

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Continuing Appropriations Acts: Brief Overview of Recent Practices

Updated January 11, 2002

Sandy Streeter
Analyst in American National Government
Government and Finance Division

Continuing Appropriations Acts: Brief Overview of Recent Practices

Summary

Normally, most of the operations of federal departments and agencies are funded each year through the separate enactment of 13 regular appropriations acts, which are scheduled to be enacted by October 1. Rarely, however, are all 13 bills enacted by the deadline. The affected departments and agencies usually are funded under continuing appropriations acts. Because continuing appropriations acts typically are enacted in the form of joint resolutions, such acts are referred to as *continuing resolutions* (or *CRs*).

Over the last 30 years, the nature, scope, and duration of continuing resolutions have fluctuated. From the early 1970s through 1987, continuing resolutions gradually expanded from interim funding measures of comparatively brief duration and length to full-year funding measures. From 1988 through 2001, the nature, scope, and duration generally contracted, except during 1995 and 1996. During this period expanded FY1996 continuing resolutions were enacted.

Continuing resolutions generally can be divided into two categories—those that provide temporary funding and those that provide funds for the entire fiscal year. Temporary continuing resolutions provide interim funding until a specific date or until the enactment of the applicable regular appropriations acts. Full-year continuing resolutions provide continuing appropriations for the entire fiscal year.

Over the years, delay in the enactment of regular appropriations measures and continuing resolutions after the beginning of the fiscal year has led to periods during which appropriations authority has lapsed. Such periods generally are referred to as *funding gaps*.

Since none of the 13 FY2002 regular appropriations bills were enacted by October 1, 2001, and the last three regular bills did not become law until January 10, 2002, eight FY2002 continuing resolutions were enacted into law. These measures sequentially extended funding for each of the outstanding regular appropriations bills from October 1, 2001, through midnight, January 10, 2002.

Contents

Most Recent Developments	1
Background	3
History and Recent Trends	3
Types of Continuing Resolutions	7
Substantive Legislative Provisions	8
Funding Gaps	9
For Additional Reading	10
Congressional Documents	10
CRS Reports	10
Other Sources	11

List of Tables

Table 1. Current Status of FY2002 Continuing Resolutions	2
Table 2. Regular Appropriations Bills Enacted by Deadline and Continuing Resolutions (CRs), FY1977-FY2002	6

Continuing Appropriations Acts: Brief Overview of Recent Practices

Most Recent Developments

Since none of the 13 FY2002 regular appropriations were enacted by October 1, 2001, and the last three regular bills did not become law until January 10, 2002,¹ eight FY2002 continuing resolutions were enacted into law. These measures sequentially extended funding for each of the outstanding regular appropriations bills from October 1, 2001, through midnight, January 10, 2002.

The first FY2002 continuing resolution (H.J.Res. 65, P.L. 107-44) extended funding from October 1, through midnight, October 16, 2001. This continuing resolution provided a spending level for each appropriation at generally the total amount of *budget authority*² that was available last year. The funding level included adjustments for supplementals and rescissions. The continuing resolution also extended provisions in various acts through October 16, 2001 (for dates of congressional and presidential action on this measure, see **Table 1**).

Subsequently, seven FY2002 continuing resolutions have become law that sequentially extended the date:

- H.J.Res. 68 (P.L. 107-48) extended funding under the same terms as P.L. 107-44 for the outstanding regular appropriations bills for a week, through October 23, 2001;

¹The final three FY2002 regular appropriations bills were: Defense (H.R. 3338, P.L. 107-117); Foreign Operations (H.R. 2506, P.L. 107-115); and Labor-Health and Human Services-Education (H.R. 3061, P.L. 107-116).

²Congress provides budget authority instead of cash to agencies. Budget authority represents the legal authority for federal agencies to make obligations requiring either immediate or future expenditures (or outlays). These obligations (for example, entering into a contract to construct a ship or purchase supplies) result in outlays, which are payments from the Treasury, usually in the form of checks, electronic funds transfers, or cash disbursements.

For example, an appropriations act might provide \$3 billion in new budget authority for FY2000 to the Defense Department to construct four ships. That is, the act gives the department legal authority to sign contracts to build the ships. The department can not commit the government to pay more than \$3 billion. The outlays occur when the contractor cashes the government check for building the ships.

Generally, appropriations are a type of budget authority.

