



Biden's First 100 Days

Not Your Average Joe



Brian Daingerfield

Head of G10 FX
Strategy, US



John Briggs

Global Head of
Strategy

President Joe Biden was sworn into office January 20th – and he hit the ground running, signing nearly 20 executive orders that in most cases reverse the previous administration's policies on a wide range of issues including immigration (halting border wall construction, reversing immigration bans), climate change (re-entering the Paris Climate Accord), and public health (mandatory mask wearing in some public spaces).

His number one priority will be passing the previously-announced \$1.9 trillion coronavirus stimulus plan (the 'America Rescue Plan') but getting that package through in its entirety is hardly guaranteed; legislative numbers required for approval aren't a given and procedural limitations could make the path forward quite difficult.

The focus on the coronavirus stimulus package will likely backburner other issues for now – such as foreign policy & international trade, where we broadly expect (with some key differences) a return to Obama-style multilateralism. But as we've already seen, executive order does give Biden some leeway to make key changes immediately.

Coronavirus Relief is Step One, Priority One

The Biden administration will pursue fiscal stimulus in two distinct bills. The first, which Biden outlined in a speech in early January, is the \$1.9 trillion [America Rescue Plan](#) aimed squarely at coronavirus relief. He plans to outline a second-step stimulus bill, the Build Back Better Recovery Plan, at the State of the Union address in February.

We think market participants should be fully focused on the America Rescue Plan – the Build Back Better Recovery Plan will likely receive significant attention due to its probable inclusions of corporate tax increases as a source of funding, but that plan may face an even steeper uphill battle than the former. For now, we think all effort will be on the more narrowly tailored coronavirus relief package.

This is Non-Independent Research, as defined by the Financial Conduct Authority. This material should be regarded as a marketing communication and may have been produced in conjunction with the NatWest Markets Plc trading desks that trade as principal in the instruments mentioned herein. All data is accurate as of the report date, unless otherwise specified.

Biden's Covid-19 Response Plan – America Rescue Plan

Provision	Deficit Impact
Provide \$1,400 per person “Recovery Rebates” on top of the \$600 already issued	\$465 billion
Provide aid to state and local governments	\$350 billion
Increase Unemployment Insurance supplement to \$400/week and extend emergency UI provisions through September	~\$350 billion
Provide funding for a national vaccination program, testing, and other COVID containment efforts	\$160 billion
Fund school reopening and increase funding to schools and colleges	\$170 billion
Expand the Child Tax Credit to a refundable \$3,000 per child, \$3,600 for children under 6 (assuming one year)	~\$120 billion
Provide rental and small landlord support	\$30 billion
Provide support to childcare providers	\$25 billion
Other policy changes	~\$200 billion
Total Reported Cost	\$1.9 trillion

Sources: Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, NatWest Markets

Two Paths for Passage – Regular Order Likely to be Quickly Scrapped

Any stimulus package would require approval from both the House and Senate. The combination of a relatively large House majority for Democrats and the requirement for only a simple majority should provide smooth sailing for Biden's priorities through the US House (though there are some risks here too – should the package get too small for progressive pockets of the party).

Senate approval will likely be a tougher challenge, due to the Democrats slim majority as well as the presence of the filibuster, a rule that allows Senators to delay a vote by extending debate – which could effectively stall legislation indefinitely.

If several Republicans do mount a filibuster threat to the bill, the Biden administration has two options:

- The first is to simply attempt to pass the stimulus plan via ‘regular order’ (the usual processes & procedures governing debate and approval of legislation). That would require buy in from at least 10 Republican Senators to break their GOP colleagues’ filibuster, an outcome we see as highly unlikely.
- The second option would be to use ‘budget reconciliation’ (which would not have been an available option had the Democrats not won control of the Senate in January).

Budget reconciliation is among the most consequential loopholes in law-making because it allows for major legislation to be passed without the threat of a filibuster (more on this in the table below, and for a deeper dive, Appendix A). That benefit comes at some cost, though – the process is more limited, and would take more time, than a bill that can win approval in regular order.

Democrats have strongly signalled a willingness to use reconciliation to get one, or both, of their stimulus plans over the line if they are stonewalled in regular order, and we expect Democrats to eventually head down this road (the prospect for 10 Republican Senators backing Biden's stimulus push is unlikely).

