Like the Deepwater Horizon, the Santa Barbara oil spill was caused by a natural gas blowout when pressure in the drill hole fluctuated.

It took 11 days to plug the hole with mud and cement, but oil and gas continued to seep for months.

Using containment technologies still in place today, the cleanup effort relied on skimmers, detergent, and booms.

There has been no new drilling in waters controlled by the State of California since then, and there has been no new drilling in Federal waters off the coast of California since 1981.

Appropriately, the most recent plan from the Department of the Interior for Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing will not allow new leasing off the Pacific Coast of California, Oregon or Washington through 2022.

The fact is that those of us on the Pacific coast do not want any further offshore oil or gas development.

In 2012 California's 19 coastal counties generated $662 billion in wages and $1.7 trillion in GDP. This accounts for 80 percent of the economic activity in the State.

California's Ocean economy, including tourism, recreation, and marine transportation, accounts for over 489,000 jobs.

Unlike other areas of the country, any potential fossil fuel resources off the coast of California are likely to be found within only 50 miles of the coast, because of the narrow shelf off the California coast. This means that any potential drilling, and any potential spills, would be in direct conflict with the ocean environment and economy that my state enjoys.

Enacting a permanent ban on offshore drilling would protect our coast for generations to come.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 6—OBJECTING TO UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2334 AND TO ALL EFFORTS THAT UNDERMINE DIRECT NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN ISRAEL AND THE PALESTINIANS FOR A SECURE AND PEACEFUL SETTLEMENT

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BENNET, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 6

Whereas it is long-standing policy of the United States Government that a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict must come through direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions for a sustainable two-state solution;

Whereas President Barack Obama expressed before the United Nations General Assembly in 2011 that ''peace will not come through statements and resolutions at the United Nations—if it were that easy, it would have been accomplished by now'';

Whereas Yasser Arafat committed by letter dated September 9, 1993, to then Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, ''The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process and to the peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two sides and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved by negotiation.'';

Whereas the United Nations has taken a long-standing biased approach towards Israel, confirmed in outgoing Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon's final address to the United Nations Security Council, when he described the ''disproportionate'' volume of resolutions targeting Israel and stated that ''decades of political maneuvering have created a disproportionate number of resolutions, reports, and committees against Israel'';

Whereas the United Nations is not the appropriate venue and should not be a forum used for seeking unilateral action, recognition, or dictating parameters for a two-state solution, including the status of Jerusalem;

Whereas it is long-standing practice of the United States Government to oppose and veto any United Nations Security Council resolution dictating terms, conditions, and timelines on the peace process;

Whereas it is also the historic position of the United States Government to oppose and veto one-sided or anti-Israel resolutions at the United Nations Security Council;

Whereas efforts to impose a solution or parameters for a solution will make negotiations more difficult and will set back the cause of peace;

Whereas the Obama Administration's decision not to veto United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016) is inconsistent with long-standing United States policy and makes direct negotiations more, not less, challenging;

Whereas several United States administrations have articulated principles as a vision for achieving a two-state solution, including addressing borders, mutual recognition, refugees, Jerusalem, and ending all outstanding claims;

Whereas Israel is a vibrant democracy whose leaders are elected and accountable to the Israeli people; and

Whereas the Palestinian Authority must engage in broad, meaningful, and systemic reforms in order to ultimately prepare its institutions and people for statehood and peaceful coexistence with Israel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses grave objection to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 (2016);

(2) calls for United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to be repealed or fundamentally altered so that it is no longer one-sided and allows all final status issues toward a two-state solution to be resolved through direct bilateral negotiations between the parties;

(3) rejects efforts by outside bodies, including the United Nations Security Council, to impose solutions from the outside that set back the cause of peace;

(4) demands that the United States ensure that no action is taken at the Paris Conference on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict scheduled for January 15, 2017, that imposes an agreement or parameters on the parties;

(5) notes that granting membership and statehood standing to the Palestinians at the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other international institutions outside of the context of a bilateral peace agreement with Israel would cause severe harm to the peace process, and would likely trigger the implementation of penalties under sections 7036 and 7041(j) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2016 (division K of Public Law 114–113);

(6) rejects any efforts by the United Nations, United Nations agencies, United Nations member states, and other international organizations to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel through economic or other boycotts or any other measures, and urges the United States Government to take action where needed to counter any attempts to use United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 to further isolate Israel;