- H.J.Res. 69 (P.L. 107-53) continued funding under the same terms as P.L. 107-44 for the outstanding regular appropriations bills through October 31, 2001;
- H.J.Res. 70 (P.L. 107-58) extended funding under the same terms for the outstanding bills through November 16, 2001;
- H.J.Res. 74 (P.L. 107-70) continued funding under the same terms through December 7, 2001;
- H.J.Res. 76 (P.L. 107-79) extended funding under the same terms through December 15, 2001;
- H.J.Res. 78 (P.L. 107-83) continued funding under the same terms through December 21, 2001; and
- H.J.Res. 79. (P.L. 107-97) extended funding under the same terms through January 10, 2002.

For dates of congressional and presidential action on these measures, see **Table 1**.

Table 1. Current Status of FY2002 Continuing Resolutions

Measure	House Report	House Adoption	Senate Report	Senate Adoption	Conference	Public Law
H.J.Res. 65	—	09/24/01 Vote: 392-0	—	09/25/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	09/28/01 P.L. 107-44
H.J.Res. 68	c	10/11/01 Vote: Voice	—	10/11/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	10/12/01 P.L. 107-48
H.J.Res. 69	c	10/17/01 Vote: Voice	—	10/17/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	10/22/01 P.L. 107-53
H.J.Res. 70	—	10/25/01 Vote: 419-0	—	10/25/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	10/31/01 P.L. 107-58
H.J.Res. 74	c	11/15/01 Vote: Voice	—	11/15/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	11/17/01 P.L. 107-70
H.J.Res. 76	c	12/05/01 Vote: Voice	—	12/05/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	12/07/01 P.L. 107-79
H.J.Res. 78	—	12/13/01 Vote: Voice	—	12/14/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	12/15/01 P.L. 107-83
H.J.Res. 79	—	12/20/01 Vote: Voice	—	12/20/01 Vote: UC ^a	b	12/21/01 P.L. 107-97

- By unanimous consent, the House discharged the House Appropriations Committee from further consideration of the measure.
- The Senate adopted the House-adopted measure without amendment.
- The continuing resolution was adopted by unanimous consent. That is, a unanimous consent request was proposed to adopt the measure and since no Senator objected, the resolution was adopted.

Background

Under the Constitution and federal law, no funds may be drawn from the U.S. Treasury or obligated by federal officials unless appropriated by law.³ Normally, most of the operations of federal departments and agencies are funded each year through the separate enactment of 13 *regular appropriations acts*.⁴ These measures provide funding by fiscal year.⁵ Since these measures expire at the end of the fiscal year, the regular appropriations bills for the subsequent fiscal year must be enacted by October 1st. However, it is not unusual for the enactment of one or more of these acts to be delayed beyond the deadline (for data on the FY1977-FY2002 period, see **Table 2**). When this occurs, affected departments and agencies usually are funded under continuing appropriations acts. Because continuing appropriations acts typically are enacted in the form of joint resolutions, such acts are referred to as *continuing resolutions* (or *CRs*).

This report provides information on the history of continuing resolutions; the nature, scope, and duration of CRs during the last 30 years; the various types of CRs that have been enacted; and an overview of those instances when budget authority has lapsed and a funding gap has resulted.

History and Recent Trends

Continuing resolutions date from at least the late 1870s, and have been a regular part of the annual appropriations process in the post World War II period. In fact, with the exception of FY1989, FY1995, and FY1997, at least one continuing resolution has been enacted for each fiscal year since 1954. During the past 26 years (FY1977-FY2002), Congress enacted on average four continuing resolutions per year (for detailed information, see **Table 2**).

Over the last 30 years, the nature, scope, and duration of continuing resolutions have varied.⁶ From the early 1970s through 1987, continuing resolutions gradually

³See Article I, Section 9 of the Constitution, and 31 U.S.C. 1341.

⁴There are three types of appropriations measures. Regular appropriations acts provide most of the funding that is provided in all appropriations measures for a fiscal year. *Supplemental appropriations acts* are generally considered after the regular appropriations bills are enacted and provide additional appropriations. Continuing resolutions are discussed in this report. For more information on regular and supplemental appropriations measures and the appropriations process, see CRS Report 97-684, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by Sandy Streeter.

⁵Fiscal years begin on October 1 and end the following September 30. For example, the fiscal year 1997 began on October 1, 1996.

