

House Amendment to Senate Amendment to H.R. 195 - Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 (Rep. Frelinghuysen, R-NJ)

CONTACT: Jay Fields, 202-226-9143; Amanda Lincoln, 202-226-2076

FLOOR SCHEDULE:

The <u>House Amendment to Senate Amendment to H.R. 195</u>, a Continuing Resolution (CR), may be considered on January 18, 2017, under a <u>rule</u>.

The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of <u>Rules</u> <u>Committee Print 115-55</u>.

The rule would waive through January 20, 2018, the requirement of a two-thirds vote for consideration of a rule on the same day it is reported by the Rules Committee. This is sometimes referred to as "martial law".

The rule would also provide for suspension authority through January 20, 2018. Under the rules of the House, motions to suspend the rules are only permitted on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday.

TOPLINE SUMMARY:

H.R. 195 (as amended) would extend defense and non-defense discretionary funding to February 16, 2018, at current levels as provided in H.R. 601, the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (the "September CR"), suspend several taxes created by the Affordable Care Act, extend the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) for six years, and provide additional funding for several healthcare related programs.

COST:

The report from the Congressional budget Office (CBO) can be found here.

Continuing Resolution

The CR portion of H.R. 195 would provide funding at a \$1.071 trillion annualized rate for base purposes, which is slightly above the FY 2017 spending levels. To achieve this level, H.R. 195 continues the across-the-board reduction of 0.6791 percent initially instituted in the September CR. After adding in cap-exempt spending, H.R. 195 provides for total discretionary spending at an annualized rate of \$1.225 trillion.

¹ This includes \$104.4 billion for Overseas Contingency Operations, \$6.7 billion for disaster relief, \$1.9 billion for program integrity, and \$41.2 billion for emergency requirements.

H.R. 195 continues base funding levels above the Budget Control Act (BCA) caps: \$2.43 billion over for defense and \$3.72 billion over for non-defense. For FY 2018, the BCA caps limit base defense spending to \$549.06 billion and non-defense spending to \$515.75 billion.

Under the Budget Control Act, spending levels that exceed the BCA caps normally would result in a sequestration order from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) 15 days after the adjournment of the First Session of the 115th Congress. The order would be enforced through across-the-board cuts to non-exempt programs to offset the breach in each category. However, the <u>Continuing Resolution</u> passed by the House on December 21, 2018 contained a provision delaying any potential enforcement of the discretionary spending caps via a sequestration order until 15 days after January 19, 2018. H.R. 195, by virtue changing the expiration date of government funding, changes the date from which the 15-day period for enforcement of the BCA caps starts to February 16, 2018.

CR Base Discretionary Funding Levels (in millions of dollars)			
	Base Defense	Base Non-Defense	Total Base
H.R. 195	551,489	519,469	1,070,958
FY 2018 Caps	549,057	515,749	1,064,806
H.R 195 vs. FY 2018 Caps	+ 2,432	+ 3,719	+ 6,151

HEALTHY KIDS Act

Division C of H.R. 195 would increase direct spending outlays by \$8.203 billion, and increase revenues by \$8.204 billion for a net deficit savings of approximately \$1 million. Of the \$8.203 billion in outlays, \$7.223 billion is attributable to provisions related to the Children's Health Insurance Program, and the remainder (\$980 million) is money allocated to the Medicaid Improvement Fund instead of using those savings for deficit reduction, which may concern some conservatives.

Obamacare Taxes Suspensions

Division D of H.R. 195, containing several Obamacare tax suspensions, would decrease direct spending outlays by \$1.937 billion, and decrease revenues by \$33.191 billion for net deficit increase of \$31.254 billion.

Together, Divisions C and D of H.R. 195 would produce a net increase in the deficit of \$31.252 billion.

Budgetary Waivers:

Division E of the bill contains a number of provisions waiving the budgetary impacts of Division C (CHIP extension) and Division D (Obamacare tax suspensions).

Division E would waive the requirement that the budgetary impact of Divisions C and D be added to the annual <u>statutory PAYGO scorecard</u> maintained by OMB. By doing so, any deficit impact would not be offset by across the board spending cuts to non-exempt programs through the sequestration process.

The Senate PAYGO rule establishes a point of order -- requiring 60 votes to overcome -- against tax and mandatory spending legislation that would increase or produce the deficit over a 6 or 11-year period.

