

against him. He deserves an affirmative vote, to be judged on the body of his work and the admirable qualities of his character. I thought that is what we did here. It is a real shame that people are questioning whether he deserves this vote.

I ask unanimous consent that following the cloture vote on the Hernandez nomination, the Senate recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly caucus meetings; that at 2:15 p.m. the Senate proceed to legislative session and a period of morning business until 3:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each; that at 3:30 p.m. the Senate resume executive session and the consideration of the Hernandez nomination with the time until 4 p.m. equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Judiciary Committee; that at 4 p.m. all remaining postcloture time be yielded back on the Hernandez nomination and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the Hernandez nomination; that upon disposition of the Hernandez nomination, the Senate proceed to the votes on the remaining motions to invoke cloture which were filed Thursday, February 27, on Executive Calendar Nos. 569, 565, 571, and 636; that if cloture is invoked on any of the nominees, with the exception of the Gottemoeller nomination, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate proceed to vote on the confirmation of the nominations; that there be 2 minutes equally divided in the usual form prior to each cloture vote; finally, all after the first vote be 10 minutes.

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

Mr. REID. I would close by saying I sure hope we get enough votes for this good man. If we do not, maybe it is time America had a good discussion on civil rights. If this man who is defending the right of the Constitution—that is what he has done. Does the Constitution mean anything? Should a man who has had nothing to do with the case of a violent murderer be used as a scapegoat for the Republicans to try to stop people from voting? I hope not.

We will have a discussion if this good man does not have the votes. We will have a discussion on civil rights. I think he will have a lot to do with the direction the discussion will take.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Debo P. Adegbile, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Barbara Boxer, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed, Carl

Levin, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Udall, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Michael F. Bennet, Maria Cantwell, Amy Klobuchar, Richard Blumenthal, Tom Harkin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate on the nomination of Debo P. Adegbile, of New York, to be an Assistant Attorney General be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted "nay."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Ex.]

YEAS—47

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Blumenthal	Kaine	Sanders
Booker	King	Schatz
Boxer	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Landrieu	Shaheen
Cantwell	Leahy	Stabenow
Cardin	Levin	Tester
Carper	Markey	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Franken	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden
Harkin	Murray	

NAYS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Pryor
Boozman	Hatch	Reid
Burr	Heitkamp	Risch
Casey	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shelby
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Coons	Kirk	Toomey
Corker	Lee	Vitter
Crapo	Manchin	Walsh
Cruz	McCain	Wicker
Donnelly	McConnell	
Enzi	Moran	

NOT VOTING—1

Cornyn

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 47, the nays are 52. The motion is rejected.

The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is entered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. The cloture motion having been presented, under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mark L. Pryor, Mark Begich, Tom Harkin, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Jon Tester, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Angus S. King, Jr., Claire McCaskill, Richard Blumenthal, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jack Reed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HATCH (when his name was called). "Present."

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) would have voted "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Pryor
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Rockefeller
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Menendez	Walsh
Feinstein	Merkley	Warner
Franken	Mikulski	Warren
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Hagan	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—41

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rubio
Chambliss	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Isakson	Sessions
Coburn	Johanns	Shelby
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Thune
Corker	Kirk	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Vitter
Cruz	McCain	
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hatch

NOT VOTING—1

Cornyn

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 57, the nays are 41, with one Senator voting “present.”

The motion to invoke cloture is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF PEDRO A. DELGADO HERNANDEZ TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Pedro A. Delgado Hernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:54 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. COONS).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 3:30 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant majority leader is recognized.

UKRAINE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Sunday was a perfect Chicago afternoon—not in terms of weather, which has not been too kind to us lately, but in terms of my events and schedule.

My first stop was at Navy Pier for the Lithuanian Independence Day celebration, an event which is important to me personally because my mother was born there. I happened to be on hand for the latest round of independence in Lithuania when the Soviet Union was finally dispelled and this country was allowed to stand on its feet. It was a great celebration with regional food people might expect, dancing and music.

I left there to go over to a section of Chicago known as Ukrainian Village. I asked, after church on Sunday, if my friends in the Ukrainian-American community would come gather and we would invite a telephone call from Kiev from the American Ambassador, Geoffrey Pyatt. I expected a nice crowd. I didn't expect an overflowing crowd, but that is what I found.

The concern of Ukrainian-Americans and many others about the situation in that country is very tense and very personal. Many of them have family members there and strong cultural family ties, and they are very worried.

So the Ambassador called in and gave a few moments of remarks and then answered questions. Then we met later to talk about some of the possibilities as we consider the future of Ukraine.

I looked through the audience and found many of my Polish friends, many of my Lithuanian friends—friends from all of the different ethnic groups which had endured some form of Soviet Union or Russian aggression in the past. They felt bonded with the people of Ukraine, the Ukrainian-Americans, as we discussed this.

I had hoped a few weeks ago that we had turned a corner in Ukraine—that the difficult events of the last few months were coming to an end—but that didn't happen. We saw horrific violence in Maidan Square and sadly many innocent people were killed. Just as Ukraine seemed to be emerging from this difficult period with the departure of President Yanukovich, the Russians moved into Crimea. I think that situation has moderated somewhat, although I don't know because it changes by the hour, but their decision to have a show of force in Crimea is one we cannot ignore.

The operation in Crimea was so well orchestrated that it had to have been planned by Russian President Vladimir Putin during the 22nd Winter Olympic Games hosted in Sochi, Russia. Can anyone imagine anything so crass or brazen as to lavishly try to present Russia to the world as a peaceful and moderate nation while secretly planning the military occupation of another neighboring country? The Russian taxpayers should get their \$51 billion back they paid to set up the Olympics. It was money wasted by Vladimir Putin to try to create an impression of Russia which sadly does not exist.

The former Ukraine President, Viktor Yanukovich, freely elected, also squandered a historic opportunity to further modernize Ukraine, to overcome corruption, and to lift the aspirations of his people. He unnecessarily and cynically divided his Nation. Instead of strengthening economic and political ties with Europe, reforming his economy, and respecting Ukraine's historical ties to Russia, he set off to become a pawn in Moscow. He saw his survival politically teaming up with Vladimir Putin. As the emerging pictures from Yanukovich's opulent palace illustrate, he enriched himself personally and his enablers while allowing the country's promising yet troubled economy to deteriorate. Ultimately, his government led the bloody assault on his own people using heavily armed snipers to massacre the Ukrainian people on the streets of Kiev.

I met with Mr. Yanukovich and many in his government just a year and a half ago. Yanukovich said he truly saw his country's future with greater ties to the West. But under enormous Russian pressure and unable to let go of his own political grudges and terrified of the transparency that an Association Agreement with the Eu-

ropean Union would mean for his corrupt regime, he ultimately put his own political future ahead of the good and the needs of the Ukrainian people.

We all know the likely tragic consequences of such self-serving political calculations. Look at President Assad in Syria and President Maduro in Venezuela. The Ukraine will be no different.

I understand the Crimea region of Ukraine has a long and complicated history. I understand that then-Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev actually gave Crimea to Ukraine in 1954, probably never imagining the collapse of the Soviet Union and an independent Ukraine to follow.

Let's be clear about what happened. Ukraine wasn't joining NATO. