children who have entered the foster care system were victims of neglect, abandonment, or abuse;

Whereas 39 percent of individuals in the United States believe that foster care adoption is expensive, when in reality there is no substantial cost for adopting from foster care and financial support is available to adoptive parents after the adoption is finalized;

Whereas family reunification, kinship care, and domestic and intercounty adoption promote permanency and stability to a far greater degree than long-term institutionalization or long-term, often disrupted, foster care;

Whereas November is National Adoption Month, and National Adoption Day occurs in November;

Whereas National Adoption Day is a collective national effort to find permanent, loving families for children in the foster care system;

Whereas, since the first National Adoption Day in 2000, nearly 58,500 children have joined permanent families during National Adoption Day; and

Whereas the President traditionally issues an annual proclamation to declare the month of November as National Adoption Month, and National Adoption Day is on November 19, 2016: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Adoption Day and National Adoption Month;

(2) recognizes that every child should have a permanent and loving family; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to consider adoption during the month of November and throughout the year.

SENATE RESOLUTION 623—RECOGNIZING THE VITAL ROLE THE CIVIL AIR PATROL HAS PLAYED, AND CONTINUES TO PLAY, IN SUPPORTING THE HOMELAND SECURITY AND NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KIRK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. NELSON, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. COTTON, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. PERDUE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 623

Whereas, on December 1, 1941, a new civilian defense organization known as the Civil Air Patrol was founded, which was to rely on volunteer civilian aviators who would fly in support of the homeland security of the United States;

Whereas with the attack on Pearl Harbor 6 days later and the entry of the United States into World War II, the Civil Air Patrol would find itself serving the United States in ways that were not imagined at the time of the conception of the Civil Air Patrol;

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol initially engaged in coastal patrol operations that were considered critical to the United States war effort, piloting aircraft that in total flew 24,000,000 miles over 18 months, reporting 173 possible enemy submarines, and dropping 82 bombs or depth charges;

Whereas Civil Air Patrol civilian volunteers flew privately owned light aircraft armed with military bombs at the expense of the volunteers, often at low altitude, in bad weather, and up to 60 miles from shore;

Whereas Civil Air Patrol civilian volunteers undertook other vital World War II missions nationwide, which included border patrols, search and rescue operations, courier and cargo services, and air defense and pilot training;

Whereas, unlike many organizations at the time, the Civil Air Patrol welcomed women into its ranks to fly for the Civil Air Patrol, with approximately one-half of the women later joining the Women's Airforce Service Pilots (commonly known as ''WASP'') after having first flown with the Civil Air Patrol;

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol was open to all pilots interested in flying for the Civil Air Patrol, which allowed African-Americans an opportunity to serve and fly for the United States well before the adoption of the integrated Armed Forces;

Whereas, in 2016, the Civil Air Patrol continues its critical mission in service to the United States, now as a vital partner for the Air Force, serving as the auxiliary force, and, since 2015, as an official component of the total force;

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol remains one of the premier inland search and rescue organizations of the United States, and was credited with saving the lives of 69 individuals through search and rescue operations in 2015;

Whereas the Civil Air Patrol continues to fulfill many other vital missions, including helping train interceptor pilots and unmanned aerial vehicle operators under realistic conditions, aerial observation missions, counterdrug operations, disaster relief support, live organ transport, aerospace education, cadet programs, and Reserve Officer Training Corps orientation flights;

Whereas the continued work of the all-volunteer force of the Civil Air Patrol offers vital support to homeland security and defense missions; and

Whereas the weekly youth and aerospace education programs of the Civil Air Patrol continue to introduce young students to the field of aviation and instill within the students the values of national service and personal responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) applauds the Civil Air Patrol for 75 years of continuous service in times of peace and war;

(2) recognizes the critical emergency services, training support, and mission capabilities that the Civil Air Patrol offers State and national homeland security agencies as well as the United States Armed Forces; and

(3) commends the more than 23,500 youth and 32,500 adult volunteers of the Civil Air Patrol, who hail from a range of professions and across the United States, and dedicate their time to the service of their communities and the United States.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 56—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, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. REED, Mr. CARPER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. CON. RES. 56

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, has 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 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 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 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, I come to the floor to speak on behalf of a resolution I will submit today on the enrollment clause, which seems to uphold the values and strictures of one of our Nation's most sacred documents—the Constitution itself.

The Founding Fathers were clear in their belief that any Federal officeholder in the United States must never be put in a position where he or she could be influenced by a foreign governmental actor. Article 1, section 9, clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution, known as the emolument clause, 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 the President of the United States, as the head of the executive branch of government, clearly occupies an office of profit or trust. As such, the emolument clause clearly applies to and constrains whoever holds the Oval Office of the Presidency.

