



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017

No. 167

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, October 19, 2017, at 12 p.m.

## Senate

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2017

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of all wisdom and power, we are grateful that You still rule in Heaven. May our lawmakers continue to remember that Your purposes will prevail and that Your justice cannot be thwarted. Answer the prayers of our Senators as they daily seek Your wisdom, guidance, and protection. Lord, sustain them with Your unfailing love, rescuing them from the destructive forces that go contrary to Your will. Instruct our legislators even in the night seasons so that Your will may be done on Earth even as it is done in Heaven. Do for them exceedingly, abundantly above all that they can ask or imagine according to Your power working in and through them.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

### WORK BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate, as I said yesterday, has a full schedule of work before it this fall. It is what the President, Vice President, and I discussed at our working lunch at the White House yesterday.

This week, the Senate is advancing one of the most important items on our agenda with consideration of the comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2018. It is a good budget that reflects the hard work of Chairman ENZI and the Budget Committee. It will help rein in Federal spending. It will help our country achieve balance. It will also help our economy grow.

One of the ways this budget will do so is by providing legislative tools to advance tax reform. After a lost decade of missed economic opportunities, America's middle class deserves an economy that reaches for its full potential again, and tax reform is the single most important thing we can do today to get there.

It is not hard to see why. Our current Tax Code is archaic, arduous, and often just plain bizarre. It holds our economy back. It can hold workers' wages down. It actually incentivizes companies to shift jobs and profits overseas. It makes it easier for the wealthy and well-connected to game the system. Yet it is almost impossible for anyone else to understand it.

A constituent from Harrodsburg, KY, wrote to my office exasperated about the unfair Tax Code. This is what she said: "I am writing today to express my complete and total disgust for the complex, completely unfair, and completely messed up tax system in this country." This constituent, who has worked for nearly three decades as a CPA and has helped countless Kentuckians navigate the system, described some of the hardships faced by her clients and then continued by saying that "the honest, hardworking folks can't get ahead, the cheaters don't get caught and the rich just keep getting richer."

That was my constituent from Harrodsburg, KY, summing up today's Tax Code. Her story underlines the systemic problems of our Tax Code, and it is often our Nation's workers—including those in Kentucky—who continue to bear the burden.

Recently, the Kentucky State treasurer wrote an op-ed calling on Congress to provide much needed relief from our Tax Code. "We need tax reform," she wrote, "to increase Kentucky's economic growth and for greater middle-class prosperity throughout the Commonwealth."

I agree. So does President Trump, his team, and our colleagues here in Congress. We are all in agreement that delivering relief to working families should be at the heart of our plan, and that is what we continue to work toward in developing tax reform.

For families and individuals in Kentucky and across the Nation, we think taxes should be lower, simpler, and fairer. Our plan calls for doubling the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6421

standard deduction and significantly increasing the child tax credit. We will eliminate loopholes that are primarily used by the wealthy while protecting incentives that benefit the middle class.

Our plan also reforms the Tax Code to provide relief to our Nation's small businesses and to make it easier to keep jobs here in America. In an increasingly competitive global economy, we are working to put American workers on a level playing field.

Above all, our goal is this. We want to take more money out of Washington's pockets and put more money into the pockets of the middle class in Kentucky and across our country.

This sounds like a place where we should all be able to agree—Republicans and Democrats alike. In fact, our friends on the other side of the aisle have often supported the idea of tax reform and bringing jobs back to America. I hope they will again in the course of this important effort. I hope they will not fall into blind partisanship and reject any collaboration simply because they don't like the President.

Instead, they can work with us in a serious way on an overhaul of the Tax Code that can truly help the people of Kentucky, help the people of their States, and help Americans all across the land.

I look forward to continuing to work with colleagues in Congress and the administration to pass a responsible budget and to deliver tax reform for the American workers and families, who deserve an economy that reaches its true potential once again.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. First, Mr. President, a brief word on healthcare. Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY continue to negotiate a bipartisan package of legislation to stabilize our healthcare markets and lower premiums, a process that began over the summer. From what I have heard, they are down to a few final issues and are hopefully close to an agreement that can be taken back to both of our caucuses. Congress ought to show, through the work started by Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY way back in July, that Congress can work in a bipartisan way on healthcare, and we have no intention of

going along with President Trump's reckless sabotage of the Nation's healthcare law.

Last week, President Trump showed that he is willing to take a wrecking ball to our Nation's healthcare for the sake of politics without any regard to the people it would hurt: veterans, senior citizens, kids, and folks struggling to afford insurance. President Trump was so angry they couldn't repeal and replace, he instead said: I am going to wreck the system. The problem is, it hurts millions of innocent people all for pique and politics. He has shown he is willing to put at risk the healthcare of millions of Americans. President Trump's decision to end the cost-sharing program was an act of impulsive malice with no benefit and no end.

This seems to be his MO. He throws red meat to his rightwing base, whether it is on healthcare, immigration, Iran, or disaster aid. Then he says to Congress: You fix it up. That is not the way to lead. That is following. That is an act that exhibits no strength—no strength.

We want our President to be a strong leader. Every American does, regardless of ideology, but when the President plays so many political games that are not just harmless but that hurt people and then says to Congress to clean it up, blaming Congress for the mess he created, it doesn't work, it is not fair, it is not right, and it is the reason that, except for his base, President Trump's numbers keep sliding. They are flat now, and they are down below 40 percent. No President has had such low numbers. By the way, it is not helping the Republican Party. Numbers today show a record difference between whether people prefer Democrats or Republicans, so I would urge him to stop these harmful, almost malicious shenanigans and let us all work together for the good of our country.

On healthcare, we in Congress should continue to shore up the healthcare markets and lower premiums in a bipartisan way. We ought to reject the path of President Trump's sabotage and destruction and instead view a path of consensus and compromise. That is the way it has to go. No side wins everything they want. That is not how the Founding Fathers set up this country, otherwise we would be a dictatorship or a country without checks and balances. We ought to work together to improve our healthcare system, to lower costs for people, and to ensure that more people have access to health coverage. We Democrats have been pushing that for several months now.

I salute Senators ALEXANDER and MURRAY for understanding that. They have been in careful negotiations that represent the best first step forward on healthcare. I hope we hear more from them on the status of negotiations. I hope they can come to an agreement that includes curtailing the sabotage I spoke of that the President is doing. I hope Leader MCCONNELL and I can sup-

port this bill together, and then maybe even the House might pass it. The President has said, I think—we don't know, it changes from day to day—but I think the most recent pronouncement is that he might sign it.

#### TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the GOP tax plan, as soon as today, we will vote on the motion to proceed to the GOP budget resolution, which includes instructions to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, slash Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion, and sets up, unfortunately for everybody, the same destructive, partisan process on taxes that the GOP used for healthcare called reconciliation. It says: We don't need you. We are just going to rush it through with our votes. It didn't work on healthcare. It is not going to work on this either.

Tax reform—if it is real reform—or even just tax cuts are very complicated. If you don't have the center coming together, everyone can pick it apart, and they are setting themselves up to do just that.

Although the Republican tax plan is little more than principles at the moment—and we have talked a lot about these principles of the Republican plan—it is so far away from what the American people want because of the process they have decided to use. When you don't want Democrats and use just Republicans, the people of the hard right—a minority in the Republican Party probably—can push the debate so far over because they say: We are not voting for this unless you do it our way. So we have a bill that really is so out of touch and harmful to all but the wealthiest Americans that it is hard to believe the Republicans are putting it forward with a straight face.

It is going to be the first time, my friends, that Republicans in Congress will vote to increase our Nation's deficit by \$1.5 trillion, which is spelled out as clear as day in the budget. I hope, given this dramatic increase in the deficit, all of the Republican deficit hawks are out of their nests for this one.

For the sake of ideological consistency, the same folks who decried debt and deficit under President Obama ought to denounce them under President Trump, but we haven't heard much of a peep from a whole lot of Republicans on this side with a few notable, brave, and leaderlike exceptions.

Here is what Representative WALKER, a conservative Member of the House, said, lamenting what was going on:

[The deficit is] a great talking point when you have an administration that is Democrat-led. It's a little different now that Republicans have both houses and the administration. There's been less talk about it this year with a Republican-led administration than there has been the last seven or eight years.

Representative WALKER is exactly accurate.

The Republican leader on May 16 told Bloomberg TV that tax reform “will have to be revenue neutral.” These are his words. That is a principle he has advanced for years.

We are not hearing much from Republicans about deficits now. Yet, I repeat, this budget instructs the committees to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. It will be difficult for many of my Republican friends to say that they care about deficits and still vote for this budget.

The GOP budget resolution will also be the first time that my Republican colleagues vote to slash Medicare. The budget spells out over \$400 billion in Medicare cuts, as well as over \$1 trillion in Medicaid cuts—even more than the healthcare bill, and probably the No. 1 reason for its demise was that huge slash to Medicaid.

So it is going to be difficult for my Republican friends and this Republican Party to say that they want to protect Medicare and Medicaid and still vote for this budget. Unfortunately, this will not be the first time Republicans vote to advance a major piece of legislation—changes to our Tax Code—through a hyperpartisan process known as reconciliation. Reconciliation, as has just been documented in an article—I believe it was in Politico, but in one of our leading publications—was never intended for this type of purpose.

With this vote, though, Republicans are saying from the very outset that they don’t really want Democratic input on this bill because they are setting up a process in which they don’t really need Democratic votes. It is honestly a shame. And just as the partisan reconciliation process portended failure for the Republican healthcare bill, it is likely to portend failure here as well.

It is difficult to pass major legislation in the Senate, as it should be. That is what the Founding Fathers intended. That is the true conservatism of our government: checks and balances, no rush. It is even more difficult if you work only with the votes of one party. As I said, that allows a small few, usually on the hard right, to dictate what is in this bill.

My guess is that the vast majority of people here didn’t want to vote for Medicare and Medicaid cuts, but because they couldn’t get enough votes in the House to pass the budget without putting that in, because maybe 30 or 40 Members there insisted on it, it is in there. It is not going to serve you well. If anyone thinks it doesn’t have real effect, look at the PAYGO rules. This is not just the budget. PAYGO, after this budget passes, would insist on slashes in Medicare, 4 percent. That is the law; that is not a rule.

I hope that our colleagues will vote down this bill, and then I promise you, just as we are doing on healthcare, we can come together in a bipartisan way. That doesn’t mean you get everything you like. It probably means more of the tax cuts go to the middle class and

fewer to the wealthy, but there are lots of people on our side of the aisle who want to see small business get a tax cut, who want to see money from overseas come here and be used for jobs, and who want to see a middle-class tax break. We could come up with a bipartisan bill that would make, for the first time in a long time, this body shine.

The Republican Congress, at least at the moment on the path it is on, has abandoned the grand tradition of bipartisanship, working together, which has made this Chamber great through the decades and centuries.

When Republicans need Democratic votes, they come to us. The President and the leader have said: Come vote with us. Make it bipartisan. That is not what bipartisanship is. You don’t craft a bill just within your party and then say: Voting with us is bipartisan. Bipartisanship means you sit down together and you come out with a proposal that a majority of both parties can support. They are not doing that.

Republicans will spend the entire first year of this Congress trying to pass their major agendas through reconciliation or similar vehicles, first with CRAs, then healthcare, now taxes. The majority leader himself said in a speech, “Restoring the Senate,” in 2014 that “when the Senate is allowed to work the way it was designed to, it arrives at a result acceptable to people all along the political spectrum.” But if it’s an “assembly line for one party’s partisan legislative agenda,” it creates “instability and strife” rather than “good, stable law.”

The American people want to see us work together. We may not always succeed. It may not be easy, but we can try.

As I said—and I would say this to my colleagues—there are areas in which we can agree on taxes: Lower middle-class taxes; don’t raise them. Give some relief to small business. Try to bring the money from overseas and put it into infrastructure and job creation. We can work together, but not in this process and not with this awful bill, which favors the wealthy dramatically, raises taxes on the middle class, hurts the deficit—increases the deficit dramatically—and is a partisan process. I hope my Republican friends keep that in mind when they vote today. If you vote this down, I promise you that we will come together in a bipartisan way and work for something that actually could pass, instead of what happened with healthcare. Try it. Try it. Reconciliation—working with one party—failed miserably for you on healthcare, and now we are coming together. Let’s not repeat the same mistake on taxes.

#### OFFICE OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY NOMINATION

Finally, Mr. President, I just heard that the nomination of Representative MARINO to lead the Office of National Drug Control Policy has been withdrawn. That is the right decision. The fact that he was nominated in the first place is evidence that the Trump ad-

ministration talks the talk but refuses to walk the walk. The bottom line is that this Congressman supported President Trump but is the wrong person for the job, and I am glad they saw it and withdrew.

I want to salute two of my colleagues who were way out in front on this: Senator MANCHIN, whose State has been ravaged by opioids, and Senator MCCASKILL, who has similar problems, particularly in rural areas, but all over. Senator MCCASKILL has legislation that I think would correct the kinds of ills we have seen in Representative MARINO’s proposals, and I hope that in a bipartisan way we can support them.

The opioid crisis demands that the next drug czar be solely focused on getting communities across the country the help they desperately need, and we hope the administration nominates someone who fits that bill so we can pass that nominee quickly and in a bipartisan way.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Joel Trachtenberg, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent all remaining time be yielded back.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Trachtenberg nomination?

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), 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. 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
Barraso	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	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Warner
Duckworth	Moran	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Young
Feinstein	Murray	
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
Barraso	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	Strange
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	McCain	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

#### NAYS—47

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



Maybe one of the toughest assignments I have ever had was in 2010, when President Obama created the National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility and Reform. It was known as the Simpson-Bowles Commission. I was one of 18 Republicans and Democrats given the responsibility of trying to find a way to balance America's budget and reform our country's largest spending programs and our Tax Code.

This was no small task, but it was an important one. We spent month after month in bipartisan meetings working at it. Nearly a year after the Commission was created, we were asked to vote on the final report.

Simpson-Bowles was not a perfect plan, but I decided to vote in favor of the report, and I knew it would be controversial, but I believed then, as I do now, that there is only one honest way to reduce debt: cut spending, raise revenues, do not ignore the Tax Code. Bowles-Simpson did just that. It raised revenue by eliminating a lot of the exclusions and deductions and efforts of the Tax Code to reward certain companies and special interests, and it cut spending for both defense and non-defense. To say nothing of the months-long bipartisan process—a far cry from the current reconciliation that we have been going through this year on the healthcare issue—there simply is no comparison between the Simpson-Bowles deficit reduction plan and what the Republicans want to bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate and House this year in the name of tax reform.

Simpson-Bowles was about balancing our budget responsibly. It raised nearly \$88 billion in revenue over the first decade, and unlike the Republican tax plan, it boosted the standard deduction and still retained the personal exemptions families claim on their taxes. It protected middle-income families from backdoor cuts, and—and I underline this—it ensured that the wealthy in America paid their fair share of taxes.

If there is one thing I can never understand, it is why the Republicans, in the name of budget deficits or in the name of tax reform, always end up in the same place—always cutting taxes on the wealthiest people in America. Where in the world is that coming from? I have met a lot of wealthy people in the course of my life; not one of them, with a straight face, has said to me: Senator, I desperately need a tax cut. They don't. Yet that is the fallback default position on every Republican plan.

Importantly, the Simpson-Bowles plan provided details of the hard choices necessary to reach our goal. There is simply no comparison between that comprehensive, bipartisan plan to balance the budget and the highly fiscally irresponsible Republican tax reform plan before us now that will literally add \$2.4 trillion to the national debt.

How many times have Members on the Republican side of the aisle come to the floor to pose for holy pictures

and to preach to us about the deficit? Now that they are in the majority and they have a President of their party, what is the first thing they do? They propose adding \$2.4 trillion to the national debt.

Where are my colleagues across the aisle who have been the first to speak out and admonish the Democrats about their failure to recognize the Federal debt? Where is my colleague the majority leader of the Senate who was so quick to rail on the “alarming level” of our national debt during the Obama years? He is silent now.

Even the most stalwart of self-proclaimed fiscal hawks on the right are falling in line behind this phony plan, which would allow for \$1.5 trillion in unpaid-for tax cuts—clinging on to economic growth projections no responsible economist would dream of using. They used to call this economic theory of cutting taxes on the rich and economic growth the Laffer curve. I have never heard a better named description of an economic theory. It is a laugh. And this Laffer curve inspired the Governor of Kansas to bring that State to near fiscal ruin, trying to apply that great theory and watching his State crumble in the process.

History has proven that tax cuts simply do not yield economic growth. The economic growth promises of the Bush tax cuts turned out to be completely false. Those tax cuts for the wealthy ballooned our deficits and our debt and contributed to a scandalous rise in income inequality in the United States of America.

Tax cuts don't pay for themselves, and I know my Republican colleagues know that.

When Republicans' rosy estimates of economic growth do, in fact, fail and the deficit is sky-rocketing, the Republican budget spells out exactly how they plan to pay for the tax cuts on the backs of hard-working Americans. Listen to this. To pay for the tax cuts for the wealthiest people in America, the Republican tax reform plan—now, get this—uses \$1 trillion in cuts from Medicaid and more than \$470 billion in cuts from Medicare.

Think about it. Health insurance for the elderly in America will take a \$470 billion cut under the Republican tax reform plan—for what? To give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country—go figure—and then \$1 trillion in cuts in Medicaid.

What is Medicaid for? Isn't it just health insurance for the poor? Well, in some respects, that is a good general description, but it is so much more. The Medicaid Program, which the Republicans return to time and time again to cut, is critically important for parts of America. Half of the children born in the State of Illinois are taken care of by Medicaid. Their mothers are taken care of before the baby is delivered and after. Plus, it is the No. 1 source of health insurance for the disabled across America. They want to cut \$1 trillion out of it. I haven't even

gotten close to the most expensive part of Medicaid. Two-thirds of seniors in America in nursing homes count on Medicaid to pay for their medical bills.

The Republicans want to cut \$1 trillion out of Medicaid to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in America. What is going to happen to those folks in nursing homes? What is going to happen to the disabled who count on Medicaid? What is going to happen to those mothers and their babies? That is a legitimate question to ask.

Make no mistake, the real answer for who pays for these cuts doesn't involve fake economics; it involves real families across America.

Let's look at the plan for what it is. While claiming to fix our broken Tax Code, this Republican tax reform plan would instead provide nothing short of a windfall for the wealthiest in our country and stick hard-working families in Illinois and across the country with the bill.

Under the Republican plan, no less than 80 percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent of wealthiest Americans. Eighty percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest people in this country. That is more than three-quarters of all tax breaks going to people who make more than \$730,000 a year. Is that why Members of the Senate were elected—to take care of people making more than \$730,000 a year? Not in my State.

What about the middle-income Americans this plan is supposed to help? The Republican plan would raise taxes on nearly one-third of Americans who make between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year. One-third of them will pay higher taxes. That is not tax relief for working families. In fact, the Republican plan would eliminate the State and local tax deduction—a deduction used by one-third of all taxpayers to reduce their tax bill. That has been part of our Tax Code from the beginning, and here is the theory: We believe, in the current Federal Tax Code, you shouldn't pay a tax on a tax. It is basic. If you are paying \$1,000 in property taxes where you live right now, should you be taxed on that \$1,000? Under the current Tax Code, no. You are able to deduct State and local taxes. The Republicans eliminate that deduction. If they have their way, families with homes, families who pay sales taxes will pay a Federal tax on the State and local taxes they pay. This deduction currently allows families who pay State and local income or sales taxes to deduct those taxes from their Federal income tax. In other words, this deduction prevents families from double taxation—once by the Federal Government and again by the State. Yet the Republicans eliminate this deduction.

In Illinois, we rank fifth in the Nation for people who are helped by the State and local tax deduction. The taxpayers I represent will be hit especially hard. Nearly 2 million Illinoisans—roughly a third of the taxpayers of my State—claimed more than \$24 billion in



State and local tax deductions in 2015. If Republicans have their way, almost 2 million people in Illinois would be double-taxed on an average \$12,500 of earnings. That is just plain wrong.

Republicans would have you believe that State and local tax deduction only helps the wealthy, but most people who take this deduction make less than \$200,000 a year.

Even families who do not claim the State and local deduction will see their taxes increase under the Republicans' so-called tax reform plan. The Republican plan eliminates the personal exemption worth \$4,050 a person. A family of four making \$50,000 a year in my State will pay \$887 more under this part of the Republican tax reform plan. Getting hit by losing the State and local tax deduction and then turning around and losing a personal exemption, a family of four in Illinois making \$50,000 will pay \$887 more a year, just on that provision, in Federal taxes.

What are the Republicans raising taxes on my middle class for? They are raising taxes on middle-income families to provide massive tax cuts for corporations to the tune of \$2.6 trillion over the first 10 years, and—Mr. and Mrs. America, sleep well tonight—we are going to take care of that with economic growth. Here is the reality: Corporate profits are soaring in America. Today, corporate profits in the United States of America as a share of gross domestic product are at record highs; corporate taxes paid to the Federal Government as a share of GDP, record lows. What is the Republican approach to those two facts? To cut more corporate taxes.

Wouldn't it be good to have someone come to the floor and say: Instead of just looking at corporate taxes, why don't we look at corporate employees? How are they doing? We know how they are doing. They are falling behind. They are more productive than ever. The corporations are more profitable than ever. Yet the disparity in income in America gets worse. We have the best workers in the world—no apologies. They do great work. They don't get paid enough. The answer on the Republican side is to give the corporations more tax breaks. I say the answer should be something else.

Why don't we address the fact that CEOs in America make 271 times the average wage of their employees? Two hundred seventy-one? Come on. If they are going to head up these corporations, of course they are entitled to be paid more—their profitability, their entrepreneurial spirit, their talent, and all the rest—but 271 times? American workers are still waiting for their pay raise, and they won't get it with this Republican tax reform plan.

While American workers and their families continue to wait for their turn, the Republicans seemed determined to provide tax cuts to corporations and the wealthy rather than make the Tax Code work for working

families. This has to stop. It is time we look at tax reform and economic growth in terms of the family room, not the boardroom.

The very successful Warren Buffett said:

My friends and I have been coddled long enough by a billionaire-friendly Congress. It's time for our government to get serious about shared sacrifice.

Thank you, Warren Buffett. I agree.

If Republicans want to get serious about fixing the faulty incentives in our Tax Code and provide working families some relief, it is time they stop clinging to the Laffer curve and this failed trickle-down policy that giving a tax break to the wealthiest person in America can only help the poorest person in America.

I know these are difficult and complex issues. It is no secret in Washington how difficult tax reform can be. But these are issues that deserve robust, bipartisan debate. Now is not the time to abandon any semblance of fiscal responsibility and rush through this deficit-exploding plan that has no prayer of paying for itself with growth.