⁶For a discussion of trends involving the use of continuing resolutions through the mid-1980s, see U.S. Congress, House Committee on the Budget, *The Whole and the Parts: Piecemeal and Integrated Approaches to Congressional Budgeting*, committee print No. CP-3, prepared for the Task Force on the Budget Process by Allen Schick, 100th Congress, 1st session (continued...)

expanded from interim funding measures of comparatively brief duration and length to full-year funding measures. In many cases, the full-year measures included the full text of several regular appropriations bills and contained substantive legislation (*i.e.*, provisions under the jurisdiction of committees other than the House and Senate Appropriations Committees). From 1988 through 2002, the nature, scope, and duration generally contracted,⁷ except during 1995 and 1996.⁸

Until the early 1970s, continuing resolutions principally were limited in scope and duration, and rarely exceeded a page or two in length. They were used almost exclusively to provide temporary funding at a minimum, formulaic level, and contained few provisions unrelated to the interim funding.

Beginning in the early 1970s, conflict between the President and Congress over major budget priorities, triggered in part by rapidly increasing deficits, greatly increased the difficulty of reaching final agreement on regular appropriations acts. This conflict led to protracted delay in their enactment. Continuing resolutions, because they historically have been viewed as “must-pass” measures in view of the constitutional and statutory imperatives, became a major battleground for the resolution of budgetary and other conflicts. Consequently, the nature, scope, and duration of continuing resolutions began to change.

Continuing resolutions began to be used to provide funds for longer periods, and occasionally for an entire fiscal year, when agreement on one or more regular acts could not be reached. Further, continuing resolutions became vehicles for substantive legislative provisions unrelated to interim funding, as it became clear that in some years continuing resolutions would be the most effective means to enact such provisions into law. These trends culminated in FY1987 and FY1988, following a period of persistently high deficits and sustained conflict over how to deal with them. For those 2 years, continuing resolutions effectively became omnibus appropriations measures for the federal government, incorporating all of the regular appropriations acts for the entire fiscal year as well as a host of substantive legislation covering a broad range of policy areas.⁹

Since FY1988, Congress and the President have generally operated under multi-year deficit reduction agreements achieved through budget summits. Since 1990, these agreements have included enforceable limits on spending controlled in annual appropriations acts (so-called *discretionary spending*).¹⁰ From FY1988 through FY1995, a period of relative agreement on overall budget priorities, agreement on regular appropriations acts came more readily. Continuing resolutions, when

⁶(...continued)

(Washington: U.S. Govt. Print. Off, 1987).

⁷There were no continuing resolutions for FY1995 and FY1997.

⁸During this period, expanded FY1996 continuing resolutions were enacted.

⁹See P.L. 99-591 and P.L. 100-202.

¹⁰For more information, see CRS Report 97-684, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by Sandy Streeter; and CRS Report 98-720, *Manual on the Federal Budget Process*, by Allen Schick and Robert Keith.

necessary, generally were more limited, contained far less substantive legislation, and were used mainly to provide interim funding for relatively brief periods.

During consideration of the FY1996 regular appropriations bills and continuing resolutions, the President and Congress were in conflict over the 1995 balanced budget plan and spending and policy priorities in the FY1996 appropriations measures. As a result, two funding gaps¹¹ occurred; 14 continuing resolutions were enacted; and action was not completed until almost seven months into the fiscal year. The final continuing resolution was used for the entire fiscal year and contained six regular appropriations bills.

From FY1997 through FY2001, budgetary and other conflicts continued between the President and Congress. Instead of resolving these differences in expanded continuing resolutions, they were generally resolved in omnibus regular appropriations bills.¹² During conference on a regular appropriations bill, other outstanding regular appropriations bills and substantive legislation were attached to the bill in conference — creating an omnibus regular appropriations bill. During this period, continuing resolutions, when needed, provided interim funding for short periods of time and included little substantive legislation.

The change in the type of vehicle for omnibus appropriations bills from continuing resolutions to regular appropriations bills was due, in part, to avoid floor amendments to regular appropriations bills¹³ and to expedite completion of the regular bills.¹⁴

¹¹For information on funding gaps, see *Funding Gaps* below.

¹²During this 5-year period, all 13 regular appropriations bills were enacted separately only once (FY1998).

¹³In the House and Senate, conference reports are not amendable. Some regular bills either were not considered on the House or Senate floors or were pulled before floor action was completed thereby preventing action on certain floor amendments. By attaching these measures to a conference report on another regular bill, action on amendments was avoided.

