

get at the real issues and put political issues aside.

If we give DACA recipients a path for legal status without a real investment in border security and a wall, we are going to further incentivize a new wave of illegal immigration.

By the way, the President has said this publicly. It is not necessarily a 2,000-mile wall, but it is a system of constraints where we know that we can protect our southern borders. It is not just an immigration issue; it is a national security issue, as has been demonstrated by two acts of terror just in recent months. The plans I heard last night don't even address that seriously. A \$1.8 billion allocation is not a serious attempt at that. The Dream Act—the estimated cost back in 2013 for doing that was \$26 billion. Today, who knows what that estimate would be. It has to be greater than that.

The second criteria in this was that if we are going to solve the DACA problem and eliminate the things that created this issue going forward, we have to deal with how to protect the family of the immigrant, the primary worker. We must protect the immediate family of the person who is sponsored and comes in as a citizen. But I believe there is a great deal of confusion about that. This is the so-called chain migration. There is nothing derogatory about that term. That was a term used by the Gang of 8 in 2013. The Democratic leader and the whip of the Democrats right now all used that term repeatedly. There was nothing derogatory and there is certainly nothing prejudicial about that term; it was a mere description of what happens in the current law.

The current law says this: The person sponsored for citizenship comes in as a legal permanent resident, moves through a period of time, and becomes a citizen. If they apply, they become a citizen. After that process, as a citizen, they can then sponsor their spouse, their immediate minor children, their family, their adult married children, their adult unmarried children, their parents, and their siblings. The only thing we are talking about is limiting that to the primary worker and their immediate family, and that would break the so-called chain as described by our Members across the aisle.

Let's be very clear. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe that immigration should be limited to the individual worker, their spouse, and their immediate family. Again, the only difference between that ethos and what we have today are the parents and the siblings.

Somebody says: Well, I want to protect the family.

Well, so do we. But whose family? The family of the sponsored worker or their parents' family or their parents' parents' family or their parents' parents' siblings' family? Which family? I believe the American people have spoken loud and clear about which family.

There is a significant portion who believe it should just be the worker, but

that is not our position. We believe we need to protect the family of that immediate worker.

There are some of us who are trying to get to a merit-based immigration system like Canada and Australia have been using for decades and they have proven works. It helps their society, builds their economy, and opens their doors with a welcoming hand for those who want to come. Canada is no bastion of conservatism in its immigration policy. Yet it has a merit-based immigration system.

Now, we are not proposing that. We are happy to wait for phase two, which the President talked about last week. Many people on the other side have absolutely discredited his words and confused them knowingly. What the President is talking about right now is, focus on this legal immigration system, solve DACA, solve the border crisis, eliminate the chain migration issue, and eliminate the diversity visa lottery. It is just that simple.

The diversity visa lottery is the last thing in his scope, and it is so easy. We all know that needs to be eliminated. The issue comes up in their bill that they want to reallocate the 50,000 people who are coming in today. We know that the diversity visa lottery is fraught with fraud. We know that it has been related to at least one act of terrorism, and it needs to be eliminated. How to do it is the question. Well, let's talk about that.

There is no reason why that can't be negotiated. But the Graham-Durbin bill, if it is ever offered, ensures that we will be right back here in a few short years. What we want is to have a solution on the DACA side and protect America from repeating this mistake again and again and again.

Let me be very clear. If we do what is on the table today in the Graham-Durbin bill, it would allow the parents of DACA recipients legal status. This would ignite future waves of parents entering the United States, putting their children at risk as they come across the border illegally. Thank God most of us have never had to deal with that. Imagine putting your children at risk coming across the border illegally. But then their children will eventually be given legal status, according to this bill and precedent, and then they will be able to sponsor their parents, who broke the law in the first place. Then here we go, reigniting another wave. So we have not done anything to prevent being right back here just a few short years from now.

I believe it is time for action. My colleagues last night talked about, well, nobody is offering up any other solution. Well, that is just not true. There are three Republican Senate bills right now that relate to this issue, active bills that have been filed, and they are out there. The language is out there. You can read them. There is one bill in the House. Chairman GOODLATTE was there in committee and brought out a bill. So it is just not true that we don't

have things to talk about on the Republican side on this issue. What is missing in this process is a good-faith effort to negotiate the details of a deal and make it happen.

To try to make an end run on that process is not going to work. I don't believe it, and I don't think the American people want it. What they want is to solve DACA and ensure that we are not doing it again in just a few short years. This means that we need a real investment in border security. We need to put a focus on the immediate family of the sponsored new U.S. citizen, the family of the incoming immigrant, and we need to end this archaic, outdated diversity visa lottery.