Regular Order vs. Budget Reconciliation – The Basics

	Regular Order	Budget Reconciliation
House Approval	Simple Majority	Simple Majority
Senate Approval	Filibuster-proof majority (60)*	Simple Majority (50 + VP tiebreaker)
Scope	Unlimited	Only include line items that directly impact spending, revenues, or debt limit
Special Pre-requisites	None	Budget Resolution with reconciliation instructions
How Often?	Unlimited	Only one budget per fiscal year
Deficit Limits	None	Must not exceed reconciliation instructions within 10 years and no budget impact outside of a 10-year window. Scoring done by non-partisan Congressional Budget Office

Source: Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, Tax Policy Center, Tax Foundation, NatWest Markets

*Technically a simple majority is needed to pass legislation, but to end debate and go to a vote at all a filibuster threat would need to be broken with 60 votes. So, in practice, 60 votes are needed if we assume at least one Republican would filibuster.

The Holdup? Legislative math

United government alone increases the prospect of fiscal stimulus, given it has opened the door to using budget reconciliation. But getting fiscal stimulus out the door may take longer (and it be smaller in size) than many believe.

Assuming regular order is quickly scuttled in favour of reconciliation, Democrats will need unanimous Democratic support (due to their extremely slim 50/ 50 +1 “majority”) as we would be surprised if even one Senate Republican considered voting in support of a reconciliation bill (a process generally used to stop the minority party from participating in the legislative process).

More consequentially, several centrist Democrats may also take some convincing, according to reports from the Washington Post. Just one dissention among the Democratic Senate ranks is enough to delay, if not outright halt, the process. That said, one piece of leverage the Biden administration will likely hold is pressure. Suggesting casually that you may not support key components of Biden’s stimulus package in a press interview is easy. But voting against your own party’s landmark stimulus package, amid a new wave of cases, is another matter – which could ultimately pull centrist lawmakers to Biden’s side.

The pressure to pass a major long-term bill is unlikely to be as high as the short-term pressure to support emergency Covid-19 relief, especially given that it would likely include corporate tax increases and some squarely Democratic priorities. This could also create a balancing act for Democrats in crafting the final text of

the first plan: add too much (and skew too far from Covid-19 relief) and you risk alienating conservative Democratic Senators.

No hard deadline for stimulus – but March 14 is a major soft deadline

The Biden stimulus plan seeks to increase and extend supplemental unemployment benefits, but a failure to get something done by mid-March will result in a lapse of current benefits.

Under the \$900bn stimulus package passed at the end of 2020, Pandemic Unemployment Assistance (PUA) and Pandemic Emergency Unemployment Compensation were each extended through March 14, 2021. We do not believe the stimulus push has a true “hard” deadline outside of the November 2022 midterm elections. But mid-March expiration of key provisions for unemployed workers is a critical soft deadline.

In the end, we do think some additional stimulus will get passed, even if it’s less clear how we get there. Our size estimate at the time of writing is ~\$1-1.5tn, but with risks on both sides. While we expect the figure to be negotiated down in the first package, a slower than anticipated Q1 in the US and an increase in virus cases and deaths should add pressure on lawmakers to get the package closer to Biden’s total. However as noted above, there are plenty of opportunities for the bill to not only get delayed, but potentially derailed if the package gets too big for more conservative Democratic lawmakers.

Foreign policy – a return to multilateralism

On the foreign policy front, we expect an ongoing strong US stance against China in the medium-term as he seeks to build a consensus amongst allies.

On the flip side, while not necessarily an executive order per se, we expect to see a lot of positive headlines regarding Europe (like those seen after the US rejoined the Paris Climate Agreement): reaffirming commitment to NATO, potentially cooperating regarding Iran once again, and the like.

Lastly, we expect Biden to loosen immigration and visa policies, which may aid labour supply, as per above.

Trade policy – America (Coronavirus-Relief) First

We think the desire to quickly pass coronavirus relief is likely to relegate international trade issues to the backburner – at least for the near-term (his own version of “America First”).