¹⁴By attaching five of the FY1997 regular appropriations bills to a sixth FY1997 regular bill in conference, all the regular bills were enacted by the October 1st deadline, which obviated the need for a continuing resolution.

Table 2. Regular Appropriations Bills Enacted by Deadline and Continuing Resolutions (CRs), FY1977-FY2002

Fiscal Year	Presidential Administration	Party in Control of Congress:		Regular Appropriations Bills:		Continuing Resolutions Enacted
		Senate	House	Approved by or on October 1st	Enacted in Continuing Resolution	
1977	Gerald Ford	Democrats	Democrats	13	0	2 ^a
1978	Jimmy Carter	Democrats	Democrats	9	1	3
1979				5	1	1
1980				3	3	2
1981				1	5	2
1982		Ronald Reagan	Republicans	Democrats	0	4
1983				1	7	2
1984				4	3	2
1985				4	8	5
1986				0	7	5
1987				0	13	5
1988		Democrats		0	13	5
1989				13	0	0
1990	George Bush	Democrats	Democrats	1	0	3
1991				0	0	5
1992				3	1	4
1993				1	0	1
1994	William Clinton	Democrats	Democrats	2	0	3
1995				13	0	0
1996		Republicans	Republicans	0	5 ^b	14
1997				8 ^c	0	0
1998				1	0	6
1999				1	0	6
2000				4	0	7
2001				2	0	21
2002	George W. Bush	Democrats ^d	Republicans ^d	0	0	8

Sources: U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Appropriations, *Appropriations, Budget Estimates, Etc.*, 94th Congress, 2nd session - 104th Congress, 1st session (Washington: GPO, 1976-1995). U.S. Congress, House, *Calendars of the U.S. House of Representatives and History of Legislation*, 104th Congress, 1st session - 107th Congress, 1st session (Washington: GPO, 1995-2001).

a. The two CRs did not provide continuing funding for entire regular bills; instead, they provided funding for selected activities.

b. An FY1996 continuing resolution (P.L. 104-99) provided full-year funding for the FY1996 foreign operations regular bill; however, the continuing resolution provided that the foreign operations measure be enacted separately (P.L. 104-107). It is excluded from the amount.

c. The remaining five bills were enacted by October 1, but not as separate measures; therefore, they are excluded from this amount. The five bills were attached to the FY1997 Defense regular act.

d. On June 6, 2001, the Democrats became the majority in the Senate. By that time, the Senate Appropriations Committee had not reported any FY2002 regular appropriations measures.

Types of Continuing Resolutions

Continuing resolutions generally can be divided into two categories—those that provide temporary funding and those that provide funds for the entire fiscal year.

Temporary continuing resolutions provide interim funding until a specific date or until the enactment of the applicable regular appropriations acts, if earlier. They have remained fairly constant in form and structure in recent years. Traditionally, they have established formulas that provide funding levels for programs and activities. Recently, they have provided spending levels at the previous year's amount and sometimes included formulaic exceptions. For example, P.L. 105-240 provided that when the President's request and the House- and Senate-passed versions of the bill are lower than the previous year's amount, the funding level is the higher of the President's request, House-passed bill, or Senate-passed bill. (See section 101 of P.L. 105-240.)

In most cases, the formula has applied to all programs or activities covered by a particular regular appropriations act. However, such formulas also have been used to fund specific programs that were not covered by regular appropriations acts because they were not yet authorized by law or for other reasons (for example, Section 101 of P.L. 94-473, approved October 11, 1976).

Once a temporary continuing resolution is enacted, additional temporary resolutions, if necessary, may simply extend the deadline in the initial resolution without changing the funding formula, or they may include an updated formula that represents, for example, a later stage of congressional action on one or more of the covered regular acts than had been reached earlier.

Full-year continuing resolutions provide continuing appropriations for the entire fiscal year. (**Table 2** provides the number of regular bills funded through the end of the fiscal year in continuing resolutions.) Typically, full-year funding provisions are one of two types: (1) provisions that incorporate regular appropriations acts by reference to the latest stage of congressional action (usually the conference agreement, if one has been reached); or (2) the full text of the regular act.