The solutions are here. I might not be 100 percent happy, they might not be 100 percent happy, but I promise you that in my experience, this situation is closer to a deal, a negotiated deal right now because both sides really want to see an end to the situation where there is a question about the DACA recipients. But we want to make sure we are not back here in 5 years or even sooner dealing with the same problem again. That is the lesson we should have learned from 1986 and 1991.

It is an honor to be in this body, but it is time for action. It is time to get to point B. We know we have been trying for over a decade with many Members of this body who are well-intended. I, for one, am ready to negotiate. The President is ready to negotiate. Let's get together and make this happen. It is time for action. The American people demand it. But let's please don't tie this solution to the funding of the Federal Government. That is totally irresponsible. Our men and women in uniform deserve better.

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

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

FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats here in the Senate have really raised obstruction to an art form in this Congress. The Presidential nominees—they have obstructed and obstructed some more, even when they ultimately planned to support the nominee. We have had many nominees who have come to the floor who have been objected to and had to go through the long postcloture process, only to get to the end of it and have those nominees be voted out in many cases unanimously. I have seen that happen in the committee that I chair, the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. We have nominees over here who are noncontroversial who are being held up by the Democrats. Many of them are in important

positions in our government. The FRA—Federal Railroad Administrator—is a key safety position in the administration who is being held up by the Democrats even though he is supremely qualified for the job and I think will have a huge bipartisan vote here in the Senate, were it to occur.

We have seen this consistent pattern of obstruction when it comes to nominees and giving the President an opportunity to fill his administration with the positions that are key to not only his getting his agenda done but the American people seeing their government function in a way that represents their interests.

Tax reform. Well, Democrats absolutely refused to work with Republicans on a bill. They fought hard against passage despite the fact that the Democrats have previously called for reform and supported many of the very proposals that were included in the law.

Now, of course, the Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program—a program they claim to support—because they are not happy that they are not getting an immigration bill that they want this week. That is right, Mr. President—Democrats are threatening to shut down the government and block funding for health insurance for 9 million low-income children because they are not getting the bill they want when they want it.

Members on both sides of the aisle are eager to find a legislative solution to the status of children who were brought to this country illegally through no fault of their own. There is broad support among both Democrats and Republicans for getting a solution to that. In fact, there is a group who has been meeting every day on that very issue in an attempt to try to put together a solution that would help address that issue in a way that not only resolves the status of these young people who came to this country illegally but also addresses the broader issue of border security and chain migration and visa lotteries and all those sorts of things. So there are a series of issues that relate to immigration that are being worked on now by both sides of the aisle in the hope that they can come to a solution about that, but there is no agreement just yet.

While we hope to get to a deal as soon as possible, the deadline for reaching an agreement is not imminent, not to mention that passing a bill on the status of Dreamers is completely unrelated to the need to fund the government.

If the Democrats continue with their plan to block government funding, the government will shut down tomorrow night. That means that all kinds of government services will be affected in areas ranging from veterans, to public health, to worker and product safety, and to national parks and monuments. Funding for our military will also be

threatened, which represents a particular danger as we try to rebuild our military after years of neglect under the Obama administration. Also, of course, as I mentioned, the Children's Health Insurance Program will not get funded, and 9 million low-income children will be well on the way to losing their healthcare coverage.

The Children's Health Insurance Program extension that we want to pass as part of this bill is something that has long been supported by Democrats. In fact, the policy in this bill is virtually identical to the bipartisan extension legislation that was introduced by Senators Hatch and Wyden and passed by the Senate Finance Committee last year, except that we have included an additional year of funding. I serve as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, and when we passed that bill last year, it was a 5-year authorization. The legislation that we will have in front of us this evening that will fund the government includes a 6-year reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program. That would mark the longest extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program since the program was created back in 1997. It would provide 6 years of guaranteed funding so that care for children and pregnant women can continue without disruption.

It is extremely difficult to understand how the same Democrats who have strongly advocated for this program are now opposing legislation to extend it and seeking to shut down the government. In fact, Democrats are now actively bragging that they have the votes to shut down the government.

Nobody thinks the short-term funding bill before us is ideal. We would much rather have a long-term agreement, and eventually we will. But this bill will fund the government, it will protect the military, and it will provide a very significant extension of an essential healthcare program for low-income children.

