

terms of Ukraine's future; we simply supported the right of the people to determine it for themselves.

But now, despite the success of the Maidan, the crisis in Ukraine has changed its face. It hasn't dissipated. And today Secretary Kerry was greeted in Kiev by Ukrainians pleading for the continued support of the United States.

Having been so clear-voiced in our support of the Ukrainian people thus far since the protests began last November, now is the moment when Democrats and Republicans should stand united in this Congress so that years from now, when a group assembles in Kiev marking the anniversary of this grave crisis, they will celebrate Ukraine's political sovereignty and economic rebirth with more chants of thanks to the United States.

In what shape should this support come?

First, we need to stand together in the next week to deliver serious financial assistance to a Ukrainian economy that is weak and is growing weaker as this crisis persists. A \$1 billion aid package is a good start, but our real work must happen within the structures of the IMF, which can provide potentially tens of billions of dollars necessary to fully right the Ukrainian economic ship. While Ukraine does need to undergo economic and budget reforms from within, I would caution the IMF to be gentle in the timing of the conditions applied to this aid. Difficult steps need to be undertaken to right-size gas prices and trim budget deficits, but Ukraine should be given a long enough lease so that these necessary reforms don't strangle a nation today dealing with threats to its very existence.

Second, Crimea. Russia has invaded Ukraine, make no mistake. They have done so in violation of the United Nations charter and the very accord they signed in 1994 guaranteeing Crimea's territorial security. No doubt Vladimir Putin was sore at losing his erstwhile ally in the Ukrainian President's office. No doubt he didn't like the fact that the United States voiced its strong support for the right of a sovereign Ukraine to make independent decisions about its future partnerships. No doubt he is infuriated that the Ukrainian people are now on their way to getting their way. But this is not a schoolyard. You don't get to push weaker kids around just because you don't like them. This is the 21st century.

The reason we belong to organizations such as the United Nations or the reason we negotiate treaties such as the Budapest memorandum is because now we understand, after centuries of European war, how destabilizing this kind of behavior is.

The irony for Russia, of course, is that this invasion demonstrably weakens, not strengthens, their nation's position in the world. Let's say for argument's sake that the end result of this crisis is a Crimea that is more closely aligned with Russia than with Ukraine.

What does that accomplish for Russia? Well, it will have won the occupation of 2 million Ukrainians while the majority of the other 43 million continue to orient themselves permanently toward the European Union.

If the United States and Europe make good on sanctions threats, which I hope we will, it will devastate the Russian economy, leaving millions of Russians out of work and adding political instability to Putin's own land at a time when he really can't afford much more instability, and it will make Russia an international pariah, shunned by the industrialized nations that help form the future path of global, political, and economic values.

Given this reality, why did Putin do it? He didn't do it to protect Russians in Ukraine because the only threat to their safety is due to the military crisis of Russia's own making. He did it because, like the schoolyard bully, he doesn't see past his own nose. He believes that he wins by temporarily flexing his muscles and by capturing the world's attention. He doesn't look to the long-term, potentially dire consequences to his own political standing and to his own people. He pulls punches because it feels good today no matter how bad it will hurt tomorrow.

But that being said, no matter the irrationality of Moscow's behavior, we need to make sure in the case that Russia does not correct its mistake, and correct it soon, the consequences do hurt. I believe Congress should authorize broad authority for President Obama to enact strong sanctions on Russia through penalties to its banks, its oil companies, and its political and economic elite. I believe the President should only be allowed to use this authority in the case that this illegal incursion into Ukraine continues and that we should give Moscow the opportunity to reverse course or join with the international community to address their concerns about the safety of Russian citizens in Ukraine.

Let's give Russia a chance to make this better and deliver a clear message of the consequences if they don't. This, of course, can't happen without the support of our European allies. As chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on European Affairs, I will be on the phone this week with European Parliamentarians urging them to join us in proposing new sanctions on the Russian economy.