I hope my Republican colleagues will look beyond the boardroom and seize this opportunity to reward and incentivize businesses to make real investments in the United States and its workers. Look at this Tax Code. If you own a big business in my State of Illinois and want to move your business out of Illinois—to Mexico or China or you name it—we are going to give you a helping hand. Our Tax Code says that the cost of the moving expenses are deductible. You don't have to pay taxes on those; we are going to give you a break to move your business. What are we thinking?

For goodness' sake, why don't we have what Senator SHERROD BROWN and I are submitting as an amendment—a patriot employers tax break, a patriot corporation tax break. You keep your business in Illinois. You keep your business in Ohio. When your workforce grows, it is American workers who get the jobs, and the wages you pay for 90 percent of them have to be at least \$15 an hour. You have to provide health insurance and a basic retirement plan that is fair. Give a veterans preference, please, to the men and women who served our country. And then we will give you a tax break. We won't give it to the company that is ready to move overseas; we will give it to the company that is ready to invest in the United States and U.S. workers. I think that is a tax policy most Americans would say makes sense. Why aren't we talking about that kind of approach instead of finding a way to give a tax break to the wealthiest?

American workers and families are watching this debate, and they are still waiting for a better deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will vote on a budget resolution for fiscal year 2018. While there are many elements to this particular resolution, most of this Chamber's and the public's attention are on the reconciliation instructions related to tax reform.

Before I go too far, I first want to thank Chairman ENZI and all of our colleagues on the Budget Committee for their work on this resolution. Chairman ENZI has been a critical player in the ongoing effort to reform our broken Tax Code, and his work to craft this budget resolution and move it out of committee has been critical to this effort.

For the next step, he is going to need help passing the resolution here on the floor. I think we will get there.

Specifically, this budget resolution contains a \$1.5 trillion reconciliation instruction for tax reform. That is a good number, putting meaningful tax reform within reach.

As the debate over the budget and the instruction moves forward, I think it is critical that everyone understand what tax reform will do for our country and, perhaps more importantly, what will happen if we fail.

Tax reform has been the chief focus of the Senate Finance Committee for years now. In the 6½ years that I have been the lead Republican on the committee, we have had about 70 hearings focused on the Tax Code. In the vast majority of those hearings, we have heard both Democrats and Republicans acknowledge the inefficiency of our current tax system, with very few members having spent their time and energy defending the status quo, which is not at all surprising.

Our current tax system imposes undue burdens on middle-class families. Our current tax system is obscenely complex, riddled with credits, exemptions, and deductions, many of which were designed to benefit special interests. Our current tax system's complicated rate structure makes it difficult for families to plan and, for some workers, creates a disincentive to work for additional earnings. Our current tax system subjects American businesses and job creators to the highest tax rates in the industrialized world. Our current tax system creates incentives for businesses to move headquarters and operations offshore, eroding our Nation's tax base. And our current system has forced companies to keep trillions of dollars offshore, preventing further investment and growth here at home.

Reform of this broken system is long overdue. The last major overhaul to our Tax Code was more than three decades ago. Even if the Tax Code hadn't changed dramatically since that time,

the economy of 1986 was dramatically different from the one we have today. Of course, the code has undergone a number of piecemeal changes since the 1986 reform, but that approach has left us with a system that simply does not work.

Fundamental change is what our tax system needs—change that takes the entire system into account and change that will create a tax code that, at the very least, looks as though it was designed on purpose. That is what we aim to provide once the Senate and the House have passed a consensus budget resolution.

On the Finance Committee, we are working to craft legislation pursuant to the guideposts in the unified framework released last month. Our bill, based on the uniform tax reform framework, will give much needed relief to millions of low- to middle-income families. It will level the playing field for Americans and for American job creators and promote more investment in the United States.

In the end, all of this will mean bigger paychecks for American workers, a more vibrant U.S. economy, and more American jobs. But without this budget resolution, we are unlikely to get there.

Don't get me wrong, I would like to produce a tax reform product that could get 60 votes. I have spent years asking my Democratic colleagues to meaningfully engage in this effort. To be sure, there have been Democrats who have been willing to put themselves out there on tax reform in recent years, including the former Finance Committee chairman, Max Baucus, and our current ranking member, Senator WYDEN. But they have generally been the exception.

When President Obama was in office, many Democrats typically talked about tax reform only in the context of raising revenues to fuel additional spending, which isn't tax reform at all. It is simply raising taxes.

Under President Trump, the focus, at least among many in the Democratic leadership, seems to be about preventing passage of anything that could be viewed as a win for the President and Republicans in Congress. Perhaps I am wrong about that—and I hope I am—but when we are talking about tax reform these days, most of the talk from my friends on the other side of the aisle has been about unreasonable and unprecedented process demands.

That is unfortunate. There are a number of areas of tax reform where Democrats and Republicans are largely in agreement. Those areas include middle-class tax relief, bringing down the corporate rates, and fixing our international tax system to make American companies more competitive.

Given these shared concerns, I am still hopeful that some of our Democratic colleagues will join us in this effort. I remain willing to work with any Member of the Senate who wants to engage in this effort in good faith.

Historically speaking, tax bills that pass through the budget reconciliation process tend to have support from both parties. In fact, when Republicans have held the White House and Congress, purely partisan tax reconciliation bills have not been enacted. That being the case, I think the unified framework envisions a tax reform approach that both parties can and should support.

Long story short, I haven't given up on producing a bipartisan tax reform package. But, once again, we need to pass this budget resolution if we are going to move the ball forward. That being the case, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution before us this week and to work with us as we develop tax reform legislation that will help middle-class families and job creators throughout the country.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. CORNYN. Mr. President, the first step to achieving our goal of overhauling our antiquated and uncompetitive Tax Code is passing a fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and we have made the first step in that journey earlier today. No one should be confused about this. A vote for the budget is a vote for tax reform. In converse, a vote against the budget is a vote against tax reform.

I don't know anybody in America who thinks that our Tax Code is a paragon of simplicity, efficiency, and virtue. To the contrary, I think most Americans realize that our Tax Code is simply too complex and that our Tax Code punishes taxpayers here at home by keeping overseas money earned overseas, rather than being brought back home and being invested in jobs and wages in America.

The budget resolution will steer our Nation into a safer and sounder fiscal course through a combination of restraining spending, reducing tax burdens, and strengthening our economy. Strengthening our economy really needs to be the focus, like a laser, that we have on what we are all about here—trying to get the economy to grow again faster.

We know that since the great recession of 2008, our economy has experienced anemic economic growth. Last quarter we saw that our economy, instead of growing at the annual rate of about 1.8 percent, grew at 3.1 percent. Why is that important? Well, when the economy grows faster, that means that people are finding more work to do and they are paying their taxes to the Treasury. That eases the financial burdens of the U.S. Government while allowing people to keep more of what they earn in their pockets.

Here are some of the goals that we are attempting to accomplish by the 10-year budget resolution. First of all, we want to try to restrain Federal spending, parts of which go up at the rate of 5.5 percent or more a year and is about 70 percent of what the government spends. I know most people focus on the 30 percent that Congress appropriates, but, really, that is not the biggest part of the problem. That 30 percent includes about \$600-plus billion for defense spending alone. But the 70 percent of the money that is spent on auto pilot through mandatory spending programs grows at the rate of about 5.5 percent per year. That is the reason why we are seeing huge annual deficits and unsustainable debt. So restraining spending is an important goal of our budget.

Reducing nondefense discretionary spending is also important. Part of having a budget is establishing our priorities. That is what we do in our household budgets. That is what we do in our individual budget. That is what countries need to do in their budgets. We need to determine what our No. 1 priority is.

Well, I happen to believe that the safety and security of the American people is our No. 1 priority. That is why I believe defense spending is so important. While there are other things we would like to do, just like there are other things we would like to be able to buy as an individual or as a household, sometimes you simply can't afford it, recognizing the priorities that are important to you and to your family. Defense spending is the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government. Nobody else can do that. We can't do it as individuals. We can't do it as States. That is why it needs to be our national priority.

This budget also provides for the maximum level of defense funding allowed under the law, while allowing for an adjustment if an agreement on revised funding levels is reached. It provides a glidepath to an on-budget surplus, leaving aside Social Security entirely.

Most importantly, the budget will provide Congress with the roadmap forward in the goal of being able to pass tax reform and ultimately allowing middle-class Americans to keep more of their hard-earned pay.

Helping working families is one of the most important benefits of tax reform, but it is not the only benefit. Equally important is enhancing our Nation's competitiveness in a global economy and achieving growth for our job creators.

We have a self-inflicted wound caused by our Tax Code when competing with other countries around the world. We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world. Why is that important? Why should we care what corporations pay in taxes? Because that influences how much money is paid to shareholders. It influences how much money can be paid in wages to people employed by

businesses. What we have seen frankly is a negative incentive for companies to move their businesses overseas.

About a week or so ago I remember reading an article—I think it was in the *Wall Street Journal*—that said IBM now has more employees in India than it has in the United States. I am sure that is caused by a number of circumstances—perhaps access to the workforce, perhaps the markets that are available to the company—but I have to believe that at least some of that is caused by our Tax Code. It is cheaper, more efficient, and more cost effective to develop those jobs and that business overseas than it is here at home. Why in the world would we want to sustain that status quo? That is one of the things we are trying to do in our tax reform—enhancing our competitiveness and achieving growth for our job creators right here in America.

It used to be that reducing the business tax was a bipartisan effort. In 2011, when President Obama was President of the United States, he gave a speech to a joint session of Congress where he called it a national priority, recognizing that having the highest corporate rate in the world moved business overseas and it hurt workers here in America.

The Democratic leader, our friend and colleague from New York, has previously advocated reducing that corporate tax rate because he recognizes the benefits to workers and working families right here in America. So, occasionally, we have to remind them, when they come out and say harsh and frankly untrue things about what we are trying to do, that they used to be for the very same things that we are now advocating for today.

There are other significant pieces, too, such as those that affect the people in my State and those who work in the energy sector. It is no secret that Texas leads the Nation in energy production. I know people think that it is only about oil and gas, but we are actually the No. 1 electricity producer from wind energy in the country. So we believe, literally, in an “all of the above” policy when it comes to energy.

We know that some parts of the energy sector, particularly those refiners in the oil and gas sector, spent the past month and a half trying to recover from Hurricane Harvey, and at least 25 refineries were closed temporarily because of the storm. Why should you or I care about refineries that were closed because of the storm? Because all you had to do after Hurricane Harvey hit Texas was to look at the price you pay for gasoline. It has skyrocketed because of the closed refineries. It actually benefits the entire Nation and consumers when energy prices are low.

Operations have now resumed in some areas and, thankfully, some of those higher prices at the pump have dropped, but the hurricane underscored the need to ensure our energy sector's ongoing dynamism and vitality. That is where tax reform can help as well.

One component of our proposal is a territorial tax system. Companies such as Apple, IBM, ConocoPhillips, and ExxonMobil all have headquarters in the United States, and they have earned money overseas. One has to wonder: Why in the world wouldn't they want to bring that back to the United States and invest it in businesses and paychecks here in America? That is because under our current tax structure, they have to pay taxes on the money they earn overseas, but if they want to bring it back to the United States, they have to pay taxes again up to a 35-percent corporate tax rate on the same money. So they make the rational decision and keep the money overseas. They build their businesses there and hire more workers abroad and not here at home. Why in the world would we want to maintain that sort of self-destructive status quo?

A new territorial tax system is going to be an important part of tax reform, and it is not to help big businesses. It is to help workers who are looking for work or people who are working who have had stagnant wages and are looking for a little extra in their paycheck each month. That is why it is so important.

In addition, we plan to help decrease the cost of investing in things like new plants and equipment in America. Things like expensing rather than depreciating over many years investment in new equipment and new businesses are really important to encourage those businesses to modernize their plants and, again, to hire more workers.

Tax reform represents an opportunity to cement America's position as the world's largest energy producer, as well, rather than one of those regulatory exercises that, unfortunately, happens far too often and ends up increasing the cost of creating jobs in the energy sector. I will continue to be an advocate for the countless number of Texans whose livelihoods depend on this sector of our economy while it continues to face challenges on a multitude of fronts.

Getting back to my point about the price of gasoline, if we drive a car, we are all paying for gasoline. It just makes sense to do what we can to help that price get lower, and we all benefit. One of those ways we can do that is through regulatory reform and the second is through tax reform.

#### NAFTA

Mr. President, I mentioned Hurricane Harvey earlier, but that is not the only challenge. Another potential challenge, I should mention, is NAFTA. This is the North American Free Trade Agreement, which is a 20-year-old trade agreement that includes Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This is a topic I will have a chance to speak about further at the Hoover Institution this afternoon.

As most of us know, the NAFTA negotiations are ongoing. President Trump has said—at least his adminis-

tration, Ambassador Lighthizer, and the Commerce Secretary have said that their attitude toward renegotiating NAFTA is first to do no harm. I really appreciate that because NAFTA has been an important part of our trading relationships with Mexico and Canada, and it supports about 14 million jobs in commerce between our 3 countries in North America.

Since the administration announced its intent to revisit NAFTA, I think it is important to revisit the critical role that NAFTA has played in all North American energy markets, including electricity, renewables, oil, and natural gas. As I wrote in a letter to Ambassador Lighthizer this summer, each market is highly integrated with and remains dependent on vital energy infrastructure and trade crossings that border the United States, Canada, and Mexico.

Free trade and the free-trade agreements, such as NAFTA, allow the United States to maximize the benefits of being the world's largest energy producer. If you have been paying attention, you know that our energy industry has undergone dramatic changes over the past two decades. I remember when we were worried about having to import liquefied natural gas from places around the world to our own shores before the natural gas revolution took place here in America, thanks to improvements in technology and drilling techniques.

Now we have such cheap and plentiful natural gas that we can export that gas around the world. It is just not an economic boom. It is a way for us to provide alternative energy resources to some of our friends and allies around the world, particularly in Europe, where Mr. Putin uses energy as a weapon, threatening to shut off energy supplies if countries in his neighborhood don't cooperate.

So opening Mexico's energy market has positioned U.S. companies to meet Mexico's needs for technical expertise and capital. As my friends south of the border reminded me, they said the Eagle Ford shale, which is one of the most plentiful sources of natural gas in the world, doesn't stop at the Rio Grande. So as we provide additional technical expertise and capital to Mexico, we can expect for them to experience the sort of energy renaissance we ourselves have experienced in the United States.

During the NAFTA negotiations, we should seek to promote North American energy security by maintaining and protecting rules that reduce or eliminate barriers to U.S. investment in Mexico and Canada. Opportunities like this are why NAFTA could benefit from an update rather than a repeal.

Former Secretary of State George Shultz reminded us yesterday in the *New York Times* that NAFTA has helped a wide range of U.S. manufacturing industries like auto, electronics, and aerospace become more competitive relative to their foreign competitors. Secretary Shultz also pointed out

how that increased competitiveness is fostered. It has resulted mainly from the development throughout the last 24 years of strong vertical supply chains that take advantage of economies of scale. Thanks to NAFTA, economic production can take place wherever in North America it is most efficient.

Let's remember all of this as negotiations continue. Let's seek to preserve all of the good we have inherited from NAFTA and update all that is outdated in NAFTA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1974 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, to speak for up to 10 minutes.

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

#### HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, later this week, Senator MURRAY and I, with other Senators, will introduce bipartisan legislation to give States additional flexibility to create more choices of health insurance policies in the individual market and to extend cost-sharing reduction subsidies during 2018 and 2019. These subsidies pay for copays and deductibles for millions of low-income Americans who buy health insurance on the Affordable Care Act exchanges. Our goal is to stabilize and then lower the cost of premiums and to enable all Americans to have access to health insurance.

Our legislation will be based on the four hearings and other meetings that the Senate's Health, Education, Labor, and Pension Committee held last month. I am chairman of that committee, and Senator MURRAY is the ranking Democratic member. These hearings and meetings were bipartisan. They were lengthy. They were remarkable in this sense: They engaged nearly 60 Senators from both political parties in extensive discussions. We not only had the four hearings, which involved the 23 members of our HELP Committee, but we invited any other Senator who wished to come to a committee meeting ahead of time to meet the Governors and the State insurance commissioners and others who were testifying, and 37 did. So we have had extensive participation by 60 Members

of the U.S. Senate through four hearings and a variety of committee meetings in the process that developed this legislative proposal that Senator MURRAY and I have agreed upon.

According to witnesses at our hearings, according to the Congressional Budget Office and Congress's Joint Tax Committee, without these cost-sharing payment reductions, premiums will rise, the Federal debt will increase to pay for the higher subsidies by \$194 billion over 10 years, and up to 16 million Americans may find themselves living in counties where no company sells insurance in the individual market.

Imagine yourself as a 45-year-old songwriter in Tennessee who loses her job, has three kids, goes to the individual market, and finds that she can't buy health insurance; no company is offering it because we did not act. Those are the consequences we are talking about.

Witnesses also testified that one way to lower costs for consumers is to give States more flexibility than the Affordable Care Act now allows to design health insurance plans that give consumers more choices.

We have purposefully limited our proposal to two themes: first, 2 years of temporary cost-sharing payments and, second, amendments that would give States meaningful flexibility in using the section 1332 innovation waiver, which is already a part of the Affordable Care Act.

The problem with the waiver is that while it was designed to give States the opportunity for innovation, it has been very restrictive. It limited the number of opportunities States could use. It would be like saying to someone: You can drive anywhere you want to in the United States as long as you end up in New York or in Nashville or in Birmingham, AL. Our goal is still to protect patients but to give States more flexibility in offering more choices.

There are, of course, many other good and useful ideas that would improve Federal laws regulating health insurance. There are many on the Republican side, and there are many on the Democratic side. There are probably even ideas that both of us would agree on, but Congress has been stuck for 7 years in a partisan stalemate over the Affordable Care Act. Most of that stalemate is about the individual insurance market.

Most people get their insurance from the government, Medicare, or Medicaid. Most of the rest of the people get their insurance from their employer on the job; that is 50 or 60 percent of Americans. Only 6 percent of Americans get their insurance in the so-called individual market. It is about 350,000 people in Tennessee. Every single one of them is very important, and every single one of them is terrified by the skyrocketing premiums in that market and by the possibility that they might not be able to buy insurance at all in that market if we don't act.

We concluded that the best course would be to take this limited, bipartisan first step, which would avoid the chaos that could occur during 2018 and 2019 if premiums continue to skyrocket and millions of Americans find themselves without a way to purchase health insurance. Once we complete this limited first step, then we can take the second and the third steps.

I want to undersell this proposal rather than oversell it. It has significant advantages in terms of cost-sharing reductions, which make it more likely that premiums will stabilize in 2018 and actually go down in 2019. It has significant advantages in changing the law so that States will have more flexibility in offering choices, which is another way to lower costs, but it is only a limited first step.

Senator MURRAY and I hope that by the end of the week we can present Senate leadership—Senator McCONNELL and Senator SCHUMER—with the support of a significant number of Republican and Democratic Senators. We then hope the Senate will pass the legislation, the House will agree to it, and the President will sign it.

During the last several days, I have had encouraging discussions with President Trump, who called me on two different occasions, encouraging me to work with Senator MURRAY to come to a bipartisan agreement. I am grateful to him for that encouragement, and I am grateful to her for her patience and for working on this so diligently for such a long period of time. I see she has just come to the floor.

I think one other thing Senator MURRAY and I can agree on is that we hope our next legislative assignment is easier than this one. I think we both also agree that the sooner we act, the better, so Americans will have the benefit of lower premium costs and the peace of mind of knowing that they will be able to buy insurance for themselves and their families.

I would like to say through the Chair to Senator MURRAY that I asked for 10 minutes to speak, and then I asked for 10 minutes for her to follow me. I am about finished, and when I am through, then she has the floor, according to my request.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief summary of the agreement that Senator MURRAY and I have.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWER PREMIUMS, MORE STATE FLEXIBILITY,  
ZERO SCORE, AVOID CHAOS IN 2018, 2019  
Make Section 1332 State Innovation Waivers  
Work

Amend law to provide meaningful flexibility for health plan designs

—Example: Iowa waiver

—Example: higher co-pay opioids, lower co-pay statins

—Example: Medicaid savings for Sec. 1332 costs (NH)

—Repeal 2015 Regulation and Guidance "Alaska for All" (Maine, Minnesota)

- State-based program to cover very sick
- 20% premium decrease for everyone
- NO new federal spending; savings help pay for the fund
- Streamline approval process
- Governors apply for waiver
- Federal waiver approval time in half
- Fast-track approval for emergency situations
- Fast-track approval for “me too” waivers
- Waivers can last longer (6 years)
- Harder for future administrations to cancel waiver
- Model waivers help states get approved faster

New Copper Plan: Catastrophic Insurance All Ages

Interstate Health Insurance Compacts: Texas Public Policy

- Redirect Existing User Fee Funding to States for Consumer Outreach

2 Years Funding Cost Sharing Reduction Subsidies (Zero score), No Double Dipping by Insurance Companies

Chaos Without Cost Sharing (CBO, JCT, CMS):

- 20% average premium increases in 2018
- \$194 billion new federal debt over ten years
- 50% counties with one insurer today—would get worse
- Up to 16 million Americans with zero insurance options on exchanges
- Four-lane highway to single payer solution

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have said repeatedly over the last several weeks that while it is important that the two of us, as the chairman and the ranking member of the HELP Committee, come to an agreement, that is not nearly enough because our real job was and is to see if we can find, among a significant number of Republicans and a significant number of Democratic Senators, a consensus that will cause this to be enacted, will cause the Senate to pass it and the House to pass it and the President to sign it. In my opinion, we wouldn't have come to an agreement ourselves unless we thought that was likely.

I will not go into the specific provisions that are in this, except to briefly summarize them. The first group of them makes the section 1332 innovation waivers work by giving more flexibility. In New Hampshire, for example, the State would like to use Medicaid savings to help pay for the cost of its Affordable Care Act waiver, and this would allow that. In Maine, for example, the State has applied for a waiver. The waiver has been approved, but the use of the funding has not been approved. This would allow that. Alaska, Oklahoma, Iowa, for example, all have waivers in line that they would like to submit to give a greater variety of choices in their States and hopefully lower premium costs, but it is too restrictive under the current conditions.

About the only sort of waiver that the current Director of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services can approve is the Alaska-type waiver, which is a good idea. Alaska created a reinsurance fund, which helped the very sick Alaskans, immediately low-

ered premiums 20 percent for all other Alaskans, and then used the savings from the lower subsidies as a result of the lower premiums to pay for 85 percent of the cost of the fund. Minnesota has tried a similar thing. Maine did that on its own a few years ago. We have streamlined the approval process for those waivers, so that can be done more easily.

I would emphasize that a number of these, while they are limited proposals, could not be done in a budget reconciliation process. They had have to be done with 60 votes.