Democrats' intention of opposing this bill because they are upset that they can't get exactly what they want, when they want it, is irresponsible given the good-faith efforts that are being made by both sides to come to an agreement when it comes to the issue of immigration and when it comes to the issue of the broader funding debate we are having here in the Senate. This attempt by the Democrats is totally shortsighted. It is a partisan, political maneuver that will harm our troops and some of the most vulnerable among us.

We still have time before the government shuts down, and I hope the more moderate elements of the Democratic Party here in the Senate will rethink their leader's opposition to funding the government and to extending health insurance for low-income children and for pregnant women. That is what we are talking about. That is simply what this does. There is still time to come

together to pass this bill and to move on to the other important priorities that are facing our Nation.

I hope that cooler heads will prevail, that people here in this Chamber will come to their senses, and that we can pass a funding bill this evening that would avoid a government shutdown tomorrow and would fund for 6 years the Children's Health Insurance Program and set up the conditions that would allow the discussions to continue about how to resolve some of the outstanding and unrelated issues that still need to come to a resolution.

That is my hope. I hope our colleagues on both sides will come to the realization that this idea that is being put forward by the Democrats—and for which, as I said, they are taking credit right now—of shutting down the government is really a bad idea and not in the best interests of the American people, nor those 9 million children who would benefit from a long-term extension of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, to paraphrase a Republican President I enjoyed knowing, here we go again.

In 1995 Republicans shut down our government. They wanted to recklessly cut education programs and environmental programs, and they even wanted to raise Medicare premiums on millions of senior citizens, and they were willing to shut down the government to do it.

Of course, more recently in 2013, Republicans once again sought to strip the healthcare of millions of Americans. They wanted to shut down the government in a failed effort to repeal the Affordable Care Act. Actually, that is an effort they continued this summer instead of negotiating a bipartisan budget deal that could have averted the situation we find ourselves in today.

In 2015 Republicans continued their attack on healthcare by bringing us to the brink of yet another government shutdown in an attempt to defund Planned Parenthood. Planned Parenthood is the source of healthcare to millions of Americans in rural America. Millions of American women, men, and young people—certainly, tens of thousands of Vermonters in my little State—trust and depend on Planned Parenthood for their basic healthcare needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screening, and HIV screenings—terrible that they might provide that care to Americans.

They tried to shut down the government because of it. It was also in 2015 that the Republicans began their attack on Dreamers. They attempted to shut down the entire Department of Homeland Security, which protects our skies, our borders, and everything else, and they were risking our national security because they wanted to block DACA, the Dreamers bill.

If these were just talking points and political ploys, it would be one thing, but they have real consequences.

The 2013 Republican shutdown dealt a devastating blow to economic growth amounting to \$1.5 billion per day. For a State the size of Vermont, \$1.5 billion is a lot of money. It was an estimated \$1.5 billion for each of the days of the shutdown, and there were 16 of those days. That is economic growth we lost that we never get back. Hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed through no fault of their own for a combined total of 6.6 million days. Lifesaving research on cancer, on diabetes, on heart conditions ground to a halt. The doors and fences of our iconic national parks and monuments that Americans have always relied on to go and see were shuttered.

Now, in 2018, President Trump wants to shut down the government over a cynical and misbegotten “big, beautiful wall.” And he wants that “big, beautiful wall”—whatever it might be—to be paid for by U.S. taxpayers, not Mexico. He is using the Dreamers as negotiable commodities, as though they are some kind of money, instead of people, to meet his unreasonable demands to spend \$18 billion on last century’s technology. President Trump is making these demands after he promised taxpayers it wouldn’t cost us a cent because Mexico would pay for it. Well, if he really believes that, open a bank account, and let Mexico send the money. When they send the money, we will build the wall. I mean, be serious. He said they will build it. Now he wants the American taxpayers—who are strapped on so many things—to build last century’s technology. Let Mexico send us the money. When they do, we will build it. If he is telling the truth, they will send it. If he is not telling the truth, of course, they will not.

But he is also just continuing the Republican tradition of being the “shutdown party.” We have some very responsible Republicans and Democrats in the House and the Senate. I have not heard a single one of them say we need a good government shutdown. I take it back. One Republican has: Donald Trump. Donald Trump has said that our country needs “a good shutdown.” That is the only person, Republican or Democrat, I have heard say that they want a shutdown.