I know there is hesitance in Europe due to the integration of Russia into the European economies, but this crisis should, frankly, matter more to Europe than it matters to us. Five years ago it was a laughable proposition that Russia would invade Ukraine, but it is happening now. It may be unthinkable today that Russia, in 5 years, is going to move on a NATO ally, but if this aggression goes unchecked, then the future can be very perilous, even for our friends in Europe.

Finally, a word on the politics of this crisis. I have listened to some of my

good friends on the Republican side try to score political points in connection with the Russian move on Crimea, trying to paint this somehow as Obama's fault. This is a ridiculous contention. Putin marched into Georgia in 2008 under a Republican President, who many of my Republican colleagues considered to be strong on foreign policy, and now he is doing it with a Democrat in office. President Obama is considering steps in response that seemingly weren't even considered in 2008.

What has me feeling even more suspect of the criticisms of President Obama is there doesn't seem to be any real difference between what the Republicans want the President to do and what he is actually doing. It is easy to say it is Obama's fault, but history tells us otherwise, and these political attacks mask the fortunate fact that there is pretty solid bipartisan agreement on what to do next.

Ukraine can remain whole and free and it can stay on a path to join Europe. When that day emerges from the smoke and the fire of the crisis, if we play our cards right, then they will have America and our European allies to thank, in part, for that new day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. McCAIN. I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his thoughtful remarks on events taking place and the tragedies taking place in Ukraine as we speak. I appreciate his commitment to trying to find a way through this very difficult situation.

The Senator is dead wrong when he says this is similar to Georgia. In fact, this Senator wanted to do a lot more than we did. In fact, we did a lot more. The fundamental problem, I say to my friend from Connecticut, is that this President does not understand Vladimir Putin. He does not understand his ambitions. He does not understand that Vladimir Putin is an old KGB colonel bent on restoration of the Russian empire. It was Vladimir Putin who said: The greatest catastrophe of the 20th century was the downfall of the Soviet Union.

The Senator from Connecticut should understand that. This President has never understood this. This President is the one who ridiculed Mitt Romney when Mitt Romney said our great enemy was Russia and its geopolitical threats. This President said the Cold War has been over for 20 years. This President believes the Cold War is over, but Vladimir Putin doesn't believe the Cold War is over.

When the President of the United States is overheard to say to Mr. Putin's puppet, Mr. Medvedev: Tell Vladimir that after I am reelected I will be more flexible.

Did you get that? The President said: Tell Vladimir after I am reelected I will be more flexible. This is the same

President who believed that somehow Vladimir Putin had anything but the ambitions which he is now realizing in Ukraine. In fact, I think it might be interesting for my colleagues to note that Vladimir Putin spoke to the press today and Vladimir Putin, among other things, during his answering questions from the press, said:

First of all, my assessment of what happened in Kiev and in Ukraine in general. There can only be one assessment: this was an anti-constitutional takeover, an armed seizure of power.

That was Vladimir Putin's view of what happened in Kiev as Yanukovych slaughtered, I believe, 82 innocent civilians as well as wounding hundreds.

Then he goes on to say:

I would like to stress that under that agreement Mr. Yanukovych actually handed over power.

Obviously, Yanukovych did not hand over power. He was driven from power by the good people who were tired of his corruption and were sick of his nepotism and his crony capitalism. Anybody who believes anything good about Mr. Yanukovych should see the pictures of the home he had and the dacha he was building that cost hundreds of millions of dollars—truly a man of the people.

President Putin went on to say:

The current acting president [of Ukraine] is definitely not legitimate. There is only one legitimate president, from a legal standpoint. . . . Yanukovych is the only undoubtedly legitimate President.

Then comes more interesting things. Vladimir Putin now says:

Now about financial aid to Crimea. As you know, we have decided to organize work in the Russian regions to aid Crimea, which has turned to us for humanitarian support. We will provide it, of course. I cannot say how much, when or how. The government is working on this by bringing together the regions bordering on Crimea by providing additional support to our regions so they can help the people in Crimea. We will do it, of course.

