

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hassan	Reed
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Casey	Inhofe	Schumer
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Strange
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCain	Tillis
Daines	McCaskill	Toomey
Donnelly	McConnell	Udall
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Fischer	Nelson	

NAYS—17

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Sanders
Booker	Harris	Schatz
Brown	Hirono	Van Hollen
Cantwell	Leahy	Warren
Durbin	Markey	Wyden
Franken	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—4

Cochran	Menendez
Isakson	Shelby

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 2810.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

*Resolved*, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2810) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators MCCAIN, INHOFE, WICKER, FISCHER, COTTON, ROUNDS, ERNST, TILLIS, SULLIVAN, PERDUE, CRUZ, GRAHAM, SASSE, STRANGE, REED, NELSON, MCCASKILL, SHAHEEN, GILLIBRAND, BLUMENTHAL, DONNELLY, HIRONO, KAINE, KING, HEINRICH, WARREN, and PETERS.

Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the motion, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H. Con. Res. 71.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 219 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Daines	McCain	Thune
Enzi	McConnell	Tillis
Ernst	Moran	Toomey
Fischer	Murkowski	Wicker
		Young

NAYS—47

Baldwin	Donnelly	Kaine
Bennet	Duckworth	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Klobuchar
Booker	Feinstein	Leahy
Brown	Franken	Leahy
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Manchin
Cardin	Harris	Markey
Carper	Hassan	McCaskill
Casey	Heinrich	Merkley
Coons	Heitkamp	Murphy
Cortez Masto	Hirono	Murray
		Nelson

Peters	Shaheen	Warner
Reed	Stabenow	Warren
Sanders	Tester	Whitehouse
Schatz	Udall	Wyden
Schumer	Van Hollen	

NOT VOTING—3

Cochran	Menendez	Shelby
---------	----------	--------

The motion was agreed to.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the Joint Economic Committee debate be reserved to occur from 4:30 p.m. until 5:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for the duration of the Senate's consideration of H. Con. Res. 71, the majority and Democratic managers of the concurrent resolution, while seated or standing at the managers' desks, be permitted to deliver floor remarks, retrieve, review, and edit documents, and send email and other data communications from text displayed on wireless personal digital assistant devices and tablet devices. I further ask unanimous consent that the use of calculators be permitted on the floor during consideration of the budget resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with the amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenues, the amount by which the Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the staff be permitted to make technical and conforming changes to the resolution, if necessary, consistent with the amendments adopted during Senate consideration, including calculating the associated change in the net interest function, and incorporating the effect of such adopted amendments on the budgetary aggregates for Federal revenues, the amount by which the Federal revenues should be changed, new budget authority, budget outlays, deficits, public debt, and debt held by the public.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, earlier this month, the Senate Budget Committee took an important first step toward tax reform by approving a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution focused on growing America's economy through tax policies that put more money in the hands of hard-working Americans.

This week, we take the next step as the Senate begins debating the budget blueprint to pursue long-overdue tax relief for families and job creators that will jump-start economic growth. It is

crucial that Congress approve this fiscal framework in order to eliminate the dated and stifling tax policies that are holding back American investment and productivity.

As Budget Committee chairman, I am proud that Congress and the President are tackling these important issues. After 8 years of stagnant growth, it is clear our Nation needs a simpler, fairer, and more transparent tax system that will leave more dollars in the pockets of hard-working families.

The last time Congress was able to accomplish large-scale tax reform was in 1986. Just think how much has changed in the country and world in those 31 years, including our Tax Code. America's tax laws are incredibly complicated and work to slow our economy and hurt American families. Incredibly, our current tax system actually benefits foreign-based companies while harming U.S.-headquartered companies and employers. We continually ask why jobs are leaving this country. A big reason is the hostile tax landscape.

The Senate budget aims to help reverse this trend by setting the stage for pro-growth tax reform that will lower taxes on American families and on job creators by a net \$1.5 trillion over 10 years. By keeping more money in the pockets of hard-working taxpayers, these reforms—if done right—will boost investment, wages, and productivity here at home.