(7) urges the current presidential administration and all future presidential administrations to uphold the practice of vetoing all United Nations Security Council resolutions that seek to insert the Council into the peace process, recognize unilateral Palestinian actions including declaration of a Palestinian state, or dictate terms and a timeline for a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

(8) reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to continue to seek a sustainable, just, and secure two-state solution to resolve the conflict between the Israelis and the Palestinians; and

(9) urges the incoming Administration to work with Congress to create conditions that facilitate the resumption of direct, bilateral negotiations without preconditions between Israelis and Palestinians with the goal of achieving a sustainable agreement that is acceptable to both sides.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 4—CLARIFYING ANY POTENTIAL MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO WHETHER ACTIONS TAKEN BY PRESIDENT-ELECT DONALD TRUMP CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF THE EMOLUMENTS CLAUSE, AND CALLING ON PRESIDENT-ELECT TRUMP TO DIVEST HIS INTEREST IN, AND SEVER HIS RELATIONSHIP TO, THE TRUMP ORGANIZATION

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 4

Whereas article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution (commonly known as the ''Emoluments Clause'') declares, ''No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or

Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.'';

Whereas, according to the remarks of Governor Edmund Randolph at the 1787 Constitutional Convention, the Emoluments Clause ''was thought proper, in order to exclude corruption and foreign influence, to prohibit any one in office from receiving or holding any emoluments from foreign states'';

Whereas the issue of foreign corruption greatly concerned the Founding Fathers of the United States, such that Alexander Hamilton in Federalist No. 22 wrote, ''In republics, persons elevated from the mass of the community, by the suffrages of their fellow-citizens, to stations of great pre-eminence and power, may find compensations for betraying their trust, which, to any but minds animated and guided by superior virtue, may appear to exceed the proportion of interest they have in the common stock, and to overbalance the obligations of duty. Hence it is that history furnishes us with so many mortifying examples of the prevalency of foreign corruption in republican governments.'';

Whereas the President of the United States is the head of the executive branch of the Federal Government and is expected to have undivided loyalty to the United States, and clearly occupies an ''office of profit or trust'' within the meaning of article I, section 9, clause 8 of the Constitution, according to the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice;

Whereas the Office of Legal Counsel of the Department of Justice opined in 2009 that corporations owned or controlled by a foreign government are presumptively foreign states under the Emoluments Clause;

Whereas President-elect Donald J. Trump has a business network, the Trump Organization, that has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states and entities that are extensions of foreign states;

Whereas Michael Cohen, an attorney for Donald J. Trump and the Trump Organization, initially stated that the Trump Organization would be placed into a ''blind trust'' managed by Donald Trump's children, Donald Trump, Jr., Ivanka Trump, and Eric Trump;

Whereas the very nature of a ''blind trust'' is such that the official will have no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets held in the trust, and that the manager of the trust is independent of the owner, and as such the arrangement proposed by Mr. Cohen is not a blind trust;

Whereas, on November 30, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump announced on Twitter that ''I will be holding a major news conference in New York City with my children on December 15 to discuss the fact that I will be leaving my great business in total in order to fully focus on running the country in order to MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!'';

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump abruptly canceled the planned December 15, 2016 news conference, and has provided no set date for a future announcement;

Whereas, on December 12, 2016, President-elect Donald J. Trump stated on Twitter, ''Even though I am not mandated by law to do so, I will be leaving my busineses [sic] before January 20th so that I can focus full time on the Presidency. Two of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office'';

Whereas numerous legal and constitutional experts, including several former White House ethics counsels, have made clear that, notwithstanding the problems inherent in temporarily ceding control of the Trump Organization to his children, such an arrangement, in which the President-elect fails to exit the ownership of his businesses through use of a blind trust or equivalent, will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits, which raises both constitutional and public interest concerns;

Whereas Presidents Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, William J. Clinton, and George W. Bush have set the precedent of using true blind trusts, in which their holdings were liquidated and placed in new investments unknown to them by an independent trustee who managed them free of familial bias;

Whereas the continued intermingling of the business of the Trump Organization and the work of government has the potential to constitute the foreign corruption so feared by the Founding Fathers and to betray the trust of America's citizens;

