

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.

Why is this important? It is important because there are three major instruments. There are many more, but I will only mention three. No. 1, it will constantly aim an instrument at the Sun so when there is an additional solar explosion, which is a nuclear explosion on the face of the Sun, and all that additional radiation starts coming in what is known as solar wind to the United States, we can prepare for that nuclear radiation and save our satellites, save certain electrical grid systems, and warn pilots who are flying a route over the poles where the magnetic field of the Earth does not protect and repel against the nuclear radiation coming from the Sun, which is extremely important to commercial satellites, commercial systems on the ground, and is especially important to our military warning satellites.

We are fortunate there is a satellite that was put up in the late 1990s. Its acronym is ACE. It had a design life of 5 years, which would have been the early 2000s. This little satellite keeps producing. It measures the solar wind, or nuclear radiation, coming from the Sun about every 40 minutes. It was supposed to have been dead years ago. It is still perking.

This satellite will replace it and will warn us of a nuclear blast—not every 40 minutes but much more rapidly, like every 1 or 2 minutes, which will give us the ability to save our systems on the ground and in orbit. That is one instrument.

Now, since this payload will be at a neutrally buoyant point where the Earth's gravitational pull stops and the Sun's gravitational pull stops—called the Lagrangian Point No. 1, or L-1, between the Earth and the Sun—which is a little less than 1 million miles from the Earth, and because the gravitational pull of the Sun is much greater—it is about 92 million miles from the Sun—it will stay there and constantly look at the Sun in one direction, and in the other direction it looks at the Earth.

These are the other two instruments. One instrument will constantly measure the heat coming from the Sun that is being absorbed by the Earth, and that instrument then also measures the amount of heat that is reflected off of the Earth and radiated back out into space.

So if you want to measure exactly how the Earth is heating up, you get this very precise measurement of what is being absorbed minus what is being radiated back out into space, and you will know exactly how much heat the Earth is absorbing and how this planet is heating up.

The final instrument is one that was conceived of by then-Vice President Al Gore, who at my invitation was there yesterday. I don't know if he is going to be able to stay over until tomorrow to see the launch.

What Al Gore knew was that 42 years ago was the last time we had a full sunlit picture of the Earth. It was by the

Apollo 17 astronauts on the face of the moon. They got the Earth just at the exact time. They were able to photograph one-half of the Earth, which was lit by the Sun behind the astronauts on the moon. That was the last time we had a full, live picture of the Earth.

We have had many other pictures, but what they are is a strip here and a snippet there, and they are all stitched together—even though they were taken at different times—to make a composite of what the Earth looks like.

What the satellite Discovery will do, as its camera looks straight back at Earth, taking about 13 photographs in a 24-hour period, since the satellite is between the Earth and the Sun, it is able to look back with the telephoto lens and it will always see the sunlit side of the entire side of the Earth as it rotates on its axis every 24 hours and as it rotates around the Sun every 365 days. That will give us a new perspective of the overview effect of what this home that we call planet Earth is and what it looks like on a daily basis every 2 hours.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, the Keystone legislation is likely to move to the President's desk this week after the House takes it up, and he will veto it. The votes are not there to override a veto, either in the Senate or the House. Legislation has a natural lifecycle, and this piece of legislation is reaching the end of its lifecycle. This debate is almost over.

So where are we when it comes to American energy policy? The debate that occurred on Keystone was no doubt an important one, but it was exactly upside down. Congress and the media treated the Keystone bill as if it would settle American energy policy once and for all, when in fact it was and is a tiny sliver of debate. American energy policy is not defined by one project or one piece of infrastructure, however contentious it may be.

In order to have a real energy conversation, we have to agree on the facts, and this body cannot be the only place where there is a lack of consensus on the basic facts. That is why Senator WHITEHOUSE's amendment, my amendment, Senator HOEVEN's amendment, and those of many others were so important.

Last month's climate votes were illuminating and encouraging. First, Senator WHITEHOUSE's language, which simply stated that climate change was not a hoax, received a nearly unanimous vote. Believe it or not, that is progress. My amendment, which stated that climate change is real, caused by humans, and has real and significant impacts, received a bare majority of the votes, with five Republicans supporting it. Senator HOEVEN's amendment had similar language, as well as

some pro-Keystone language, and it attracted a dozen or so Republican votes.

What is the significance of all of this? It is very simple. Without acknowledging the problem, we cannot even begin to work on it. The wall of denial has begun to crack. So now we have a majority—and depending on how it is phrased, even a potential supermajority—in the Senate saying that climate change is real.

Now, most every serious person in public life either admits the basic facts of climate change or is on their way to getting there, and that is a good thing. Now the question is: What should we do? Given our regional differences, ideological differences, and the partisan divide, what comes next?

Later this year or next, we will see efforts to repeal a number of important environmental rules, especially the administration's clean power plan, which will regulate carbon pollution from existing and new powerplants, but that too is highly unlikely to result in anything other than a Presidential veto.

So are there any areas for potential common ground?

I think we saw real glimmers of hope and possibility during the Keystone debate. Several of my Republican colleagues made the argument during the debate on Keystone that while climate change is a real problem, we must be aware of how energy costs influence economic activity.

I could not agree more. We don't hear this often from folks on my side of the debate, but price matters. No climate policy is a real solution unless it strengthens both the national and global economies. As we pursue clean energy, we must understand its impacts on consumers—especially individuals and families in lower income communities—as well as businesses. We miss an opportunity to find common ground if we move too quickly past the questions of cost and the social and economic context in which this transition is going to occur.

We can contend with these challenges in Congress through a legislative solution. We can create incentives, create market-based mechanisms, look at regional differences, and fund R&D to help develop new and less-expensive solutions. EPA certainly has the authority and the obligation under the law to regulate carbon and other greenhouse gases. I support the President's Clean Power Plan because carbon pollution is real and it ought to be regulated under the Clean Air Act. If we want to be more comprehensive and if we want to be more nuanced and more flexible and more responsive to communities, we need a bill. Structured properly, a bill has the advantage of creating economically efficient solutions that can reduce carbon pollution from a much wider range of sources. That is why a well-designed fee on carbon is critical for our economy and our environment.

I understand the politics are nearly impossible right now, but if we think