The proposal also includes what we call a new copper plan, catastrophic insurance for all ages. We still keep the patient protections; that is, preexisting conditions, et cetera. We still keep the essential health benefits, but we allow someone who is healthy and young, for example, to pay a higher deductible and a lower premium if that is what they choose to do. We direct the Department of Health and Human Services to go ahead and write regulations to encourage interstate health insurance compacts. We compromised on the outreach funding and agreed that we will spend about twice as much as or more than President Trump wanted to expend, but we will do most of that by grants to the States. And of course we agree on 2 years of funding for the cost payments.

Finally, I would say that if we do not do this, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the Joint Tax Committee, and CMS, premiums next year will increase 20 percent, there will be a \$194 billion increase in the Federal debt over 10 years, and up to 16 million Americans might find themselves unable to buy insurance through the individual market. In my view, this agreement avoids chaos, and I don't know a Democrat or a Republican who benefits from chaos.

I thank President Trump for his encouragement to me and to Senator MURRAY to try to succeed on this. I thank Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, for creating an environment in which we could get to this point. I thank the majority leader, Senator McConnell—despite his focus on tax reform—for allowing us to work together and try to do this. I especially thank Senator MURRAY, who, whenever she sets about to get a result, I have found, she usually gets one. I could not have a better partner to work with on difficult issues in the Senate. In fact, the one thing we probably most agree on, we found the most difficult to solve; that is, in 2018, we want to make sure that the cost-sharing payments go to the benefit of consumers, not the insurance companies. I want that. Senator MURRAY wants that. The President wants that. My Republican colleagues want that. And I know Democrats want it. We believe we have strong language in our proposed agreement to do that, but we are going to make sure that it is the strongest possible language.

I thank the Presiding Officer. I look forward to working with Senator MURRAY over the next few days to see if we can find a consensus among Republicans and Democrats to present to the Senate leadership. I hope that we can then pass it, the House will pass it, and the President will sign it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to thank Chairman ALEXANDER for his tremendous work on this. I am very grateful for his leadership in supporting a bipartisan discussion under regular order in the HELP Committee and his determination to see it to this point and beyond.

I remember very clearly back in July when it was clear that the so-called skinny repeal didn't have the votes to pass. We talked right then and there about getting to work on ways to stabilize the healthcare market and protect patients and families from premium spikes as a result of the uncertainty this administration caused. We were able to engage nearly half the Senate in our hearings and conversations on the HELP Committee, and we found that there was a lot more that we agreed on than we disagreed on when it came to strengthening healthcare and controlling costs in the near term.

Since then, actions by this administration have made our work more urgent. So I am very glad Democrats and Republicans agreed to work together to address this, and I am extremely pleased that, with the input of Members on both sides of the aisle, as well as Governors and patients and advocates, we were able to reach an agreement that I hope will set the healthcare discussion in Congress on a very different path than the one we have all seen for the last 7 years.

This agreement provides certainty on the reduction of out-of-pocket payments for the next 2 years. It will address attempts by this administration to keep people from getting enrolled in the care they need. It takes a number of very strong, bipartisan steps to offer States more flexibility to innovate in the way the Affordable Care Act intended, without undermining the essential health benefits, such as maternity care and mental health coverage, or burdening people who have preexisting conditions.

This is an agreement I am proud to support, not only because of the important steps to strengthen our healthcare system but because of the message it sends about the best way to get things done in this Congress. The way to deliver results, as Chairman ALEXANDER says, for patients and families is to work under regular order, to find common ground rather than retreating to partisan corners, and to hear from our experts and our families and our Members on both sides of the aisle rather than reciting talking points to each other. We know that is true because

just a month ago, the idea of an agreement between Republicans and Democrats on healthcare seemed impossible at best, if not improbable. Thanks to the strong, bipartisan work of Chairman ALEXANDER and many of our Members, we have been able to bridge the divide.

I strongly believe that patients and families in every State across our country will be stronger if we can get this agreement signed into law. I urge my colleagues to not only support it but to continue working together because there is no question we have work to do.

I thank Chairman ALEXANDER and all the Republicans and Democrats who have been so engaged in this effort, and I echo the comments of Senator ALEXANDER about what is in the bill. I won't repeat them. I agree with his last comments that we both want to make sure the payments go to consumers. We are working on that language, and I wish to assure our colleagues that is our joint intent as we get this language finalized and put into place.

I thank the Presiding Officer for this short amount of time during a busy day on the floor. I again thank Chairman ALEXANDER, and I remain committed to him to get this done in the right way for the people of this country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HEINRICH. 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. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise to oppose this deeply flawed budget that is terrible for America and particularly harmful to working families.

The Republican plan that we face today is a budget-busting first step toward issuing massive tax breaks to special interests and to wealthy individuals. This proposed budget fails to improve economic growth or to drive up wages. It should look awfully familiar to all of us because it is a retread of the failed trickle-down economics which exploded budget deficits in the 1980s and squandered the budget surplus we had briefly in the early 2000s. That trickle-down theory ruined our budget and failed to grow the economy then, and we cannot afford to relive those failed policies now.

Our Nation faces significant economic challenges today that need to be addressed directly. Wages have barely improved in the past 20 years; the costs of education, childcare, and other essential living expenses continue to climb.

Job creation is slowing. From February through September of this year, the economy added the lowest number of jobs in 7 years. Wages are also falling this year. Since the Trump admin-

istration took over, 39 States and the District of Columbia have seen workers' wages decline, after adjusting for inflation. Nearly 4 in 10 rural families don't have access to high-speed internet and the opportunities it affords.

We all know many of the communities we represent, in both rural and urban areas, still have not fully recovered from the great recession. Yet this budget only makes life harder for working families by cutting vital programs and critical services that invest directly in those communities. The Republican budget ignores our current reality and makes it tougher for American families to afford a college education or access quality healthcare coverage. As we saw through last week's executive actions, the Trump administration remains singularly focused on taking away healthcare from 20 million Americans and sabotaging the system for those left. This proposed budget would take us deeper down that destructive path.

The Republican 2018 budget cuts more than \$5 trillion over the next decade in healthcare, education, transportation, medical research, and other critical investments. It slashes Medicaid by \$1 trillion and Medicare by more than \$470 billion. When they are done, these budget-busting tax giveaways will leave other Federal efforts with a gaping \$660 billion hole, bringing our domestic Federal investments as a share of our Nation's GDP to the lowest levels since the Hoover administration.

If you are at home listening, all of that sounds pretty unbelievable. Washington Republicans wouldn't really jeopardize our Nation's healthcare, our educational system, our rural communities, and bust the budget all at the same time, right? Unfortunately, all of that is true when we look at the details of this failing budget. Again, this is all based on a brazen theory that led to the failed and harmful tax policies of the past.

The real question we should be asking now is, How do we improve our communities, grow our economy, and drive up wages for hard-working families? That is what I am focused on when I look at the budget.

Republicans believe step one should be to take funds out of Medicare, out of education, out of infrastructure, and pull healthcare away from the working poor. Then step two of their plan is to give all that money to wealthy political interests under the ruse that regular people, someday, will be better off because America's elite investing class will have done something spectacular with the money we just sucked out of our communities.

It is truly amazing that this idea continues to resurface because the promise of wild economic growth and trickle-down benefits has failed to materialize time and time again. What we have found is, working families, rural communities, and others who are robbed to finance this type of plan are

the ones who suffer, all to put money into other people's pockets.

Who exactly loses in this budget? For starters, senior citizens, who will see Medicare cut \$470 billion, to be exact. Let me say that again. This Republican budget cuts Medicare to the tune of nearly half a trillion dollars.

Children, working families, and people in need of opioid treatment will be pounded by Medicaid cuts of more than \$1 trillion. Medicaid cuts will lead to millions losing their coverage. They will unravel the progress we have made fighting the opioid epidemic, jeopardize mental health coverage, and force many rural hospitals to close.

The hit will be especially hard in rural areas, where more than 12 percent of rural hospital revenue comes from Medicaid. In New Mexico, Medicaid actually accounts for more than 20 percent of hospital revenue in rural areas.

For seniors, the Medicare and Medicaid cuts together will have devastating consequences. Let's look at one example, Alzheimer's disease. Medicare and Medicaid together pay for nearly 70 percent of care for those 65 and older with Alzheimer's. These deep cuts will force families to make a terrible choice between working and caring for their family members. Already, 15 percent of caregivers to someone with Alzheimer's have left their jobs or retired early in the past year due to their caregiving responsibilities. Cutting Medicare and Medicaid, when Alzheimer's costs are getting higher and no cure is in sight, will saddle individuals and their families with massive costs and hardship.

The devastation this budget will create does not stop there. More than 8 million students will see their Pell grants cut by one-third. That is right. Republicans want to cut investments in education so they can give special interests a tax break. These are Americans who are striving for a college degree, who just want a fair shot at opportunity without being crushed by debt. Pell grants are the primary form of financial aid for so many students, giving them access to an education that might otherwise be out of reach.

This chart pretty much sums up what I have been saying about the priorities reflected in this budget: tax cuts over investments in things like Medicare, Medicaid, education. The picture is pretty clear. They are taking direct investments away from our people and our communities and instead giving those dollars away as part of a convoluted plan that leaves the wealthy better off.

What is more amazing about this plan is that Republicans have changed budget rules to allow them to add \$1.5 trillion to the debt while doing it. For many years, the Conrad rule in the Senate specifically prohibited reconciliation legislation from increasing the deficit in the first 10 years. It was what reconciliation bills were designed to do—reduce the deficit. Then, Republicans repealed that rule in 2015 and



threw any illusion of fiscal responsibility out the window.

Remember when Republicans believed in fiscal responsibility and balanced budgets? Under President Trump, Republicans barely give these values lip service—and this year's budget goes even further than before to reject fiscal reason. It removes a Senate requirement for the CBO—the Congressional Budget Office—to issue a cost estimate a day ahead of votes on the Senate floor, the so-called 28-hour rule. Why? Because they want to hide how fiscally irresponsible these votes are from their constituents and the American people.

Finally, the Republican budget assumes far faster growth than the CBO could possibly justify under even the rosiest assumptions. This backward math says that their budget magically delivers \$1.24 trillion in deficit reduction. According to the Tax Policy Center, the Republican tax plan will reduce revenues by \$2.4 trillion over the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion over the next 10 years. The actual cost far exceeds the Republican estimates.

Where do all the tax cuts go? Most of them go to wealthy folks who are doing just fine without them. We don't need to be doling out tax breaks to wealthy trust-funders when families in Las Cruces, Gallup, and Santa Rosa are struggling to make ends meet, don't have high-speed internet, and haven't gotten a raise in years, in some cases.

Under this Republican plan, the top 0.1 percent will receive a tax cut of more than \$700,000 a year. It would take a typical household in my State nearly 15 years—15 years of work and earning—just to match the giveaway being provided to a single wealthy investor under this budget. That is not just wrong, it is downright sickening.

Part of this massive benefit to the rich comes from the creation of a special rate for passthrough income of 25 percent. This plan is designed to help large law firms and hedge funds that, in my mind, don't need a special tax break to further enrich themselves. Millions of working families will actually face higher taxes as a result. Under the Republican tax plan, nearly 8 million working households will actually see an average tax hike of \$794. Now, \$800 may not seem like a lot if you are working on Wall Street, but \$800 is a lot for people working hard on relatively modest incomes in New Mexico.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier, we have seen this movie before. We don't need another bad sequel.

This Republican plan delivers higher deficits and fewer community investments. Tax cuts in 1981 and the early 2000s led to less revenue as a share of GDP and higher deficits. The national debt nearly tripled under President Reagan and nearly doubled under President George W. Bush.

We have also seen the dangers of reckless tax cuts for the wealthy at the State level. In Kansas, Republicans

slashed individual rates by more than 20 percent and abolished taxes on passthrough income. Sound familiar? Since the tax cuts were enacted in 2012, the State's revenue plummeted, and Kansas has buckled under an economy that has trailed the United States in job, wage, and economic growth.

A recent study found that for tax cuts to pay for themselves, the economy would have to grow \$5 to \$6 for every single dollar of cuts. Yet the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation found that tax cuts generate nowhere near that amount. According to them, each dollar of tax cuts would lead to only 4 cents to, at best, \$1.25 in new economic activity.

The evidence is clear. Large tax cuts for special interests and for the rich simply don't pay for themselves. As we have seen, time and time again, trickle down only works in fake, so-called think tank models, not in real life.

Rather than rely on disproven theories, we should be investing in what we know actually works in increasing wages and accelerating economic growth. Expanding the earned-income tax credit, for example, has proven to be effective at increasing the living standards of working families. It effectively raises their wages. Let's strengthen and make fully refundable the child tax credit.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be investing to prepare our Nation to compete. Investing in infrastructure is proven to create good-paying jobs and stimulate our overall economy. President Trump talked about infrastructure investment incessantly on the campaign trail. Where is that rhetoric today? Where is that commitment today? Sending kids to high-quality pre-K is shown to improve both theirs and, for that matter, their parents' economic outcomes.

We need to invest in clean energy because it is cheaper, because it is good for the economy, and because all of our future livelihoods depend on addressing climate change. The renewable energy sector is a place where jobs are growing rapidly in New Mexico—and not just in urban metro areas but especially in rural communities.

We need to invest in Federal research and development that has led to the internet, to the GPS, to the laser, and to lifesaving medical breakthroughs. We must ensure that startups can access the capital they need to launch and grow their businesses, whether they are in rural New Mexico or downtown Detroit. We need to close the digital divide so that every person in America, regardless of ZIP Code, has access to high-speed internet that connects people and communities to financial and educational opportunities.

Democrats have a plan to grow the economy, to increase wages, and to improve the lives of folks who work on Main Streets across this country. Our plan connects people with the opportunities that will exist tomorrow.

The Republican plan is very different. It is written by the lobbyists on K Street, with much of the benefit flowing to the investment bankers on Wall Street. Regrettably, Republicans are pursuing the same partisan process with the budget and with tax reform that failed when they tried to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

The cost of Republican chaos and backward thinking is growing by the day, and this budget will continue that process. We need bipartisan, pragmatic solutions to the challenges that our country faces.

To all of my colleagues, we are asking simply to do what we know works. Let's work across the aisle through regular order to get things done for our constituents.

Mr. President, I yield back.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Utah.

**Mr. LEE.** Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, chairman of the Budget Committee, Mr. ENZI, for allowing me, as the vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, some time on the Senate floor to discuss the budget.

Our budget process is important, and it has long been in a period of neglect. It needs reform. That is what I am here to talk about today. There are so many areas that are affected by our budgeting process or, at least, that should be. In fact, it is difficult to conceive of any aspect of the Federal Government that couldn't be or shouldn't be addressed through the budgeting process.

When we look at the budget process, it is important for us to focus, to one degree or another, on the Budget Act of 1974. This is an old law. Forty-three years in statute has not exactly improved it. It hasn't matured into something better. In other words, rather than a piece of art that has appreciated in value over time, this is something more akin to the 8-track tape player that you might have purchased in 1974 to go inside your Ford Pinto, which would explode upon impact. This is something that didn't really improve in the 43 years since it was passed, especially not the way we have followed it or, better said, the way we have utterly failed to follow it.

One of the best ways to describe the budgeting process, prescribed by the Budget Act of 1974, is that it is non-binding. It is less legislation than it is legislative fiction. It is aspirational in the sense that it aims for what could be and what should be, except no one actually aspires to it. In Congress, we don't get to the aspiration, basically, ever. It is reminiscent almost of the immortal words of St. Augustine. When he was undergoing his transition to Christianity, he famously said: "Lord, grant me chastity . . . but not yet"—always wanting to restrain oneself later and not now, even though the need for restraint, the need for reform is present now, is calling out for reform right now. That is why it is important to remember that what comes next is



important, and next is now. We are discussing the budget this week, and it is important that we focus on these issues right now.

We do have a system that has to be kept carefully in balance. That balance depends on Congress keeping the national interest front and center. It depends on Congress being willing to restrain itself and follow the dictates of our constitutional structure. We have failed on these scores.

Congress collectively, actively, almost defiantly avoids the very type of accountability built into our constitutional structure—the type of accountability called for by article I of the Constitution. Article I, the very first clause of the first section of the first article of the Constitution, makes clear that if you are going to make policy within the Federal Government, if you are going to establish norms that will be enforceable as generally applicable laws within our Federal Government, you have to go through Congress.

“All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.” Article I, section 1 tells us that.

Article I, section 7 tells us that in order to make a law in our Federal system, you first have to pass something through the House of Representatives and the Senate, and then you have to submit it to the White House. You cannot make law without going through that process. That process is also worked in for a budgeting process.

The way the Budget Act of 1974 is supposed to work, the way our budget process is supposed to operate is that we will pass a series of laws appropriating money in various aspects of the Federal Government. We have a budget that gets passed first, which is an aspirational statement not submitted to the President. It is a resolution passed jointly by both Houses of Congress that sets budgeting priorities. Then, following from those priorities, there are supposed to be 13 separate appropriations bills that spend money, that allocate the scarce resources of the Federal Government, understanding that they are finite to each of the major areas of government spending.

There will be one bill, for example, that funds National Defense. There is another bill that will fund our Justice Department or Federal court system. There is another bill that will fund, for example, our national parks, and so on and so forth. When you follow that formula, you avoid the kind of circumstance in which we push all spending decisions into one legislative package, setting up a potential for disaster.

A common analogy that I sometimes use to describe this is, imagine if you live in an outlying area, in an area where there is only one grocery store for 100, maybe 200 miles around. Upon moving there, suppose, on your way home from work, you receive a phone

call from your significant other telling you to stop by the store: Don't come home without bread, milk, and eggs. You don't need everything else. Just get bread, milk, and eggs.

You go to the grocery store. You get your shopping cart, and you put in your bread, milk, and eggs. You get to the checkout counter. You put out your bread, milk, and eggs.

The cashier says to you: Excuse me, there is a problem. You can't buy just bread, milk, and eggs. This is a special kind of store where you can't buy bread, milk, and eggs unless you also buy a bucket of nails, one-half ton of iron ore, a Barry Manilow album, and a book about cowboy poetry. In fact, for that matter, this is the kind of store where you have to buy one of every item in order to buy anything else. That is kind of what it is like every time we pass a spending bill lately because, even though the Budget Act of 1974 contemplates 12 or 13 separate appropriations bills, each addressing one discreet aspect of the Federal Government's spending, we end up, more often than not—in fact, basically every single time for the last 6 of ½ years I have been serving here, and even longer than that, we end up passing either a continuing resolution, which basically is a reset button saying that we will continue to spend next year at the same rate we have been spending this year, subject to these minor exceptions or, alternatively, we might pass an omnibus spending bill, which can be 1,000, maybe 2,000 pages long, sometimes longer, and identify all the areas in which we will be spending but put into one unified bill.

The problem with these bills, the way we have tended to do continuing resolutions and omnibus spending bills, is that we tend to consider and pass them under a compacted time agreement in the final hours or minutes before a cliff. By “cliff,” I mean an arbitrary deadline, after which a spending measure already in place will expire. So if there is a spending bill that expires on September 30 of a particular year, it is not uncommon for us to address a spending bill on September 30, sometimes late in the day on September 30 or in the days leading up to it.

It is not uncommon for Members of Congress to be told at that moment: You have two choices. You can either pass this as is and have everything funded more or less as it has been or you can shut down the government.

Nobody really wants to cause a government shutdown. Certainly, nobody wants to be accused of shutting down the government.

Most Members tend to vote for it, and then the American people continue to get what they have been getting. They continue to operate a Federal Government that spends about \$4 trillion a year, with little or no control, even by the people's own elected Representatives in Congress, whose job it is to do these things over their own government. This is wrong.

We shouldn't be governing this way. Yet there is a touch of irony in this in that we govern this way, I think, at least in part, because of a fear of public outcry against the process or criticism about the process in which we might engage. Yet, as we undertake this process, which undercuts that process altogether and sidesteps it, as we have avoided that studiously in order to avoid criticism, we have seen Congress's approval rating plummet. In fact, if you look at most opinion polls these days, it puts our approval rating as an institution right around 10 percent. The last time I checked, in the United States of America, that makes us less popular than Fidel Castro. It makes us only slightly more popular than the influenza virus, which is rapidly gaining on us.

If what we are wanting to do is avoid criticism, then the last thing we ought to do is continue to do what we have been doing, which is to consolidate all spending decisions into one legislative package to be addressed at the end of the fiscal year, telling Members they have to either vote for it or be blamed for a government shutdown. That is wrong. That shuts out the American people, and it makes their government unaccountable to them.

In the process, we avoid reforming a lot of programs that need reforming. Among other things, we avoid reforming entitlement spending. It is important when we think about entitlement spending and how it needs to be reformed to remember the immortal words of President John F. Kennedy, who said that “to govern is to choose.” But today, to budget is not to choose or to choose in advance not to choose, to avoid choosing altogether.

We are \$20 trillion in debt, and we choose to ignore that. Twenty trillion dollars is an enormous amount of money, as is the interest we pay on that sum every single year, which is about \$250 billion a year—an enormous sum of money in and of itself. But that isn't the scary part. The scary part is that \$250 billion, which is what we spend every year on interest on our national debt, is roughly the same interest payment we had about 20 years ago. I believe our national debt was one-sixth or one-seventh of its current size. The only reason it is even that low is because our Treasury yield rates—the interest rate at which the U.S. Government pays its creditors—is at an all-time historical low.

Laws of mathematics are such that what goes down must inevitably come back up. As soon as it does come back up, even if it comes up only to its historical average and doesn't rebound above that average, in a short period of time, within a few years after that, we will find ourselves going from about \$250 billion a year in interest on debt to about \$1 trillion a year in interest on debt, leaving ourselves with the uncomfortable, darned-near impossible

prospect of having to cover a \$750 billion shortfall—this on top of our existing sprawling national deficit—without any clear means of doing so.

Congress, in many cases, fears reform, but reform remains necessary to make programs structurally reliable and fiscally sustainable. In other words, we are fearing the wrong thing. A lot of people in my home State of Utah fear snakes, understandably. We have rattlesnakes in parts of Utah. Rattlesnakes can do a lot of damage to you if they bite you. You don't want to mess with a rattlesnake. But sometimes we fear the wrong things, at least in the sense of, in addition to a lot of rattlesnakes, we also have a lot of deer. They should actually fear deer more than rattlesnakes. More people die in the United States every year as a result of deer causing automotive accidents than they do from rattlesnake bites altogether. Sometimes we fear the wrong things.

We fear making reform. But reform is not what we should fear; we should fear the consequences of failure to do that.

In some ways, the central unifying problem isn't just about the debt or dysfunction but the distrust. Congress has squandered the trust of the American people, and we as an institution have a responsibility to work hard to win back that trust. The only way to win back that trust is through real reform. We have to put the national interest ahead of our own interests, our own political interests and the special interests that are constantly moving here in Washington, DC. That work can begin with this very budget. It should begin with this budget. Budgets provide us with an opportunity to discuss our priorities. Those priorities always need to be all about reform.

This budget is far from perfect, but in understanding that it is not perfect, it is a vehicle to begin the real process of reform. Nowhere is this more important than with tax reform, and this will set in motion those events that can culminate in real, genuine, and much needed tax reform.