Whereas the intent of this resolution is to prevent any potential misunderstanding or crisis with regards to whether the actions of Donald J. Trump as President of the United States will violate the Emoluments Clause of the Constitution, Federal law, or fundamental principles of ethics; and

Whereas Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States does not violate the Emoluments Clause and is discharging the obligations of office based on the national interest, not based on personal interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump to follow the precedent established by prior Presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings, adopt blind trusts managed by an independent trustee with no relationship to Donald J. Trump or his businesses, or take other equivalent measures, in order to ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution;

(2) calls upon President-elect Donald J. Trump not to use the powers or opportunities of his position as President-elect or President of the United States for any purpose related to the Trump Organization; and

(3) regards, in the absence of such actions outlined in paragraph (1) or specific authorization by Congress, dealings that Donald J. Trump, as President of the United States, may have through his companies with foreign governments or entities owned or controlled by foreign governments as potential violations of the Emoluments Clause.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it is with a renewed sense of purpose that I reintroduce my resolution on the Emoluments Clause. It is a resolution intended to uphold the values and strictures of one of our most sacred documents. I am referring, of course, to the Constitution, the instrument that, in but a short time, President-elect Donald Trump will take an oath to preserve, protect, and defend.

Our Founding Fathers could not have been clearer that any Federal office holder of the United States must never be put in a position where he or she could be influenced by a foreign governmental actor. It was a concern made explicit by Alexander Hamilton's writings in Federalist No. 22, in which he noted examples of republics that had been ruthlessly dismembered by their hostile neighbors who had paralyzed the victim republic by bribing its officers and officials.

The Founding Fathers addressed this grave concern by placing the Emoluments Clause within the Constitution as an explicit bar on foreign corruption and interference. Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the United States Constitution declares that:

> No title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States: And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under them, shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.

Longstanding precedent has made it plain that the President of the United States, as the head of the executive branch of the government, clearly occupies an ''office of profit or trust''. As such, the Emoluments Clause clearly applies to and constrains whomever holds the office of the Presidency.

Past American presidents have recognized the danger of foreign corruption and interference, or merely the perception of corruption and interference, and have accordingly taken great pains to avoid even the appearance of impropriety with regard to their personal wealth and investments, ensuring that such investments never interfere with performing their duties as President of the United States. Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all had their assets placed into blind trust while they were President. To fulfill his promises of greater government transparency, President Obama went even further and invested the vast majority of his funds in U.S. Treasury bonds.

The President-elect has claimed he will ''absolutely sever'' his ties to the Trump Organization, which has financial interests around the world and negotiates and concludes transactions with foreign states, as well as entities that are extensions of foreign states. We have a constitutional duty to ensure that he does. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which a foreign government will want to give President Trump a personal gift through his businesses with the intent to curry favor with him and seek to influence his decisions in ways that benefit them, instead of the American people—precisely the danger our Founding Fathers sought to protect against with the Emoluments Clause.

This is not an esoteric argument about rules that do not affect real people. Put simply, the American public has a right to know that the President of the United States is always acting in their best interest, and not take the risk that his actions are influenced by some benefit or gift from a foreign government like Russia or China. The citizens of this country need to know that when the President of the United States is making decisions about potential trade agreements, sending troops into war, or spending America's great resources, those actions are motivated by the public interest, and not because they might advance or harm

the President's private pecuniary interests.

We should be concerned when the President-elect is connected to an organization that has dealings with countries and entities that are not interested in distinguishing between doing business with President Trump and the profit-making organization that bears his name. The President-elect's failure thus far to dispose of his business interests in a comprehensive fashion has left this door wide open, and we are already seeing indications that foreign companies and businesses are beginning to take advantage. Kuwait's National Day event, which has traditionally been held at the Four Seasons in Washington, D.C., was moved to the Trump International Hotel, allegedly because of pressure—or perhaps merely a suggestion—from the President-elect's associates. Similarly, Bahrain has chosen to schedule an event to take place at the Trump International Hotel.

News reports suggest that one day after a phone call between President-elect Trump and the President of Argentina, permits under review for the Trump building in Buenos Aires were suddenly approved. In China, just days after the presidential election, Donald Trump scored a legal victory in a decade-long trademark dispute over the right to use the Trump name for real estate agent services in commercial and residential properties in China. The timing of these actions is interesting, to put it mildly.