Regarding the deployment of troops, the use of armed forces, so far there is no need for it, but the possibility remains.

Let me repeat that. This is from today. Vladimir Putin said:

Regarding the deployment of troops, the use of armed forces, so far there is no need for it, but the possibility remains.

This is a return to the old Russian Soviet doublespeak which was absolute nonsense, but they said it anyway.

He goes on to say:

What is our biggest concern? We see the rampage of reactionary forces, nationalist and anti-Semitic forces going on in certain parts of Ukraine, including Kiev. . . . When we see this, we understand what worries the citizens of Ukraine, both Russian and Ukrainian, and the Russian-speaking population in the eastern and southern regions of Ukraine. It is this uncontrolled crime that worries them. Therefore, if we see such uncontrolled crime spreading to the eastern regions of the country—

We should pay careful attention to these words of Mr. Putin—

if we see such uncontrolled crime spreading to the eastern regions of the country, and if the people ask us for help, while we already have the official request from the legitimate President, we retain the right to use all

available means to protect those people. We believe this would be absolutely legitimate.

Then he goes on to say, in answer to a question:

Thus the tension in Crimea that was linked to the possibility of using our Armed Forces simply died down and there was no need to use them.

I repeat:

Thus the tension in Crimea that was linked to the possibility of using our Armed Forces simply died down and there was no need to use them. The only something we had to do, and we did it, was to enhance the defense of our military facilities because they were constantly receiving threats and we were aware of the armed nationalists moving in.

Russia has well trained, well equipped now an additional 16,000 or more, and Vladimir Putin was worried about enhancing the defense of his military facilities because they were constantly receiving threats.

He goes on to say:

There is something I would like to stress, however. Obviously, what I am going to say now is not within my authority and we do not intend to interfere. However, we firmly believe all citizens of Ukraine, I repeat, wherever they live, should be given the same equal right to participate in the life of their country and determining its future.

My friends, we are seeing justification for intervention and serious intervention in eastern Ukraine. So the article goes on with further questions, and he goes on to take a shot at the United States saying:

Our partners, especially in the United States, always clearly formulate their own geopolitical and state interests and follow them with persistence. Then, using the principle "You're either with us or against us" they draw the whole world in. And those who do not join in get "beaten" until they do.

Then he goes on to say:

Our approach is different. We proceed from the conviction that we always act legitimately. I have personally—

I say to my colleagues, I am not making this up. This is what Vladimir Putin said—

I have always been an advocate of acting in compliance with international law. I would like to stress yet again that if we do make the decision, if I do decide to use the Armed Forces, this will be a legitimate decision in full compliance with both general norms of international law, since we have the appeal of the legitimate President, and with our commitments, which in this case coincide with our interest to protect the people with whom we have close historical cultural and economic ties. Protecting these people is in our national interests. This is a humanitarian mission. We do not intend to subjugate anyone or to dictate to anyone. However, we cannot remain indifferent if we see they are being persecuted, destroyed and humiliated.

Here is probably the most interesting part:

Question: Mr. President, a clarification, if I may. The people who were blocking the Ukrainian Army units in Crimea were wearing uniforms that strongly resembled the Russian Army uniform. Were those Russian soldiers, Russian military?

Vladimir Putin: Why don't you take a look at the post-Soviet states. There are many military uniforms there that are similar. You can go to a store and buy any kind of uniform.

Question: But were they Russian soldiers or not?

Vladimir Putin: Those were local self-defence units.

Question: How well trained are they? If we compare them to the self-defence units in Kiev. . . .

Vladimir Putin: My dear colleague, look how well trained the people who operated in Kiev were. As we all know they were trained at special bases in neighboring states: in Lithuania, Poland and in Ukraine itself too. They were trained by instructors for extended periods. They were divided into dozens and hundreds, their actions were coordinated, they had good communication systems. It was all like clockwork. Did you see them in action? They looked very professional, like special forces. Why do you think those in Crimea should be any worse?

Question: In that case, can I specify: did we take part in training Crimea self-defence forces?

