

It is the intellectual center of the Army. It hosts our Nation's best and brightest warfighters at the Command and General Staff College, which also hosts 100 international officers every year.

I want to remind my colleagues just how important Fort Leavenworth's mission is to the Army and to our national security and of the risk that this entire mission would be endangered by making it a terrorist prison.

Fort Leavenworth is home to the U.S. Army's Training and Doctrine Command Combined Arms Center. The Combined Arms Center oversees 13 schools, including the Command and General Staff College. Most recently, Fort Leavenworth was named the "Army University," giving our intellectual center of the Army an official title. Since 1881, the Command and General Staff College and the Combined Arms Center have been engaged in the primary mission of preparing the Army and its leaders for war.

In order to accomplish critical missions, Fort Leavenworth develops and integrates Army leader development, doctrine education, lessons learned, functional training, training support, training development, and proponent responsibilities in order to support mission command and to prepare the Army to successfully conduct unified land operations in a joint, interagency, intergovernmental, multinational environment—a lot of words. It is a big mission, an important mission. To degrade Fort Leavenworth to a terrorist prison would have ominous repercussions to our professional military and the value it serves every American and our national security.

In addition, we must consider how our allies will respond to having enemy combatants so close to their top military leaders training at Fort Leavenworth. In my effort to reach out to Embassies tied to the school, all have expressed their deep support for the International Military Officers Division, its value to their military and security, and the importance of maintaining the program at Fort Leavenworth. There is every possibility that the countries that participate in the Command and General Staff College would reconsider their participation given the relocation of terrorists. This would bring negative consequences and represent a terrible detriment to the partnership building that takes place during their course work. It would mean a loss of international cooperation for American military education and our national security.

There are so many imperative factors that must be examined at Fort Leavenworth, in Colorado, and in South Carolina, factors that we cannot ignore. The fact that the FBI has nearly 1,000 investigations into ISIS activity within the United States and all 50 States, that ISIS released a video right after the attacks in Paris stating that the United States was next, and, most important, the fact that we are not deal-

ing with everyday criminals—the detainees currently held at Guantanamo Bay are enemy combatants, terrorists, individuals with no remorse, and with a recidivism of 30 percent and a strong desire to return to the battlefield. The reality is, these individuals and the organizations they support pose the greatest risk to national security we face today.

This administration should not obstruct the will of Congress reflecting the voice of the American people, which has prohibited this White House from transferring detainees from Gitmo to the United States every year since 2009 when we first won this battle. We won the battle back then. Why do we have to repeat it now?

If the President believes he can act without consequences, he is wrong. Again, 91 Senators voted in favor of this prohibition just last week when we passed the National Defense Authorization Act. That is not just a majority, that is a veto-proof majority. Article II of the Constitution does not provide this President—any President—with the power to ignore the law.

Just the other night in a tele-town-hall meeting, caller after caller asked if the President's actions are constitutional. The question was, How can the President do this when Congress has prohibited funding? In my view and that of the President's own Attorney General, if the President acts by Executive order, he is acting unconstitutionally.

I agree with our Founding Fathers such as George Mason who said "When the same man, or set of men, holds the sword and the purse, there is an end of liberty" and James Madison who said it is "particularly dangerous to give the keys of the treasury and the command of the army, into the same hands."

I have mentioned the Congress, the merits of Ft. Leavenworth, the Constitution, but what I have not mentioned yet are our servicemembers. We have asked so much of our men and women in uniform over the past 14 years. We have asked them to go into harm's way before every bit of equipment was ready. We have asked them to deploy and redeploy with almost no dwell time. We have asked them to extend their stays, and we have put them in more places across the globe than any period in history. They have done it all without hesitation or complaint because we have the best fighting force in the history of the world.

I am unwilling to ask them to take on the challenge of guarding enemy combatants in the United States and put their families at risk for harassment, kidnapping, or other tactics homegrown terrorists and foreign fighters have used or will use. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines do not live anonymously when their families are stationed with them, as is the case at Ft. Leavenworth.

I believe, along with many who have worn the uniform, that the attacks in

Benghazi may have broken the Nation's promise to never leave a man in harm's way. On a personal note, when I signed up to enlist in the U.S. Marine Corps, I was told that if I was in harm's way, I would never be left behind. That is what the Marine Corps could do for me. The Corps would have my back either by squad—if I got in harm's way—or they would send the platoon or the company or the battalion or the regiment or the division or the whole Marine Corps, and I believed that. I still believe it as the senior marine in the Congress. The Marines would have my back.

It has been the same for generations before me and hopefully generations after—that is, until now. If we are going to ask our men and women to fight ISIS or to put their families at risk, they have to know that we have their backs.

Until that bond is restored and we have a President who is willing to lead instead of following, our Nation remains vulnerable to every terrorist organization and cell in the world. We must put national security back as our top priority. It must be our first duty in Congress and by the Commander in Chief.