I sincerely regret the necessity of reintroducing this resolution. Just after Thanksgiving, when President-elect Trump held a press conference to state that on December 15, 2016, he would make an announcement about his future with the Trump Organization, I publicly said how encouraged I was to see the President-elect's positive response. When I first introduced this resolution, my intent was to create an opportunity for the President-elect to act and remove this as an issue, so that he could put aside any appearance of impropriety and devote himself to good work on behalf of the American people. That is why I was disappointed when Mr. Trump abruptly canceled his December 15 announcement—and, as of today, he has not yet rescheduled it. This issue is far too critical to kick the can down the road, or to ignore, before an incipient violation of the Constitution becomes an actual violation.

Even before Mr. Trump's cancellation of his December 15 announcement, I was deeply concerned by statements he and his lawyers made with regard to the disposition of his numerous business interests. Mr. Trump's lawyers had initially announced that the Trump Organization would be placed into a ''blind trust'' managed by Donald Trump's older children. That arrangement is, unfortunately, by its terms the complete opposite of an actual blind trust. An actual blind trust is an arrangement which the official has no control over, will receive no communications about, and will have no knowledge of the identity of the specific assets being held, and in which the trust's manager operates independently of the owner.

Around the same time President-elect Trump cancelled his December 15th announcement, he tweeted another idea for disposition of his businesses, stating that ''[t]wo of my children, Don and Eric, plus executives, will manage them. No new deals will be done during my term(s) in office''. Let me be absolutely clear: the arrangement tweeted by Mr. Trump is not sufficient and is hardly independent. Mr. Trump would be well-aware of the specific assets held, and he could receive communications about and take actions to affect the value of those assets. The idea that President-elect Trump's children, who are listed as members of his transition team and have already been present at meetings or phone calls with foreign leaders, can ever be truly ''independent managers'' is simply not a credible resolution of this concern.

This inadequate suggested arrangement is not a blind trust and will not ensure compliance with the Emoluments Clause of the United States Constitution. Indeed, numerous legal and constitutional experts, including Richard Painter, a former adviser to George W. Bush, have made clear that such an arrangement will leave the President-elect with a personal financial interest in businesses that collect foreign government payments and benefits. The notion that the American people should be satisfied by an unbinding promise that no new deals will be pursued—a promise that does not define what constitutes a ''deal'' and which can be reneged on at any time—does not pass the laugh test.

I must admit, I have also been quite disturbed and disappointed by the recent excuses and suggestions by surrogate speakers and supporters of the President-elect as to why no action need be taken and, indeed, by statements the President-elect has made himself. President-elect Trump has tweeted, [p]rior to the election it was well known that I have interests in properties all over the world.'' This is undoubtedly true. But the American people, in voting for a candidate, cannot—and, in fact, would not—want to excuse a potential future violation of the Constitution by that candidate. Indeed, I would say that President-elect Trump has this idea backwards. Prior to the election, he was well aware of the fact that he had interests in unique properties all over the world. Since the President-elect has referred to himself as ''a constitutionalist,'' he must have known of the importance of complying with the Constitution by severing his foreign business connections in advance of his inauguration, which makes his continued failure and delay on this front all the more inexplicable.

On November 22nd, President-elect Trump stated, ''The law's totally on my side, meaning, the president can't have a conflict of interest.'' This regrettable statement selectively picks facts and shows a troubling disregard for the Constitution and for the duties owed to the American people. While the President, Vice President, Members of Congress, and Federal judges may be granted specific, limited exemptions from conflicts of interest so that they may act and carry out their duties, that law does not supersede the Constitution nor, frankly, have anything to do with the very specific provisions of the Emoluments Clause, which are intended to prevent foreign governmental financial influence over the President.

Even as some of the President-elect's most trusted surrogates have acknowledged that the potential ethics challenges facing President-elect Trump are ''a very real problem,'' they have persisted in arguing that Mr. Trump is somehow exempt from constitutional strictures, and even from the temptation of corruption itself, by virtue of his great wealth. For example, former Speaker Gingrich has claimed ''that this is a new situation we've never seen before, and the rules [that] were written for people who were dramatically less successful literally do not work,'' while Mr. Trump's leading candidate to head the administration's Council of Economic Advisors has claimed that ''[w]ealthy folks have no need to steal or engage in corruption.'' Really? That is a transparently false idea that one does not have to look very far to disprove. We need only glance at the countries where the Trump Organization has done business—places like Russia, Azerbaijan, Argentina, and Nigeria—to find numerous examples of already-wealthy government officials who have used their positions to lie, cheat, extort, and further enrich themselves and their families at the expense of the people they are supposed to be serving.