Pro-growth tax reform should reward hard work, savings, and encourage investment. It should broaden the tax base while lowering the marginal tax rates, streamline our tax laws, and limit government distortion of market-based decisions. Our tax policy should provide for a globally competitive corporate tax rate and an international tax system that does not penalize U.S. companies.

It is no secret that tax policies influence the everyday dollars-and-cents decisions of individuals and small businesses. They help drive such decisions as to whether to work an additional hour or invest in an additional unit of capital. This is why economic experts note that potential economic growth should always be considered when talking about tax cuts. In fact, the Joint Committee on Taxation states "tax policy can directly influence the level of labor supply, physical capital, human capital, and technology in an economy by changing the after-tax returns to certain economic activities or changing the cost of pursuing such activities."

Pro-growth reform that removes government distortions of the marketplace would also allow for resources to be reallocated from what produces the best tax outcome to what is the best economic use. This efficiency will lead to increased investment, growth of businesses, and higher economic output or gross domestic product, GDP. In fact, increasing GDP from private sector growth can provide additional dollars

to the Treasury. Let me repeat that. Better tax policy will boost the value of everything we produce, and this will mean more revenue for the Federal Government.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, an increase in productivity of one-tenth of 1 percentage point could increase revenue into the Treasury by \$273 billion over a 10-year period. A return to our historic average growth would decrease projected spending deficits by over \$2 trillion in the 10-year window—more than enough to pay for the decrease in revenues assumed under static scoring conventions that don't account for economic growth. That is what we have to operate under.

In addition to the Senate Budget's key role in reforming the Tax Code, it is also a serious fiscal plan. If Congress and the administration can adhere to this blueprint, we will be taking steps to get our fiscal house in order with a combination of restrained spending, reduced tax burdens, and a growing economy.

The Senate Budget Committee has put together a responsible budget that provides a path to creating a more effective, efficient, and accountable government for hard-working taxpayers. To accomplish this goal, the budget proposes \$5.1 trillion in savings over the next 10 years, while investing in a strong national defense, providing for the care of our most vulnerable citizens, and not touching Social Security.

From the start, this budget was focused on achieving on-budget balance by the end of the 10-year budget window. By 2026, the resolution—with ensuing economic growth from tax reform and an improved regulatory landscape—will generate a \$79 billion on-budget surplus. This surplus would rise to \$197 billion by 2027.

In addition to the fiscal reforms proposed by this resolution, it also continues efforts to respond to concerns about the broken budget process. This budget promotes curtailing budget gimmicks, increasing honesty and accuracy by government scorekeepers, and ending the "spend now, pay later" mentality of Washington.

It is also important to note the thorough and robust committee process that produced this Senate budget resolution. More than 150 amendments from both sides were filed, and 29 were voted on during our daylong markup process. This budget reflects bipartisan input and includes five amendments that were accepted from Democratic members of the committee.

The next step for tax reform will build on the Budget Committee's open and transparent committee process. Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and Senate Finance Committee Chairman ORRIN HATCH have promised that tax reform legislation will also move through the committee process. In other words, any speculation people have heard about where the tax is, is not right because it has a process to go through. This will provide Finance

Committee members the opportunity to offer amendments before the full Senate considers the legislation. So we will consider it in committee and then on the floor. Once the bill moves to the Senate floor, every Member will be able to offer amendments before voting on the measure.

This budget serves as a framework to expand economic opportunity for each and every American. It reflects our belief in the American entrepreneurial spirit and that by allowing American families and small businesses to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, they will innovate and invest money in ways that will grow our economy. We believe our Nation's best days—and those of its citizens—are ahead of us.

The time to act is now. If we don't change course, our Nation will continue to experience the sluggish economic growth of the last decade. I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to support America's hard-working families and employers and help put our Nation on a better course. Approving this budget focused on pro-growth tax reform does just that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and reserve the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to complete my remarks before the Senate recesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I know that budgets are not particularly sexy and exciting discussions. A lot of people wonder about a trillion here and a hundred billion there and what it all means. It means a lot. What it means is that if this horrific Republican budget is implemented, it will mean an enormous amount of pain for tens of millions of working-class, middle-class, and lower income people in this country. That is what this budget means.