For those who claim to value a strict interpretation of the Constitution and who place upholding the Constitution above partisan politics, the unambiguous reading and meaning are clear and evident. Put simply, the American public has a right to know the President of the United States is acting in their best interest and not because he or she has received some benefit or gift from a foreign government, such as Russia or China or any foreign entity. They need to know the President of the United States is making decisions about potential trade agreements, sending troops into war, or where we spend America's great resources is based upon what is in the public interest and not because it would advance the President's private pecuniary interests.

The Founding Fathers' concerns on this subject were neither abstract nor baseless. Alexander Hamilton made specific references to these dangers in the Federalist Papers. While the Constitution was being debated in America, the Polish Lithuanian Commonwealth was in the process of being ruthlessly dismembered by her neighbors—Prussia, the Austrian Empire and Russia.

Poland's neighbors bribed Polish Government officials and succeeded in paralyzing the state for decades. The Founding Fathers placed the emoluments clause, an explicit bar on foreign corruption and interference, within the Constitution so we may avoid Poland's fate.

Happily, the emoluments clause has not been a section of the Constitution that has had to be of concern to this body, nor is there voluminous case history detailing its legal interpretation with regard to the highest offices of the executive branch. This is because every President, from George Washington to Barack Obama, has 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.

That is why, over the past four decades, Presidents Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George Herbert Walker Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush all had their assets placed into blind trusts while they were President. President Obama went even further because he wanted to fulfill his promises of greater transparency. He invested the vast majority of his funds into U.S. Treasury bonds.

I wish the well-established precedent and practice would make it unnecessary to introduce and seek to move this resolution today. I wish President-Elect Trump would be inclined to continue the longstanding and bipartisan tradition of Presidential traditions.

In September, Mr. Trump said, if he were elected, he would absolutely sever ties to The Trump Organization. Despite that pledge, it has since become clear that absent intervention by this body, the President-elect may not follow the precedents established by his predecessors. In so doing, he may well—for whatever reason and whatever motive—place himself and our Constitution in jeopardy.

As a separate and coequal branch of government, the Senate has a duty and obligation to safeguard our Constitution. It is to the Constitution, after all, not the person or position, that we swear our oath of office and to nourish the republican virtues that have allowed our Nation and government to flourish.

We must do so because following the election, it appears that President-Elect Trump may have changed his mind about the promises he made as he sought office. Mr. Trump's lawyers announced The Trump Organization would be placed into a ''blind trust,'' managed by Don Trump's older children, Donald Trump, Jr., Ivanka Trump, and Eric Trump.

Let me be clear, as the gravity of this issue demands absolute clarity. The financial arrangement described by Mr. Trump and his lawyers is not a blind trust. It just isn't. We can't allow Mr. Trump or his lawyers to trick us or the American people into thinking it is just because they use that term.

A true blind trust, including the ones established by past Presidents, is an arrangement where the official has 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 the trust's managers operate independently of the owner.

The arrangement described by Mr. Trump and his lawyers is not independent. Mr. Trump is well aware of the specific assets held, and he can receive communications about and take actions to affect the values of such assets. The idea that President-Elect Trump's children are or will be truly independent managers is not credible. This is not a blind trust, and this is not an arrangement that will ensure compliance with the emoluments clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. Trump has said there is no one like him who has ever become President of the United States. On that point, he may well be correct. I am very concerned Mr. Trump may violate the U.S. Constitution on the day he takes office and, even if it is not his intent, place himself and our Nation at risk. The purpose of my resolution is to convey to the President-elect there is still time for him to avoid this constitutional conflict.

Some might ask: Why should anyone care? It is not hard to imagine circumstances in which a foreign governmental actor will want to give President Trump gifts so they can curry favor with him and hope to influence his decisions in ways that benefit them when the President's decisions should benefit 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. The American public has the right to know if President Trump will put our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in harm's way to protect America's national security or to protect the latest Trump Tower in some far-off country. They have the right to know if the trade agreements negotiated by the new administration will benefit American businesses, farmers, workers, and consumers or whether they will benefit some Trump company or hotel.

Donald Trump's business network, The Trump Organization, has financial interests around the world and negotiates and includes transactions with foreign states and entities that are extensions of foreign states.

To give but one example of how bad things can get if Mr. Trump is allowed to stay connected to his businesses: In Azerbaijan, The Trump Organization partnered with billionaire Anar Mammadov to build a 33-story Trump Tower in Baku, the capital of Azerbaijan. Mammadov's father is Azerbaijan's long-time Transportation Minister and a confidant of the President of Azerbaijan. There have been allegations this billionaire's company and the companies he is connected to have profited from more than $1 billion worth of transportation contracts related to his father's position in the Transportation Ministry.

