

So from day one, the law officers of our country got a clear message. What was the message? If you go out and enforce the law, you will get in trouble. If you do not say anything and do not do anything and stay back and lay back and not enforce the law, everything will be OK. That began the situation.

Here are just some of the highlights that I circled and looked at.

This was the Bellingham, WA, case I just mentioned, detaining 28 illegal immigrants who were using false, fake Social Security documents.

On January 29, 2009, in April of 2009, and June of 2009, the Secretary of Homeland Security Janet Napolitano delays the E-Verify deadlines. E-Verify is a system by which businesses are supposed to check a person's Social Security Number to find out if it is valid before they hire them. Many times we know people have used false Social Security Numbers to get work. She delayed that. Then she delayed it again in April, and delayed it again in June.

In June of 2010, the ICE union—the Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers—they are three basic groups: the ICE group, there is the Border Patrol group, and the Citizenship and Immigration Services group that processes the paperwork. The ICE union cast a unanimous vote of “no confidence” in the agency Homeland Security leadership, including ICE Director John Morton and Assistant Director Phyllis Coven, citing “the growing dissatisfaction and concern among ICE employees” that they “have abandoned the Agency’s”—ICE’s—“core mission of enforcing United States Immigration Laws and providing for public safety, and have instead directed their attention to campaigning for programs and policies related to amnesty.”

He said the policy of this government—not what we as sworn officers are supposed to be enforcing, but the policy of our leaders is to spend all their time campaigning for policies related to amnesty and undermining enforcement.

ICE officers went so far, colleagues, as to file a lawsuit in Federal court contending they were being ordered to violate the law by their supervisors. A judge expressed sympathy for them but eventually decided they didn’t have standing to proceed with the case, but I think it is still on appeal.

In 2011, at a roundtable with amnesty advocates, President Obama admitted his deportation statistics were misleading. Indeed, they have been. They claim they have increased deportation, but that is totally incorrect. They finally had to admit it.

In February of 2012 President Obama slashed the budget for the 287(g) Program, a program that I helped advocate for and moved forward when I came to the Senate 10 years ago. It simply says the Federal Government will work with State and local law enforcement officers to train them in the things they can legally do to help the Federal officers enforce the law. It is a per-

fectly sensible program, and it is very popular. A number of States have taken quite a step toward it. It was working in an effective way, and they canceled it after he took office.

They announced the delay in the biometric entry-exit visa system in February of last year. An inspector general audit revealed declines in workplace enforcement of substantial amounts as a direct result of White House policies, and they admit the Obama administration manipulated deportation data.

In March of last year a new report revealed that the ICE officers—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair, and I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to wrap up.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. It was revealed that ICE released 68,000 convicted criminals in 2013. These are convicted criminals.

In May of last year the Deputy Chief of Border Patrol revealed that the border surge was incentivized by the administration’s policies.

As I said, there are 49 pages of this.

I would point out that we are ready to bring the bill to the floor and allow amendments to the legislation passed by the House that fully funds Homeland Security and ensures that the money is spent for enforcement and not to dismantle the law.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator ENZI are here on the floor. I want to briefly address the nominee we will be voting on this afternoon and then turn to the matter the three of us wish to address.

Today the Senate is going to vote on the nomination of Michael Botticelli to be the next Director of National Drug Control Policy. I look forward to working with our Nation’s next drug czar just as I have with previous drug czars.

Drug abuse is a serious problem in my home State. Kentucky is the fifth highest prescribing State when it comes to pain killers, and we have the Nation’s third highest drug overdose mortality rate, with many deaths driven by prescription pain killers.

Heroin abuse is also a problem in the Bluegrass State. Heroin deaths accounted for 32 percent of the drug overdoses back in 2013, and they continue to climb. The epicenter of the heroin problem is located in the northern region across the river from Cincinnati, although I am hearing more and more from constituents that drug abuse is rising in other parts of the Commonwealth as well.

All told, the Kentucky Office of Drug Control Policy reports that about 1,000 Kentuckians lose their lives overdosing on drugs every year, which is more than we lose in fatal car crashes.