More broadly, we believe President Biden would pursue a return towards Obama-era multilateralism and strengthen security and economic alliances with the country’s democratic partners. The looming threat of sudden trade escalation against the European Union, Canada and Mexico is likely to end under the Biden administration – though he is not exactly calling for a push towards a free-trade utopia.

Biden’s Expected Geopolitical Stance: Summary

Expected Trade / Foreign Policy Stance under Biden	
China	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Predictable, principled, but still tough stance on trade• May leave Phase 1 deal / May be open to removing Trump tariffs• Pursue “Carbon tax / quota”, which may mean new tariffs
Euro-area	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trade war / auto tariff risk ends• May be open to more cooperation on global taxes• Work with EU to re-enter / rework Iran Deal
UK	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Free trade negotiations stall as new admin brings new priorities / leaders (USTR)• UK “Back of the Queue” on trade? Pivot to EU• UK and US may gain trade pact if both join TPP
CEEMEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• New sanction risk for Russia on electoral interference• Support for Israel but more critical of Israeli policies
Latin America	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Less confrontational border policy with Mexico• Climate focus may have negative implications for commodity producers• May reduce Venezuela economic sanctions• Effort to rejoin the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) may benefit signatories Chile, Mexico, Canada

Source: NatWest Markets

China – predictable, principled, but still tough

We think Biden’s approach on China will be stylistically different than Trump’s, though it may not be significantly “easier” from a trade and economic perspective. We do think a Biden approach – one that seeks to leverage US allies to add pressure on China – would be more consistent with principles espoused under President Obama, and unlikely to change at the drop of a tweet.

Biden’s past criticism of Trump’s tariffs on Chinese goods suggests that he would be open to removing the tariffs put in place under the Trump administration, but the Biden camp has been cagey about the prospect of doing so. His desire to link economic activity with climate targets suggests a new potential realm of economic tension between the US and China.

Europe and the UK – hitting the reset button

Europe – auto-tariff risk gone

Biden’s views on US-EU trade were not well specified on the campaign trail or in the months since his electoral victory. But his overarching goal of restoring American partnership with the country’s democratic allies implies a shift toward a more cooperative relationship with the EU and NATO (Biden also criticized Trump’s tariffs taken in the name of national security against the EU and Canada), so we think the risk of tariffs on European autos is essentially gone.

One specific issue we are tracking between the US and the EU relates to digital services taxes. Pre-election, we felt the Biden administration may prove more open to international cooperation in corporate taxes, specifically related to digital services, certainly more so than

the Trump administration. But recent comments from Treasury Secretary Nominee Yellen that the US would try and stop foreign countries from taxing US companies unfairly has thrown cold water on that.

UK – new management, new priorities

Like US-EU trade objectives, Biden's US-UK trade objectives are not particularly well specified. Prior to the year-end Brexit deal, we felt the uncertain relationship between the EU and the UK stood in the way of major progress on a US-UK free trade deal.

With the Trump administration now out, and a skinny FTA not yet complete between the US and the UK, we fear that the process of formalizing the US-UK relationship in the post-Brexit world may effectively need to start over. Politico reported in December that an agreement on

some key provisions had been found, though a new administration may bring with it a fresh set of priorities, particularly on reported sticking points between the Trump administration and the UK (agriculture, financial services, and pharmaceuticals).

There is also the risk that the Biden administration moves away from a bilateral UK-US deal and in a more multilateral direction with the UK: both the Biden campaign and the UK government have expressed interest in rejoining the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (also known as CPTPP, or simply TPP).

Appendix A | Budget Reconciliation Basics

Budget reconciliation is both complex and archaic. Unlike “regular order”, under which laws are intended to be passed, the budget reconciliation process is subject to strict (but workable) limitations. The budget reconciliation process requires a budget resolution, of which there can only be one per fiscal year. The Biden administration could use other FY budgets to use reconciliation instructions multiple times in the same calendar year. Recall that the Trump administration attempted to use one budget to repeal and replace the ACA in 2017 and then followed with a second budget with reconciliation instructions for tax cuts within the same calendar year.