There are a couple of odd quirks within our Federal Tax Code. First of all, its sheer length and complexity are a problem. Arthur Brooks from the American Enterprise Institute said that complexity is itself a subsidy—a subsidy that disproportionately benefits the well connected, the wealthy, the well educated, the specialists who handle the complexity and profit from it. One hundred years ago, our Tax Code was only a few hundred pages long. Today, our Tax Code, depending on what you count, can fairly be described as much closer to 100,000 pages than to a few hundred.

Among the many problems we can find in the Tax Code is the marriage tax penalty, which many Americans are familiar with, whereby a hard-working American couple might pay higher taxes only because of the fact that they happen to be married. This is wrong, and it needs to be fixed.

There is a related point—a related flaw—that is much less well known than the Tax Code marriage penalty, and that is the Tax Code parent penalty. Let me explain what that is. Imagine two couples—couple A and couple B. Imagine that couple A and couple B are identical in every respect but one. In other words, they both have the same income, they both have the same pattern of charitable contributions, mortgage interest, State and local taxes, and so forth. Everything that affects their taxes is the same except one thing: Couple A has three children and couple B chooses to remain childless. Because of the way our Tax Code interacts and intersects with our senior entitlement programs—namely, Social Security and Medicare—we end up penalizing parents, creating this parent tax penalty. Let me explain that a little bit.

Let's call couple A—the couple with three children—Jack and Julie. According to very modest assessments made by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Jack and Julie, with their three children, will incur costs of about \$700,000 as they raise their children. These are the costs of raising children. I believe it is a little faulty—there are a number of things it doesn't include—but it is an estimate produced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Jack and Julie, our hypothetical couple A, will spend \$700,000 raising their three children to maturity. It doesn't take into account the non-economic costs associated with parenting or the myriad benefits that go along with that—but \$700,000. That is the amount they will put into raising these three children. That cost doesn't benefit just Jack and Julie, it doesn't benefit just their three children—no, the way our system works, the way Social Security and Medicare work, it also goes to stabilize, to shore-up entitlement benefits for tomorrow's retirees, because Social Security and Medicare operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. Today's retiree benefits are paid by today's workers. Today's workers will be tomorrow's retirees. Today's children will be tomorrow's workers and will be paying the retirement benefits of today's workers, tomorrow's retirees.

Let's look at couple A, back to Jack and Julie. Jack and Julie operate solely with Julie's income. Jack is a stay-at-home father. Meanwhile, Julie has a good job that pays \$75,000 a year. As you look at this chart, it shows how the pay stubs Julie receives twice a month might look.

I would imagine many Americans look at this the same way I do. People approach their pay stubs with a degree of trepidation. It is almost easier not to look at it when you see all the things the government does to your paycheck each time it goes through.

Jack and Julie look at Julie's pay stub when it comes out twice a month, and they see a few things, including the fact that, in addition to the \$205 that is withheld from her Federal in-

come tax twice a month, she also sees \$41.84 withheld for Medicare, \$178 withheld for Social Security, and \$144 withheld for State income tax.

So when we look at Julie's pay stub, we see that what Julie is paying into Social Security and Medicare is roughly the same as what we will see from couple B, who chooses to remain childless. Couple B has every right not to have children. We don't want to penalize anybody regarding their decision on whether to have children. But the point here is that the investment Jack and Julie are making into the Social Security system comes twice—first as they pay their taxes, including their Social Security and Medicare taxes—and with Social Security taxes, by the way, that is also going to play a role in determining the Social Security benefits for which Jack and Julie will one day be eligible when they retire. Yet the Tax Code doesn't adequately take into account the \$700,000 they are investing into their own children and that those children will make it possible for couple B to receive their Social Security and Medicare benefits when they retire. That is why we need to fix the parent tax penalty.

The parent tax penalty consists of this unique interaction between our tax system and our senior entitlement programs and doesn't take into account the intense investment in financial terms that America's moms and dads make in their children.

By increasing the child tax credit, we could offset this penalty. One of the proposals out there would involve raising it to, say, \$2,000 per child. I think that would be great. I could even go higher than that, but \$2,000 wouldn't cover the whole problem, it wouldn't undo the whole penalty, but it would go a long way toward offsetting that. I would welcome that. That would be a good development. There are people just like Jack and Julie Jones all over this country who would benefit from that, and the American people as a whole would benefit from it. Social Security and Medicare would be more stable and made more sustainable by this change.

The next step we need to make with tax reform involves making the Tax Code more pro-worker. A lot of people criticize the Tax Code for the fact that it has the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world at 35 percent. I believe that the best reform we could achieve would be substantial. There are a lot of people who are talking about reducing the corporate tax rate to maybe 15 percent or 20 percent. I hope we can get to something like that, and that would be a great first step. What I would really like to do is to bring that down not to 25 percent or 20 percent or 15 percent, I would like to see it brought down to zero. Let me explain why I believe that.

A corporation consists of and is animated by two things: capital and labor, investors and workers. Investors and workers join together and form partnerships to make profits. Both of them

pay a share of the corporate tax. In the United States, forces of globalization have benefited from this arrangement between workers and investors. The forces of globalization have benefited the investor class more than the workers. In this new global economic environment, we need to think about how to increase the returns to workers.

Globalization has helped the investors, and policy now needs to go out of its way to help the workers. One way to do that would be to eliminate the corporate tax altogether and tax investment income the same way we do regular income. That would shift the worker share of business tax to business owners. This would immediately do two things: It would give a raise to American workers, who really need it, and it would turn the United States into an irresistible magnet for foreign investment in the United States of America. In one stroke, the most profitable, favorable tax strategy in the global economy would be creating American jobs.

The current code gives preferential treatment to U.S. investors sending their money overseas. While this is their right to do, this is not something we should be incentivizing and pushing them into, which is exactly what the status quo does. Reform would give preferential treatment to international investors coming here, which is, after all, what we want. Let's level the national playing field between the working class and the investor class, while tilting the global playing field toward the United States rather than pushing it outward, away from our great country.

If these tax reforms could be set in motion through this budget or at least set in motion indirectly if not directly, the Tax Code would finally start working again for American families and finally start benefiting hard-working American mothers and fathers.

Another issue that we struggle with significantly in the Federal Government involves Federal regulations. This, too, is something we could start to address through the budgeting process. Our Federal regulatory system is economically damaging. This is something that strangles small business. It inherently—by its very nature, it injures disproportionately to the benefit of large, established, incumbent businesses, those that can afford an army of lawyers, accountants, lobbyists, and compliance specialists, that benefit from a heavy system of regulation, which is often made heavier still at the urging of the largest, wealthiest, most established companies because these Federal regulations provide a natural restriction on entry, a natural barrier that disincentivizes and in some ways disables would-be competitors from joining and entering into the marketplace. One thing we know about competition is that it brings down costs and it raises quality, and that is a good thing.

Federal regulations also create a sort of constitutional distrust. They them-

selves represent a harsh deviation from the natural constitutional order. I mentioned a few minutes ago the provisions of article I. Article I, section 1, and article I, section 7 require that Federal laws be passed by Congress. Federal regulations get around that.

Sometimes Congress chooses voluntarily to delegate to someone else the task that we, by operation of the Constitution, are supposed to perform and not to delegate to someone else. This administrative action makes things easier on occasion for Congress, but that is a bug, not a feature. The Constitution never was intended to make life easier for Members of Congress.

Let me explain how this happens and how it shows up here. It happens sometimes with good intentions. Congress wants to approach a particular issue, solve a particular problem without necessarily having to go into the difficult, painstaking, line-drawing process that inevitably is brought into question anytime we are trying to solve a problem through lawmaking. In other words, Congress will identify a problem and pass a law that says, for instance: We shall have a good law in area X, and we hereby delegate to agency Y the power to make and enforce rules carrying the force of generally applicable Federal law that will carry out the objectives we have outlined in our legislation.

In other words—let's get to something more approximating a real example. Congress, for instance, passes a law that says: We shall have clean air. We hereby delegate to the EPA the power to decide what clean air is, what pollution is, what acceptable limits on pollution might be, and what penalties will befall polluters. And then those same regulators, those same people at that same agency who made all the rules defining pollution and defining acceptable limits for pollution, prescribing penalties, they are the same people who also enforce them. You have the lawmakers who are also the law enforcers, and none of them are subject to an election.

Now, I don't mean to disparage the character or the capabilities of any of the fine people who work at the EPA or any of our other Federal bureaucracies. For the most part, these are well-intentioned, hard-working, well-educated, and highly specialized public figures or government employees, we might say, but there is a difference.

People in Congress are not magically empowered with any gifts for coming up with good legislation any more than any other American is, but there is a difference. We are elected, and we are subject to the people at regular intervals. You can fire your U.S. Senator every 6 years, you can fire your Representative every 2 years. You cannot fire a government bureaucrat. As Ronald Reagan said, the closest thing we see to eternal life on this Earth is a new government program. The closest thing you can find to a lifelong career is in government, in many government bureaucracies.

What this has produced is a profound proliferation of Federal law. We have been able to make more things Federal, and we have been able to make more Federal laws as a result of the fact that Congress now delegates away far more of its legislative power than it actually exercises. Let me explain what I mean.

I keep in my office two sets of documents. I welcome any of you to come by. In my office, we serve Jell-O every Wednesday at 3:30. For reasons I don't entirely understand, Utah consumes more Jell-O than any other State in the Union on a per capita basis. The Utah Legislature has actually designated Jell-O as Utah's official State snack. Now, I will be clear that these are not Jell-O shots. They are not tainted with alcohol or anything like that, but we serve Jell-O every Wednesday at 3:30. You are all invited to join us any time you would like. If the Senate is in session and if it is Wednesday at 3:30, it is time for Jell-O.

When you come by my office for Jell-O Wednesday, you will see two stacks of documents that I have represented in this graph. One stack of documents is a few inches tall, it is about 3,000 pages long, and it consists of the laws passed by Congress last year. The other stack is 13 feet tall, it is about 96,000 pages long, and it consists of last year's Federal Register.

For those of you who are fortunate enough not to know what the Federal Register is—and I really do envy you—it is the annual index, the compilation of Federal regulations. First is their release for public notice and comment, and then later is their finalized Federal Register.

These are laws. These are not just rules exclusively deciding what time the lights will go on and off at the Commerce Department or what times the gates will be staffed at this or that Embassy. No. Many of these are regulations that impose affirmative obligations on the American people, sometimes with criminal penalties, often with substantial civil penalties attached to them, and yet they are not passed by anyone who is elected. In many cases, they are not even written by people who are accountable to anyone who is, in turn, elected. This is a problem.

During 2016, Congress enacted 214 laws; whereas, the agencies issued 3,853 rules. Those are 18 rules that were put in place by Federal agencies for every 1 law that was enacted by Congress. This is not without consequence. This is not just an abstract constitutional violation.

This costs the American people a lot of money, and it costs them money in a way that is kind of invisible. You have the Tax Code. You have your pay stub. I showed you that chart earlier from Julie's pay stub showing how much the government takes out of each paycheck. That is visible. That is tangible. That is something she can see each week. There is another bite that

gets taken out of each and every one of her paychecks that is invisible, and that bite is taken out by these Federal regulations, meaning everything that Jack and Julie, everything that every one of you, everything that every American purchases, every good or every service is made more expensive by these Federal regulations. In fact, it is fair to say really that the costs of compliance with these Federal regulations are passed on disproportionately to America's poor and middle class who pay for those regulations through higher prices on goods and services, diminished wages, unemployment, and underemployment, and it is not insignificant.

Twenty years ago, when I first started studying this problem, I was shocked to learn that this backdoor, invisible, highly regressive form of tax—that is the cost of compliance with Federal regulations—stood at \$300 billion a year. That was astounding to me, stunning. Today that number stands at about \$2 trillion a year. In 20 years, we have seen the cost of complying with Federal regulations multiply nearly sevenfold. That is troubling.

If the cost of complying with U.S. Federal regulations were a country, if it were the GDP, the \$2 trillion in compliance costs, that is roughly the same as the gross domestic product of India and Italy. The cost of complying with Federal regulations is slightly less than the GDP of India and slightly more than the GDP of Italy. That is sad, that is stunning, that is a constitutional problem, and it is a public policy problem. The 2016 Federal Register contains 95,894 pages—the highest level in its history and 19 percent higher than the previous year of 2015, which contained 80,260 pages.

In the absence of trust, we need an abundance of transparency, and that is what constitutional lawmaking is all about. We need to restore that constitutional order by passing reforms like the REINS Act, which would require congressional assent before major rules are put into place. It would require Congress to affirmatively enact a regulation into law before an economically significant regulation could take effect.

There are some other areas where we need transparency—in higher education and healthcare. These things appear to have little in common at the outset, and yet, in many ways, they have a lot in common in that they are two areas where there has been a lot of Federal involvement where there probably shouldn't be and where that Federal involvement has made things more opaque and less transparent and resulted in higher costs.

In higher education, I highlighted the need in the last Congress for reforms through my introduction of the Higher Education Reform and Opportunity Act, which would have opened up the accreditation process. Currently, the higher education system in America

has been commandeered by the iron triangle, consisting of the U.S. Department of Education, Federal accreditation bodies, and institutions of higher education in this country. Unless you are part of that iron triangle, you can't really break into the higher education market because you can't get Federal higher education assistance.

As a result, things like apprenticeships, distance learning, massive open online courses—or MOOCs, as they are sometimes described—suffer. They get left out. The upshot is, if we reformed this area, we would have more opportunities to get postsecondary skills and training, we would lower the cost of higher education, we would save money for both borrowers and taxpayers alike, and we would have more people able to pursue their chosen vocation.

With healthcare, as in higher education, Federal influence is driving up prices while outcomes are flatlined. In 2009, Congress doubled down on what wasn't working when they passed ObamaCare. The results were instability, lost coverage, new plans, higher premiums, and higher deductibles at the same time.

Meanwhile, you had a whole lot of concentration of market power in a few companies. The top 10 health insurance companies in 2008—the year President Obama was elected President—had combined profits of about \$8 billion a year. Last year, that number skyrocketed to \$15 billion a year. The difference was ObamaCare.

ObamaCare made it easier for those companies to see their profits skyrocket, but they did so on the backs of America's poor and middle class. With ObamaCare, we also had the unsustainable expansion of Medicaid, a failed program we should be trying to rescue people from, not trap them in. We need to repeal and replace ObamaCare.

As we look toward reform, a guiding principle should always be restoring the constitutional principal of federalism or some might call it localism or the principle of subsidiarity. The idea is that you should govern locally, as locally as possible. There is a reason for this. The Constitution requires it, but it is also the case that we all benefit when we follow that constitutional system. It allows more Americans to get more of the kind of government they want and less of the kind of government they don't want. Bad things happen when we ignore federalism, as we have over the last 80 years and increasingly so over the last decade. There are some examples of that.

One involves transportation. Our Interstate Highway System was created by the Federal Government in the 1950s under the leadership of President Eisenhower. He acknowledged that for national security and interstate commerce reasons, it would be a good idea to have an interstate highway system. So we proposed—and Congress passed into law—a gasoline tax that would fund the establishment, the creation of

an interstate highway system. The idea was always to hand that interstate highway system back over to the States after the project was completed, which it has been now since the 1980s. Yet we are still collecting a Federal gasoline tax—18.4 cents per gallon, to be precise. Yet that 18.4 cents per gallon still doesn't ever seem to be sufficient, even though the Interstate Highway System has been completed since the 1980s and even though, stunningly, you could maintain the existing Interstate Highway System for about 4 cents per gallon. So where is the rest of it going? Well, it is going to purely local projects: surface roads, bike paths, all sorts of other things, many of which might well be worthy but aren't necessarily Federal in nature.

Another example involves public land. A lot of people were surprised to learn this—especially people from the East—but the Federal Government owns and controls about 30 percent of the land in the United States. A lot of people in the East aren't aware of this because, in every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent of the land. In no State west of Colorado does the Federal Government own less than 15 percent and, in many States like my own, that number is much larger. In fact, in my State, the State of Utah, the Federal Government owns 67 percent of the land.

Let's set aside the question, for a minute, of why the Federal Government needs to own that much land at all and why it needs to own 30 percent of the landmass in the United States. If it is going to own that much, why does it disproportionately own so much land in States like mine, especially when that harms people in States like mine?

You see, in Utah—this map shows Federal land. Anyplace you see white, that is non-Federal land. If you see any of these colors represented here, that is one type of Federal land ownership or another. Where you see color on this chart, that is where the Federal land is owned and controlled by the Federal Government and the local taxing authorities can't tax it. As a result, people have to go to the Federal Government for a "Mother May I" in order to even cross the property or utilize the property for some legitimate business or personal need, and the local taxing authorities can't tax it. This harms westerners disproportionately, and it is wrong. We need reform in this area.

We also need to get the Federal Government out of the business of thinking it needs to own this much land and into the business of thinking, if it is going to own that much, then it needs to allow taxing authorities to collect at least a rough equivalent of property tax.

Also, in the area of primary and secondary education, because public education is so important, the Federal Government needs to stay out of the K-12 education arena. In other words, what is taught in the K-12 classroom

needs to be decisions made by teachers in consultation with parents, principals, local school officials and, in some cases, State officials, not from Washington, DC. That is not an appropriate decision to make from Washington, DC, unless you are talking about educational experiences perhaps in the District of Columbia or a U.S. territory or on a military base or something like that.

The Federal Government should have no role in K-12 public education. That is not our job. We have to remember the text of the 10th Amendment echoing the structure of the original Constitution: that powers not granted to Congress and not prohibited to the States are reserved to the States respectively or the people. That has to mean something. In order for it to mean something, there has to be some limit to what powers are, in fact, granted to the Federal Government.

Over the last 80 years, we gradually drifted away from this idea. We concluded that every problem in society is a government problem and that every government problem is a Federal problem. That is wrong. That has harmed the American people.

We need to restore federalism, localism, and subsidiary. This will free the people of the tyranny they feel as the result of a lost election. At any given moment in America, there are people who are disappointed about the last election, especially so with House elections, Senate elections, and the occupant of the White House. At any given moment, the people who feel as if they are not well represented in Washington—either at the U.S. Capitol or at the White House or both—can be counted in the tens, if not hundreds of millions. We will end this tyranny if we return a lot of that power.

In other words, let's say someone living in Connecticut might not quite be on the bandwagon of "make America great again." If they don't want to make America great again, they can want to make Connecticut great again. In other words, federalism allows more people in America to get more of the kind of government they want and less of the kind of government they don't want. It allows more people to have more of a say because local governments, while not perfect, are more responsive to their local constituencies. It better protects both the minorities and majorities. It lowers the temperature of our national politics. One of the reasons national politics have become so contentious is because everything has been centered in Washington, DC. There is no reason it has to be that way. In fact, the Constitution says it should never be that way.

Finally, with regard to federalism, there are a few things that only the Federal Government can do. Those things include national defense, establishing a uniform system of weights and measures, coming up with a uniform system of laws governing immigration and naturalization and a uni-

form system of laws governing interstate and foreign trade or commerce. Those things that can be done only by Congress must be done well. When we are so busy doing the things we are not supposed to do, we fail to do those things that only we can do. That is yet another reason to restore federalism.

Then, whatever is left over, whatever remains, whatever we can't bring back, needs to be fixed. It needs to be made to work. Whatever we don't return to the States can be made more effective and more efficient, and we should do that.

The 1974 Budget Act, as I explained at the outset of my address today, is outdated. We have to reform it. The Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation use formulas that are opaque and unknown, that are effectively a black box. This is wrong, and we have to get rid of those.

That is one of the reasons I introduced the CBO Show Your Work Act, so they can't just tell us anymore: You can't know why we reached the conclusions we reached that have stunning implications for law and public policy.

From budget, to taxing, to spending policy and policymaking, the constant theme is inertia. One could argue that the consistent theme is nostalgia. We are stuck in that era of the Ford Pinto and the eight-track cassette player. Americans are being held back, not only by outdated policies but by a process that is out of date too.

We met the challenges of the 20th century with policies that met the moment, but we have to be constantly updating, constantly overseeing and tweaking and improving. Government may well move at the pace of a turtle, but it can move, nonetheless, and move it must because the only way to get to next is to focus on now.

In our increasingly personalized, customizable society and economy, government's obsession with centralization is making these things worse, not better. We need to govern locally and not nationally in every single instance. We need to empower individuals and local communities.

In Washington, we have to embrace accountability, especially the kind of accountability prescribed by the Constitution. We can do better, but we have to first recognize the need to do so.

The budget is indicative of all the problems we face in Washington. It is also indicative of Congress's authority and its ability to create solutions. We can do this. We can. We must. And together, we will.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to speak about the budget. I find many points of agreement with my colleague from Utah.

Just to sort of jump into it, normally we wouldn't be having this budget discussion in the fall. The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 suggests that the

President would give us a budget in February, that we would pass a budget by April, and that budget would then set top-line numbers that would be given to the committees, that would then write their authorizing bills with those budgetary numbers. Then it would be handed over, and the appropriators would ultimately fashion appropriations bills that were responsive to the budget and the authorizing bills. We are into a new fiscal year, and the many of the authorizing committees have already done their jobs.

I am on the Armed Services Committee. Probably the biggest piece of legislation we do every year is the NDAA. We have already written it without having a budget. We didn't have a budget top-line number this year. We have gone ahead and written the bill, and the appropriators are already working.

I think what everybody on this floor understands is that this really isn't a budget debate; it is an effort to set up a set of instructions around which to do tax reform via budget reconciliation. In my view, this budgetary document fails as a budget, and it also fails as a good-faith beginning to a tax reform discussion.

I want to talk about each of these: why this document fails as a budget—I voted against it in committee, and I am going to vote against it on the floor—and why it fails as an effort to initiate the necessary process for reforming the Tax Code for the first time since 1986.

If you look at this document, the budget that is on the floor has a whole set of priorities that are either wrong or completely unrealistic. As an example, the budget proposes over \$5 trillion in spending cuts, \$470-plus billion cut to Medicare, and an over \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid. That would not only be a bad idea, but it is completely unrealistic and unlikely to occur. These cuts are not going to happen, and so it is just artificial.

Second, the budget does not address the primary budgetary reality—a dangerous reality we are living under—of sequestration and budget caps. It continues to gut domestic discretionary programs, to the tune of over \$600 billion over the decade.

Finally, just a particular item that I think is very important: The budget proposes a fast track, a 50-vote process, to open up drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is really not a budgetary matter; it is shoehorned into the budget because we like to assume we are going to get a big chunk of revenue by drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. But this is a fundamental matter of environmental policy that shouldn't be squirreled away in a tiny detail on the budget.

I opposed drilling in the National Arctic Wildlife Refuge when it was last on the floor in the mid-2000s. We were dealing with high oil prices and overreliance on Middle Eastern oil. The energy situation has completely changed.

