

At the State of the Union speech last month, President Obama specifically said—and I am quoting now:

I call on this Congress to show the world that we are united in this mission by passing a resolution to authorize the use of force against ISIL. We need that authority.

That was a quote from his State of the Union Message. Quite frankly, he had already stated before he had that authority. I am not going to argue about that. Let's just make sure to eliminate all doubts.

Subsequent official White House statements have called for a "right-sized, modernized AUMF...it would send a powerful signal to the citizens of this country, the citizens of our allies, and to our enemies."

It was on January 23 that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Dempsey said—and I am going to quote General Dempsey's entire quote because I think he is the No. 1 guy. He is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the one who should be the best qualified to make these decisions.

He said:

I think in the crafting of the AUMF, all options should be on the table, and then we can debate whether we want to use them. But the authorization should be there...In particular, it shouldn't constrain activities geographically, because ISIL knows no boundaries, [and] doesn't recognize any boundaries—in fact it's their intention to erase all boundaries to their benefit. Constraints on time, or a "sunset clause," I just don't think it's necessary. I think the nation should speak of its intent to confront this radical ideological barbaric group and leave the option until we can deal with it.

That is all a quote from General Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I think we need to listen to it. I don't think the immediate need for an AUMF could be put more clearly or succinctly than General Dempsey's words, and it is my hope he was intimately involved in the drafting of the administration's AUMF.

It is my understanding we will see this tomorrow. Again, I, along with many colleagues—including my good friend from Utah—look forward to reading President Obama's AUMF. We have to get rid of this monster.

With that, I yield to my good friend from Utah.

NATIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MR. HATCH. Madam President, today I rise with my friend, the senior Senator from Oklahoma, to discuss some of the most pressing national security issues the Senate is poised to confront. These matters include the confirmation of Ashton Carter as Secretary of Defense, whose nomination I strongly support; and Senator AYOTTE's Guantanamo Bay detainee transfer bill, of which I am a cosponsor. Indeed, I applaud the expeditious consideration of Senator AYOTTE's bill in the Armed Services Committee under the leadership of Senator MCCAIN.

These moves come at a critically important time as we continue to witness the spectacles of barbarism perpetrated by the so-called Islamic State, or ISIS—aid workers and journalists gruesomely beheaded; Christians tortured and murdered for refusing to convert; and most recently, a captured coalition pilot burned alive.

These acts are just a glimpse of the undiluted savagery unleashed by this terrorist organization on the large swath of territory in Iraq and Syria that it controls. Even beyond its horrific human rights violations, the Islamic State threatens to destabilize the entire Middle East and it is attempting to undo all that was accomplished by our servicemembers in 8 years of blood and sacrifice in Iraq.

Most troubling of all, the Islamic State serves as a safe haven for terrorist training and planning, similar to Afghanistan prior to the September 11 attacks. With the Islamic State's stated intention to "raise the flag of Allah in the White House" and kill "hundreds of millions" in a worldwide "religious cleansing," there can be no doubt this organization poses a clear and present danger to the national security of the United States and to our allies, not only in the Middle East but throughout the world. Accordingly, we must fight and defeat this dangerous terrorist organization.

It is therefore incumbent upon us as legislators to ensure we provide all the tools necessary for defeating the enemy. Personally, I agree with the Obama administration's previous determination that the President has ample powers to conduct operations against the Islamic State under article II of the Constitution as well as the existing authorizations for the use of military force passed by Congress in 2001 against Al Qaeda and the Taliban in 2002 for Iraq. Nevertheless, I agree with the President that Congress should authorize the use of force against the Islamic State, not only to put to rest any legal questions about the President's power to use force, but also to demonstrate to the world America's resolve in this fight against terror.

If we are to pass a new authorization for use of military force, it is critically important to ensure that this new law is properly crafted. It will define against whom and under what conditions our Nation may direct its national might.

Therefore, Senator INHOFE and I feel compelled to propose general principles that we believe should guide this effort, especially since it appears the President will send his own draft to Congress shortly. Senator INHOFE and I are offering these thoughts with no intention to undermine careful consideration of the President's proposal by the Senate's national security committees.

Furthermore, we do not at all wish to complicate the efforts to reach consensus by laying down demands. Far from it. Rather, our intent is to facili-

tate the legislative process by outlining some of the elements we believe to be most crucial for ensuring the success of our servicemembers as they confront this great evil.

First, the authorization should clearly articulate that the executive branch is authorized to use force—employed in accordance with the law of armed conflict—against the Islamic State.

Second, the authorization should be flexible enough to be utilized not only against the Islamic State as it appears today, but also in whatever form the organization takes going forward. This flexibility should also include the authority to use force against organizations that are associated with or materially supporting the Islamic State.

Finally, and most importantly, the authorization should not impose any artificial and unnecessary limitations—such as those based on time, geography, and type of force—that could interfere with our strategic objective of defeating the Islamic State.

Unfortunately, many have suggested including such artificial limitations on the use of force in a future authorization. Specifically, many have discussed prohibiting the use of ground forces as well as providing an expiration date for the authorization. These are restrictions the Islamic State could use to its advantage. If we are telling the Islamic State upfront we will not use ground forces, will they not tailor their strategy around that fact? If we advertise when the authorization expires at an arbitrary date and time, will they not hunker down and wait for that date? Why would we not only unilaterally impose limitations as to which types of tools and tactics our servicemembers can use, but then also broadcast those limitations to the enemy?