The <u>FY2018 budget resolution</u> restates the 6 and 11-year tests and adds new current year and budget year tests. Division E would waive any budgetary impact of Divisions C and D from these scorecards.

Division E would also would exempt any budgetary impact of Divisions C and D for purposes of the BCA's discretionary sequestration.

CONSERVATIVE CONCERNS:

Some conservatives may be concerned that passing a short-term CR that includes funding for defense programs at current levels instead of full-year defense funding and a short term non-defense continuing resolution.

Many conservatives oppose continuing resolutions that apply to defense spending arguing that they negatively impact military training, readiness, equipment, and personnel.

Conservatives may be concerned that the bill extends the discretionary appropriations originally provided by H.R.244, the Consolidated Appropriations Act 2017 ("FY 2017 Omnibus") that was passed with <u>primarily Democratic support</u>. For conservative concerns of the FY 2017 Omnibus, the RSC Legislative Bulletin is available <u>here</u>.

Some conservatives oppose continuing resolutions arguing that they perpetuate an inability of Congress to wield its power of the purse and properly carry out the annual appropriations process to prioritize funding decisions based on the will of the voters that elected them. H.R. 195 would be the fourth CR passed by Congress since the FY 2017 Omnibus.

Some conservatives may be concerned that passing a string of continuing resolutions under the threat of a government shutdown gives Democrats leverage on each occasion to extract concessions on liberal policy items.

Some conservatives may be concerned that H.R. 195 would continue to appropriate discretionary funding in excess of the FY 2018 BCA spending caps despite being nearly four months into the 2018 fiscal year.

Some conservatives may be concerned that the bill contains a number of provisions waiving the budgetary impacts of Divisions C and D of the bill for purposes of Statutory PAYGO, the Senate PAYGO rule, and the BCA's discretionary sequestration mechanism.

Some conservatives may be concerned that one of the bill's spending anomalies – provisions that enumerate exceptions to the duration, amount, or purposes for which those funds may be used for certain appropriations accounts or activities – would allow the Department of Defense to use previously appropriated emergency missile defense funds for intelligence activities not specifically enumerated in that appropriation.

Some conservatives may be concerned that the bill would reauthorize CHIP for six years while only gradually phasing out the Obamacare match-rate increase and would extend an Obamacare requirement that states must maintain income eligibility for children enrolled in Medicaid or CHIP.

Some conservatives may be concerned the bill would deposit \$980 million in the Medicaid Improvement Fund which would allow the HHS Secretary to use these funds beginning in FY 2023. Congress has historically used the Medicaid Improvement Fund as a "parking spot" to bank savings to offset future spending.

- **Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?** Yes. The bill would eliminate application of a restriction on the use of previously appropriated funds for intelligence activities. The bill would also increase the amount of funding for certain healthcare related programs.
- **Encroach into State or Local Authority?** Some conservatives may believe that many of the programs and activities funded by this bill would be more appropriately handled by state and local governments, or the private sector.
- **Delegate Any Legislative Authority to the Executive Branch?** Some conservatives believe that continuing resolutions delegate authority regarding spending to the Executive Branch.
- Contain Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits? No.

DETAILED SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

DIVISION B2

Extension of Continuing Appropriations

Division B would extend discretionary appropriations for defense and non-defense programs through February 16, 2018. It would do so by extending the expiration date of the <u>September CR</u>, which provided continuing discretionary appropriations through December 8, 2017, and was subsequently extended by <u>H.J.Res. 123</u>, the <u>Continuing Appropriations Act</u> through December 22, 2017, and then by <u>H.R. 1370</u>, <u>Further Continuing Resolution</u> through January 19, 2018.

Division B would extend the National Flood Insurance Program through February 16, 2018 by virtue of extending the September CR.

For background, the September CR, which <u>passed the House 316-90 with primarily Democratic support</u> on September 8, 2017, provided funding through December 8, 2017 by extending appropriations, funds, and other authority made available by the <u>FY 2017 Omnibus</u>. The FY 2017 Omnibus <u>passed the House 309-118 on May 3, 2017, again with primarily Democratic support</u>. A more complete history of the FY 2017 appropriations process can be found in the <u>RSC's Legislative Look Ahead – FY 2017 Appropriations</u>.