We are moving to low- and no-carbon energy sources, and oil prices are significantly lower. We are not relying on Middle Eastern oil. I would also argue that the cost-benefit calculation now makes drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge a particularly poor idea. I went to the Refuge two summers ago and saw the environmental damage that would be caused by drilling there, and I opposed it.

So the budget—from the unrealistic expense cuts to Medicaid and Medicare that would really hurt people, to other cuts—is unrealistic. The fact that it was being done after the authorizers and appropriators were generally done with their work demonstrates that the budget isn't that serious. What this is really about is coming up with an instruction to begin the process of tax reform.

Tax reform done through the reconciliation process is a bad idea for at least two reasons. First, it begins as completely partisan. If you are going to do tax reform for the first time since 1986, you ought to try to get the best ideas of both parties. But that is not what is done with reconciliation. When you say "We are going to do it through reconciliation," you are saying "We, the majority, have 52 votes. All we need is 50 plus a tiebreaker. We are not going to listen to Democrats. We are not going to meaningfully entertain the ideas you have. We are going to do it on our own."

I would venture to say that the same outcome as was achieved with the effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act via reconciliation is going to be the end result here. Trying to do something this important all on your own, without meaningfully including the public and the minority, almost destines it for failure.

The second reason it is a bad idea to do tax reform via reconciliation is this: Matters in reconciliation are temporary, not permanent.

I went to the Chamber of Commerce in Northern Virginia with Senator WARNER a couple of weeks back. We talked about tax reform. We talked about the fact that it was needed to grow the economy, that it hadn't been done for a long time. But what my business leaders want is tax reform that is permanent. They don't want a tax reform bill where the provisions expire, and because of the rules of reconciliation, that is what happens. So to do tax reform via reconciliation is a mistake.

But let's go further and look at the tax reform ideas that have been discussed by the administration and others that we will likely embark upon if this budget passes. The budget sets up a mechanism for partisan and temporary tax cuts that would increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion. The first page of the GOP's own budget talks about the challenges of deficits:

"Continual overspending and its resulting deficits will expand the Federal debt. During the next 10 years, debt held by the public is

slated to rise from 77 percent of GDP (\$15 trillion) to 91 percent of GDP (\$26 trillion)."

Why would we propose to increase the debt by \$1.5 trillion in a partisan, temporary tax reconciliation bill? If folks—especially the GOP—are so focused on the deficit and debt, and we should be, why are we including a mechanism in this instruction to raise the debt by \$1.5 trillion? I think, again, the answer is that this is not a serious proposal, and it is only the vehicle for partisan and temporary tax cuts.

The initial analyses I have seen of this tax proposal suggests a couple of things. First, the tax benefits would overwhelmingly be for folks at the top, the wealthiest, the folks who least need a break in taxes. To give an example, the Republican proposal calls for the elimination of the estate tax. That would cost more than \$270 billion over 10 years. The estate tax has high thresholds already. It affects an extremely limited number of Virginians and a limited number of folks in virtually every State. Giving up \$270 billion to get rid of the estate tax is enough to provide every child from a low- or moderate-income family with access to free preschool. That is about 7 million kids. You would still have enough money left over to take every student off Head Start waiting lists. Which would you rather do—cut the estate tax \$270 billion for a few families or provide access to free preschool to every low- and moderate-income kid in this country and take every child on a Head Start waiting list off the list?

Second, the proposal has some gimmicks and special quirks that I think need to be brought to attention. I hope we will bring it to attention on the floor. Here is an example: The budget that is before us repeals a rule that is currently in place that requires the CBO to issue scores on legislation coming out of reconciliation at least 28 hours in advance of a vote. Now, 28 hours isn't that long, but at least it is enough time for a Senator and staff to read a bill and understand the consequences of the bill before voting. This Republican budget repeals the transparency rule that forces the CBO to issue a score. I have an amendment to not repeal the rule but to restore it and make it stronger. There should be a CBO score to let every Senator and especially the public know what we are voting on with respect to these matters.

I will conclude and say this: Tax reform is important. Let's not sugarcoat this. We are not really debating a budget on the floor. If we were really going to debate a budget, we would have done it last spring. This is all about setting the stage for tax reform. We haven't done it for a long time. It is important. We should promote tax reform that makes the Tax Code simpler and fair and that focuses on middle-class working families and makes it easier to start businesses and grow them. We shouldn't be doing tax reform that is partisan, that is temporary, that in-

creases the deficit, and that produces the overwhelming benefit of a tax reform package to those at the top of the income scale who don't need it.

It is my hope that we will have that debate in earnest on the floor of the Senate. I would love to join my colleagues in a good-faith effort to reform the Tax Code. Reconciliation and this particular proposal is not the way to do that.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I read from my remarks, I would like to make the point that I get the impression that what some Members of the other political party—but more often editorials and think tanks—believe and want the public to believe is that there is actually a tax bill produced by the tax-writing committees of the Congress, something that is very definitive in what it does to the tax policy. I want to make clear that there is no such document. All we have so far is what is called a framework agreed to by the leaders of the two tax-writing committees and the Treasury Department and the leaders of the House and the Senate. You cannot draw conclusions about who is going to pay what taxes just from the framework.

I will get into real detail on this, but the other thing I would like to make clear is the fact that there are a lot of people drawing conclusions about who is going to get tax benefits and who is going to be hurt as a result of all this information that is out there, from which no one can draw conclusions because there isn't any bill before the Congress at this point. There will be in a matter of weeks.

The budget that we are debating this week paves the way for fundamental tax reform. For more than a decade, both sides of the aisle have talked about the need for tax reform that provides tax simplification, tax fairness, and gives us the ability to increase our economic competitiveness so that we can grow the economy.

Under President George W. Bush, we had a bipartisan tax reform panel. Under President Obama, we had the bipartisan Simpson-Bowles Commission. We have had individual Members also authoring tax plans, including a bipartisan bill authored by Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN, the Senator from Oregon, and former Senator Coats, then representing the State of Indiana.

In addition to these high-profile plans that have been out there over the years, the Senate Finance Committee has also had countless tax reform hearings over this extended period. The



committee also held a series of bipartisan options papers discussions under then-Chairman Baucus. Additionally, under Chairman HATCH, we had bipartisan tax reform working groups. All of this work over the years has laid the foundation and informed the unified framework released by the Big 6. That is the framework I previously referred to.

The influence of these prior discussions and proposals on the Big 6 framework is evident. In other words, all of that work that has gone on over the years in different environs is bearing fruit now in getting a consensus of what we ought to do in a broad way of moving forward on tax simplification, tax reform, and tax cuts.

The framework is nothing but a framework and will be filled in with details by the tax-writing committees. It is at that point that any think tank, any Member of the other political party, any Member of our political party, any college professors, any economists anywhere can make some sound judgments as to the extent to which certain people benefit or don't benefit from the legislation before us.

I think they ought to take into consideration that you have to think about the country as a whole, which hasn't grown by more than 1.6 percent in each of the 8 years of the previous administration. If you are going to have jobs created, you have to grow at about twice that amount, at 3 percent or more. That is some of the thinking behind this budget that is before the Senate right now and the thinking behind the tax reform measures that will follow our adoption of the budget.

I will be repeating myself to some extent here, but for illustration, I have a chart here comparing the Big 6 framework, the Wyden-Coats bill, and the Simpson-Bowles plan to which I have already referred. You can see here the main point about putting these three plans together is to show similarity. All proposals would consolidate the current tax brackets down to three. That is one point the chart makes.

Two plans provide for a top rate of 35 percent, while one provides for a top rate of 28 percent. Yet the Big 6 framework, the framework that will evolve into a piece of legislation called tax simplification, tax reform, and tax cuts, is being criticized for having a 35-percent top rate that somehow is a giveaway to the wealthy, whereas you can see from this chart that plans that have been bipartisan in the past have had the 35-percent top rate or less. Of course, the 35-percent tax rate that is said to be a giveaway to the wealthy is not even the one that proposes a lower 28-percent rate. The 28-percent rate is reserved for the Simpson-Bowles plan. That Simpson-Bowles group was put together by none other than a Democratic President.

Let me ask: Were Democratic members of the Simpson-Bowles Commission, which voted for that plan, voting to give huge tax cuts to the wealthy?

Do our Democratic colleagues expect us to believe that a 35-percent top rate is a sensible bipartisan compromise when offered by Democrats but a giveaway to the rich once it is associated with this administration or with Republican Members of Congress?

Well, another thing is the same: All three plans would repeal the alternative minimum tax. This is very surprising. From listening to my Democratic colleagues, I thought repealing the alternative minimum tax was some nefarious plot to benefit President Trump, but that just doesn't square with the reality and what has gone on in the Congress over the last decade and a half with regard to tax reform. Repealing the alternative minimum tax has had strong bipartisan support.

While serving as either chairman or the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator Baucus and I introduced bipartisan, stand-alone legislation to repeal the alternative minimum tax. We did that across several Congresses. Of course, we were not successful. I hope this Congress will be successful in doing that.

Our legislation eliminating the alternative minimum tax garnered bipartisan support from across the political spectrum. The current ranking member of the Finance Committee and the current minority leader of the entire U.S. Senate even joined Senator Baucus and me at that time in these efforts as co-sponsors of that legislation.

At the time, a few years ago, the current ranking member even went so far as to say that "the alternative minimum tax should be Congress' number-one priority for tax reform." I agree with what the current ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee said a few years ago, which I just quoted. The alternative minimum tax repeal should be a top priority, and it seems as though it is going to be a top priority this year because the alternative minimum tax adds needless complexity to the Tax Code and often hits middle-income taxpayers rather than the wealthy, as originally intended.

Let me give a history of the alternative minimum tax. I think it was passed in 1969. Studies of wealthy people showed that about 150 people who were very wealthy paid no income tax, and there was a feeling that everyone ought to pay some tax. The alternative minimum tax was set up to hit those 150 and some other people, but it wasn't ever indexed. Now it hits millions of middle-income taxpayers. To help those middle-income taxpayers who should have never been hit by the alternative minimum tax—that is the rationale for doing away with it.

We even have the Internal Revenue Service's Taxpayer Advocate Service repeatedly calling for the repeal of the alternative minimum tax, noting that it "does not achieve its original goal" and "stealthily increases marginal rates for middle-income taxpayers."

I want to move now to the corporate tax part of the framework. I am back

at the chart now. Similarity between these plans exists for reform of corporate taxes. For instance, each one of these three plans seeks to significantly lower our corporate tax rate.

The Wyden-Coats bill calls for an 11-percent reduction in the corporate rate, bringing that rate down from 35 to 24 percent. The Big 6 framework aims for 20 percent as the highest corporate tax rate. Yet, according to the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, the corporate rate reduction in the Big 6 framework is "a massive corporate tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits shareholders."

The last time I checked, the distribution of the benefit from a corporate rate reduction is the same no matter what party or what President proposed it. This chart shows that similarity between the bipartisan plans and the Big 6 framework. I don't think the Senate Finance Committee ranking member proposed a 24-percent corporate rate when that Wyden-Coats plan was developed because he wanted to provide a massive benefit to the shareholders he now talks about. I also know for certain that isn't why the Big 6 framework aims for 20 percent.

The truth is, there has been a really big, growing, bipartisan consensus that our corporate tax rate is out of step with other major trading partners. Now, at 35 percent—and it has been at 35 percent for decades—our corporate tax rate is the highest among developed countries. While we have been at 35 percent, our major trading partners have been lowering their rates. On average, their rates are more than 10 percent lower than ours, so averaging maybe about 24 percent.

Now, that obviously has a great impact on jobs in America because it puts American companies at a competitive disadvantage globally, costing American jobs. It has also strained our corporate tax system to its breaking point as we have battled corporate inversions and foreign takeovers. Now, how much in the last several years have we heard Members of this body complaining about foreign takeovers and inversions to skip the country, to save taxes? Well, that is one of the reasons for reducing the corporate tax rate so that doesn't happen.

Moreover, a growing body of economic literature is showing that a significant portion of the corporate tax does indeed fall on workers in the form of lower wages. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation as well as the Congressional Budget Office assumes 25 percent of corporate tax falls on workers. So if you reduce the corporate tax rate, according to congressional researchers here who work for us, one would assume that workers are going to get 25 percent of that benefit to their wages. We even have other studies—many—finding that workers could bear more than 70 percent of the burden of a high corporate tax rate.

While the exact burden borne by workers may be debated, the economic



research is very clear. A corporate rate reduction means a significant wage increase for workers. In fact, the Council of Economic Advisers very conservatively estimates that workers could see their wages increase by more than \$4,000 due to lowering the corporate rate to 20 percent.

In reality, there is very little in this tax framework that has not had bipartisan support in the past or is not well within the mainstream of bipartisan proposals before us. Once again, that statement I just made is the purpose of this chart, to show that this bipartisan agreement and what we have before the Congress coming up—the Big 6 framework—have so many likenesses in it that there is absolutely no rationale for the partisanship we are having in the news media and on the Senate floor talking about this framework. This is why the accusations that the Big 6 tax framework is nothing more than a giveaway to the rich—why that statement we hear so often is so dumbfounding.

I want to move on to another issue about whether these are tax cuts for the rich, and I want to show how one of the proposals before the Congress will help the rich. More perplexing is that those who are screaming “tax cuts for the rich” and saying it the loudest have also been the most ardent supporters of maintaining one of the largest loopholes for the wealthy; namely, the State and local tax deduction.

I know the minority leader was on the floor last week, I think, citing IRS statistics to claim that the deduction was really a middle-class benefit, but the minority leader told only part of that story. I would like to look at some estimates by the liberal Tax Policy Center that my Democratic colleagues like to cite so often. According to the Tax Policy Center, 90 percent of the tax increase from eliminating the deduction would fall on taxpayers with incomes exceeding \$100,000, and 40 percent of the total would be paid just by taxpayers with incomes exceeding \$500,000 a year.

Think of it this way. Those with incomes exceeding \$500,000 make up less than 1 percent of all tax filers, yet receive 40 percent of the deduction benefit of claiming the State and local tax deduction.

I would like to illustrate it a better way. I have a chart based on IRS data that looks at the benefit of the deduction by adjusted gross income. Prior to going to the chart, I think it is important to point out that only about 30 percent of the taxpayers even itemize and have the State and local tax deduction available to them because you have to itemize to get that. This chart is going to focus on that 30 percent.

The first group I have highlighted on this chart are taxpayers with incomes below \$50,000. As we can see on the chart, only about 12 percent of the tax filers in this group claim the deduction. In other words, 88 percent of the taxpayers in this category receive no

benefit from the State and local tax deduction. That 12 percent does get a fairly nice benefit from it. They are deducting an average of a little over \$3,000 in State taxes for a State benefit of just under \$500, assuming they are in today's 15 percent bracket.

From further down the chart, we can see that the benefits afforded to low- to middle-income taxpayers are very much dwarfed by the benefits afforded to the wealthy or, as some of my Democratic colleagues might have become accustomed to referring to them, the millionaires and billionaires. Where only 12 percent of taxpayers with incomes under \$50,000 have any benefit from the State and local tax deduction, over 90 percent of filers with incomes exceeding \$500,000 claim the deduction. Tax filers in the \$500,000 to \$1 million range are, on average, deducting more in State and local taxes—\$53,000—than the incomes of the taxpayers in the first group.

If we assume taxpayers in this second group are, under the current law, in the 39.6-percent tax bracket, that translates into a tax benefit of nearly \$21,000. For those with incomes exceeding \$1 million, there is an average tax benefit of about \$100,000.

So if you are truly interested in eliminating tax loopholes for the rich, look no further than the elimination of the State and local tax deduction. This elimination provides an opportunity to better target more tax relief where we want to target it—to the middle class—making up for any benefit the middle class may lose from deductions and then some. In other words, the income tax would remain much more progressive.

The Big 6 framework provides the tools to do a middle-income tax reduction, including nearly doubling the standard deduction, reducing the current 15-percent rate to 12 percent, and significantly increasing the child tax credit. The framework also grants significant leeway to the Finance Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to explore additional options to ensuring middle-income tax relief.

In addition to being a benefit that overwhelmingly goes to the wealthy, the State and local tax deduction also has the effect of disproportionately benefiting States with high State and local taxes. Essentially, the deduction allows wealthy individuals in high-tax States to then offload some of their State and local tax burdens onto taxpayers in other States.

This new chart lists the top 10 States that benefit the most from the State and local tax deduction. The States are listed, and we can see the extent to which they benefit from it. We see we have New York at the top, a little lower is California, and a little bit below that is Massachusetts. It would seem to me that our Democratic colleagues like to talk a big game about eliminating loopholes for the wealthy, but when it comes down to actually doing it, they are more interested in

holding on to a tax subsidy that favors the tax-and-spend policies of overwhelmingly blue States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the obscenity that will be the attempt by the Republicans to insert into the budget bill an ability for the big oil companies of our country to be able to drill for oil in this sacred, pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I first wish to thank Senator CANTWELL from the State of Washington, our great Democratic leader on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for her leadership not just on this issue but on so many other issues in the energy and environment area that we are having to confront during this era of Donald Trump.

Let me just tell my colleagues that the Republican budget is ultimately all about massive handouts to the 1-percent richest people in our country and to huge corporations, while doing almost nothing for working and middle-class Americans in our country. In this bill, the Republicans will slash Medicaid and Medicare while at the same time blowing a \$1.5 trillion hole in the deficit to finance tax cuts for the superrich. But if that weren't bad enough, tucked inside of the Republican budget is a poison pill, one more massive corporate handout—a giveaway of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska to Big Oil.

Senate Republicans have included instructions for the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution that would open the door for drilling in one of America's greatest natural resources. This GOP budget sets the stage for Republicans to ram drilling in the crown jewel of America's National Wildlife Refuge System through the Senate's using only a 50-vote threshold. This is nothing more than a Big Oil polar payout. This cold-hearted Republican budgetary scam only underscores the backward priorities of President Trump and congressional Republicans.

As our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico look desperately for relief from the devastation of Hurricane Maria, there has been no refuge in the Trump administration. When tens of millions of Americans wanted to be sure that their healthcare would be protected, there was no refuge in the Republican Party. But the instant billionaires and oil companies look for a tax cut, a refuge suddenly appears. That is when the Republicans can find a refuge. Unfortunately, it is the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

But the Republican plan to offset \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts for the super-wealthy will only result in \$1 billion being able to be raised from allowing the oil companies to drill in this pristine refuge. That plan neither makes any sense nor will it actually bring in any cents sufficient to pay for this

huge tax break and the deficit they are creating.

Maybe my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think there is a different exchange rate above the Arctic Circle, but down here those numbers don't even come close to adding up. This is exactly the kind of polarizing politics we need to get away from—giveaways to Big Oil and billionaires at the expense of the American people and our planet.

There is a long, bipartisan history of fighting to protect the Arctic Refuge for future generations. It was Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower who began this bipartisan legacy by setting aside the core of the Arctic Refuge in 1960. It was further protected by President Kennedy and Senator TOM UDALL's father, Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, during the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. Then, Representative Mo Udall succeeded in doubling the size of the Refuge, protecting even more of this untrammelled wilderness. Protecting this special place has always been an issue that rose above party lines, and it should continue to do so.

In 2015 the Interior Department recommended that Congress designate this area as wilderness and not open it to drilling. In making that wilderness recommendation, the Department of the Interior concluded that the "Arctic Refuge exemplifies the idea of wilderness—to leave some remnants of this nation's natural heritage intact, wild, and free of the human intent to control, alter, or manipulate the natural order."

The Coastal Plain is the biological heart of the Refuge. The Fish and Wildlife Service has called it the "center for wildlife activity" in the Refuge. It supports more than 250 species, including caribou, polar bears, and migratory birds, but that is exactly where this Republican legislation would allow Big Oil to drill, forever despoiling this ecosystem.

Two years ago, we lifted the four-decades-old ban on exporting American crude oil. As a result of that giveaway to the big oil industry, we are now exporting more U.S. crude oil—nearly 1 million barrels a day—than we could ever produce from drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

We have a fracking revolution taking place in our country right now. We hear it over and over from President Trump. We hear it from the Republicans: There is a fracking revolution. We are on our way to energy independence. We should lift the ban on exporting oil out of the United States. We should start selling it around the world to the highest bidder. We have so much oil that we can afford to send it out of our own country. Don't worry about it; there is no problem with exporting American oil.

As a matter of fact, what the Trump administration also says is this: Don't worry about the fuel economy standards in America. We are going to start

to review them so we can lower—lower—the goals for our country for making the vehicles that we drive in our country more efficient.

Where do we put the oil in our country? We put 70 percent into gasoline tanks. We don't have to be a detective to figure out what happens if, instead of having our cars continue to get more and more efficient in terms of reducing the amount of oil that we need, we have our standards get lower and lower, and, as a result, we need to consume more oil.

What does the Trump administration say? They say they are going to review the fuel economy standards. They are going to take a "we can't do it" stand. They are going to take an "it's too hard to improve the economy standards" stand. That is what they said for four decades: It is too hard.

But during the Obama administration they were able to put on the books a standard that moves America to 54.5 miles per gallon by the year 2025 in the United States of America—54.5 miles per gallon. That is where the plug-in hybrid revolution comes from. That is where the all-electric vehicle revolution comes from. That is where Elon Musk comes from. That is where all of these statements coming from the Chinese, the Indians, Volvo, and others come from. It is this movement toward plug-in hybrids and all-electric vehicles, reducing the amount of oil that we consume,—not just here in the United States, but around the globe.

What does the Trump administration say? We can't do it. It is too hard. We are going to review those standards. So they are saying: We don't have the technological capability to accomplish something that avoids the necessity of having to drill in a pristine wildlife refuge—to put a gasoline station on top of something that should be preserved for generations to come. They are saying: We can't improve the fuel economy standards. We are going to export 1 million barrels of oil a day. Guess what. We are going to go up into the Arctic Refuge in order to find the oil so that the gas guzzlers can stay on the road and so we can export oil to China. We are going to allow, finally, for the Big Oil cartel—which is now taking over the Department of the Interior, the Department of Energy, and the EPA—the ability to be able to despoil one of the last untrammelled, perfect, pristine areas in our country.

That is just fundamentally wrong, and we are going to have a vote on it on the floor of the Senate during this budget debate. To raise \$1 billion total as they run up a deficit of \$1.5 trillion, they despoil this sacred part of our country. It is immoral. It is wrong. It says that the Trump administration is handing over the keys of our government to the big oil companies. It is saying: No matter how many hurricanes hit our country, no matter how warm the water is off the coast of our country, they are going to remain in climate change denial—that it is really

not a problem. Therefore, you don't have to increase the fuel economy standards. You don't have to reduce the fossil fuels going into the atmosphere. You don't have to worry. Climate change—ignore it. Fuel economy standards—we are not going to do it. What is the one thing we will do? For the oil industry, we are going to allow them to drill in the pristine Arctic wilderness. It is immoral—fundamentally immoral.

