropriated could be spent on a program above a certain amount or that “no more” than a certain amount could be spent on a program were not classified as LRs. Such provisions merely do what all other appropriation provisions do, allocate a set amount of funds for program authorized by law (or previously authorized by law). Additionally, provisions specifying that “none of the funds” or “no funds” could be spent for a purpose “in this or any other year” were not recorded as LRs. The reason for this decision is that such provisions constitute legislation in an appropriations bill because they preclude funding for a purpose in the future. In other words, such provision would change the law. As such, they are not pure LRs and are not protected from points of order.

18 For example, a LR in the FY 1997 Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies bill forbade the Food and Drug Administration from spending money to enforce any “rules or regulations for a selenium supplement level in animal feeds below 0.3 parts per million.”

19 Anything referring to the Kyoto Protocols is coded as a treaty because it refers to that treaty. In fact, the only LRs that mentioned treaties all mentioned Kyoto.

20 Applying such subsections in this way was necessary to avoid double counting. That is, if a rider applied to two subsections within a title but both of those subsections fell into the same authorizing committee’s jurisdiction, then applying it to both sections would result in counting it as two riders in the authorizing committee’s jurisdiction.