Anomalies

Division B contains a number of anomalies – provisions that enumerate exceptions to the duration, amount, or purposes for which those funds may be used for certain appropriations accounts or activities.

Under <u>existing law</u>, appropriated funds cannot be used for an intelligence activity unless Congress specifically authorizes funding to be used for the activity. H.R. 195 would lift this restriction with respect to \$4.68 billion appropriated under the December CR and designated therein for missile defense purposes and naval ship repairs.

The bill would allow funds to be obligated at a rate necessary to ensure that a Department of Agriculture program designed to develop and test methods of providing access to food for children in urban and rural areas during the summer months can be fully operational by May 2018.

The bill would allow funds to be obligated at a rate necessary to maintain the planned launch capability schedules for the Space Launch System launch vehicle, Exploration Ground Systems, and Orion Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle programs.

² The legislative language that would appear prior to the proposed Division B in a final enrolled bill consists of text of <u>H.R.</u> 195, the Federal Register Printing Savings Act of 2017, as passed by the House and the Senate. This legislative language is *not* a matter of disagreement between the House and Senate, and is not modified by the House Amendment to the Senate Amendment.

The bill would allow funds to be obligated at a rate necessary to sustain staffing levels achieved on June 30, 2017 within the Department of Energy's Energy Programs Inspector General Office.

The bill would allow funds to be obligated at a rate necessary to accommodate increased demand for small businesses loans. Some conservatives may feel that subsidizing private businesses in the form of loans is an inappropriate use of federal taxpayer money and interferes with free markets.

The bill would allow the Department of Housing and Urban Development to adjust its funding allocations related to administration of the Section 8 housing voucher program to public housing agencies in areas receiving a presidential disaster declaration in 2017 and 2018. Some conservatives may feel that the Section 8 housing program is a wasteful use of taxpayer money that does a poor job of helping beneficiaries improve their education or earnings.

DIVISION C

Division C would extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) through FY 2023 and gradually eliminate the temporary 23 percent increase to the federal CHIP matching rate provided under Obamacare. It would also extend funding for certain pediatric-related public health programs, the childhood obesity demonstration project (\$30 million) and certain activities related to pediatric quality measures (\$90 million). The six-year funding extension follows the model of a bipartisan agreement between Senators Hatch and Wyden that, if enacted, would extend CHIP funding for five years.

Previously, the <u>Congressional Budget Office (CBO)</u> scored the Hatch-Wyden proposal as increasing direct spending by \$8.2 billion over the FY2018-FY2027 period, and the House voted <u>242-174</u> on November 3, 2017 to advance this proposal with full offsets. Following repeal of Obamacare's harmful individual mandate, however, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) <u>substantially revised cost estimates</u> given that "the federal costs of the alternatives to providing coverage through CHIP (primarily Medicaid, subsidized coverage in the marketplaces, and employment-based insurance) are larger than the costs of providing CHIP during that period."

Specifically, under H.R. 195 CHIP would be funded at the following levels:

- FY 2018: \$21.5 billion
- FY 2019: \$22.6 billion
- FY 2020: \$23.7 billion
- FY 2021: \$24.8 billion
- FY 2022: \$25.9 billion
- Funding for FY 2023 would be structured like CHIP's FY 2015 and FY 2017 funding, with semiannual appropriations of \$2.85 billion plus a one-time \$20.2 billion appropriation provided in the first six months of the fiscal year that would remain available until exhausted.

Some conservatives have <u>raised concerns</u> that some of the CHIP appropriation has historically been diverted to other, unrelated HHS programs and thus the formula-derived funding levels may be inflated. Governors have <u>previously suggested</u>, however, that the formula works well.

Although federal CHIP funding is capped at the level Congress appropriates for the program, rather than extended as an open-ended entitlement, the federal government provides a matching payment for CHIP services. Obamacare applied a 23 percent increase to this matching payment, which affected the traditional state-federal financing partnership by shifting more responsibility to the federal government, and in some cases even superseded the need to states to contribute to their own programs. Division C would gradually roll back this increase and restore the traditional state-federal financing partnership by providing an 11.5 percent matching rate in FY 2020 and returning to the pre-Obamacare matching rate for FY 2021-

2023. <u>Some conservatives</u> may be concerned about the gradual reduction of this phase out, given that the increase would fully expire in FY 2019 under current law.