Vladimir Putin: No, we did not.

This is the same guy the President of the United States pushed the reset button for time and again. This is the same guy whom the President says we can work with—Vladimir Putin.

Then my colleague and former Member of this body on Friday—on Friday, as Putin's forces moved into Crimea, and it was very clear to anyone the Russians were moving in—Secretary of State John F. Kerry spoke Friday with Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov. This is a quote from Secretary Kerry.

We raised the issue of the airports, raised the issue of armored vehicles, raised the issue of personnel in various places. While we were told they are not engaging in any violation of the sovereignty, and do not intend to, I nevertheless made it clear that could be misinterpreted at this moment and that there are enough tensions that it is important for everybody to be extremely careful not to inflame the situation and not to send the wrong messages.

I am not making that up. So after 5 years of believing that somehow Vladimir Putin was anything but what he is, we are now paying the piper. The chickens are coming home to roost.

Do we have a military option? No. But we do have a number of other options.

I wish to read one other article that was in USA Today by Jonah Goldberg entitled "Obama In Denial on Russia."

I will not go through a lot of it, about student Obama, but here is some of the quote from the article:

In 1983, then-Columbia University student Obama penned a lengthy article for the school magazine placing the blame for U.S.-Soviet tensions largely on America's "war mentality" and the "twisted logic" of the Cold War. President Reagan's defense buildup, according to Obama, contributed to the "silent spread of militarism" and reflected our "distorted national priorities" rather than what should be our goal: a "nuclear free world."

That is what student Obama said. But the remarkable thing is 2 weeks ago in response to tensions in Ukraine, the President explained that:

Our approach . . . is not to see (events in Ukraine) as some Cold War chessboard in which we're in competition with Russia.

This is a horrible way to talk about the Cold War because it starts from the premise that it all was just a game conducted between two morally equivalent competitors.

Similar comments about Cold War rivalries and the like are commonplace of late, especially during the Sochi Olympics, when NBC commentators were desperate to portray the entire Soviet chapter as nothing more than a pivotal experience.

America surely made mistakes during the near half-century twilight struggle. The fact is there was a right side and a wrong side to that conflict and we were on the right side of it. The Soviet Union, of which Vladimir Putin was a part, murdered millions of its own people, stifled freedom in nearly every forum, enslaved whole nations, and actively tried to undermine democracy all around the world, including in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent for 5 more minutes.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. President Putin, a former KGB agent, has said the collapse of the "evil empire" was "the greatest geopolitical catastrophe of the 20th century." This alone should have been a clue to this White House that misspelled reset buttons weren't going to cut it. But they were too stuck in the past to see it.

I could go on and on, including the ridicule some of us were subjected to when we pointed this out from time to time, including in 2008 when I said in a debate with then-candidate Obama: Watch Ukraine. Watch Ukraine. Putin will not give up Ukraine.

We need to have an economic aid package immediately, and I am glad our Secretary of State is over there with initial U.S. loan guarantees, joining the EU, and a longer substitute package through the International Monetary Fund. We have to stabilize the economy of Ukraine which is near collapse. Financial sanctions, freezing assets, visa bans, trade embargoes—all of those can be accomplished, particularly expansion of the Magnitsky act, so people who are responsible will not have bank accounts, they will not travel, they will not ever get a visa. They need to pay a penalty for orchestrating what is happening in Ukraine right now.

Obviously we should not go to the G-8 summit. He should be thrown out of the G-8. It should now be the G-7. They obviously have to suspend military-to-military engagements. We need to have a path—and a quick one—for both Moldova and Georgia to move into NATO. Both countries are occupied by Russian troops, Moldova in Transnistria and in Georgia at Kajan South Abkhazia, and quite often Russians keep moving the fence farther and farther into the sovereign territory of these countries. In an attempt to ap-

pease Mr. Putin, we abandoned missile defense systems in Poland and the Czech Republic. We need to reinstate those and move forward as quickly as possible.