After failing to pass a so-called healthcare bill that would throw up to 32 million Americans off of the health insurance they currently have—a bill that was widely opposed by the American people—Donald Trump and the Republican leadership are back again. While I totally disagree with what they are trying to do, I do appreciate their temerity. They are not giving up in terms of trying to protect the interests of the billionaire class against the vast majority of the American people.

The Republicans are now pushing one of the most destructive and unfair budget and tax proposals in the modern history of the United States—a plan that would do incalculable harm to tens of millions of working families, our children, the sick, the elderly, and the poor. The Republican budget we are debating on the floor of the Senate this week is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. Robin Hood took from the rich and gave to the poor. What this budget does is take from working people, the middle class, the elderly, and the poor

to give massive tax breaks to people who are already living in incredible opulence.

Donald Trump and the Republican leadership claim that their plan would provide a “big league” tax cut for the middle class. Nothing could be further from the truth.

According to the Tax Policy Center, by the end of this decade, nearly 80 percent—underline 80 percent—of the tax benefits of the Republican plan would go to the top 1 percent. Even more incredibly, the top one-tenth of 1 percent would receive some 40 percent of the tax breaks over a 10-year period. A tax proposal which gives 80 percent of the benefits to the top 1 percent and 40 percent of the benefits to the top one-tenth of 1 percent is not a tax proposal benefiting the middle-class or working families of this country; it is a tax proposal designed to benefit the wealthiest people and the campaign contributors of the billionaire class.

This budget cuts Medicaid by more than \$1 trillion over a 10-year period. That is kind of strange. The United States of America is the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee healthcare to all people. What the American people want, in my view, is to join the rest of the world and understand that healthcare is a right, that we should not have 28 million people without any health insurance and even more underinsured with high deductibles and high copayments. Yet what this budget does, unbelievably, is throw 15 million people off of the health insurance they have with a trillion-dollar cut in Medicaid.

I would hope that my friend the chairman of the Budget Committee might at some point during this long debate tell us what happens to somebody today who is struggling with cancer, with heart disease, with diabetes, with a life-threatening illness, who suddenly loses the Medicaid health insurance they have. What happens to that person? I would hope that some of my Republican friends would tell the American people what happens, because study after study tells us what will happen, and that is that thousands of people will lose their lives. They will die because they will no longer have access to the health insurance they had.

Further, this budget does what Republicans have not yet attempted to do during the past year in their so-called healthcare legislation, and that is to make a \$473 billion cut to Medicare. So it is not only a trillion-dollar cut to Medicaid, it is also a \$473 billion cut to Medicare.

Interestingly enough, I think many Americans will recall that during his campaign for President, Donald Trump told the American people that he would not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. He said that over and over again. On April 18, 2015—this is just one quote of many—Mr. Trump said:

Every Republican wants to do a big number on Social Security, they want to do it on

Medicare, they want to do it on Medicaid. And we can't do that. And it's not fair to the people that have been paying in for years and now all of a sudden they want to be cut.

That is Donald Trump running for President.

Well, I would say to President Trump: That is what you told the American people during your campaign, and now I hope you will tell your Republican friends right here in the Senate that they should respect the campaign promises you ran on and that if they pass a budget that cuts Medicare or Medicaid, you will veto that legislation.

I hope the President has the integrity to do that. I don't think he will, but I hope he does that.

Poll after poll tells us that the overwhelming majority of the American people do not want Congress to cut Medicare or Medicaid. In fact, I think in this country today, if you ask people what their deepest concerns are, they are concerned about jobs, and they are concerned about income. I think even more so they are concerned about the healthcare they have, how much it costs, and whether they are going to have it tomorrow.

Poll after poll tells us that the American people do not want Congress to cut Medicare—which, by the way, is the most popular health insurance program in this country—and they don't want to see Medicaid cut either because they know, among other things, that about two-thirds of nursing home dollars come from Medicaid. So if you have a mom or a dad dealing with Alzheimer's or some other terrible illness in a nursing home and massive cuts to Medicaid are made, what is going to happen to your parent who is in a nursing home? People know that. They do not want to cut Medicare and Medicaid.