For 60 years, going back to Eisenhower, we figured out how to protect it. But now, at the height of a fracking revolution, with millions of new barrels of oil; at the height of an incredible plug-in hybrid and all-electric vehicle revolution, as we are reducing the amount of oil we are consuming in our country; at the height of storms that are assaulting every part of our Nation with an intensity we have never seen in our history, the President says: I am going to ignore all of those issues and just focus upon what Big Oil wants.

This is going to be a monumental debate we will have on the floor of the Senate this week. I am looking forward to that debate because I think the American people are going to want to know who has voted which way on this critical environmental issue—the environment issue, in my opinion—which will be taken on the floor of the Senate this week and will be led by our great leader on energy and environment issues, Senator MARIA CANTWELL, from the State of Washington. She has been a clear, consistent, insistent voice on these issues.

I think this week we are going to have the kind of historic debate the American people will want us to have on this issue.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak against the budget resolution's containment of language that might direct our colleagues in the future to open up drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts for his leadership on this issue and for being on the Senate floor tonight to talk about how important it is that we continue to maintain this Wildlife Refuge as it exists.

Our public lands have been under assault from this administration. It comes in all forms. It certainly comes in the form of trying to use the Antiquities Act in reverse and, basically, to say: You can open up public lands for drilling.

This really caused a controversy in Utah with the Bears Ears National Monument. There are Tribes, sportsmen, fishermen, and hunters who value the public lands in this national monument and who don't want to see it turned over to companies or individuals who want to mine or drill for oil and gas to the detriment of the monument resources. Now the budget resolution will allow for a "for sale" sign on

some of our public lands to give a tax break to millionaires.

It is not that this is the only issue. As I said, there is the notion that the administration is taking our public lands and trying to turn them over to be developed, the notion that they are giving land to coal companies so they can harvest coal off of Federal lands and then not charging them a royalty rate which is compensatory and fair to the American public. We tried to fix that. Obviously, this Secretary of the Interior is trying to roll that back and give coal companies a sweetheart deal.

Now we have an EPA Administrator who, basically, has had a mining company CEO walk into his office and say: By the way, we want to develop a mine at the headwaters of Bristol Bay in Alaska, home of the largest salmon run and probably responsible for 50 percent of sockeye salmon around the world. Immediately after the mining executive left the EPA Administrator's office, the EPA Administrator sent out a letter saying: Let's toss aside Clean Water Act safeguards to protect Bristol Bay, move forward on this idea of allowing the mine application to proceed.

So much for due process, so much for preserving what has taken the American public more than a hundred years to put together so that the public can recreate on public lands—so, yes, hunting, fishing, Native American, and recreational communities are all upset.

What is the latest play? Let's stick in the budget resolution language providing for the opening of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development—something that has been so precious to the United States of America—basically a Serengeti for wildlife, an intact arctic ecosystem that doesn't exist in other places in the United States. Yet people are trying what I call a sneak attack, just like they did 12 years ago, just as people tried to open up the Arctic refuge for development before and on its own merits couldn't get it enacted into law. They put it in the Defense appropriation bill, thinking that there is no way people could vote against money for the troops—that is how we can get the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge open for mineral development.

But it didn't work then, and it is not going to work now. The American people are not for legislative sneak attacks, backdoor ways to move legislation that could never pass on its own merits. I know the President wants to get a big budget package together, get healthcare in there, throw in Arctic National Wildlife Refuge drilling, hope that people can't vote no, and move forward. I would say, if this is such a wonderful idea, let it stand on its own merits.

This area, as we can see, is a very pristine part of the United States. And now some people are saying: Oh, well, we could do some sort of drilling. Why do you want to have drilling in a pristine wildlife refuge? When people say:

Oh, well, there are refuges that have had drilling—if that was prior to it being declared a refuge, yes, but this is a pristine area that we decided to set aside. Why? Because, as I mentioned, it is a Serengeti, it is an arctic Serengeti of caribou and other wildlife, over 200 different species of birds that come to the area, to say nothing about the population of polar bears in the region. Why do we want to destroy this? It is not that we are somehow thinking that we are going to get oil reserves out of it for our Nation. In fact, the issue is really, with the price of oil and the oil export market that has now been created, oil produced here is going on to the larger world market. So why is it that we think this is going to help us in the United States?

People are trying to use a budget process to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion to pay for tax cuts for wealthy people. They are willing to degrade the environment as a way to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy. I don't agree to it. I don't think the American people agree to it. They know that this iconic wildlife refuge has been attacked many times. They know that every time, someone has had to come up with some backdoor way of trying to get the refuge opened. I think my colleagues should understand and take note that these have all failed. They failed in the past because this idea is not the brightest, most brilliant idea in America. It is not the thing that is going to turn the U.S. economy around. It is not the thing that is going to help us get tax reform. It is not an idea that is even going to help us with the bipartisan effort to move forward on an energy package. If you think about it, we passed an energy bill out of here last Congress with 85 votes. If this was something that could be done in that package, it would have been done in that package.

I know that we are going to have more oil and gas exploration in Alaska. I know there is going to be more exploration in many parts of the Arctic. There is going to be a rush of Arctic nations to look at oil drilling off of our coast and in the Arctic Circle. The United States should get ready and participate in those discussions. I am first in line to say that we need a fleet of icebreakers to be prepared and be ready for the advent and the change in the Arctic. There will be many discussions about where responsible drilling should take place. I guarantee you, even if you opened up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it would not stop this debate about more drilling in Alaska.

Let's remember that we set aside this pristine area for a very specific purpose: to keep the uniqueness that has existed in this part of the world—just a very small piece of it. Continue to have the debate in other parts of Alaska and in the Arctic about what the development of oil resources are going to be.

I encourage my colleagues not to fall prey to another backdoor attempt at

trying to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Don't fall for a cynical bill where somehow somebody is going to try to cram everything in it and say: You can't vote against it because it has too many things for your State. Let's do the work that it takes to do bipartisan work—work together, agree on the things that we can agree on, and move forward. I guarantee you, our energy policy will be better in America for doing that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). If no one yields time, then time will be charged equally.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on October 18, 2017, that it be in order to call up the following amendments; that the time until 3 p.m. be for debate on the amendments, equally divided between the managers or their designees; and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes: Hatch amendment No. 1144 and Sanders amendment No. 1119.

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

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, Senators should be prepared for additional amendment votes to occur during the series at 3 p.m.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 218, on the confirmation of David Joel Trachtenberg to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 219, on the motion to proceed to H. Con. Res. 71. Had I been present, I would have voted nay. •

#### ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-16, concerning the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Kuwait for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$29 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,  
*Lieutenant General, USA, Director.*  
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-16

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Kuwait.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$27 million.  
Other \$2 million.  
Total \$29 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Two hundred eighteen (218) M1A1 Abrams Tank Hulls with 120mm cannons.

Two hundred eighteen (218) AGT-1500 (M1 Tank Series) Engines.

Non-MDE: Also includes transportation and other logistics support.

(iv) Military Department: Army (USA).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: KU-B-JAT, KU-B-UKO, KU-B-UKN, KU-B-ULB, KU-B-ULX, KU-B-UMK.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 16, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Kuwait—M1A1 Abrams Tanks

The Government of Kuwait has requested a possible sale of two hundred eighteen (218) M1A1 Abrams tank hulls with 120mm cannons and two hundred eighteen (218) AGT-1500 (M1 Tank Series) engines in support of its M1A2 tank recapitalization. Also included are transportation and other logistics support. The estimated cost is \$29 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a friendly country. Kuwait plays a large role in U.S. efforts to advance stability in the Middle East, providing basing, access, and transit for U.S. forces in the region.

This potential sale is associated with Congressional Notification 16-66 which was notified to Congress on December 12, 2016, regarding recapitalization of 218 Kuwait M1A2 tanks. Subsequent to the notification, Kuwait requested 218 M1A1 tank hulls from U.S. inventory be provided and upgraded vice using Kuwait's current fleet of tanks due to its interest in maintaining operational readiness. Kuwait will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The M1A1 tank hulls will come from U.S. inventory. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Kuwait.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-16

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. 120mm Gun. The gun is composed of a 120mm smoothbore gun (cannon) manufactured at Watervliet Arsenal; "long rod" armor-piercing fin-stabilized discarding-sabot (APFSDS) warheads; and combustible cartridge case ammunition. There may be a need to procure/produce new gun cannon tubes from Watervliet Arsenal. New cannons inducted at Anniston Army Depot would be inspected according to established criteria and shipped to Lima Army Tank Plant for the tank upgrade process. The highest level of information that could be disclosed through the sale of this end-item is UNCLASSIFIED.

2. AGT-1500 Gas Turbine Propulsion System. The use of a gas turbine propulsion system in the M1A2 is a unique application of armored vehicle power pack technology. The hardware is composed of the AGT-1500 engine and transmission and is not classified. Manufacturing processes associated with the production of turbine blades, recuperator, bearings and shafts, and hydrostatic pump and motor are proprietary and therefore commercially competition sensitive. The highest level of information that could be disclosed through the sale of this end-item is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Kuwait.

DEFENSE SECURITY  
COOPERATION AGENCY,  
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,  
*Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-16, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to Greece for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$2.404 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,  
*Lieutenant General, USA, Director.*  
Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-54

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Greece.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:  
Major Defense Equipment\* \$.918 billion.  
Other \$1.486 billion.  
Total \$2.404 billion.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase: The Government of Greece has requested the possible sale of items and services to support the upgrade of up to one hundred twenty-three (123) F-16 aircraft to Block V configuration.

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred twenty-five (125) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes 2 spares).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Modular Mission Computers (MMCs).

One hundred twenty-three (123) LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and EHSI.

One hundred twenty-three (123) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)-Inertial Navigation System (INS).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS).

One hundred twenty-three (123) Improved Programmable Display Generators (IPDGs).

Non-MDE: Included in the possible sale are up to one hundred twenty-three (123) APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); one (1) Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS); one (1) F-16V Simulator; upgrade to two (2) existing simulators; one (1) Avionics Level Test Station; Secure Communications, cryptographic equipment and navigation equipment; upgrade and integration of the Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite (ASPIS) I to ASPIS II on twenty-six (26) F-16s; Ground Support System, systems integration and test; spares and repair parts, support and test equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistical, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (SNY Amendment 6).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: GR-D-SBD, \$1.3B, 7 Dec 1992; GR-D-SNX, \$2B, 9 Mar 2000; GR-D-SNY, \$1.9B, 13 Dec 2005.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: October 16, 2017.

\*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Greece—Upgrade of F-16 Aircraft to an F-16 Block V Configuration

The Government of Greece has requested a possible purchase of an upgrade of its existing F-16 fleet to an F-16 Block V configuration which includes up to one hundred twenty-five (125) APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radars (includes two (2) spares); one hundred twenty-three (123) Modular Mission Computers (MMCs); one hundred twenty-three (123) LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) with TACAN and EHSI; one hundred twenty-three (123) LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)-Inertial Navigation System (INS); one hundred twenty-three (123)

Improved Programmable Display Generators (iPDGs). Also included in the proposed sale are up to one hundred twenty-three (123) APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); one (1) Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS); one (1) F-16V Simulator; upgrade to two (2) existing simulators; one (1) Avionics Level Test Station; Secure Communications, cryptographic equipment and navigation equipment; upgrade and integration of the Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite (ASPIS) I to ASPIS II on twenty-six (26) F-16s; Ground Support System, systems integration and test; spares and repair parts, support and test equipment; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, logistical, and technical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$2.404 billion.

This proposed sale will contribute to U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which is an important partner for political stability and economic progress in Europe. The upgrade of F-16 aircraft to an F-16 Block V configuration will bolster the Hellenic Air Force's ability to support NATO and remain interoperable with the U.S. and the NATO alliance. It will also help Greece sustain operations in the future, thereby reducing the threat the alliance's enemies pose to the U.S. and the alliance.

The proposed sale will improve Greece's capability to meet current and future security threats. Greece will use this capability as a deterrent to regional threats, strengthen its homeland defense, and execute counter-terrorism operations.

Greece currently employs a mix of F-16s in Block 30, Block 50, Block 52+, and Block 52+ Advanced configurations. Therefore, Greece will have no difficulty absorbing the upgrade of these aircraft from an operation and support standpoint.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin of Fort Worth, TX. There are currently no known offsets. However, Greece typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between Greece and the contractor.

The proposed sale will require the assignment of approximately 3-5 additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Greece.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

#### TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-54

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

#### Annex Item No. vii

##### (vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The proposed sale for upgrade of Greece's F-16s to Block V will involve the release of sensitive and/or classified (up to SECRET) elements to Greece, including hardware, accessories, components, and associated software. The F-16 Block V aircraft system is UNCLASSIFIED, except as noted below. The aircraft utilizes the F-16 airframe and features advanced avionics and systems including the AN/APG-83 Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) Radar, Modular Mission Computers (MMCs); LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System LINK-16 Multifunctional Information Distribution System Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS); Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite

(ASPIS) II ship-sets; LN260 Embedded Global Navigation Systems (EGI)—Inertial Navigation System (INS); Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing Systems (JHMCS II); Improved Programmable Display Generators (iPDGs); APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT); and Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS).

2. Additional sensitive areas include operating manuals and maintenance technical orders containing performance information, operating and test procedures, and other information related to support operations and repair. The hardware, software, and data identified are classified (up to SECRET) to protect vulnerabilities, design, and performance parameters and other similar critical information.

3. The AN/APG-83 is an Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar upgrade for the F-16. It includes higher processor power, higher transmission power, more sensitive receiver electronics, and Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR), which creates higher-resolution ground maps from a greater distance than existing mechanically scanned array radars (e.g., APG-68). The upgrade features an increase in detection range of air targets, increases in processing speed and memory, as well as significant improvements in all modes. The highest classification of the radar is SECRET.

4. The Modular Mission Computer (MMC) is the central aircraft computer of the F-16. It serves as the hub for all aircraft subsystems and avionics data transfer. The hardware and software are classified SECRET.

5. The Multifunctional Information Distribution System-Joint Tactical Radio System (MIDS-JTRS) is classified CONFIDENTIAL. The MIDS-JTRS is a secure data and voice communication network using Link-16 architecture. The system provides enhanced situational awareness, positive identification of participants within the network, secure fighter-to-fighter connectivity, secure voice capability, and ARN-118 TACAN functionality. It provides three major functions: Air Control, Wide Area Surveillance, and Fighter-to-Fighter. The MIDS-JTRS can be used to transfer data in Air-to-Air, Air-to-Surface, and Air-to-Ground scenarios. The MIDS terminal hardware, publications, performance specifications, operational capability, parameters, vulnerabilities to countermeasures, and software documentation are classified CONFIDENTIAL. The classified information to be provided consists of that which is necessary for the operation, maintenance, and repair (through intermediate level) of the data link terminal, installed systems, and related software.

6. The Advanced Self-Protection Integrated Suite II (ASPIS II) is an enhanced version of the original ASPIS I integrated Electronic Warfare (EW) system, which provides passive radar warning, wide spectrum Radio Frequency (RF) jamming, and control and management of the entire EW system. It is an externally mounted EW pod. The suite includes an ALQ-187 EW System, ALR-93 Radar Warning Receiver, and ALE-47 Countermeasure Dispenser System. Greece has upgraded ASPIS I to II on all but a remaining twenty-six jets. The commercially developed system software and hardware are UNCLASSIFIED. The system is classified SECRET when loaded with a U.S. derived EW database.

7. The Embedded Global Positioning System (EGI)—Inertial Navigation System (INS)/LN-260 is a sensor that combines Global Positioning System (GPS) and inertial sensor inputs to provide accurate location information for navigation and targeting. The EGI-INS/LN-260 is UNCLASSIFIED. The GPS cryptovariable keys needed for highest GPS accuracy are classified up to SECRET.

8. The Joint Helmet Mounted Cueing System (JHMCS) is a modified HGU-55/P helmet that incorporates a visor-projected Heads-Up Display (HUD) to cue weapons and aircraft sensors to air and ground targets. In close combat, a pilot must currently align the aircraft to shoot at a target. JHMCS allows the pilot to simply look at a target to shoot. This system projects visual targeting and aircraft performance information on the back of the helmet's visor, enabling the pilot to monitor this information without interrupting his field of view through the cockpit canopy. The system uses a magnetic transmitter unit fixed to the pilot's seat and a magnetic field probe mounted on the helmet to define helmet pointing positioning. A Helmet Vehicle Interface (HVI) interacts with the aircraft system bus to provide signal generation for the helmet display. This provides significant improvement for close combat targeting and engagement. Hardware is UNCLASSIFIED; technical data and documents are classified up to SECRET.

9. The Improved Programmable Display Generator (iPDG) and color multifunction displays utilize ruggedized commercial liquid crystal display technology that is designed to withstand the harsh environment found in modern fighter cockpits. The display generator is the fifth generation graphics processor for the F-16. Through the use of state-of-the-art microprocessors and graphics engines, it provides orders of magnitude increases in throughput, memory, and graphics capabilities. The hardware and software are UNCLASSIFIED.

10. The AN/APX-126 Advanced Identification Friend or Foe (AIFF) Combined Interrogator Transponder (CIT) is a system capable of transmitting and interrogating Mode V. It is UNCLASSIFIED unless/until Mode IV and/or Mode V operational evaluator parameters are loaded into the equipment. Elements of the IFF system classified up to SECRET include software object code, operating characteristics, parameters, and technical data. Mode IV and Mode V anti-jam performance specifications/data, software source code, algorithms, and tempest plans or reports will not be offered, released, discussed, or demonstrated.

11. The Joint Mission Planning System (JMPS) is a multi-platform PC based mission planning system. JMPS hardware is UNCLASSIFIED and the software is classified up to SECRET.

12. Software, hardware, and other data/information, which is classified or sensitive, is reviewed prior to release to protect system vulnerabilities, design data, and performance parameters. Some end-item hardware, software, and other data identified above are classified at the CONFIDENTIAL and SECRET level. Potential compromise of these systems is controlled through management of the basic software programs of highly sensitive systems and software-controlled weapon systems on a case-by-case basis.

13. If a technologically advanced adversary obtains knowledge of the specific hardware and software source code in this proposed sale, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

14. Greece is both willing and able to protect U.S. classified military information. Greek physical and document security standards are equivalent to U.S. standards. Greece has signed a General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) with the United States and is in negotiations with CENTCOM on the Communications Interoperability and Security Memorandum of Agreement (CISMOA). The Government of

Greece has demonstrated its willingness and capability to protect sensitive military technology and information released to its military in the past.

15. A determination has been made that the Greece can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

16. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal are authorized for release and export to the Government of Greece.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GREATER DANBURY NAACP

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Greater Danbury NAACP as they celebrate 60 years of outstanding advocacy and support for equal rights and an end to race-based discrimination in Connecticut and the Nation.

Founded in 1957, the Danbury NAACP serves as a branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, NAACP. By focusing on the Danbury, CT, area, this branch helps connect people in the region with the national NAACP mission. As part of the oldest civil rights organization in America, the Greater Danbury NAACP has had a valuable role in the progress we have made toward a society free from discrimination and respectful of individual civil rights. This year's theme, "Steadfast & Immovable," exemplifies the branch's continuous dedication to leading the fight to ensure every person in our great Nation will truly enjoy equal rights under the law.

The organization continues its rich history of collaboration with other civil rights groups. Recently, alongside other organizations and individuals, the Greater Danbury NAACP participated in an International Workers' Day event to emphasize the need for better treatment of immigrants. The branch's president, Glenda Armstrong, spoke at the event, emphasizing how, even with its founding centered on the inequality facing African Americans, the NAACP's goal of racial equality encompasses everyone in America.

One of the national organization's key objectives, mirrored in the work of the Greater Danbury branch, is to use democratic processes to put an end to racial discrimination. In March, the Danbury NAACP expressed its support—along with its parent association—for the NO HATE Act. I introduced this act with Congressman BEYER to counter the rising number of hate crimes in America. The NO HATE Act will encourage more thorough reports on hate crimes by law enforcement, grant victims of these crimes the right to sue in civil court, and establish hotlines run by the State to make sure hate crimes were reported. These key measures align with the NAACP's vision of equality.

Since its formation, the Greater Danbury NAACP continuously strives to eliminate racial discrimination and achieve social, political, economic, and educational equality for the people of Danbury, CT, and the Nation. I applaud their tireless work and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Greater Danbury NAACP on 60 years of dedication and advocacy on behalf of Connecticut residents.●

##### 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF A.T. STILL UNIVERSITY-KIRKSVILLE COLLEGE OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 125th anniversary of A.T. Still University's Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine, KCOM. KCOM was established in 1892 as the first osteopathic medical school in the world and continues to be recognized for its success as a multidisciplinary healthcare educator.

KCOM was founded by Dr. Andrew Taylor Still, whose novel methods of treating patients gave birth to the field of osteopathy. The school's first class included 21 students, five of whom were women. The school and medical practice quickly became a success, providing more than 30,000 osteopathic treatments in 1895.

According to the American Osteopathic Association, osteopathic medicine is one of the fastest growing specialties in U.S. healthcare. In fact, the number of doctors of osteopathic medicine has increased 276 percent since 1986. Importantly, more than half of all active doctors of osteopathic practice in primary care specialties, and many of these choose to practice in community-based settings. Students trained by KCOM are uniquely situated to impact communities lacking medical resources, whether they be rural or urban.

The focus of the KCOM administration and faculty on community outreach and underserved populations is to be commended. They partner with community health centers around the State to provide services to the most vulnerable individuals and instill a spirit of service in their students. Unique programs such as these that further education and support community health are of great benefit to the people of Missouri and serve as an example to others.

Today KCOM continues to make strides in whole person healthcare and works to be a leader in health professions education. I extend my sincere thanks for all they do. Congratulations to A.T. Still University president Craig M. Phelps, A.T. Still University-Kirksville College of Osteopathic Medicine dean Margaret Wilson, faculty, and all former and current students on this important occasion.●

#### REMEMBERING ROBERT BRADSHAW

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to remember former Reno police chief Robert Bradshaw, who recently passed away at the age of 79.

Mr. Bradshaw served as chief of the Reno Police Department from 1981 to 1991. Before that, he was an assistant chief for the San Jose Police Department. After working in Reno, Bradshaw served with the Nevada Highway Patrol and later became chief of the Concord Police Department in California.

Mr. Bradshaw strongly believed in the role community plays when it came to reducing and preventing crimes in Reno. The Reno Police Department said he was widely regarded as an expert in community-oriented policing and is credited with bringing that philosophy to the force.

In fact, the police department's current motto of "Your Police, Our Community" has been attributed to him.

One of Reno's longest serving chiefs, Bradshaw was a mentor to countless officers and had a large impact on the city. During his tenure, Bradshaw developed specialized units and created neighborhood advisory groups. He also started the community satisfaction survey in 1987, which still continues three decades later.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I know firsthand that Mr. Bradshaw's tireless efforts while chief made Reno a safer place. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family and loved ones as they mourn his loss.●

#### REMEMBERING PATRICK FLANAGAN

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to remember my friend, Second Judicial District Court Chief Judge Patrick Flanagan, who recently passed away in Reno at the age of 64. My deepest sympathy goes out to his family and loved ones.

