

ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2196

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2196, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 2216

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2219

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2219, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the outdoor recreation economy of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam.

S. 2659

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2659, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency cannot regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to reauthorize the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007.

S. 2895

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2895, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S. 2946

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2946, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 3039

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROB-

ERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3039, a bill to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control.

S. 3059

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3059, a bill to reauthorize and amend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue and Response Grant Program and for other purposes.

S. 3060

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3060, a bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements.

S. 3089

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3089, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal anti-discrimination claims.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to "Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act".

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and to increase pressure on the organization and its members to the fullest extent possible.

S. RES. 505

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 505, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding compliance enforcement of Russian violations of the Open Skies Treaty.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 506, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Warsaw, Poland from July 8–9, 2016, and in support of committing NATO to a security posture capable of deterring threats to the Alliance.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 508, a resolution expressing support for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance to Israel between the United States Government and the Government of Israel.

S. RES. 511

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 511, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 26, 2016, as "LGBT Equality Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 4762

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4762 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 3100. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; read the first time.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, by Friday a lot of American families are going to be packing up the car and the kids and going somewhere to celebrate the holiday or gathering in the backyard to fire up a barbecue to celebrate the Fourth that way. But one father will be marking the day quite differently. For Jim Steinle, Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of the murder of his daughter. On July 1, 2015, as Jim Steinle was walking on a pier in San Francisco with his daughter Kate, the gunman opened fire, shot Kate, and she bled to death in her father's arms. Her last words were "Help me, dad."

As outrageous as this is, one of the aspects that is particularly maddening about this is that the shooter never should have been on the pier that day. The shooter was an illegal immigrant. He had been convicted of seven felonies and had been deported five times. But what is truly maddening is that 3 months prior to his murdering Kate Steinle, he was held in the custody of the San Francisco Police Department. They had him, and when Federal immigration officials learned that the San Francisco police had this guy, they asked them to hold him until they could get someone there because they knew he was here illegally. They knew his background, they knew how dangerous he was, and they wanted to deport him.

What did the San Francisco police do? They refused. They did not cooperate with the Federal immigration officials, and instead they released him onto the streets of San Francisco.

Why would the San Francisco Police Department do a thing like that? Why in the world would they do a thing like that with a seven-time convicted felon, five-time deported person whom Federal immigration officials were asking them to detain? They did it because San Francisco is a sanctuary city. That means it is the legal policy of the city of San Francisco to forbid their own police department from cooperating—from even cooperating—with Federal immigration officials. Even when the police would like to, they can't. It is against the law in San Francisco. So think about that.

Even when President Obama's administration and the local police are in complete agreement that this person is dangerous and they want to work together, they want to remove this person and the threat he poses to their community in a sanctuary city, the local politicians override that and they decide it would be illegal for the local police to cooperate. So the San Francisco police had no choice. They were forced by their own city government to release the man who would go on to kill Kate Steinle. If Federal officials had called about almost any other crime—if it had been about bank robbery, a trademark violation, car theft—it would have been perfectly legal for the San Francisco Police Department to cooperate with the Federal authorities. But because this involved an illegal immigrant, the San Francisco Police Department's hands were tied. They were forced to release Kate Steinle's eventual killer.

As the father of three young kids, I can't even imagine what Jim Steinle and his wife have endured and what they are going to go through this Friday. Sadly, the Steinles are not alone. According to an internal Department of Homeland Security memo, during an 8-month period in 2014, sanctuary jurisdictions—cities and counties and towns that have chosen to be sanctuaries—have released 8,000 immigrants during this period in 2014, and 1,800 of those released were later arrested for new criminal acts, including two cities that released individuals who had been arrested for sexual abuse of children. Not surprisingly, these individuals were arrested yet again for sexually molesting additional children because that is what these monsters do.

Let's be clear. This is not about immigration. This is really not about immigration. The vast majority of immigrants in this country would never commit a heinous crime against anybody, but any large group of individuals is going to have some bad actors. With roughly 11 million people here illegally, among them there are absolutely violent criminals. It is completely unavoidable. It makes absolutely no sense to insulate those violent criminals from capture by law enforcement.

I should point out that the dangers posed by these sanctuary city laws are not limited to domestic crimes, as ap-

palling as they are. Obviously, the sexual abuse of children and murder are more than sufficient reason to make sure we are not conferring a special benefit on these people. But the fact is, sanctuary cities are impeding our ability to prosecute the war against terrorists.

I will give a case in point. Last month, President Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Johnson, took a trip to Philadelphia with a modest request, because Philadelphia has a very extreme and radical sanctuary city policy. So President Obama's Homeland Security Secretary went to Philadelphia and asked Mayor Kenney of Philadelphia to make very narrow exceptions to the sanctuary city policy of Philadelphia. Specifically, he was asking that the Philadelphia Police Department be permitted to cooperate—just sharing information is what they were asking for—with the DHS if they were dealing with a suspected terrorist or someone who had been convicted of a violent felony or someone who had been convicted of a gang-related offense. Just those cases. Just those. Mayor Kenney refused. The city refused and made no change whatsoever to their sanctuary city status.

So as we gather this evening, the Philadelphia Police Department is absolutely forbidden from cooperating with Federal officials unless the Federal officials can prove that the person in question has already been convicted of a violent felony and they have a warrant for the arrest, which, of course, since the police are not allowed to even communicate with the Federal officials, how would they know to seek an arrest warrant?