A recent Pew Foundation poll finds that 85 percent of Republicans and 94 percent of Democrats want to either maintain or increase funding for Medicare.

Sixty percent of Americans oppose slashing Medicaid, according to a recent Quinnipiac poll.

A recent Wall Street Journal and NBC poll finds that only 12 percent of the American people believe the wealthy should receive a tax cut, while 62 percent believe the wealthiest people in our country should pay more in taxes.

You have the American people saying: Don't cut Medicare. Don't cut Medicaid. Don't give tax breaks to billionaires. In fact, ask them to pay more in taxes. That, by and large, is where the American people are coming from, whether Democrats, Republicans, or Independents.

Then the question arises: Why is the Republican leadership bringing forward a budget that does the exact opposite of what the American people want? The answer to that question, I am sorry to say, is not complicated. It has everything to do with a corrupt campaign fi-

nance system that allows billionaires and the wealthiest people in this country to exert their influence over the political process. Increasingly, it is not the ordinary American middle-class worker the Congress listens to, but it is wealthy campaign contributors. Today, we have a corrupt campaign finance system that enables multi-billionaires, along with some of the most powerful CEOs in America, to contribute many hundreds of millions of dollars to the political process.

Many of us believe that the concept of democracy is one person, one vote. You get a vote, and I get a vote. Sometimes you win; sometimes you lose. The majority wins. That is what we teach the children in the fifth grade and sixth grade: One person, one vote, majority wins.

Unfortunately, as a result of the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision, the American campaign finance system has been totally corrupted. We now have a situation where billionaire families can spend unlimited sums of money to help elect candidates who protect their interests, and not only can they spend that money, that is exactly what they are doing.

There was a very interesting article in the Boston Globe just the other day, October 14. This is what the article says. The headline is: “The Koch brothers (and their friends) want President Trump's tax cut. Very badly.”

This is what the article says—but first, I should say a word about the Koch brothers. Not everyone knows who they are. The Koch brothers are the second wealthiest family in America. They are struggling to catch up to the Waltons. They are not quite there. They are worth only \$90 billion. They are struggling, but they are getting by, I am happy to tell you. With that \$90 billion, what they are doing, along with a few of their friends, is spending hundreds of millions of dollars every campaign cycle to elect people, in this case Republicans, who support their agenda. This is what the article says:

The message from the billionaire-led Koch network of donors to President Trump and the Republican Congress it helped to shape couldn't be more clear: Pass a tax overhaul, or else.

As the donors mixed and mingled for a policy summit at the St. Regis hotel in midtown Manhattan last week, just a block south from Trump Tower, it came up again. And again. And again.

“It's the most significant federal effort we've ever taken on,” said Tim Phillips, president of Americans for Prosperity, a Koch-aligned group with offices in 36 States. “The stakes for the Republicans, I've never seen them this high.”

Many in the Koch network, a vast group of libertarian-leaning nonprofits and advocacy and political organizations, described the upcoming legislative push for a tax overhaul as an inflection point in modern political history, a do-or-die moment that would define whether their efforts over the years will pay off or not. The network leaders plan to dedicate much of their two-year \$400 million politics and policy budget to the effort—though they wouldn't give an exact number.

That is \$400 million in the next two years to pass this piece of legislation.

This comes from a family, the Koch brothers, who are pretty upfront about what they believe. They do not want to cut Social Security or Medicare and Medicaid. They will take that, but that is really not their goal. They want to eliminate Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and virtually every other Federal program that provides help to the working families of this country.

By the way, just in passing, if the estate tax, which is part of the Republican budget, is repealed, we might want to mention that the Koch brothers' family would see a benefit of some \$30 billion. If your family is going to get a \$30 billion benefit, then putting a few hundred million dollars into seeing that legislation passed is not a difficult idea.

This budget makes clear who the Republicans in Congress are listening to, and it is not the middle class or the working families who do not want to see Medicare cut or Medicaid cut and who certainly do not want to see a \$1.9 trillion tax break for the top 1 percent. I am afraid that my Republican colleagues are listening to their top campaign contributors who have told the Republican Party, in no uncertain terms, that if they do not get their tax cuts, they will stop providing the Republicans with hundreds of millions of dollars in campaign contributions. How sad is that?