It was the enduring wisdom of our Founders to recognize that America is not magically immune from the corruption problems in other countries, and that not all men are angels. This is why we place our trust in the Constitution, not in individuals. A man with more wealth and extensive foreign holdings than prior presidents is, by an order of magnitude, more vulnerable to foreign corruption and interference than any president before him. The Emoluments Clause has greater bearing on Mr. Trump's presidency than his predecessors, not less.

No man can gain such wealth and power that he outgrows the limits of our Constitution. John Adams said it best: ''We are a government of laws, and not of men.'' No matter our political or partisan sympathies, we all recognize that the Constitution is the law of the land, and that when the needs and ambitions of any man conflicts with the Constitution, the Constitution must win out.

It has also been suggested by some of Donald Trump's supporters that the

Emoluments Clause does not actually apply to the office of the Presidency. Not only does this conflict with long-standing understanding of the Emoluments Clause in the Executive Branch, it contravenes both the strict interpretation of the plain words of the Constitution, as well as the traditional values and practices adopted by previous presidents.

To get around the ethics challenges facing Mr. Trump, it has been suggested by the President-elect's supporters that a panel of five ''experts'' regularly monitor the Trump Organization businesses and tell the President ''don't go over these bounds''. It has even been suggested that the President-elect can simply sidestep ethics issues that clearly violate the law by pardoning advisors ''if anyone finds them to have behaved against the rules''. These 'ideas' are non-starters that cut dangerously against the plain intent of the Emoluments Clause. I am afraid they show a disregard for the values of our Constitution.

The solution to this problem is simple, not complex, and is set forth by my resolution: President-elect Trump has only to follow the precedents established by prior presidents and convert his assets to simple, conflict-free holdings; adopt blind trusts managed by truly independent trustees with no relationship to Mr. Trump or his businesses; or to take other, equivalent measures. This solution also has the benefit of having been successfully implemented by every modem president before Mr. Trump.

This resolution and its aims should not be viewed through the distorting prism of politics. I want the Trump administration to have the support from Congress to succeed on behalf of the American people. Nevertheless, I believe that Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States, whoever that person may be, does not violate our Constitution, acts lawfully, and is discharging the obligations of the office based on the broad interests of the American people and not his or her own narrow, personal interests.

Despite the late hour—just days before the inauguration—it is still possible for President-elect Trump to live up to the values of the Constitution, give the American people the transparency they deserve, and completely sever his relationship with the Trump Organization before he takes the oath of office on January 20, 2017. To do so would avoid a constitutional crisis that would not serve the best interests of the President, Congress, or the American people. Therefore, I ask for prompt, bipartisan support to advance this vital resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 7. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 3, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2017 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2017 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2026.

(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 2017.

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 for health care legislation.
Sec. 3002. Reserve fund for health care legislation.

TITLE IV—OTHER MATTERS

Sec. 4001. Enforcement filing.
Sec. 4002. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
Sec. 4003. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 4004. 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 2017 through 2026:

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

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

Fiscal year 2017: $2,682,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $2,787,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,884,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,012,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,131,369,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,262,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,402,888,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,556,097,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,727,756,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,903,628,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: $0.
Fiscal year 2018: $0.
Fiscal year 2019: $0.
Fiscal year 2020: $0.
Fiscal year 2021: $0.
Fiscal year 2022: $0.
Fiscal year 2023: $0.
Fiscal year 2024: $0.
Fiscal year 2025: $0.
Fiscal year 2026: $0.

(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 2017: $3,308,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,227,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,104,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,177,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,152,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,091,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,216,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,203,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,091,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,127,000,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,265,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,265,000,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: $582,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $477,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $409,980,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $314,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $232,080,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $140,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $41,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: −$68,390,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: −$191,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: −$314,150,000,000.

(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 2017: $20,034,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $20,719,451,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,326,280,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,018,470,000,000.