Indeed, we believe that Congress and the President should heed the advice of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who stated in an interview on January 23, 2015, that:

I think in the crafting of the AUMF, all options should be on the table, and then we can debate whether we want to use them. But the authorization should be there. . . . In particular, it shouldn't constrain activities geographically, because ISIL knows no boundaries [and] doesn't recognize any boundaries—in fact it's their intention to erase all boundaries to their benefit. . . . Constraints on time, or a "sunset clause," I just don't think it's necessary. I think the nation should speak of its intent to confront this radical ideological barbaric group and leave the option until we can deal with it.

Senators INHOFE and I could not agree more. We hope the Congress will enact a new authorization based on the principles we are outlining here today. I want to thank him. I hope our colleagues will take this seriously and hopefully we can turn this mess around.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL P. BOTTICELLI TO BE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL POLICY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael P. Botticelli, of the District of Columbia, to be Director of National Drug Control Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Millions of American families are struggling with an unrelenting addiction to controlled substances. This is nothing new and that is the unfortunate part about it. But after decades of taking the wrong path toward treating drug abuse, it appears that we are finally in the midst of a fundamental shift in the way we are going to focus and approach this issue.

For years we simply considered drug abuse as a crime, to be dealt with by police, prosecutors, and prisons. There is now, however, a near consensus that addiction must be viewed as a public health issue. This requires coordinated investments in prevention and treatment. Law enforcement agencies would rather not arrest the same offenders over and over without dealing with the underlying addiction. Treating that addiction—rather than just punishing the addict—is often the more effective, more humane, and less costly approach.

There is perhaps no greater advocate for this shift in thinking than Michael Botticelli. Throughout his career in public health he has worked to bridge gaps between law enforcement, health care, and education providers. As acting director for the Office of National Drug Control Policy, ONDCP, he has made clear that we cannot “incarcerate addiction out of people.” While

law enforcement will always play a vital role in protecting citizens from drug-related crime, Mr. Botticelli recognizes that addiction is a disease—one that can be successfully prevented and treated using the same evidence-based approach we use for other public health challenges.

Mr. Botticelli's nomination was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last year and again last week. I am pleased that he continued to receive strong, bipartisan support from the full Senate here today. As director of ONDCP, Mr. Botticelli will help to coordinate drug-control activities across the Federal Government. This includes critical efforts such as administering funding for Drug-Free Communities grants and High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas. It is no small task. Just last week, the President requested over \$12 billion for demand reduction programs. This represents the largest commitment to treating and preventing drug addiction in our Nation's history, and it is badly needed.

Much of the country is now confronting a rising challenge: addiction to heroin and powerful painkillers. My home State of Vermont has not been spared, and it has attracted much attention for its struggles with opioid abuse. In fact, the film “The Hungry Heart” provides a powerful portrayal of the damage this addiction has inflicted on Vermont families. I was honored to host a screening of this moving film with Michael Botticelli last May.

However in many ways, Vermont is ahead of the Nation. We in Vermont long ago recognized the problem and began developing new approaches to address it. Dedicated Vermonters working in the traditional roles of prevention, treatment, and law enforcement came together around common goals and shared strategies. These community partnerships have produced innovative and successful programs such as the Rapid Intervention Community Court in Burlington, and Project VISION in Rutland. Last year, the Judiciary Committee held a hearing in Vermont on this issue. As a lifelong Vermonter, what hit me is how everybody came together for this hearing—Republicans, Democrats, Independents, law enforcement, defense counsels, clergy, teachers, medical professionals, parents and often those who have been abusers. We all realize there is no single answer, but we can do it better than we have for decades.

First responders are saving the lives of addicts throughout the State by carrying naloxone. This will save their life instead of some who would die of an overdose. Evidence-based prevention and treatment services have been extended to all corners of Vermont, and barriers to recovery have been significantly reduced. That is the most important part.

These are all strategies that the ONDCP promotes. Mr. Botticelli understands that success requires an in-

creased commitment to early intervention and education, treatment, and smart criminal justice policies. While the scope of the challenge is immense, Mr. Botticelli has us going in the right direction. Having listened to him, having talked to him, I am really hopeful he will help get us ahead of addiction, and help end the misery it inflicts on individuals, families, and our communities. I urge my fellow Senators to vote for his immediate confirmation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for Michael Botticelli as nominee to be the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. Botticelli has more than two decades of experience supporting those who have been affected by substance use and abuse.

Prior to joining the Office of National Drug Control Policy in 2012, when he was confirmed as the Deputy Director, Mr. Botticelli served as the director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services at the Massachusetts Department of Public Health.

While there, he expanded prevention, treatment, and recovery services, and worked to implement evidence-based programs, including a youth treatment system, early intervention and treatment programs, and overdose prevention programs.

During Mr. Botticelli's tenure as director of the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services, he confronted the issues of heroin and prescription drug abuse head-on and worked to ensure that police officers in Quincy, MA were trained and equipped to resuscitate overdose victims using naloxone, an emergency opioid overdose reversal medication.

Since October 2010, Quincy police officers have administered naloxone 220 times, almost always resulting in successful overdose reversal. This program has been replicated in communities throughout the country.

As chairman of the Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control, I had the opportunity to work closely with Mr. Botticelli during his time as Deputy Director and Acting Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Most recently, Mr. Botticelli testified at a hearing I chaired to address America's addiction to prescription opioids and heroin, where he emphasized the need for increased prescriber education to reduce prescription drug abuse and expanded access to naloxone nationwide.

In addition, Mr. Botticelli has committed to working with my office to address the import, manufacture, and distribution of dangerous synthetic drugs, which take far too many lives, far too early. At a previous hearing on the topic, he provided valuable insight into the threat that synthetic drugs pose and it is my hope that we can continue to work together as the Senate considers legislation to address this threat.