There is another reason I am pleased to welcome prior drug czar Gil Kerlikowski to tour Kentucky. We had him there a couple of years ago to take a closeup look at the problems we face. He visited Louisville, Lexington, London, and Pikeville—four communities, both urban and rural, across the State. He met with Kentuckians who worked to tackle this issue from every single angle—public health officials, medical professionals, law enforcement officials, drug courts, members of the business community, and Kentuckians involved with prevention. The drug czar’s visit helped focus more Federal attention and Federal resources on this issue, and in a time of strained budgets, the extra attention and those extra resources are particularly important.

I am also pleased to report that Mr. Botticelli plans to visit Eastern Kentucky soon. He also plans, at my invitation, to visit Northern Kentucky this spring. Visits such as these help ensure continued Federal focus on Kentucky’s drug problem, and I look forward to working with the next drug czar to move closer to the day when drug abuse is no longer ravaging our families and our communities.

(The remarks of Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. ENZI pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 8 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

BOTTICELLI NOMINATION

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I rise to speak in support of Michael Botticelli in our effort today to confirm him as Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The State of Massachusetts, like too many other regions of this Nation, is being ravaged by the scourge of prescription drug and heroin addiction that is breaking apart families and burying communities under a mountain of despair. Massachusetts experienced 114 deaths in December, and that doesn’t count our biggest cities, such as Boston and Worcester and Springfield.

Drug overdose deaths fueled by prescription pain killers now claim more lives than car accidents nationwide. Approximately 100 Americans die from an overdose every day.

As a Senator from Massachusetts, I have a deep appreciation and respect for Michael Botticelli’s accomplishments addressing addiction during his nearly two decades serving in the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. He is a public health and drug policy pioneer, and he lived in my hometown of Malden, MA, while he did this job.

Immediately prior to joining the Office of National Drug Control Policy as Deputy Director, Mr. Botticelli was the director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services at the Massachusetts

Department of Public Health. While he was there, he pioneered innovative, effective approaches to substance abuse challenges. He was responsible for launching a program that expanded treatment and recovery opportunities in local community health centers, including a focus on providing a continuum of care for those suffering with substance use disorders. Mr. Botticelli also expanded innovative and nationally recognized prevention strategies. He established and implemented evidence-based jail diversion programs, reentry services for those leaving State and county correctional facilities, and overdose prevention programs.

Although there is always more work to be done, it is because of Mr. Botticelli's efforts and the legacy he left behind that Massachusetts is in many ways a national leader in addressing the prescription and heroin abuse epidemic.

Mr. Botticelli has been very public about his personal history of struggling with an alcohol use disorder as a young professional and seeking help that has led him into long-term recovery. He recently celebrated 26 years of sobriety, and I applaud him for that.

Mr. Botticelli's personal life experiences have provided him a unique perspective on the epidemic facing our Nation. When he joined me at a recent roundtable I convened in Boston about this crisis, he spoke about it in human terms. He reminded us that there is a family, a loved one, a friend, or a child behind each and every one of these statistics. His openness about his own struggles and his path to recovery helped shed much needed light on the issue of addiction, which has lurked too long in the shadows of shame and stigma. I think his story helps others to seek treatment and begin a life of recovery. He truly is leading by his own personal example.

The drug problems facing our country have changed dramatically since the Office of National Drug Control Policy was created in 1988. Mr. Botticelli has an excellent understanding of the mission of this office, the changing needs of the addiction community, and the urgency for solutions to halting the rise of substance use disorders in this country. I believe he is going to make a superlative Director, bringing his strong heart, keen mind, and Malden, MA, roots to the Office of National Drug Control Policy. I am honored to speak in support of his nomination on the floor today and look forward to working with him in the years to come. I recommend in the strongest possible terms Michael Botticelli for the Office of Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UKRAINE ASSISTANCE

MR. NELSON. Madam President, I wish to speak about the Ukraine. Lord

knows the President of the United States has enough on his plate, and he is trying to make the right decisions about what to do in giving assistance to the Ukrainian people and to the Ukrainian army to hold off Vladimir Putin's troops that are masquerading as rebels but, in fact, are bringing in Russian equipment and Russian soldiers who put on different uniforms. It is because of that that I think the wise choice would be for the United States to give lethal armaments to the Ukrainian people.