I stand on the floor because America's national security is my top priority. Bringing Guantanamo Bay detainees to the United States is not putting our Nation's security above politics, campaign promises, or anything else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

#### FUNDING VETERANS PROGRAMS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the best way to fight this war on terrorism is to give the President of the United States the tools he has asked for and he needs. Part of that is fully funding support for veterans.

The Presiding Officer sits on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with me. He stood side by side with most of us on funding veterans programs.

Some of my colleagues haven't. They are happy to send people off to war and spend all the money we need but are not so generous when it comes to taking care of our men and women when they return. There are higher suicide rates, higher head injury rates, higher drug addiction rates, and higher unemployment than regular civilians. Yet people in this body, especially the tea party in the House of Representatives, sometimes don't seem to be able to find the money to spend to help veterans.

#### NOMINATION OF ADAM SZUBIN

Mr. BROWN. Another way to fight this war on terrorism and to help our efforts on fighting ISIS is to actually put the people in place in the U.S. Government who help us do that. I came to the floor today to join Senator CASEY—my friend from Pennsylvania who is

going to mention him too—and to support the nomination of Adam Szubin.

Adam Szubin has been delayed for more than 200 days by Republican obstruction in the Senate banking committee. Well, who is Adam Szubin? Adam Szubin has been nominated—listen to this job—to be the Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes at the Treasury Department. This isn't a low-level employee who has nothing to do with ISIS, fighting ISIS, and fighting terrorism; this is the No. 1 person in the Treasury Department—perhaps the No. 1 person in our whole government next to the Commander in Chief—who is in the position to fight terrorism and fight the kinds of financial crimes that ISIS depends on to fund its operations.

We had a hearing. Originally Mr. Szubin worked for the Bush administration for a number of years. He has been serving interim during the Obama administration, but my colleagues on the banking committee, my colleagues in the Senate, simply have refused to bring Mr. Szubin to a vote. He served Republican and Democratic administrations in senior positions. There is no question, zero question, that he is qualified for this position.

Let me tell you a little more about him. In 15 years he has distinguished himself as a tough, aggressive enforcer of our Nation's sanction laws—not against England or Germany—but against countries such as Iran, Russia, North Korea, against money launderers, against terrorists, against narcotraffickers, the source of a good bit of the money for terrorist groups such as ISIS.

Republicans say the administration is not doing enough; Barack Obama won't stand up. Well, the Republicans are blocking this appointment that would give the President the tools he needs to fight terrorism.

Again, more about Mr. Szubin, he earned his undergraduate and law degrees with high honors, he was a Fulbright scholar in Israel before joining the Department of Justice. As I said, he served with President Bush and with President Obama; he was counsel to the Deputy Attorney General. He worked as trial attorney on the Terrorism Litigation Task Force. He received the Department of Justice Special Commendation Award for his work countering terrorism. For 9 years he directed the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control. Many of us first came to know him then—in both parties—as a thoughtful policymaker and superb lawyer. Both parties respected him until Barack Obama nominated him; then Republicans seemed to forget how good he was and how qualified he was.

The Anti-Defamation League in this letter described him as an “intellectual heavyweight who has worked effectively with global partners to amplify the effects of U.S. sanctions.”

The United Against Nuclear Iran, a group that strongly opposed the Presi-

dent's deal with Iran, supports Mr. Szubin to be promoted, to be confirmed by the Senate.

Many of my colleagues on the banking committee said: We are not going to confirm Szubin because he was for the Iran nuclear deal. Well, he worked for the President of the United States, who was negotiating it. Of course, he was for it. But are they going to oppose him because they don't like what his boss did or are they opposing him because they don't like much of anything President Obama did?

The fact is that group after group, whether they are for the Iran nuclear agreement or against it—it really doesn't matter—supports Mr. Szubin.

His mentor, Bush Under Secretary Stuart Levy—his mentor and his predecessor, not immediate predecessor but predecessor—was confirmed by the Senate 3 weeks after his nomination. But you know what, both parties then with President Bush recognized that you confirm somebody who is central to the war on terrorism. Republicans then believed that.

Today, with a Democratic President, even though Adam Szubin is supported by darn near everybody—with his qualifications, with his support and work in two administrations—they don't want to bring him forward for a vote. I am not even sure why. I hear all kinds of reasons, none of them really on the record, none of them official, from my colleagues. Oh, they don't like President Obama or this guy must be a bad guy because President Obama appointed him or he was part of the government when the nuclear agreement with Iran was negotiated. All of these reasons simply don't pass a straight-face test. This is a critical national security post, and it needs to be filled permanently and quickly.