Full-year continuing resolutions effectively become regular appropriation acts for the fiscal year. Further, when continuing resolutions have included the full text of one or more regular appropriations acts, they also have included all the myriad general and administrative provisions (so-called *riders*) typically included in regular acts. (See, for example, Section 101 of P.L. 100-202, approved December 22, 1987, and Section 101 of P.L. 99-591, approved October 30, 1986.) Consequently, they may be hundreds of pages in length, whereas temporary resolutions typically are a few pages or less (in the case of a simple extension of a previous resolution, perhaps only one page).

During consideration of the FY1996 continuing resolutions, Congress also used *targeted appropriations*. Traditionally, a single continuing resolution provides funding for all activities in the outstanding regular appropriations bills and generally provides the same expiration date for all these bills. However, Congress separated activities

from the outstanding regular bills and distributed them among three FY1996 continuing resolutions. Congress distributed funding for activities in four of the six outstanding regular bills among the three continuing resolutions. Funding for most of the activities in the fifth regular bill (Foreign Operations) was provided in one of these continuing resolutions and funding for most of the activities in the sixth bill (District of Columbia) in another. In addition, Congress extended funding for the entire fiscal year for selected activities in the bills, such as Meals on Wheels and visitor services in national parks, while it provided interim funding for the remaining activities.

Substantive Legislative Provisions

Substantive legislative provisions (*i.e.*, provisions in the jurisdiction of committees other than the House and Senate Appropriations Committees) covering a wide range of subjects also have been included in some continuing resolutions. Continuing resolutions are attractive vehicles for such provisions because they are considered must-pass legislation on which the President and Congress eventually must reach agreement. Such provisions have been included both in temporary and full-year continuing resolutions.

House rules¹⁵ that prohibit the consideration of general appropriations measures containing legislative provisions or *unauthorized appropriations*¹⁶ do not apply to continuing resolutions (though the House typically adopts special rules restricting amendments to continuing resolutions, in part for this reason). Comparable Senate restrictions¹⁷ on legislative provisions and unauthorized appropriations do apply in the case of continuing resolutions.

Substantive provisions in continuing resolutions have included comprehensive measures, such as omnibus crime control legislation (in FY1985), foreign affairs reform and restructuring assistance legislation (FY1999), Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act of 2000 (FY2001), that establish major new policies and amend permanent provisions of law.¹⁸ They have also included narrower provisions focused on temporary or one-time problems, such as special House and Senate procedures for considering certain presidential requests for funding, temporary increases in the statutory limit on the public debt, and adjustments to the requirements of the 1985 Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act (or *Gramm-Rudman-Hollings*). These provisions vary in length from less than one page to over 200 pages (in the case, for example, of the Comprehensive Crime Control Act of 1984).

¹⁵House Rules XXI, Clause 2, and XXII, Clause 5.

¹⁶Unauthorized appropriations are funds in an appropriations measure for agencies or programs whose authorization has expired or was never granted, or whose budget authority exceeds the ceiling authorized (for more information, see CRS Report 97-684, *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*).

¹⁷Senate Rule XVI.

¹⁸For numerous examples, see CRS Report RL30619, *Examples of Legislative Provisions in Omnibus Appropriations Acts*, by Robert Keith.

Funding Gaps

Over the years, delay in the enactment of regular appropriations measures and continuing resolutions after the beginning of the fiscal year has led to periods during which appropriations authority has lapsed. Such periods generally are referred to as funding gaps.¹⁹ Depending on the number of regular appropriations that have yet to be enacted, a funding gap can affect either a few departments or agencies or most of the federal government.

Funding gaps are not a recent phenomenon. In fact, by the 1960s and 1970s, delay in the enactment of appropriation acts, including continuing resolutions, beyond the beginning of the fiscal year had become almost routine. Notably, according to a 1981 GAO report, “most Federal managers continued to operate during periods of funding gaps while minimizing all nonessential operations and obligations, believing that Congress did not intend that agencies close down while the appropriations measures were being passed.”²⁰

On April 25, 1980, Attorney General Benjamin Civiletti issued a formal opinion which stated in general that maintaining nonessential operations in the absence of appropriations was not permitted under the Antideficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1341), and that the Justice Department would enforce the criminal sanctions provided for under the Act against future violations.²¹

In another opinion issued on January 16, 1981, the Attorney General outlined the activities that could be continued by federal agencies during a funding gap. Under that opinion, the only excepted activities include (1) those involving the orderly termination of agency functions; (2) emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property; or (3) activities authorized by law.²² Activities authorized by law, for example, include funding for entitlement programs, such as Social Security and Medicare, that are permanently appropriated. In 1990, the Antideficiency Act was amended to clarify that “the term ‘emergencies involving the safety of human life or the protection of property’ does not include ongoing, regular

¹⁹For more information on funding gaps, see CRS Report RS20348, *Federal Funding Gaps: A Brief Overview*, by Robert Keith; and CRS Report 98-844, *Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes, Effects, and Process*, by Sharon S. Gressle.