The fact is, none of this makes any sense. Imagine the Department of Homeland Security calling the Philadelphia Police Department and complaining that they discovered that the city has in custody an illegal immigrant who the FBI suspects is plotting a terrorist attack. So the Department of Homeland Security asks the Philadelphia police for information about this guy—when did they pick him up, did he have other people with him, who were they, what were they doing, when are they going to release him. There is a lot of information they might like to have. And they might say: Hold this guy until we get there in the morning so we can interrogate him and begin deportation proceedings. That would be a reasonable request from the Department of Homeland Security, but under the current sanctuary city policy of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia police have no choice—their response has to be and is “Come back after the crime has been committed. Come back after he has committed his terrorist offense, and then come back with a warrant, and then we can cooperate with you.”

Sometimes I wonder if we have learned anything after 9/11, after the Boston Marathon bombing, after the San Bernardino murders, and after this horrendous massacre in Orlando. When

are we going to start taking this threat seriously? It is here. We see it. We are living through this.

Well, in my view, we have lived through too much—way too much. So today I am continuing my ongoing fight to end these sanctuary cities that endanger all of our communities. I am introducing the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, S. 3100, and it tackles two problems.

Part of the reason some communities have chosen to be sanctuary cities is in response to court decisions. There are two court decisions that we need to address—one is by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and the other by a Federal district court in Oregon. These court decisions hold that if the Department of Homeland Security makes a mistake in issuing a detainer in a request to hold someone, if it turns out that the Department of Homeland Security made a mistake—maybe they got the wrong guy—and if the local law enforcement cooperates, as we think common sense has suggested we would like to see, according to these court decisions, the local law enforcement and the local government would bear the liability. They can be sued. That is a problem for communities. In fact, it has driven over a dozen Pennsylvania communities, counties, and municipalities to say: We can't take that legal risk, so we will, quite reluctantly, become sanctuary cities.

There is a simple solution to this. In my bill, the first action my bill takes says that when a local officer is complying with a legitimate, bona fide immigration detainer duly issued by the Department of Homeland Security, then the local officer has the same authority as the DHS official.

A way to think about it is that the local police would be considered agents of the Department of Homeland Security for this purpose. If an individual's rights are violated somehow, the individual would still have every right to sue, but they would not sue the local police department, which was just acting in good faith in cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security; the person would sue the Department of Homeland Security. There would be no diminution of the person's legal rights or their ability to redress anything that went wrong; it is just that the liability ought to attach to DHS, not the local police department.

With this change in the law, there would no longer be any pretext or any justification whatsoever for these sanctuary cities and denying the cooperation with Federal officials which we need.

The second part of my bill says that once that is in place, once we fix that legal liability problem, if a community nevertheless decides they still want to be a sanctuary city, they still want to refuse to cooperate with Federal law enforcement, then they would lose some Federal funds. They would lose some of the CDBG money, the community block grant money, and I know

every Senator is very familiar with how much every city and every municipality gets because the local politicians get to decide how to spend it.

In my view, if you are going to impose the kinds of costs on all of us that sanctuary cities impose, the additional cost for Federal law enforcement, the additional cost to the American people in living in an area where they are at greater risk—it is unbelievable and impossible to quantify the cost to people like Jim Steinle, who lost his daughter—if you are going to impose those costs, then it is reasonable for the Federal Government to choose not to subsidize that.

That is my goal. It is pretty simple. Frankly, I don't think it should even be controversial. Leaders across the political spectrum have criticized sanctuary city policies. Former Pennsylvania Governor, lifelong Democrat, and former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Ed Rendell, has criticized the sanctuary city policies of Philadelphia. The Secretary of Homeland Security has clearly gone out of his way to try to get Philadelphia to change its misguided policy.

Pennsylvania law enforcement officers from across the entire political spectrum, across the entire Commonwealth, all agree we got this right. Last October the Senate considered a similar measure, and it got bipartisan support, but it didn't have enough to overcome a filibuster. I hope now we are finally going to fix this.

This bill is a simple, commonsense bill. I had this conversation with my constituents, and everyone is shocked that we haven't already fixed this problem. The bill stands for the simple proposition that the safety of the American people matters, that the life of Kate Steinle matters, and that protecting our homeland from violent criminals, including terrorists, matters.

As the Steinles observe the tragic anniversary of their daughter's death this Friday, I think they deserve to know that the Senate cares about that loss, too, and that we are going to do what we can to prevent another senseless and avoidable death from happening again.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4865. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

SA 4866. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4865 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4867. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4868. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4869. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4868 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 4865.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:  
This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.

**SA 4866.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4865 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

**SA 4867.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:  
This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.

**SA 4868.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days".

**SA 4869.** Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4868 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Taylor Harding, an intern in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Natalie Kirilichin and Elizabeth Wagner, fellows with the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be granted floor privileges through the end of next month, July 2016.

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

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3100

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:  
A bill (S. 3100) to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terror-

ists who are illegally present in the United States.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

#### BROWNFIELDS UTILIZATION, INVESTMENT, AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 518, S. 1479.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1479) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1479) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:  
S. 1479

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Brownfields Utilization, Investment, and Local Development Act of 2015" or the "BUILD Act".

#### SEC. 2. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 104(k)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:  
"(I) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code;

"(J) a limited liability corporation in which all managing members are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I);

"(K) a limited partnership in which all general partners are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I); or

"(L) a qualified community development entity (as defined in section 45D(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)."

#### SEC. 3. MULTIPURPOSE BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) is amended—