Mr. Szubin heads what is, in effect, Treasury's economic war room. It manages U.S. efforts to combat terrorist financing and fight financial crimes. Again, ISIS, ISIL, gets a good bit of its funding through illegal activities like that. If the U.S.—and if Mr. Szubin has the full range of powers that we have given him in the Congress, he can help us fight that kind of financing, stop that kind of financing for ISIS.

He is helping to lead the charge to choke off their funding sources to prevent them from developing additional capacity to strike more targets around the world. He is working to hold Iran to its commitments under the nuclear deal and to lead a campaign against the full range of Iran's other destructive activities. He is supported by the Global Jewish Advocacy and, as I said earlier, by the Anti-Defamation League and by United Against Nuclear Iran.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the documents from the organizations I just mentioned.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,  
Washington, DC, November 4, 2015.

AJC STATEMENT ON ADAM J. SZUBIN NOMINEE  
FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF TREASURY FOR  
TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL INTELLIGENCE

Jason Isaacson, AJC Associate Executive Director for Policy, today issued the following statement on the organization's behalf:

AJC has worked with, and admired the dedication and effectiveness of, the Under Secretary-designee for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, Adam Szubin, whose nomination is now before the Senate Banking Committee.

At a time when Iran and its terrorist proxies are ever more active and empowered, and when other terrorist threats to the United States and its allies are escalating, it is urgent that Treasury have in this critical position an experienced, creative, tireless watchdog, who has the know-how and the authority to lead U.S. efforts to track and choke off the financial lifeblood of terror.

As Acting Under Secretary, Adam Szubin has demonstrated that resolve and that skill—to the benefit of America's security and that of our allies. We look forward to his continued public service.

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE,  
New York, NY, September 9, 2015.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,  
Chairman, Banking Committee, U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. SHERROD BROWN,  
Ranking Member, Banking Committee, U.S.  
Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHELBY AND RANKING MEMBER BROWN: On behalf of the Anti-Defamation League, we write in support of President Obama's nomination of Adam J. Szubin to serve as Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of Treasury.

As director of Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), Mr. Szubin has earned a reputation as an intellectual heavyweight who has worked effectively with global partners to amplify the effects of U.S. sanctions. OFAC has been dubbed America's war room, a front line for the United States and its allies against terrorists and tyrants. It is a critical part of the effort to engage global partners to amplify the impact of sanctions and to innovate in the way that the U.S. targets violators.

OFAC's effectiveness, under Mr. Szubin's leadership, has exemplified the balance between working quietly behind the scenes or through diplomatic channels and sending strong public messages around the world about America's robust commitment to crack down sponsors of terror like Iran.

But Mr. Szubin has done much more than simply ably administer and enforce U.S. sanction against terrorism, weapons proliferation and rogue states. He has continued to expand and innovate how sanctions are devised and implemented as he has done with respect to sanctions on Iran and Russia.

As Members of Congress have debated how to balance diplomacy and sanctions, leaders on all sides of the debate are unified in their assessment that the strong, vigorous enforcement efforts by committed professionals like Adam Szubin have been one of the most potent and effective tools against the funding of terror and the isolation of rogue regimes.

We urge the Committee to act promptly and favorably on Mr. Szubin's nomination.

Sincerely,  
JONATHAN GREENBLATT,  
National Director.

[From the United Against Nuclear Iran, Nov. 3, 2015]

UANI SUPPORTS SENATE CONFIRMATION OF ADAM SZUBIN AS UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES

AMBASSADOR WALLACE AND SENATOR LIEBERMAN EXPRESS SUPPORT FOR CONFIRMATION

NEW YORK, NY—United Against Nuclear Iran (UANI) CEO Ambassador Mark D. Wallace and UANI Chairman Senator Joseph I. Lieberman issued the following statement today regarding the Senate confirmation of Adam Szubin as Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes in the U.S. Department of the Treasury:

“UANI was a leading opponent of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) nuclear agreement with Iran. The administration’s success in blocking bipartisan and majority opposition to the JCPOA on Capitol Hill should not be the basis to oppose the confirmation of Director Szubin as Under Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes. Simply put, he is the best person for the job, a true expert, a dedicated public servant and fully committed to serve his country. He has shown those traits over two successive administrations—a rare feat in Washington. On behalf of UANI, and in the strongest possible terms, we support Director Szubin’s confirmation. We respectfully call on all of our Senate friends who were rightfully frustrated by the administration’s tactics related to the JCPOA to put those concerns aside and support the confirmation of Director Szubin.”

Mr. BROWN. He has support across the political spectrum—or at least he did until he was nominated by this President.

I serve on the banking committee with Chairman SHELBY. I sit next to him as the ranking member. I like Senator SHELBY. I work with Mr. SHELBY day-by-day on many things. He has described Mr. Szubin as “eminently qualified.” He has served with distinction in senior national security roles—I will say it again—for 15 years under Presidents of both parties. He is well regarded around the world for his intellect, courage, and expertise. He deserves the strong backing of the Senate.