Division C would also extend an Obamacare requirement that states must maintain income eligibility for children enrolled in Medicaid or CHIP -- or risk losing federal Medicaid matching funds -- between FY 2019 and FY 2023, but would limit its application to children in families with annual income below 300% of the federal poverty level (FPL). Some conservatives may be concerned that this limitation does not go far enough, given that the <u>vast majority of children</u> enrolled in CHIP have family incomes at or below 250 percent of FPL. The Division would also extend the Child Enrollment Contingency Fund, qualifying state option, and authority for Express Lane eligibility determinations through FY 2023. Additionally, it would provide \$100 million for <u>outreach and enrollment grants</u> between FY 2018 and FY 2023 and add parent mentors to the list of entities eligible to receive such grants.

Finally, the Division would deposit \$980 million in the Medicaid Improvement Fund and allow the HHS Secretary to use these funds beginning in FY 2023 to reimburse states for activities related to mechanized claims systems. Congress has historically used the Medicaid Improvement Fund and a similar Medicare Improvement Fund as a "parking spot" to bank savings to offset future spending. If not redirected by Congress, the MIF is available to the HHS Secretary for specific uses related to improving the Medicaid program.

DIVISION D

Division D suspends a number of taxes created by Obamacare.

Medical Device Tax. The Affordable Care Act levied a 2.3% excise tax on the sale of medical devices. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, enacted on December 18, 2015, included a two-year moratorium on the medical device tax that ended on December 31, 2017. H.R. 195 would re-establish a moratorium lasting until December 31, 2019.

<u>Cadillac Tax.</u> The Affordable Care Act established a 40% excise tax (a.k.a., the "Cadillac Tax") on the cost of high-value health plans that exceeds a statutory threshold (\$10,800 for single health plans). The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, enacted on December 18, 2015, delayed the effective date of the Cadillac Tax from January 1, 2017 to January 1, 2020. H.R. 195 would further delay implementation until January 1, 2022.

Health Insurance Tax. The Affordable Care Act created an annual fee on certain for-profit health insurers. For 2018, the total amount to be collected is \$14.8 billion. This sum is to be apportioned among health insurers based on their market share and value of their business. The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016, enacted on December 18, 2015, suspended the health insurance tax for 2017. H.R. 195 would place a moratorium on the health insurance tax for calendar year 2019.

DIVISION E

Division E of the bill contains a number of provisions waiving the budgetary impacts of Division C (CHIP extension) and Division D (Obamacare tax suspensions).

Division E would waive the requirement that the budgetary impact of Divisions C and D be added to the annual <u>statutory PAYGO scorecard</u> maintained by OMB. By doing so, any deficit impact would not be offset by across the board spending cuts to non-exempt programs through the sequestration process.

The Senate PAYGO rule establishes a point of order -- requiring 60 votes to overcome -- against tax and mandatory spending legislation that would increase or produce the deficit over a 6 or 11-year period. The

<u>FY 2018 budget resolution</u> restates the 6 and 11-year tests and adds new current year and budget year tests. Division E would waive any budgetary impact of Divisions C and D from these scorecards.

Division E would also would exempt any budgetary impact of Divisions C and D for purposes of the BCA's discretionary sequestration.

COMMITTEE ACTION:

H.R. 195 was introduced as <u>Federal Register Printing Savings Act of 2017</u> on January 3, 2017 and referred to the House Committees on Oversight and Government Reform and Administration. The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform ordered the bill reported by voice vote on February 14, 2017. The bill passed the House on May 17, 2017, by a voice vote. The bill passed the Senate with an <u>amendment</u> adding an additional title on December 21, 2017, by unanimous consent.

The Rules Committee Print 115-55, showing the text of H.J.Res. 125 as introduced, was posted on docs.house.gov at 8:53 pm on January 16, 2018. Rules Committee Print 115-55 states that its text would replace the Senate amendment.

ADMINISTRATION POSITION:

The <u>Statement of Administration Policy</u> released on January 17, 2018 states: "The Administration supports passage of H.J. Res. 125, the Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018."

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY:

The original Constitutional Authority Statement for H.R. 195 stated: "Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8."

NOTE: RSC Legislative Bulletins are for informational purposes only and should not be taken as statements of support or opposition from the Republican Study Committee.

###