All of Washoe County and Nevada's legal community will miss Chief Judge Flanagan, who only a year and a half ago was unanimously elected by the Second Judicial District Court to serve as chief judge. He was one of Nevada's finest, and his loss cannot be understated.

Before being elected to the bench, Chief Judge Flanagan served as an attorney and an assistant Federal public defender for the District of Nevada and worked in the appellate division of the Washoe County Public Defender's Office as a chief appellate deputy. In 2006, he was elected to serve as the Second Judicial District Court judge in Department 7 and was reelected in 2014.

Chief Judge Flanagan played a large role in the Reno community, as he regularly spoke to students, opened his courtroom for observation, and engaged students in public outreach initiatives, including the court's first annual student Flag Day poem contest.



His colleagues remember him as a personable, caring, and effective jurist who repeatedly inserted jokes or random facts about Irish history in his emails.

He served as the president of the State Bar of Nevada, the Washoe County Bar Association, and the Nevada Chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

Chief Judge Flanagan completed his undergraduate degree from Duquesne University and received his juris doctorate from California Western School of Law.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I know Chief Judge Flanagan's legacy will live on in the court. Lynne and my family pray for Chief Judge Flanagan's wife, their two children, grandchild, and entire extended family as they mourn his passing.●

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-3068. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0163—2017-0170); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3069. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Protection of Human Subjects" (16 CFR Part 1028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 27, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3070. A communication from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "340B Drug Pricing Program Ceiling Price and Manufacturer Civil Monetary Penalties Regulation" (RIN0906-AA11) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3071. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Head Start Program" (RIN0970-AC63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3072. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022 and 29 CFR Part 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3073. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Preparedness and Response, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3074. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Aging and Administrator of the Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3075. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Aging and Administrator of the Administration for Community Living, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3076. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3077. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on mining activities as required by the Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3078. A communication from the White House Liaison, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3079. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, General Services Administration, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 26, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3080. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3081. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Administrator for Protection and National Preparedness, Federal Emergency Management Agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3082. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the vacancy in the position of Special Counsel, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3083. A communication from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-123; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3084. A communication from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Endowment's fiscal year 2017 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3085. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Significant Improvements Needed in DCRA Management of Vacant and Blighted Property Program"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3086. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tolfeppyrad; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL-9967-72-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3087. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tall oil fatty acids; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL-9965-58-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3088. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Florpyrauxifen-benzyl; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL-9963-66-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3089. A communication from the Commanding General, Army Military District of Washington, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Military Helicopter Noise; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3090. A communication from the Executive Secretary, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Description of Office, Procedures, and Public Information" ((12 CFR Part 1101) (Docket No. FFIEC-2017-0003)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3091. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Oskaloosa, IA"



((RIN2120-AA66)) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0296)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 3, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3092. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guide Concerning Fuel Economy Advertising for New Automobiles" (16 CFR Part 259) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 11, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3093. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9969-10-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3094. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Alabama; Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 2012 PM2.5, 2010 NO2, 2010 SO2 and 2008 Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 9969-21-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3095. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; Miscellaneous Source Specific Revisions for Jefferson County" (FRL No. 9969-19-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3096. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Quality Implementation Plan; Iowa; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule; Amendment to the Administrative Consent Order, Grain Processing Corporation, Muscatine, Iowa" (FRL No. 9969-14-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3097. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 3" (FRL No. 9969-46-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3098. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of South Carolina; Regional Haze State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9969-23-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3099. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; California; Ambient Ozone Monitoring Requirements" (FRL No. 9969-18-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3100. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Oregon; Permitting and General Rule Revisions" (FRL No. 9968-98-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3101. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation; State of Utah; Salt Lake County and Utah County Nonattainment Area Coarse Particulate Matter State Implementation Plan Revisions to Control Measures for Point Sources" (FRL No. 9969-01-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3102. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Missouri Air Quality Implementation Plans; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2012 Annual Fine Particulate Matter (PM2.5) National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9969-12-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3103. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Chemical Recovery Combustion Sources at Kraft, Soda, Sulfite, and Stand-Alone Semichemical Pulp Mills," ((RIN2060-AS46)) (FRL No. 9969-06-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3104. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Nutritional Yeast Manufacturing Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 9969-08-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 6, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3105. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extended Due Date under Notice 2017-10 for Participants Affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria" (Notice 2017-58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3106. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3107. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Children, Youth and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3108. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, National Institute for Children's Health Quality, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Sickle Cell Disease Treatment Demonstration Program"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3109. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-1102); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-3110. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Health, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3111. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Health, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3112. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report relative to assistance for communities affected by hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria, and by wildfires; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3113. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3114. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 10, 2017; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-3115. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-113. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the Governor of New Jersey to join the United States Climate Alliance and take a leadership role in protecting the citizens of New Jersey and the United States, the environment, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change, to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

## ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 264

Whereas, The Paris Climate Accord, also known as the "Paris Agreement, which was agreed to by nearly every country in the world, is the first global pact aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions in order to avert the worst effects of climate change; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement, unlike previous pacts, requires every country to take action to lower greenhouse gas emissions rather than differentiating between developed and developing countries, and

Whereas, Although scientists have estimated that at best, the agreement will only cut greenhouse gas emissions by half of what is necessary to avoid an increase in atmospheric temperatures enough to prevent a cascade of devastating consequences, the agreement represents a turning point for the world and will cause fundamental shifts in global financial and energy markets; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement sent a powerful signal that the world is committed to a low carbon future; and

Whereas, The climate change caused by rising global temperatures will likely: increase the frequency, severity, and duration of heat waves, creating a greater risk for heat-related illnesses and deaths, especially among the elderly, very young, disabled, and poor; increase the intensity of hurricanes creating stronger peak winds and increased rainfall, increase the risk of flooding within storm-affected areas and increase the risk of drought in areas located outside storm tracks; and continue to decrease the size of polar ice sheets and land-based glaciers, causing sea levels to rise and contribute to enhanced coastal erosion, coastal flooding, and the loss of coastal wetlands, and

Whereas, Under the Paris Agreement, every participating country agreed to submit an individual plan to tackle its greenhouse gas emissions and to report regularly on its emissions and progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contributions; and

Whereas, President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement will assuredly weaken global efforts to avoid drastic climate change; and

Whereas, The Trump administration has already communicated its intention to dismantle domestic plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, such as protections to reduce gas emissions from the methane gas emissions from oil and gas production and the plan to reduce emissions from power plants; and

Whereas, In response to President Trump's announcement of his intention to withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, the Governors of California, New York, and Washington have announced the formation of the United States Climate Alliance, a coalition to convene states committed to upholding the Paris Agreement and to taking aggressive action to address climate change; and

Whereas, Together California, New York, and Washington represent about 68 million

people, or one-fifth of the country's population, and account for nearly 10 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in the country, and

Whereas, In addition, 85 mayors, 82 presidents and chancellors of universities, and the leaders of over 100 businesses have pledged to continue to meet the United States' greenhouse gas emissions targets despite the President's decision to withdraw the United States from the agreement; and

Whereas, The United States Climate Alliance will act as a forum to sustain and strengthen existing climate programs, promote the sharing of information and best practices, and develop and implement new programs to reduce carbon emissions; and

Whereas, The United States Climate Alliance is committed to upholding the Paris Agreement and reducing greenhouse gas emissions in order to avoid the disastrous repercussions of unchecked climate change for the United States and the planet; Now, therefore be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

1. This House urges the Governor of New Jersey to join the United States Climate Alliance and take a leadership role in protecting the citizens of New Jersey and the United States, the environment, and the planet from the devastating effects of climate change.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the Governor of New Jersey, the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, the President and Vice-President of the United States, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-114. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to continue the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey and in the nation; to the Committee on Finance.

## ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 198

Whereas, The Council of State Governments (CSG) is the nation's only organization serving all three branches of state government. CSG is a region-based forum that fosters the exchange of insights and ideas to help state officials shape public policy. This offers unparalleled regional, national and international opportunities to network, develop leaders, collaborate and create problem-solving partnerships; and

Whereas, New Jersey is a part of the CSG's Eastern Regional Conference, which is comprised of New Jersey and 10 other member states from Maine to Maryland, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and five eastern Canadian Provinces; and

Whereas, The CSG's Eastern Regional Conference has adopted a resolution urging the federal Executive and Legislative branches of government to maintain the integrity of the strong state and federal partnership that has been the hallmark of the federal Medicaid program since its inception more than fifty years ago; and

Whereas, As a member of CSG's Eastern Regional Conference, New Jersey strongly supports the continued partnership of the State and the federal government in managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey; and

Whereas, The Medicaid program was enacted as Title XIX of the Social Security Act in 1965 by President Lyndon Johnson to provide medical assistance to individuals whose incomes and resources were insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services; and

Whereas, Federal laws and policies establish a broad framework for the Medicaid program and states are provided flexibility within that framework to design state Medicaid programs which best meet the unique needs of each state to provide all necessary medical services without individual state or national spending caps; and

Whereas, New Jersey has designed a Medicaid program that is a unique support system tailored to the needs of New Jersey residents; and

Whereas, The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, commonly known as the Affordable Care Act, allowed states to opt to expand income eligibility for Medicaid to 138 percent of the federal poverty level and provided states a federal match for expenditures to cover 100 percent of the state Medicaid costs for this new cohort through calendar year 2016, after which the match will gradually decrease to 90 percent of these costs in calendar year 2020; and

Whereas, New Jersey chose to provide this expanded Medicaid coverage to its citizens starting in January 2014 and more than 500,000 New Jersey residents have received health insurance coverage through this new expanded eligibility; and

Whereas, In total, over 1.7 million New Jersey residents, or 20 percent of the State's population, receive their health insurance coverage and gain access to vital health related services through the Medicaid program; and

Whereas, New Jersey's total Medicaid budget equals \$17 billion in combined State and federal dollars; and

Whereas, In addition to providing access to health insurance for individuals, the Medicaid program provides critical financial resources for health care providers and institutions who care for the underserved, supporting the region's health care infrastructure through the Medicaid Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) program; and

Whereas, New Jersey institutions anticipate receiving over \$500 million in Medicaid DSH payments in 2016 to support the provision of services to the underserved and develop the region's health care infrastructure; and

Whereas, Like its partner states throughout the eastern region, New Jersey has benefited from the State and federal partnership which manages the Medicaid program; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

1. New Jersey, as one of the partner states in the CSG Eastern Regional Conference, strongly supports the continuation of the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program in New Jersey and in the nation.

2. The Legislature urges the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the state and federal partnership managing the Medicaid program to ensure the continuation of the provision of health care services to needy New Jersey residents.

3. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to each member of Congress representing the State of New Jersey, the Commissioner of Health and Human Services, the Chief Administrator of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, and the President of the United States.

POM-115. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey condemning the President of the United States's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION No. 263

An Assembly Resolution condemning President Trump's decision to withdraw the

United States from the Paris Climate Accord.

Whereas, The Paris Climate Accord, also known as the "Paris Agreement," is a landmark international agreement reached in 2015 between 195 countries aimed at reducing carbon emissions, slowing rising global temperatures, and helping countries deal with the effects of climate change; and

Whereas, The Paris Agreement ended the strict differentiation between developed and developing countries that characterized earlier efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and replaced it with a common framework that commits all participating countries to put forward their best efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and

Whereas, The agreement reaffirmed the goal of limiting global temperature increase well below 2 degrees Celsius, while urging further efforts to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and

Whereas, The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has concluded that the rising global temperature is very likely due to a corresponding increase in the levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere produced by human activity and is causing, Earth's climate to change; and

Whereas, The climate change caused by rising global temperatures will likely: increase the frequency, severity, and duration of heat waves, creating a greater risk for heat-related illnesses and deaths, specially among the elderly, very young, disabled, and poor; increase the intensity of hurricanes creating stronger peak winds and increased rainfall, increase the risk of flooding within storm-affected areas and increase the risk of drought in areas located outside storm tracks; and continue to decrease the size of polar ice sheets and land-based glaciers, causing sea levels to rise and contribute to enhanced coastal erosion, coastal flooding, and the loss of coastal wetlands; and

Whereas, Under the Paris Agreement, every participating country agreed to submit an individual plan to tackle its greenhouse gas emissions and to report regularly on its emissions and progress made in implementing and achieving its nationally determined contributions; and

Whereas, President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from this landmark agreement will seriously weaken global efforts to avoid drastic climate change; and

Whereas, Given the devastating effects of raising global temperatures, it is critical that this country remain in the Paris Climate Accord in order to globally reduce carbon emissions, slow rising global temperatures, and help countries deal with the effects of climate change; Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

1. This House condemns President Trump's decision to withdraw the United States from the Paris Climate Accord.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice-President of the United States, every member of Congress elected from this State, the Governor of New Jersey, and the Commissioner of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.

POM-116. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Colorado concerning ensuring access to reproductive health care; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 17-1005

Whereas, Colorado has always been committed to a quality health care system and to creating policies that meet the health

needs of women and families, including affordable reproductive health services; and

Whereas, Colorado was the first state to allow safe, legal abortion on a bipartisan basis in 1967; and

Whereas, The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists has stated that "[s]afe, legal abortion is a necessary component of women's health care", and health providers and associations affirm that good access to reproductive health care deeply and positively impacts women's lives and futures; and

Whereas, Reproductive health care is both safe and common. More than 90% of women have used contraception, about three in ten women will have an abortion in her lifetime, and more than half of women will have a child at some point in their lives.

Whereas, People may disagree with the decision to seek an abortion, but it is a decision that each person should make for themselves with the counsel of their health providers, their families, and their faiths; and

Whereas, Rates of maternal mortality are decreasing around the world, but increasing in the United States for women of color who face an alarming and disparate rate of pregnancy complications and maternal mortality; and

Whereas, Restrictions on the availability of reproductive health care and limits on health coverage, such as policies denying insurance coverage for reproductive health services, have a disparate impact on low-income women and women of color and their families; and

Whereas, Obstacles to obtaining the best method of contraception for each person's unique health and life circumstances remain a barrier to many; and

Whereas, Low-income women and women of color face a higher rate of unintended pregnancy, so ensuring access to contraception is a critical part of helping to address health disparities in marginalized communities; and

Whereas, An inability or difficulty to conceive is not only emotionally difficult for people looking to start a family but can be prohibitively expensive, so we must do more to help people seeking to build their families, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity; and

Whereas, There is a continued need to address inequities in health care access and ensure culturally and linguistically appropriate training of health providers; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-first General Assembly of the State of Colorado: That we, the members of the Colorado House of Representatives, find that:*

(1) Colorado continues to be a state where all individuals' health remains a top priority, and Coloradans resist attempts to undermine the right to access reproductive health care;

(2) Access to comprehensive and affordable reproductive health care is critical to ensure that people have the information and services to prevent unintended pregnancies, the support to have healthy pregnancies and become parents when they are ready, and the ability to raise their children in a safe and healthy environment and to be able to care for their families with dignity;

(3) State, county, and city health departments shall promote policies to ensure access to a full range of reproductive health care, including abortion, and eliminate disparities that prevent low-income women and women of color from seeking safe, high-quality care;

(4) Both public and private health insurance should cover the full range of reproductive health care, including abortion;

(5) Facilities and professionals providing reproductive health services shall not be subjected to regulations that do not have a medical benefit and that are more burdensome than those imposed on other facilities or health care professionals that provide medically comparable procedures. Provision of services should be based on the best medical practices as developed by medical experts and supported by medical evidence.

(6) All qualified health care professionals shall be able to provide the full range of reproductive health care, including abortion, and have access to appropriate medical training. Be it further

*Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to President Donald J. Trump; Vice President Mike Pence; Paul Ryan, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; Orrin Hatch, President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate; Governor John W. Hickenlooper; Dr. Larry Wolk, Executive Director, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment; and the members of Colorado's Congressional Delegation.*

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 825. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Southeast Alaska Regional Health Consortium located in Sitka, Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-173).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1116. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities (Rept. No. 115-174).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 1285. A bill to allow the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians of Oregon, the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, and the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. No. 115-175).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 832. A bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1965. A bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to protect the cultural practices and livelihoods of producers of Alaska Native handicrafts and traditional mammoth ivory products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to modify the regional conservation partnership program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1967. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide additional exemptions to the individual mandate, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1968. A bill to direct the National Science Foundation to award grants to encourage young girls to participate in computer science and other STEM activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to create a program to provide funding for organizations that support startup businesses in formation and early growth stages by providing entrepreneurs with resources and services to produce viable businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1970. A bill to establish a public health plan; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1971. A bill to provide air carriers with access to information about applicants to be pilots from the National Driver Register, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1972. A bill to improve the monitoring and reporting of propane stocks and days of supply by the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration with regard to propane export volumes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1973. A bill to provide for Federal research grant reform; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1974. A bill to require transparency in the tax code by requiring federally funded tax credits to be disclosed in the USASpending.gov website; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1975. A bill to designate additions to the Rich Hole Wilderness and the Rough Mountain Wilderness of the George Washington National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1976. A bill to allow all individuals purchasing health insurance in the individual market the option to purchase a lower premium copper plan; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Con. Res. 27. A concurrent resolution setting forth 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; to the Committee on the Budget.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 21

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

S. 200

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 200, a bill to prohibit the conduct of a first-use nuclear strike absent a declaration of war by Congress.

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 640, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in biomedical research.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma

(Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 835

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 835, a bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics.

S. 876

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 937

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 937, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in pre-kindergarten through higher education.

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to

support such centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1042

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1042, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to exclude Segal Americorps Education Awards and related awards from income.

S. 1110

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1110, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for private lactation areas in the terminals of large and medium hub airports, and for other purposes.

S. 1135

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1151

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1151, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a nonrefundable credit for working family caregivers.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with an option to provide medical assistance to individuals between the ages of 22 and 64 for inpatient services to treat substance use disorders at certain facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1224

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1224, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a Community Resilience Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1403

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in national service positions to conserve, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1480

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1480, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include biomass heating appliances for tax credits available for energy-efficient building property and energy property.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1693

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1693, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify that section 230 of that Act does not prohibit the enforcement against providers and users of interactive computer services of Federal and State criminal and civil law relating to sex trafficking.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, *supra*.

S. 1754

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1754, a bill to reauthorize section 340H of the Public Health Service Act to continue to encourage the expansion, maintenance, and establishment of approved graduate medical residency programs at qualified teaching health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1782

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1782, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1787

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1787, a bill to reauthorize the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to extend the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program.

S. 1857

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1857, a bill to establish a compliance deadline of May 15, 2023, for Step 2 emissions standards for new residential wood heaters, new residential hydronic heaters, and forced-air furnaces.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1893, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to specify when bank holding companies may be subject to certain enhanced supervision, and for other purposes.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 1901

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1901, a bill to require global economic and political pressure to support diplomatic denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, including through the imposition of sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and to reauthorize the North Korean Human Rights Act of 2004, and for other purposes.



S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. McCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1960, a bill to repeal the amendments made to the Controlled Substances Act by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016.

S.J. RES. 2

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 2, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 61

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 61, a resolution calling on the Department of Defense, other elements of the Federal Government, and foreign governments to intensify efforts to investigate, recover, and identify all missing and unaccounted-for personnel of the United States.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

S. RES. 285

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 285, a resolution honoring the life and achievements of Dr. Samuel DuBois Cook.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTION DURING ADJOURNMENT

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 25—SETTING FORTH 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

Mr. ENZI from the Committee on the Budget; submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:

S. CON. RES. 25

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

##### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.  
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.  
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.  
Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.  
Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.  
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.  
Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.  
Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.  
Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.  
Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.  
Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.  
Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.  
Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.  
Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.  
Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.  
Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.  
Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.  
Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.  
Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.  
Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.

Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.

Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

#### TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

##### Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.  
Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.  
Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.  
Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.  
Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.  
Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.  
Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.  
Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.  
Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.  
Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.  
Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.  
Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.  
Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

##### Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.  
Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.  
Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.  
Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.  
Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.  
Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

#### SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: −\$167,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: −\$169,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: −\$166,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: −\$165,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: −\$166,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: −\$167,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: −\$169,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: −\$172,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: −\$146,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: —\$145,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,136,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,131,688,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,233,119,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,579,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$640,752,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$619,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$555,198,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,278,691,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$22,063,363,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$22,760,763,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,595,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$16,281,015,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$16,933,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

#### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, —\$762,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,4



Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$4,060,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$646,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,364,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,715,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,254,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$14,163,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,648,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$16,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$17,747,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,228,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,133,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,816,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,990,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$68,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$51,055,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$133,357,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$96,088,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$145,919,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$130,658,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$176,695,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$166,918,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$218,460,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$209,169,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$247,892,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$238,885,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$276,275,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$266,915,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$307,701,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$297,489,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$366,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$356,035,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$415,402,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$404,286,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$95,229,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$95,229,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,401,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$93,401,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$95,479,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$95,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,956,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$98,956,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$101,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$102,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$102,309,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$111,119,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$111,119,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$124,766,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$124,766,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$128,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$128,332,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$141,303,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$141,303,000,000.  
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

##### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

#### **SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.**

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

#### **TITLE II—RECONCILIATION**

##### **SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.**—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) **COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.**—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) **SUBMISSIONS.**—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving

such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

##### **SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) **COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.**—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) **COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.**—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) **SUBMISSIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

#### **TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

##### **SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

##### **SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

- (1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;
- (2) lowering taxes on families with children; or
- (3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

##### **SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between

the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) **DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.**—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

##### **SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

##### **SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;
- (2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;
- (3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;
- (4) making it easier to save for retirement;
- (5) reforming the American public housing system;
- (6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or
- (7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

##### **SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);
- (2) ensuring State flexibility in education;
- (3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
- (2) military technological superiority;
- (3) structural defense reforms; or
- (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
  - (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;
  - (3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;
  - (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or
  - (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
  - (2) ending human trafficking; or
  - (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;
- (2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or
- (3) enhancing job creation,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts iden-

tified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

**SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

**SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.**—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

**SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

**SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

- (A) the period of the current fiscal year;
- (B) the period of the budget year;
- (C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or
- (D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) **DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

- (A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or
- (B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or

revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

**SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—



(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) BUDGETARY EFFECTS.—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) TIMING SHIFTS.—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

#### SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.

If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

#### SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

#### SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct

spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

#### SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

#### Subtitle B—Other Provisions

#### SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High

Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

**SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

**SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

**SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

**SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those

rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

**STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS**

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1974. A bill to require transparency in the tax code by requiring federally funded tax credits to be disclosed in the USASpending.gov website; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the much needed topic of tax reform. The high rates and complicated nature of the current Tax Code are burdening individual taxpayers and making businesses less competitive in the global market. That simply has to change. It has been more than 30 years since we have passed major tax reform, and we are well past time.