I wonder if that is what he has asked his own party to angle for—a manufactured crisis to distract from the fact that they are not doing their job. I can say, as the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I know the

Democrats have been ready and willing to negotiate a spending agreement since last June. Instead of working toward that goal, congressional Republican leadership has spent the last year overturning consumer protections. They stripped healthcare from millions of Americans. They passed a massive tax cut for big corporations and wealthy Americans, paid for by middle-class Americans and future generations because it adds trillions to the deficit. But during that time, they continued to kick the can down the road.

They have failed to do their jobs to pass sensible spending bills to keep our government open. They have cast aside Congress’s fundamental responsibilities in pursuit of a hyperpartisan agenda. As a result, we haven’t reached a bipartisan budget deal that would allow us to strengthen our military—something both Republicans and Democrats want. We haven’t reached a bipartisan budget deal to allow us to invest in our communities—something I believe both Republicans and Democrats want.

We all agree that the consequences of sequestration have been devastating. We have to lift the spending caps set into law by the Budget Control Act. Every Republican and Democrat I talked with has said they do, but we have to invest equally in our military and our communities because our national security is intrinsically linked to the investments we make in our communities. We are the greatest country in the world exactly because we make a commitment to invest in education and infrastructure. If we back off of that commitment, we are no longer great. We aim to provide the necessary resources to combat the opioid epidemic, and we strive to ensure that no child goes to school hungry, but if we don’t have defense and nondefense parity in spending, we can’t achieve these goals.

We have not passed a comprehensive disaster relief package that takes into consideration the unique needs of Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. These are American citizens. They have been living without power and without access to clean drinking water, and communities, devastated by natural disasters for months, are without adequate help from their own country—the U.S. Government—and people are dying.

The Dreamers, who are American citizens in every way but on paper, have been thrown into crisis, a crisis of President Trump’s own making, a crisis that threatens to tear them from the only lives they have ever known. Remember, the President is solely responsible—not Members here on this floor—for creating this untenable situation faced by the Dreamers. The President, all by himself—actually he is a party of one—rescinded the DACA policy.

Now we have a path forward, put together by Republicans and Democrats, which meets the requirements the

President laid out himself. But instead he continues to favor governing by chaos. He continues to move the goal posts. He continues to push the agreement further out of reach. He continues to say that our country needs a good shutdown. So much for the “Art of the Deal.” I would never hire someone to make a deal like that.

The latest effort to kick the can down the road, which Republicans passed out of the House this evening, does not address any of these issues. Its attempt to address the needs of the Children’s Health Insurance Program is public relations, but it is inadequate, and based on the President’s own twitter feed—which I get dizzy trying to follow—goes in and out of favor with the President hourly. Why does the bill extend CHIP for 6 years when extending this bipartisan program for 10 years would actually save the taxpayers \$6 billion? Why are community health centers—which millions of Americans and CHIP recipients depend upon for their primary care—not extended? Why don’t we protect Americans and our taxpayers? Most importantly, why was this program allowed to expire and to be used as a negotiating part in the first place?

Republican leadership, led by the President, has brought us to the brink of a government shutdown. I have been here a long time. I have looked at a lot of good legislation and bad legislation. I do not want to say the most terrible thing possible about the House bill because I know the respect we show back and forth. But the House bill is a joke and does not have my support. It leaves too much in doubt. What it attempts to address is woefully inadequate.

The majority now wants bipartisan support. Why not do as we always used to and work with Democrats, instead of appealing for our support only after they have written a mishmash, laughable bill crafted behind closed doors?

I have been here over 40 years. I understand reality. Republicans control the House; Republicans control the Senate; Republicans control the Presidency. If Republicans want the government to stay open, it will stay open. If Republicans want the government to shut down, it will shut it down. I wish they would stop kicking the can down the road and start negotiating in good faith, as so many Senators in both parties have been willing to.

It is time to stop kicking the can down the road and time to start negotiating in good faith. Keep our government open, and show respect to those who live here in this country who consider themselves Americans.

Madam President, 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. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO BOB BUTLER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Mayor Bob Butler of Marion, IL. Since April 16, 1963, the people of Marion have known Bob Butler as mayor. Think about this. During Bob Butler's span as mayor, there have been 11 U.S. Presidents and 10 Illinois Governors. Mayor Butler is the second longest serving active mayor in the country and is believed to be the longest serving mayor of Illinois. That is quite an accomplishment.