Republicans in Congress need to stop holding our national security apparatus hostage to political demands. They should allow—we should allow Adam Szubin and other national security nominees to be approved as soon as possible.

Again, strip the partisanship away. Do what is right: Confirm Adam Szubin; confirm these other national security people.

They aren’t controversial. The only thing controversial about these nominations is that Barack Obama made them. Well, the last time I checked, he was elected President of the United States twice, including my No. 1 swing State in the country—the hardest one to win, the one that both parties fight for in every election. He carried my State twice. He carried my State by over 100,000 votes.

He is the President of the United States. He appointed Adam Szubin, who is eminently qualified, who has had support from both parties. Why don’t my colleagues confirm him, giv-

ing him the full range of powers to fight ISIS, to keep ISIS from getting the resources and the financing they are getting now to launch these terrible terrorist crimes against innocent men and women all over the world?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is in morning business.

The Senator is recognized.

#### ISIS

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the recent terrorist attacks around the world—including, of course, the horror of Paris—but also to talk about what undergirds that, and that is the threat posed by ISIS. Some use the acronym ISIL; Daesh is another phrase that has been used to describe this vicious terrorist group. But I think we need to—at the same time as we are trying to prevent terrorist attacks—focus on the broader policy to destroy ISIS.

We know it has been 4½ years since the people of Syria began protesting against the repressive regime of Bashar al-Assad. As we also know, that conflict escalated rapidly and was coupled with a dysfunctional and sectarian government in Iraq, especially starting from the capital of Baghdad. The fighting and unrest created space for extremism to grow and to take root.

About 1½ years ago, we saw the emergence of the group we now know as ISIS. This group poses a very serious threat to our national security as well as to the security of many parts of the world. There is no question that ISIS is a clear threat to the security of our partners in the region and—as we know most horrifically, in the last few days—in Europe.

They also have a desire to attack the U.S. homeland. We know that. We have to remember that this is a group that originated as an Al Qaeda offshoot. They share the same motivations or at least similar motivations, and they, of course, share the same brutality, if not worse.

In recent weeks, ISIS has claimed responsibility for horrific attacks outside of Syria and Iraq. They claim responsibility for the bombing of a Russian airliner that went down over Egypt in the Sinai, killing all of its passengers—Russian passengers. ISIS suicide bombers attacked a market in Beirut, Lebanon, last week, just before Paris. Then, of course, came Friday night, the 13th. This was, as has been reported, a coordinated, ruthless, and despicable attack in Paris that killed 129 innocent civilians.

So what this horror—and we could list other examples, but these most recent events remind us—what this horror reminds us, is what our job is in Congress and across our country, but

especially when it comes to the role of the U.S. Federal Government. We have at least two responsibilities in this area. No. 1 is to prevent terrorists from coming into the United States of America; and second, but related, is to destroy ISIS, without a doubt. To do both of these will continue to be difficult and challenging. Anyone who comes up with a simple proposal or a commentary that makes it seem simple really doesn’t know what they are talking about, really doesn’t understand the complexity of this. I even doubt their commitment to it when they give one-line answers to difficult challenging problems.

Last year, I was blessed, in June of 2014, to have the chance to go to Normandy. Senator LEAHY, the senior Senator from Vermont, organized a visit to Normandy on the 70th anniversary of D-day. For someone representing any State—in my case representing the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, from where so many Pennsylvanians and, of course, so many Americans died on the beaches of Normandy or died within days of that battle—it was deeply moving to be in Normandy, to listen to presentations from those who had lived through the horror of Normandy and those who were coming back to celebrate the fact that they had served and were alive after these 70 years.

We were able to see the beaches. We saw the cemetery. I walked down to the cemetery, and the first grave I happened to look at was one of a Pennsylvania soldier, just fortuitously when I was looking at the first marker, the first grave.

One of the themes of that visit, of course, was France, the people of France thanking the United States, thanking allies and expressing gratitude in so many different ways, in heartfelt ways, at the leadership level, from President Hollande, all the way down. And one of the best images of that gratitude was displayed in this picture. I will put it up on the easel. This is an enlarged version of what was on a brochure. You can see it, and it is written in two languages, of course. The translation is “70th Anniversary of the Liberation of France,” in English and French, and the date—June 6, 2014, commemorating the 70th anniversary.

What you may not be able to make out from a distance is the image. It is, of course, a beach, and it is the image of a little girl. She has an orange plastic pail and a green plastic shovel—an image we all understand—a child going on to the beach to play in the sand. She is in a yellow dress, with her back towards us, and she is moving towards the beach.

What is so moving about this expression of gratitude by the people of France is that the shadow that emanates from that little girl is not her shadow. Rather, it is the shadow of an American GI, or what I believe to be an American GI, and I am not sure anyone could contest that. It is a profound and