A former U.S. Ambassador to Azerbaijan in the 1990s and an adviser to the Director of National Intelligence under George W. Bush has said of this deal: ''These are not business people acting on their own—you're dealing with daddy.''

There are a great many nations, none of which we should emulate, where the lines between officials of the foreign government and business entities controlled by that foreign government are blurred or obliterated. For that reason, the Office of Legal Counsel at the Department of Justice has stated that corporations owned or controlled by foreign governments are presumptively foreign states under the emoluments clause.

We should all be concerned when the President-elect is connected to an organization that has dealings with countries and entities that aren't interested in distinguishing between doing business with President Trump and the profitmaking portion that bears his name. We run the risk of turning the United States of America, our legal system, our immigration system, our financial system, our trade agreements, and our military into subsidiaries of The Trump Organization.

It has already been reported that the Trump International Hotel in Washington, DC, has been patronized by an increasing number of foreign dignitaries and diplomats because of Mr. Trump's election. One diplomat was recorded as saying:

> Why wouldn't I stay at his hotel, blocks from the White House, so I can tell the new president, ''I love your new hotel''? Isn't it rude to come to his city and say, ''I am staying at your competitor''?

Likewise, news reports suggest that one day after a phone call between President-Elect Trump and the President of Argentina, permits under review for a 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.

The appearance of intermingling between the business of The Trump Organization and the work of government has already begun. Despite Mr. Trump's campaign promises to sever ties to The Trump Organization, where he stated that ''I'll have my children and my executives run the company and I won't discuss it with them,'' the Trump Presidential transition team has named Mr. Trump's children, Donald Trump, Jr., Ivanka Trump, and Eric Trump, to the transition team's executive committee—the same children who are supposedly managing The Trump Organization without discussing it with him. In those positions, they have the ability to offer counsel as to which personnel are selected to critical posts in the new Trump administration.

Ivanka Trump reportedly has been present during Mr. Trump's congratulatory calls with Japan's Prime Minister and the President of Argentina. Donald Trump, Jr., reportedly met in secret prior to the election with pro-Russia politicians to discuss Syrian policy. After the election, President-Elect Trump met with Indian real estate executives—his partners in developing Trump Towers in India—in which they allegedly discussed with the Trump family about possible additional real estate deals.

The list goes on and on. The totality of these engagements and the potential implications are deeply, deeply disturbing. Yet President-Elect Trump has done nothing to assure the American people he will put their interests above the enrichment of himself and his children, and he will assure, as the Founding Fathers intended, that the President is not placed in a position where he might be vulnerable to foreign influence or even the appearance of foreign influence.

While Mr. Trump or his advisers say ''Trust us,'' let us remember what John Adams said: ''We are a government of laws and not of men.'' It was the enduring wisdom of our Founders to recognize that not all men are angels, so we place our trust in the Constitution itself, not in individuals.

Mr. Trump's wealth and business interests must yield to the U.S. Constitution. Those wide-ranging interests make us realize just how critical the Constitution's prohibition of foreign gifts is. The business that the Trump Organization does overseas in places like Scotland, Argentina, India, and Azerbaijan cannot help but not be far from Mr. Trump's mind when he discusses matters of policy with foreign heads of state. This is not because President-Elect Trump is any more susceptible to these temptations than anyone else but simply because, as the Founding Fathers recognized, we are humans, not angels.

This insight into human conditions elicited the precise fear articulated by our Founding Fathers: Leaders who receive gifts and payments from foreign governments, being human, may not act in the best interests of the American people. To quote Richard Painter, an expert in ethics and an adviser to George W. Bush: ''Imagine where we'd be today if President Franklin Roosevelt had owned apartment buildings in Frankfurt and Berlin. . . . some of us might be speaking German.''

I am extremely troubled by Mr. Trump's recent remarks on this subject. On November 22, President-Elect Trump stated, ''The law's totally on my side, meaning, the president can't have a conflict of interest.'' In typical Trump sleight of hand, he selectively picks his own facts as he shows a troubling and callous disregard for our Constitution and for the duty he owes 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 preventing foreign governmental financial influence over the President. That the President-elect is not doing enough to avoid such conflicts is what brings me to the floor today and, overall, according to one new poll, is troubling to nearly 60 percent of the people of this country. The limited exception to the conflict of interest statute recognizes that there are certain public officials whose authority to act should not be held in question. That ability to act does not cure the restrictions in the emoluments clause of the Constitution.

The Constitution is the ultimate law of the land, not the President. Mr. Trump apparently does not appreciate the reason that the law on this issue is untested because previous Presidents have had the wisdom and personal forbearance not to seek to put this question to the test. But we have tested the

unfortunate proposition that ''when the president does it, that means it is not illegal'' before, and Congress, in service of the Constitution and the American people, has found that not to be the case. No one is above the law; no one is above the Constitution, including the President of the United States.