A full discussion of the budget reconciliation process can be found [here](#). In simple terms, the budget resolution is needed because it provides budget committees with instructions to adjust federal spending / revenues to meet with the targets in the budget. These are called reconciliation instructions, and the overall size of reconciliation instructions will be instrumental in the final size of the any stimulus bill, as the deficit impact within 10yr cannot exceed that amount. A budget with reconciliation instructions to increase the deficit by \$1tn provides less spending authority than a resolution with instructions to increase the deficit by \$2tn.

There are also limitations on what can and cannot be included in reconciliation. Budget reconciliation matters must at least be related to the budget – specifically, relate to either spending, revenues, the debt limit, or all three. We do not expect this to be binding in the case of the Biden stimulus package, as the announced package has few (if any) items which are unrelated to spending or revenues. But specific provisions of the final package could be challenged on these grounds should they stray too far from direct budgetary implications.

Finally, the Byrd Rule forces any measure passed through reconciliation to have no impact on the deficit (or, at least, to not increase the deficit) outside of a 10yr horizon. This was a major hang-up in the 2017 tax cut process because a permanent tax cut will undoubtedly have an impact on the deficit in years 11 and beyond. The workaround in that case was that a significant portion of Trump's tax cuts were not permanent, and many provisions will begin rolling off starting in 2022 (which is going to be a major point of legislation contention down the road, but beyond the scope of this note)

Because budget reconciliation considers deficit impact and not strictly debt impact, we currently believe that plenty of stimulus planned by Democrats is unlikely to be subject to Byrd Rule limitations. The deficit impact of a one-time stimulus check, for example, will be fully felt in the year it is delivered and may not be scored to have a deficit impact beyond that 10yr window. Much will depend on the scoring of the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), including the economic forecasts under which assumptions are made.

Invitation to Consider a Derivatives Transaction: This communication is prepared by the sales and trading desk and is marketing material and/or trader commentary. It does not constitute research. This material constitutes an invitation to consider entering into a derivatives transaction under U.S. CFTC Regulations 1.71 and 23.605, where applicable, but is not a binding offer to buy/sell any financial instrument. The views of the author may differ from others at NatWest Markets Plc, NatWest Markets N.V. and/or NatWest Markets Securities Inc. (collectively "NatWest Markets").

Copyright © NatWest Markets Securities Inc. All rights reserved. Securities business in the United States is conducted through NatWest Markets Securities Inc. a FINRA registered broker-dealer (<http://www.finra.org>), a SIPC member (www.sipc.org) and a wholly owned indirect subsidiary of NatWest Markets Plc.

The author of this material is an economist, desk strategist, salesperson or trader and will be compensated based in part on the author's own performance, the firm's performance and the performance of the sales or trading desk for which the author works. This material is informational only. It is not considered research and is not a product of any research department. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. is not, by making this material available, providing investment, legal, tax, financial, accounting or other advice to you or any other party. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. is not acting as an advisor or fiduciary in any respect in connection with providing this information, and no information or material contained herein is to be construed as either projections or predictions. Past performance is not indicative of future results. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. transacts business with counterparties on an arm's length basis and on the basis that each counterparty is sophisticated and capable of independently evaluating the merits and risks of each transaction and that each counterparty is making an independent decision regarding any transaction. Counterparties must make their own independent decisions regarding any securities, financial instruments or strategies mentioned herein. This material is intended for institutional investors only and should not be forwarded to third parties.

NatWest Markets Securities Inc., its affiliates, and/or any of their respective employees, clients and officers, including persons involved in the preparation or issuance of this material, act as a market maker for or deal as principal in the financial instruments mentioned and may have a long or short position in, or engaged in transactions in, these financial instruments. As part of the sales or trading desk, the author may have consulted with the trading desk while preparing this material and the trading desk may have accumulated positions in the financial instruments or related derivatives products that are the subject of this material. Accordingly, information included in or excluded from this material is not independent from the proprietary interests of NatWest Markets Securities Inc., which may conflict with your interests.

Except as to securities issued by the U.S. government and debentures issued by government-sponsored enterprises, NatWest Markets Securities Inc. does not permit the author of this material to hold, or engage in transactions in, the securities or other financial instruments discussed herein in any personal account of the author or a member of the author's household.