Think about the incredibly brave Americans who have fought for democracy over the years. Some of them never return from the battlefields where they have fought for an American democracy that makes us a country where people rule. Abraham Lincoln reminded us that we are a "government of the people, by the people, for the people," not a government of the billionaires, by the billionaires, and for the billionaires.

Let's be clear about something else. The entire economic theory that Senate Republicans and President Trump have embraced with this budget is called trickle-down economics. That is what it is. You give tax breaks to billionaires and large corporations, and the benefits trickle down. They improve the economy. This whole theory is a fraud, and when applied, it has been an abysmal failure.

Since Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush slashed taxes on the wealthy and deregulated Wall Street, trillions of dollars in wealth have been redistributed from the middle class and working families to a handful of millionaires and billionaires. Today, we have more wealth and income inequality than at any time since the 1920s. Today, the top one-tenth of 1 percent owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. This budget would make a bad situation even worse by widening that gap with its trillions in cuts to social programs and gifts to the top 1 percent.

The Republican budget we are debating today would make horrific cuts to the needs of working families. Let me give you a few examples. This budget

would give the wealthiest family in America, the Walton family of Walmart, a tax cut of up to \$52 billion. Does anyone in their right mind think that the wealthiest family in this country needs a tax break of up to \$52 billion? They do that by repealing the estate tax.

At the same time, however, if you are a low-income senior citizen—and we have too many of them in the State of Vermont—trying to figure out how to keep warm in a cold winter, you and 700,000 other senior citizens and families might not be able to keep your home warm in the winter because of a cut of about \$4 billion to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

This budget says that if you are the second wealthiest family in America, the Koch brothers, your family will see a tax break of up to \$33 billion. But if you are a working class kid right now in high school in Vermont or in Texas or in Wyoming and you are scratching your head as to how you can afford to go to college and, in your computations, you are looking at what a Pell grant might mean to you, this budget would cut over \$100 billion in Pell grants and other financial assistance programs.

This budget gives members of the Trump family a tax cut of up to \$4 billion. But if you are a low-income, pregnant woman, you and over a million other new moms, babies, and toddlers may not be able to get the nutrition you need, thanks to a \$6.5 billion cut to the Women, Infants, and Children Program, the so-called WIC Program.

At a time when millions of working-class families all across this country are paying 40 percent or 50 percent or more for the housing they need, this budget eliminates housing assistance for more than a million families due to a cut of about \$37 billion to the Section 8 rental assistance program and other housing programs.

At a time when the cost of childcare has skyrocketed, which is a very serious problem in my State, the Republican budget eliminates Head Start services for 25,000 children each and every year by cutting this program by some \$3 billion.

In total, the Republican budget would cut more than \$5 trillion from education, healthcare, affordable housing, childcare, transportation, and other programs that working people desperately need over the next decade.

What is alarming is that despite this incredible giveaway for the billionaire class, the Koch brothers and their network say that it is not enough. They want more. Let us be very clear that their eventual goal—not today, not tomorrow, but their eventual goal is to see that programs like Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid are completely eliminated.

Let me conclude by saying that this budget is not a budget for the people of Texas. It is not a budget for the people of Vermont or the people of Wyoming

or the people of the United States of America. This is a budget for the billionaire class, which today is already doing phenomenally well. This is a budget for campaign contributors whose greed has no end, who provide millions of dollars to candidates who represent their interests.

This is a budget that must be opposed by the American people. I urge the American people to tell their Members of the Senate to vote no on this budget.

With that, I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:42 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOEVEN).

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2018—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

##### AMENDMENT NO. 1116

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 1116.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ENZI] proposes an amendment numbered 1116.

Mr. ENZI. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. ENZI. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss the Republican tax reform plan and what impact it will have on the fiscal health of our Nation but especially the impact it will have on working families across the United States and in my home State of Illinois.

I have represented Illinois in Congress both as a House Member and as a Senator for a number of years. I am proud to say that during my career, I have not shied away from tackling big issues.