²⁰U.S. General Accounting Office, *Funding Gaps Jeopardize Federal Government Operations*, GAO report PAD-81-31 (Washington: March 3, 1981), i.

²¹U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of the Attorney General, Memorandum to the President, April 25, 1980. Reprinted in *Funding Gaps Jeopardize Federal Government Operations*, App. IV, pp. 63-67.

²²For additional information on the 1981 opinion of the Attorney General, and on the excepted activities outlined in that opinion, see U.S. General Accounting Office, *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law: Vol. II*, GAO report GAO/OGC-92-13 (Washington: December 1992), pp. 6-92—6-99.

functions of government the suspension of which would not imminently threaten the safety of human life or the protection of property.”²³

Since 1981, whenever delay in the appropriations process has led to periods of lapsed appropriations, federal agencies and departments lacking appropriations generally have shut down all nonessential operations and furloughed nonessential employees (although provisions of law have been enacted to ratify obligations and pay employees retroactively). During late 1995 and early 1996, there were two funding gaps—one lasting 21 days and the other lasting six (including weekends). In contrast, from 1981 through 1994, there were nine funding gaps, varying in duration from only one to three days, some of which occurred over weekends. Most of these gaps occurred after the beginning of the fiscal year, meaning that they were not caused because of a failure to enact an initial continuing resolution, but because of delay in enacting a further extension.²⁴

On August 16, 1995, Assistant Attorney General Walter Dellinger, in a memorandum for the Director of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), stated that “the 1981 Opinion continues to be a sound analysis of the legal authorities respecting government operations when Congress has failed to enact regular appropriations bills or a continuing resolution to cover a hiatus between regular appropriations.”²⁵ The 1990 amendment, he maintained, basically served to confirm the appropriateness of the 1981 opinion.

For Additional Reading

Congressional Documents

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on the Budget. *The Whole and the Parts: Piecemeal and Integrated Approaches to Congressional Budgeting*, committee print No. CP-3, prepared for the Task Force on the Budget Process by Allen Schick, 100th Congress, 1st session, Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1987.

CRS Reports

CRS Report 97-947. *The Appropriations Process and the Congressional Budget Act*, by James V. Saturno.

CRS Report 97-684. *The Congressional Appropriations Process: An Introduction*, by Sandy Streater.

²³P.L. 101-508 Section 13213(b), 31 U.S.C. 1342.

²⁴See CRS Report RS20348, *Federal Funding Gaps: A Brief Overview*, by Robert Keith.

²⁵U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Legal Counsel, *Government Operations in the Event of a Lapse in Appropriations*, Memorandum for Alice Rivlin, Director, Office of Management and Budget (Washington: August 16, 1995).

CRS Report RS20095. *The Congressional Budget Process: A Brief Overview*, by James V. Saturno.

CRS Report RL30619. *Examples of Legislative Provisions in Omnibus Appropriations Acts*, by Robert Keith.

CRS Report RS20348. *Federal Funding Gaps: A Brief Overview*, by Robert Keith.

CRS Report 98-721. *Introduction to the Federal Budget Process*, by Robert Keith.

CRS Report 97-865. *Points of Order in the Congressional Budget Process*, by James V. Saturno.

CRS Report RL30339. *Preventing Federal Government Shutdowns: Proposals for an Automatic Continuing Resolution*, by Robert Keith.

CRS Report 98-844. *Shutdown of the Federal Government: Causes, Effects, and Process*, by Sharon S. Gressle.

Other Sources

U.S. General Accounting Office. *Funding Gaps Jeopardize Federal Government Operations*, GAO report PAD-81-31, Washington, March 3, 1981.

— *Principles of Federal Appropriations Law: Vol. II*, 2nd Ed., GAO report GAO/OGC-92-13, Washington, December 1992, Ch. 8, “Continuing Resolutions.”