Prior to becoming mayor, Bob Butler served in the U.S. Army Counter Intelligence Corps after the wars in Japan and Korea. Service was in his blood, so it came as no surprise when Bob decided to run for mayor. Known for his straight-shooting, old-school style, Bob outlined his simple approach to governance during his first campaign: "It's up to the mayor to study each problem as it arises, determine in his own mind what is best to do for all the people. I think the mayor of any town has got to stand on his own two feet and make up his mind without being dictated to by any individual or group. I think also when a man is elected mayor, the people are entitled to know where he stands. He ought to be able to tell the people. If a matter requires a 'yes' or 'no' answer, he should say 'yes' or 'no.'"

Southern Illinois' newspaper of record, the Southern Illinoisan, endorsed Butler's candidacy, saying: "Marion voters will choose Tuesday between orderly, progressive city government or a continuation of the present slap-dash regime . . . Butler, in short, offers an excellent alternative . . . He has our wholehearted support." Bob Butler won by 687 votes and never looked back. He won the next 13 mayoral elections in Marion.

During Mayor Butler's first council meeting, an entire block on the city square caught fire. The new council took office and shortly thereafter adjourned to help fight the fire. The fire shined a light on many of Marion's problems, inadequate firefighting resources and water supply, but that was just the tip of the iceberg. Mayor Butler inherited a city in financial crisis. Marion needed more people. Why? Because more people meant more money from the State. Mayor Butler got to work and, due to his leadership, turned Marion around.

Mayor Butler transformed Marion and southern Illinois through good old-fashioned hard work. Over the years, Mayor Butler's agenda helped turn Marion into a regional powerhouse along Interstate 57. During his tenure, Marion's population has grown nearly 92 percent. According to Mayor Butler, the secret to Marion's success was simply "A strong business community and a strong city working together [that] produced great results." He is absolutely right.

Anyone who knows Mayor Butler knows that he is an avid reader. He is on record saying that his favorite political book is a three-part novel by

Rafael Sabatini, "Scaramouche." It opens with this line: "He was born with a gift of laughter and a sense that the world was mad."

With his 91st birthday approaching next week, I want to thank Mayor Butler for his extraordinary commitment to the people of Marion and his work to help his community and the world be just a little less mad. I wish him and his family all the best in their next chapter.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Madam President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for January 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office CBO prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

The enforceable levels included in this report reflect all of the numerical adjustments made to the resolution since its passage. These adjustments include an update to enforceable levels for legislation enacted after the June 2017 CBO baseline was released but before enactment of the resolution, October 30, 2017; a revision to aggregates and allocations to accommodate legislation fulfilling the budget resolution's reconciliation instructions, December 19, 2017; and a revision to aggregates and the Appropriations Committee's allocation for emergency spending found in Fiscal Year 2018's third continuing resolution, H.R. 1370, December 21, 2017.

The information contained in this report captures legislative activity from the passage of the budget resolution through January 11, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared tables 1 through 4 of this report.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 13 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations. First, the Veterans' Affairs and Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committees violated their allocations in December 2017, the former with a \$2.1 billion extension of the Veterans Choice Program and the latter through a package of health extenders. Both of these extensions were included as separate divisions on the Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, P.L. 115-96. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee violated its allocation earlier this month with the pas-

sage of the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, P.L. 115-103, which is estimated to increase spending by \$5 million over the next 10 years. The Armed Services Committee, on the other hand, reduced spending over the budget window. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, P.L. 115-91, produced \$16 million in outlay savings over the enforceable window.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no full-year appropriations bills have been enacted for Fiscal Year 2018, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year.

The budget resolution contains two points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 3 and 4 show compliance with Fiscal Year 2018 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP, respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under section 4102 and section 4103 of H. Con. Res. 71, respectively. Notably, there have not been any full-year bills enacted thus far for Fiscal Year 2018 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by the Congress.

CBO provided a spending and revenue report for Fiscal Year 2018, which helps enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under CBA section 311. In its report, CBO annualizes the temporary effects of the latest continuing resolution, which provides funding through January 19, 2018. For the enforcement of budgetary aggregates, the Budget Committee excludes this temporary funding. As such, the committee views current-law levels as being \$836.3 billion and \$468.6 billion below budget resolution levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively.

Current-law revenues continue to be in excess of the levels assumed by the budget resolution. On-budget revenue levels currently exceed assumed levels by \$17.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2018, \$84.3 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018-2022 period, and \$135.4 billion over the Fiscal Year 2018-2027 period. These figures reflect current enforceable levels following the use of the reserve fund found in section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71 for H.R. 1, which is commonly referred to as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017, P.L. 115-97.

Social Security outlay levels are consistent with the budget resolution's figures for all enforceable periods. Social Security revenues, however, are