Certain transactions, including those involving futures, options, derivatives and high yield securities, give rise to substantial risk and are not suitable for all investors. Foreign currency denominated securities are subject to fluctuations in exchange rates that could have an adverse effect on the value or price of or income derived from any investments discussed herein. In addition, investors in securities such as ADRs, the values of which are influenced by foreign currencies, effectively assume currency risk. Please ensure that you have read and understood the current options disclosure document before entering into any options transactions. United States listed options disclosure documents are available from our sales representatives or at <http://www.theocc.com/components/docs/riskstoc.pdf>. Unless otherwise specifically stated, all statements contained herein (including any views, opinions or forecasts) are as of the date indicated only, and are subject to change without notice. Changes to assumptions made in the preparation of such material may have a material impact on returns. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. does not undertake a duty to update this material or to notify you when or whether the analysis has changed. While the information contained in this material is believed to be reliable, no representation or warranty, whether express or implied, is made and no liability or responsibility is accepted by NatWest Markets Securities Inc. or its affiliates as to the accuracy or completeness thereof, except with respect to any disclosures relative to NatWest Markets Securities Inc. and/or its affiliates and the author's involvement with an issuer that is the subject of this material.

NatWest Markets Securities Inc. makes no representations that this material or any information contained herein are appropriate for use in all locations or that transactions, securities, products, instruments or services discussed herein are available or appropriate for sale or use in all jurisdictions, or by all investors or counterparties. Investors who receive this material may not necessarily be able to deal directly with NatWest Markets Securities Inc. and should contact the NatWest Markets Securities Inc. entity or affiliate in their home jurisdiction unless governing law permits otherwise. Those who utilize this information do so on their own initiative and are responsible for compliance with applicable local laws or regulations.

This material is made available in the European Economic Area ("EEA") by NatWest Markets Plc, which is authorised by the Prudential Regulation Authority and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority and the Prudential Regulation Authority ("PRA") and/or by NatWest Markets N.V. which is incorporated with limited liability in the Netherlands, authorised by De Nederlandsche Bank and regulated by De Nederlandsche Bank and the Autoriteit Financiële Markten. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. distributes this material in the U.S. With respect to the execution of interest rate derivatives, credit derivatives and foreign exchange transactions, NatWest Markets Securities Inc. generally acts as agent for NatWest Markets which will be the principal in such transactions.

This website and its contents have not been reviewed by any regulatory authority in Hong Kong. NatWest Markets Securities Inc. does not conduct, nor holds itself out as conducting a business in investment advisory or dealing services in Hong Kong, nor any other regulated activity. It holds no Hong Kong regulatory licenses. This material is distributed in Singapore by The NatWest Markets Plc (Singapore branch), Level 26, One Raffles Quay, south Tower, Singapore 048583, which is regulated by the Monetary Authority of Singapore. In Singapore, this material is intended solely for distribution to institutional investors, accredited investors, and expert investors as defined under the (Singapore) Financial Advisers Act, Chapter 110. Persons receiving this material in Singapore should contact NatWest Markets Singapore Plc (Singapore branch) in respect of any matters in connection with the material.

NatWest Markets Securities Japan Limited is regulated by the Japan Financial Services Agency. This Material is provided for information only and it does not constitute an offer or a solicitation to deal in any specific products or to enter into any legal relations, nor an advice or a recommendation with respect to such products. Clients should independently evaluate particular investments before dealing in any products herein referred to. Persons obtaining this information through NatWest Markets Plc's website are limited to Professional Investors (as defined in Article 2-31 of Financial Instruments and Exchange Law) only. The access to the website is provided by NatWest Markets Securities Japan Limited to its respective Clients in Japan who are classified as Professional Investors. However some Material is intended to be provided only to Qualified Institutional Investors (as defined in Article 10 of Cabinet Office Ordinance concerning Definitions provided in Article 2 of Financial Instruments and Exchange Law).

NatWest Markets Plc, Singapore branch [UEN: S85FC3595J] is regulated and authorised by the Monetary Authority of Singapore.

The views expressed in this publication accurately reflect the author's personal views about the subject financial instruments and issuers, and no part of the author's compensation was, is, or will be directly or indirectly related to the specific recommendations or views contained herein.