President-Elect Trump has also tweeted: ''Prior to the election it was well known that I have interests in properties around the world.'' That is undoubtedly true. But the American people, in voting for a candidate, cannot—indeed, would not want to—excuse a potential future violation of the Constitution by that candidate.

President-Elect Trump's attempt to imply that because he won the election, the Constitution somehow does not apply to him is irresponsible and disrespectful. It would be disrespectful to the Constitution; it is truly disrespectful to the American people, who are trusting their future, their children, their livelihood, and their safety to decisions Mr. Trump will make once he becomes President.

We must do everything we can to protect our Constitution, our democracy, and the American people from such recklessness.

The aim of my resolution is straightforward. It takes a strict interpretation of the plain words of the Constitution and supports the traditional values and practices adopted by previous Presidents. It simply calls on President-Elect Trump to follow the precedent 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. It calls upon the President-elect to refrain from using the powers or opportunities of his position for any purpose related to The Trump Organization. It makes it clear that if Mr. Trump does not take appropriate actions to sever his ties to his businesses, Congress will have no choice, given the oath to protect and defend the Constitution that each and every Member has taken, but to view any dealings Mr. Trump has through his companies with foreign governments or entities owned or controlled by foreign governments as a potential violation of the emoluments clause.

As Mr. Painter observed, ''It should send a clear message to [Mr. Trump] that he should divest his assets and that [Congress] will regard dealings with his companies that he owns abroad and any entities owned by foreign governments as a potential violation of the Emoluments Clause unless he can prove it was an arm's-length transaction.''

It makes it clear to President-Elect Trump that we care about the Constitution and our democracy, that the American people really are watching, and that we will not be distracted from caring about these things.

I want to close by observing that because of strong feelings and passions generated by the recent election, some might be tempted to view this resolution and its aims through a distorted prism of politics. Nothing could be further from the truth. I strongly support a smooth transition between the Obama administration and the Trump administration. I want the Trump administration to have support from Congress to succeed on behalf of the American people. But when Mr. Trump deviates from his constitutional responsibilities or recommends policies that are contrary to the core values of our Nation, Members of Congress have an obligation to speak out and to act.

I stand here today because I believe Congress has an institutional, constitutional obligation to ensure that the President of the United States, whosoever that is, does not violate our Constitution, acts lawfully, and is discharging the obligations of the office based on the broad interests of the American people, not his or her own narrow personal interests.

My resolution is not intended to create a misunderstanding or crisis, but to avoid one, so that President-Elect Trump can put aside any appearance of impropriety and devote himself to the good work on behalf of the American people. We owe it to President-Elect Trump to make very clear what our expectations are ahead of inauguration day. Why? So that we can avoid a Constitutional crisis. Such a crisis would not serve in the best interests of the President, Congress, and the American people.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5113. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2944, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

SA 5114. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2944, supra.

SA 5115. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CORNYN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 461, to provide for alternative financing arrangements for the provision of certain services and the construction and maintenance of infrastructure at land border ports of entry, and for other purposes.

SA 5116. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. REID)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 3438, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a major medical facility project in Reno, Nevada.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5113. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. COONS)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2944, to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Public Safety Officers' Benefits Improvement Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. REPORTS.

Section 1205 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''Rules, regulations, and procedures issued under this part may include regulations based on standards developed by another Federal agency for programs related to public safety officer death or disability claims.'' before the last sentence;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''In making''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) In making a determination under section 1201, the Bureau shall give substantial weight to the evidence and all findings of fact presented by a State, local, or Federal administrative or investigative agency regarding eligibility for death or disability benefits.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(e)(1)(A) Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau information on all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

''(B) Not less frequently than once per week, the Bureau shall make available on the public website of the Bureau updated information with respect to all death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part that are pending as of the date on which the information is made available.

''(C) The information made available under this paragraph shall include—

''(i) for each pending claim—

''(I) the date on which the claim was submitted to the Bureau;

''(II) the State of residence of the claimant;

''(III) an anonymized, identifying claim number; and

''(IV) the nature of the claim; and

''(ii) the total number of pending claims that were submitted to the Bureau more than 1 year before the date on which the information is made available.

''(2)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, and every 180 days thereafter, the Bureau shall submit to Congress a report on the death, disability, and educational assistance claims submitted under this part.

''(B) Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include information on—

''(i) the total number of claims for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

''(ii) the amount of time required to process each claim for which a final determination has been made during the 180-day period preceding the report;

''(iii) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

''(iv) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number of claims submitted to the Bureau on or before the date that is 1 year before that date for which a final determination has not been made;

''(v) for each claim described in clause (iv), a detailed description of the basis for delay;

''(vi) as of the last day of the 180-day period preceding the report, the total number