There are a number of things the most powerful Nation in the world needs to do. I am not counting on our European friends. Already there have been statements by Angela Merkel and the leaking of a memorandum from the British Government. We may have to do a lot of these things by ourselves, because they are dependent on Russia for a lot of their energy supplies, and we have seen a significant recession in European leadership over the last 10 to 20 years. But we need to act, and we need to speak in favor of the people who are now being overtaken in Crimea by Vladimir Putin's army and military. I worry.

In conclusion, I say it is time we wake up about Vladimir Putin. It is time this administration gets real. It is also time for us to worry about what Vladimir Putin will do in eastern Ukraine on the pretext that somehow disorder and demonstrations might require Russian presence.

My friends, if we allow Mr. Putin to assert his authority over these areas because of Russian-speaking people, that message is not lost on Poland where there is a Russian population, on Romania, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, and Moldova. We are on the verge possibly of seeing a move to reassert the old Russian empire, which is Mr. Putin's lifelong ambition.

I have overstayed my time. I thank my colleague from Alabama.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to listen to Senator MCCAIN. I think facts have proven him right for many over many years of warning this country about how we have to conduct international relations in a realistic way.

I had the opportunity to be in Georgia and Ukraine about 3 years ago. In Georgia, we went to South Ossetia where the Russians had moved in, against European international law, and had set in. Last week or so, we were informed by the Prime Minister of Georgia they were building barbed wire fences along that border, digging in even deeper than they had before.

In Ukraine, we met with some of the democratic dissidents who were trying to hang on to democracy there. They had beaten Shevchenko, the fabulous lady who helped lead the Orange Revolution. She was worried about going to jail. I didn't think she would go to jail, but they put her in jail and kept her in jail for years on what EU and NATO officials have all said were bogus charges. They told us some of the democratic activists were somewhat depressed because Putin, with his intel background, was using the Russian intelligence services in Ukraine to buy up media and buy up television to prop-

agandize the country. They were hurting, and they didn't know if they would be able to successfully resist. It was such a delight for me to see this basically nonviolent revolution in which the people stood up for their country. Now we see Mr. Putin did not accept the sovereignty, and he is going to try to utilize military force in a way which is stunning. I have to say, Crimea is far larger and more strategically significant than South Ossetia and Abkhazia, but it is the same actions.

I thank Senator MCCAIN for his leadership.

#### ADEGBILE NOMINATION

I will share a few thoughts on the nomination of Debo Adegbile to be the Assistant Attorney General of the U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, a very important position.

There is no question he is a bright young lawyer, has a good resume. He spent 13 years with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, one of the advocacy groups of the historic organization. They have been champions for advocacy and defense of civil rights and have done tremendous work over the years, and I have seen a lot of it. But they have also used the courts to advance political agendas which haven't always been accepted and have been seen to be improper.

While serving as the acting president and director-counsel of the Legal Defense Fund, Mr. Adegbile positioned himself at the center of many high-profile cases—cases in the news media, and issues he dealt with. Perhaps most notably as litigation director, he chose, without being asked or without being even needed, to participate in the case of Mumia Abu-Jamal, the country's most notorious killer of a police officer. Abu-Jamal was tried at trial and convicted of the murder of a young 25-year-old Philadelphia police officer, Daniel Faulkner. The evidence at trial proved that Abu-Jamal shot Officer Faulkner in the back, and then stood over him and shot him three more times before firing a final shot into Officer Faulkner's face. Immediately following the murder, he stated that he hoped the officer died.

As noted by Philadelphia District Attorney Seth Williams, in his letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to this nomination, he said:

Evidence at the trial established that while this was not some case of random street crime, Abu-Jamal was a supporter of the MOVE organization, an anarchist group that explicitly advocated violence against police.

This is the district attorney's summary of this case.

Some members of this body have argued that Mr. Adegbile's choice to involve himself and his organization in this case is irrelevant because it is simply a case of a lawyer representing an unpopular client.

And lawyers do that. They are called upon to do that. I live in Monroe County, AL, the home of Atticus Finch,