Unfortunately, I recently learned of a serious threat to reforming the Tax Code called alpacas. Now, what do these cute, mild-mannered pets have to do with Federal tax policy? Earlier this year, I issued an oversight report entitled "Tax Rackets: Outlandish Loopholes to Lower Tax Liabilities." That report demonstrated how clever accounting allows nearly anything imaginable to become a writeoff, including alpacas.

To illustrate the point, the report outlined how local and Federal tax bills can be sheared by claiming exotic pets—these exotic pets—as livestock and turning backyards into barnyards. That is when the fur really started to fly.

Alpaca owners associations that once brazenly touted this tax fleece as a key selling point for the animals now feigned outrage at the suggestion. The association tried to pull the wool over the eyes of taxpayers by retaining a professional PR consultant. They launched a media campaign, inundating my office and others with phone calls, social media messages, and letters with photos of alpacas.

Through slick reporting and aggressive lobbying, tax-subsidized alpaca ownership was somehow presented as a bulwark of small business and a flourishing middle class. If this mere mention of a tax break costing \$10 million annually and enjoyed by relatively few taxpayers elicited such an outmeasured and aggressive response, imagine the backlash we will face when we are attempting to actually eliminate tax preferences benefiting powerful corporations and special interests to the tune of billions of dollars.

There are over 200 loopholes buried throughout the Tax Code that collectively cost \$123 trillion annually. Again, there are over 200 loopholes buried throughout the Tax Code that collectively cost \$1.23 trillion annually. This exceeds the total amount spent annually by the Federal Government for all discretionary programs, which includes defense, education, transportation, foreign aid, and protecting the environment.

These exemptions increase the bill for the average taxpayer. They also make the Tax Code so complicated that most individuals have to hire a tax professional or buy software to help complete their tax returns.

At more than 74,000 pages in length, no one—not even those in Washington who write the laws or enforce them—truly understands Federal tax law. Special interests are taking advantage of this confusion by hiring armies of accountants and Washington lobbyists to dodge taxes and cash in on the complexity of the code. For example, developers are claiming—these are a lot of homebuilders are claiming \$8 billion in tax credits every year supposedly to construct low-income housing, but with fewer homes being built and no basic accountability requirements, it is nearly impossible to track how this money is being spent.

The Government Accountability Office, the GAO, which is investigating, said the "IRS and no one else in the federal government really has an idea of what is going on."

The same is true with hundreds of other tax loopholes. A luxury yacht can qualify as a second home and can be eligible for a mortgage interest deduction. Alaskan ship captains can expense costs for whaling as charitable contributions, even though no money goes to charity and whaling is typically illegal otherwise. High rollers can itemize the cost of gambling trips, including entertainment. Even the cost of losing lottery tickets can be deducted, a kind of scratch-off writeoff.

Only the IRS knows who is taking advantage of these loopholes, and the agency often cannot verify whether those claiming the tax giveaways are eligible. In order to achieve meaningful tax reform that makes the code simpler and fairer, we have to be able to first evaluate who is benefiting from these loopholes, for what purpose, and for what price.

That is why I am introducing the Tax Expenditures Accountability Act, which will publicly disclose the names of the corporate and special interests receiving tax credits and the costs of these tax credits. This bill requires the Department of Treasury to disclose the special interest receiving tax credits just as all other Federal expenditures are currently disclosed on the public website USASpending.gov. Sunlight is obviously the best disinfectant, and I look forward to exposing many of these loopholes, eliminating them, and returning the savings to individual taxpayers in the form of lower taxes.

As the alpaca lobby demonstrated, riding herd on tax breaks will cause every special interest benefiting from the code's complexity and unfairness to cry foul. Washington's powerful special interests will mobilize and threaten to derail tax reform. Many would rather protect these loopholes than allow taxpayers to keep more of their own paycheck.

Coming up short on reform is not an option. We have to do it this year. Individuals and businesses are suffering under a broken, antiquated tax code that is in dire need of fixing. We can't be deterred in efforts to achieve real reform that reduces the tax bill for everyone.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 975. A bill to designate additions to the Rich Hole Wilderness and the Rough Mountain Wilderness of the George Washington National Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, this bill authorizes additions to two existing wilderness areas within the George Washington National Forest in Virginia; the Rich Hole and Rough Mountain Wilderness Areas. It's a relatively simple bill, and it provides only a small window into the volume of work done by Virginians to manage a vast swath of Federal land in this region collaboratively and responsibly.

America's Federal lands are some of our most precious assets. We may hike or bike them; derive energy, minerals, or goods from them; or sometimes just leave them to nature. There is a long history of conflict among stakeholders who disagree on which Federal lands are best suited to which purposes.

Many years ago, forest users with different views and interests formed the George Washington National Forest Stakeholder Collaborative. Through hard work and consensus, the Collaborative agreed upon a number of recommendations for forest management and protection. Everyone got some of what they wanted and gave some ground. Preservation advocates consented to timber harvest and other active forest restoration and management in certain areas. The forest products industry consented to wilderness and lightly-managed areas elsewhere. The U.S. Forest Service's 2014 revised GW Forest Management Plan reflected many of these agreements.

Subsequently, the Forest Service convened the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project, bringing more stakeholders to the table, earlier in the process, to negotiate out how to manage this particular part of the Forest, located in the lower portion of the Cowpasture River watershed, in ways that work for everyone. Within this process, further compromises were made to achieve a mutually satisfactory project that could gather broad support. All members of the Stakeholder Collaborative now support the wilderness additions identified in this bill.

I am proud to partner on this with my colleague Senator MARK WARNER, and we are following in the path blazed by Senator John Warner and Representative Rick Boucher, who were instrumental in passing the original Virginia Wilderness Act in 1984.

Taking care of our Nation's outdoor resources is good for our economy and good for our environment. Land disputes may sometimes be difficult, but the example of the GW Forest Stakeholder Collaborative proves they don't have to be. When everyone comes to the table and invests the necessary time, we can find common ground. I hope this will be a lesson for us in other tough policy challenges, and I encourage the Senate to support this bill.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 27—SETTING FORTH 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

Mr. PAUL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Budget:

S. CON. RES. 27

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

##### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

##### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.

Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.

Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.

Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.

Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.

Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.

Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.

Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.

Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.

Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.

Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.

Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.

Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.

Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.

Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.

Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.

Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.

Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.

Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

#### TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

##### Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.

Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.

Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.

Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.

Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.

Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.

Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.

Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.

Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.

Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.

Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.

Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.

Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

##### Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.

Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.

Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.

Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.

Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.

Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

# TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

## Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

### SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: –\$167,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: –\$169,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: –\$166,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: –\$165,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: –\$166,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: –\$167,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: –\$169,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: –\$172,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: –\$146,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: –\$145,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,093,721,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,095,740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,266,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,493,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$605,492,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$612,986,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$554,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,243,431,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$22,056,913,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,759,903,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,560,034,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,274,565,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$16,932,521,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, –\$762,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

## (6) Agriculture (350):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.

## (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$4,060,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$646,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$2,364,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$2,715,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$3,254,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$14,163,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$4,648,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$16,202,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$4,817,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$17,747,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$6,228,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$19,133,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, — \$6,816,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, — \$19,990,000,000.

## (8) Transportation (400):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.

- (9) Community and Regional Development (450):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.

- (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.

## (11) Health (550):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.

## (12) Medicare (570):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.

## (13) Income Security (600):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.

## (14) Social Security (650):

## Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,1

(A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$111,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$86,315,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$133,357,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$102,538,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$145,919,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$131,518,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,695,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$166,918,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$218,460,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$209,169,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$247,892,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$238,885,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$276,275,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$266,915,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$307,701,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$297,489,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$366,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$356,035,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$415,402,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$404,286,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$95,229,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$95,229,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$93,401,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,401,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$95,479,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$95,479,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$98,956,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$98,956,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$101,293,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$101,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$102,309,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$111,119,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$111,119,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$124,766,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$124,766,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$128,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$128,332,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$141,303,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$141,303,000,000.  
(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$0.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

##### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:



Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) **SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

#### **SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.**

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

### **TITLE II—RECONCILIATION**

#### **SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.**—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) **COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.**—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) **SUBMISSIONS.**—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

#### **SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) **COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.**—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) **COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.**—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) **SUBMISSIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

### **TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

#### **SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

#### **SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

#### **SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) **DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.**—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

#### **SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

#### **SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;

(2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;

(3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;

(4) making it easier to save for retirement;  
(5) reforming the American public housing system;

(6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or

(7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(2) ensuring State flexibility in education;

(3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) the Farm Bill;

(2) American energy policies;

(3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;

(4) North American energy development;

(5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;

(6) the Federal Aviation Administration;

(7) the National Flood Insurance Program;

(8) State mineral royalty revenues; or

(9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legis-

lation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;

(2) military technological superiority;

(3) structural defense reforms; or

(4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;

(3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;

(4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or

(5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) securing the border of the United States;

(2) ending human trafficking; or

(3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;

(2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or

(3) enhancing job creation, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills,

joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills,

joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

**SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

**SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted,

would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(C) **REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.**—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

**SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or

an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

**SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

- (A) the period of the current fiscal year;
- (B) the period of the budget year;
- (C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or
- (D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) **DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emer-

gency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

**SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

#### **SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.**

If a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### **SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.**

If a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation

called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### **SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.**

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

#### **SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.**

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

#### **SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.**

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) **CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) **INAPPLICABILITY.**—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

#### **SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.**

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

#### Subtitle B—Other Provisions

##### SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

##### SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

##### SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or pe-

riod of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

##### SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

##### SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

##### SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1116. Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to the 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.

SA 1117. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1118. Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1119. Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1120. Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1121. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1122. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1123. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1124. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1125. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1126. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1127. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1128. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1129. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1130. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1131. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1132. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1133. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1134. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1135. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1136. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1137. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1138. Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1139. Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. Kaine, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1140. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.



SA 1141. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1142. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1143. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1144. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1145. Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1146. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1147. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1148. Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 71, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 1116.** Mr. ENZI proposed an amendment to the 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; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### **SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.**

(a) **DECLARATION.**—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

#### **TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

##### **Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses**

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

##### **Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate**

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.  
Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### **TITLE II—RECONCILIATION**

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.  
Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### **TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS**

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.  
Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.  
Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.  
Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.  
Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.  
Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.  
Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.  
Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.  
Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.  
Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.  
Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.  
Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.  
Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.  
Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.  
Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.  
Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.  
Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.  
Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.  
Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.  
Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

#### **TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

##### **Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.  
Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.  
Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.  
Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.  
Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.  
Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.  
Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.  
Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.

Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.  
Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.  
Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.  
Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.  
Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

##### **Subtitle B—Other Provisions**

Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.  
Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.  
Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.  
Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.  
Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.  
Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

#### **TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

##### **Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses**

#### **SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: −\$167,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: −\$169,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: −\$166,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: −\$165,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: −\$166,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: −\$167,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: −\$169,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: −\$172,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: −\$146,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: −\$145,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,136,721,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,131,688,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,233,119,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,579,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$640,752,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$619,436,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$555,198,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,278,691,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$22,063,363,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,760,763,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,933,191,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,595,294,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$16,281,015,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,933,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

#### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, —\$762,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$4,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,364,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$3,254,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$14,163,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,648,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$16,202,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$4,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$17,747,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,228,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,133,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$6,816,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,990,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.  
(13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.  
(14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$68,576,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$51,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$133,357,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$96,088,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$145,919,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$130,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$176,695,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$166,918,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$218,460,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$209,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$247,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$238,885,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$276,275,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$266,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$307,701,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$297,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$366,270,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$356,035,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$415,402,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$404,286,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$95,229,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$95,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$93,401,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$93,401,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$95,479,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$95,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$98,956,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$98,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$101,293,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$101,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$102,309,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$102,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$111,119,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$111,119,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$124,766,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$124,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$128,332,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$128,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$141,303,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$141,303,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.  
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

#### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

#### SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal

Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

## TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

### SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

### SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

## TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

### SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

### SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over ei-

ther the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;

(2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;

(3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;

(4) making it easier to save for retirement;

(5) reforming the American public housing system;

(6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or

(7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

(1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);

(2) ensuring State flexibility in education;

(3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;

(4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;

(5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or

(6) child nutrition programs,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
  - (2) military technological superiority;
  - (3) structural defense reforms; or
  - (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,
- by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
- (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;

(3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;

(4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or

(5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
- (2) ending human trafficking; or
- (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;
- (2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or
- (3) enhancing job creation,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the alloca-

tions of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICARE AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills,



joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(e) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

**SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “CHIMP” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (b).

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11

(114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

**SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(3) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to paragraph (1), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(4) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—In the Senate, this subsection may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(5) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this subsection, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

**SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal year 2018 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

**SEC. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending

or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

(A) the period of the current fiscal year;

(B) the period of the budget year;

(C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or

(D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) **DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

(A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or

(B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concur-

rent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

**SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

**SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.**

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)),

such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending and may revise the aggregates and other appropriate levels in this resolution and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger in the amounts necessary to accommodate the decrease in direct spending.

(b) DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

#### SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

#### SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revis-

ing allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

#### SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

#### Subtitle B—Other Provisions

#### SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

#### SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the

Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

**SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

**SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

**SA 1117.** Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 \_\_\_\_ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD REPEAL TAX INCENTIVES FOR RETIREMENT SAVINGS.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would repeal Federal tax incentives for retirement savings.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1118.** Mr. Kaine submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 83, line 13, strike “Sections 3205 and” and insert “Section”.

On page 83, line 15, strike “are” and insert “is”.

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4114. PROHIBITION ON AGREEING TO CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO LEGISLATION WITHOUT A SCORE IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to vote on the adoption of a covered amendment to a bill or resolution that requires an estimate under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), unless an estimate described in such section 402 for the covered amendment was made publicly available on the website of the Congressional Budget Office not later than 28 hours before the time the vote commences.

(b) **COVERED AMENDMENT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered amendment” means an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

(c) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(1) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) **APPEAL.**—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1119.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. STABENOW) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 1, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 2, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 3, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 12 decrease the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, decrease the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 4, line 19, decrease the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 4, line 20, decrease the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 4, line 21, decrease the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 3, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 4, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 5, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 6, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 5, line 13, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 5, line 14, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 5, line 21, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 5, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 24, line 11, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 12, increase the amount by \$20,557,000,000.

On page 24, line 15, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by \$36,830,000,000.

On page 24, line 19, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by \$55,406,000,000.

On page 24, line 23, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by \$77,864,000,000.

On page 25, line 2, increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 25, line 3 increase the amount by \$95,078,000,000.

On page 25, line 6, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by \$109,914,000,000.

On page 25, line 10, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 25, line 11, increase the amount by \$135,221,000,000.

On page 25, line 14, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 25, line 15, increase the amount by \$156,504,000,000.

On page 25, line 18, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 25, line 19, increase the amount by \$175,071,000,000.

On page 25, line 22, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

On page 25, line 23, increase the amount by \$193,849,000,000.

**SA 1120.** Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY LEGISLATION THAT PROVIDES A TAX CUT FOR THE TOP 1 PERCENT OF THE WEALTHIEST INDIVIDUALS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides a tax cut to the top 1 percent of individuals.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1121.** Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BENNET) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT WITH TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY WITHOUT ALSO REPEALING THE DEBT CEILING.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would increase the Federal deficit by lowering taxes on the wealthiest taxpayers without also repealing the debt ceiling.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1122.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPROVING ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN AND PREGNANT WOMEN UNDER MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving oral health care for children and pregnant women under Medicaid by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1123.** Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION REDUCING ACCESS TO, OR AFFORDABILITY OF, ORAL HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would pay for tax breaks for the wealthy by reducing access to, or affordability of, oral health care for children provided through Medicaid.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1124.** Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST REDUCING ACCESS TO OR AFFORDABILITY OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR MINORITY AND DISENFRANCHISED POPULATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would reduce access to or affordability of health care services for minority and disenfranchised populations of the United States, including American Indians and Alaskan Natives, Asian Americans, African Americans, Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders, by cutting Medicaid and Medicare to offset tax breaks for the wealthy.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(1) reduce access to or affordability of healthcare services for minority and disenfranchised populations of the United States

**SA 1125.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE THE MEDICARE PROGRAM OR TURN IT INTO A VOUCHER SYSTEM.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would privatize the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or turn the program into a voucher system.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1126.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHY BEFORE PROVIDING FULL HURRICANE RECOVERY FUNDING.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that lowers taxes for the wealthiest Americans without ensuring that full recovery funding is provided to Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other areas affected by recent hurricanes.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1127.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING INCENTIVES FOR MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES TO HAVE AND MAINTAIN AN ADVANCE CARE PLAN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting incentives for Medicare beneficiaries to have and maintain an advance care plan by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1128.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING ACCESSIBILITY TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION FOR LOW-INCOME STUDENTS AND PROMOTING HIGHER GRADUATION RATES AT ALL 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregate,

and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting accessibility to postsecondary education for low-income students and promoting higher graduation rates at all 4-year institutions of higher education, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1129.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle B of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4. SENSE OF THE SENATE OPPOSING THE HARMFUL CUTS TO THE MEDICARE PROGRAM.**

It is the sense of the Senate that the Senate opposes the harmful cuts to the Medicare program under this resolution.

**SA 1130.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROMOTING THE USE OF COLLEGE SAVINGS ACCOUNTS WHILE STUDENTS ARE IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to promoting the use of college savings accounts while students are in elementary school and secondary school, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1131.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING SUFFICIENT RESOURCES FOR THE DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO RESPOND TO NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient resources for the diplomacy and development professionals at the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to respond to national security threats by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1132.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CUTS TO MEDICAID OR MEDICARE.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cut Medicaid, Medicare, or both to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1133.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT ELIMINATES OR DECREASES THE VALUE OF THE NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT OR THE LOW-INCOME HOUSING CREDIT.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would eliminate, decrease the value of, or decrease the available amount of new markets tax credits or low-income housing credits.



(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1134.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROVIDE FOR FUNDING TO IMPROVE VOTER REGISTRATION AND THE VOTING EXPERIENCE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing sufficient funding to improve voter registration and the voting experience in Federal elections by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1135.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE EXPANSION OF ACCESS TO THE INCOME TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES OF SMALL EMPLOYERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the expansion of access to the income tax credit for employee health insurance expenses of small employers by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1136.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION, GENDER IDENTITY, SOURCE OF INCOME, MARITAL STATUS, MILITARY OR VETERAN STATUS, RACE, COLOR, RELIGION, SEX, HANDICAP, FAMILIAL STATUS, OR NATIONAL ORIGIN IN HOUSING.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting efforts to eliminate discrimination based on sexual orientation, gender identity, source of income, marital status, military or veteran status, race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin in housing by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1137.** Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ENSURING THAT CHANGES TO VOTING LAWS AT THE STATE AND LOCAL LEVEL DO NOT DISPROPORTIONATELY BURDEN THE RIGHT OF RACIAL AND LANGUAGE MINORITIES TO VOTE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to ensuring that changes to voting laws at the State and local level do not disproportionately burden the right of racial and language minorities to vote, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1138.** Mr. WARNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, line 8, strike “, and” and all that follows through “ledger,” on line 9.

Beginning on page 50, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 51, line 3.

**SA 1139.** Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. KING, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41. SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION THAT WOULD INCREASE THE DEFICIT OR REDUCE A SURPLUS.**

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any reconciliation bill, resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, motion, or conference report pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 641) that would cause or increase a deficit or reduce a surplus in either of the following periods:

(1) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year.

(2) The period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(b) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.—

(1) WAIVER.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(2) APPEAL.—An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(c) DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of deficit increases and reductions in a surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SA 1140.** Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REPEALING THE ENSURING PATIENT ACCESS AND EFFECTIVE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2016 TO ENSURE THAT THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION HAS THE TOOLS NEEDED TO COMBAT THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to restoring the ability of the Drug Enforcement Administration to enforce our Nation's laws and help stop the opioid epidemic, which may include repealing the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2016, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1141.** Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1142.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 4 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX REFORM BILL THAT DOES NOT EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that provides for changes to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 without expanding and improving the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit by increasing the size of the credit, increasing the maximum of expenses eligible for the credit, and making the credit refundable.

(b) **WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling

of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

**SA 1143.** Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO REDUCING TAX COMPLEXITY FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reducing tax complexity for small businesses by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1144.** Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICAID CARE AND MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1145.** Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO INCREASING FUNDING FOR DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR WASTE CLEANUP.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to Federal investments in the Office of Environmental Management of the Department of Energy, which may include measures to meet the Federal Government's legacy responsibilities for cleanup of liquid radioactive waste, spent nuclear fuel and nuclear materials, transuranic and mixed or low-level waste, or contaminated soil and water, and which may also include measures to deactivate, decontaminate, and decommission excess facilities at 16 sites created by the Manhattan Project or Cold War programs, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1146.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

**SEC. 3 . . . DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include lowering taxes on families with children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SA 1147.** Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title IV, add the following:

**SEC. 41 . . . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ENDING MEDICARE AS WE KNOW IT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that eliminates the guaranteed health

insurance benefits for seniors and people with disabilities under the Medicare program, increases costs for seniors and people with disabilities by establishing a Medicare voucher or premium support plan that provides limited payments to Medicare beneficiaries to purchase health care in the private health insurance market, or weakens the traditional Medicare program by diverting the healthiest enrollees into private plans and undermining traditional Medicare's ability to control costs while offering access to a broad range of providers, and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

**SA 1148.** Mr. VAN HOLLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1116 proposed by Mr. ENZI to the 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; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 60, line 8, after “provided that” insert “any increase in the amount of the limit for the revised security category is accompanied by a commensurate increase in the amount for the revised nonsecurity category, and provided that”.

On page 82, line 2, after “ure” insert “, provided that any increase in the amount of the limit for the revised security category is accompanied by a commensurate increase in the amount for the revised nonsecurity category”.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “Consumer Data Security and the Credit Bureaus.”

#### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room SD-430 to conduct a hearing entitled “The Cost of Prescription Drugs: How the Drug Delivery System Affects What Patients Pay, Part II”.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Gregory G. Katsas, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit, Jeffrey Uhlman Beaverstock, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama, Emily Coody Marks, and Brett Joseph Talley, both to be a United States District Judge for the Middle District of Alabama, and Holly Lou Teeter, to be United States District Judge for the District of Kansas.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, October 17, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-216 to hold a hearing entitled “Open Hearing on the Nomination

of Christopher Sharpley to be the Inspector General of the Central Intelligence Agency.”

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following staff members from my staff and from Senator SANDERS' staff be given all-access floor passes for consideration of the budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71: Eric Ueland, Paul Vinovich, Landon Stropko, Tom Bork, Mike Jones, Joshua Smith, Alexander Beaton, and Jill Harrelson; and that the following staff members be given floor privileges for the remainder of the debate on the measure: Natalie Rico, Catherine Konieczny, Jake Whitaker, and Max Pfeiffer.

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

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 18, 2017

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, October 18; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H. Con. Res. 71.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:04 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 18, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 17, 2017:

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID JOEL TRACHTENBERG, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.