I was there in August. I spoke with all the members of the government—the Prime Minister, the Defense Minister, the Foreign Minister, the head of their Defense Council. At the time, I was surprised that they did not ask for lethal assistance but instead wanted up-to-the-minute intelligence, which was so important, and training. If my memory serves me correctly, in the Defense bill we provided about \$350 million for that assistance. But the question of lethal armaments so that they can withstand the Russian tanks—if we want them to be successful—is exceptionally important in this Senator's mind and point of view.

There is another reason. Mrs. Merkel is in town today, and her position is that she does not want Europe to provide lethal assistance. Well, Germany, of course, is not sharing a geographic line with the former Soviet Union, now Russia, and Germany is not feeling the heat, even though a major component and member of NATO, like so many of the other NATO members farther to the east.

Some of the Baltic States—Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania—have substantial Russian populations. They are frightened of the realistic possibility of Putin, who has successfully taken a Russian-speaking part of Ukraine—namely, Crimea, which fell into his hand like a ripe plum—now moving on other parts of eastern Ukraine to establish a land bridge down to Crimea. What they fear is that suddenly the Russian army will amass on their border and use as a pretext, as Putin has done in eastern Ukraine, the coming in and rescuing and protecting of the Russian-speaking elements of those particular countries, particularly in the Baltics. There is a huge percentage of the population in Estonia that is Russian, likewise in Latvia and also Lithuania.

I met with the President of Lithuania, a woman whom a lot of people refer to in very admiring terms as a tough cookie, and that is apparent when you meet her. But the concerns about the Russian aggression are clearly there. They are very concerned that if eastern Ukraine falls, they will be next.

I think that is another reason that these courageous people who, after the break up of the Soviet Union, had so many years of corruption and bad government—now having thrown off the shackles of corruption, having a new

government after all of those protests in the center of the capital city of Ukraine—I think it is incumbent upon us to help that little country defend itself against Russian aggression. When a Russian tank is bearing down on you, you need something that can penetrate the steel armor of that tank in order to stop that tank and all the other tanks from advancing.

I will stop right there and shift gears.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY FUNDING

MR. NELSON. Madam President, the clock is ticking at the Department of Homeland Security, and we are about to run out of money. We will run out of money at the end of this month. If we get into a situation where the Department that is tasked with the protection of national security here at home does not have the funding to protect our borders, to protect the central location that directs our defense against cyber attacks, to protect us as we get on airplanes through TSA, and to patrol the waters of the coastal United States through our Coast Guard—if we don't have the money appropriated, then that, to this Senator, is inexcusable.

This is all over a dispute about immigration because some people want to have it their way and only their way, and therefore, they cannot stand that the President has the legal authority to issue an Executive order. That is not the way to protect ourselves against all of these adversaries.

When I came to Washington as a young Congressman many moons ago, it was very clearly understood that partisan politics stopped at the water's edge. When it came to matters of national security, there were no partisan politics. When it came to matters of foreign policy, there were no partisan politics. Oh my, how times have changed. Now, with the injection of ideological politics, it is time for us to move on.

DISCOVERY SATELLITE

MR. NELSON. Madam President, the third and last subject I wish to address is the launch of a major spacecraft/satellite which will be for the interest of the United States and the free world. Hopefully, that will take place tomorrow evening around 6 p.m.

I was at the Cape last night thinking that the Discovery satellite was going to be launched atop a Falcon rocket on pad 40 at the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. All systems were go, save for the radar system on the eastern test range of the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center. The radar system went down, and they obviously cannot launch a rocket if they can't track it precisely, just in case it were to err from its course and had to be destroyed. So it was postponed. It has now been rescheduled for tomorrow night at approximately 6 p.m.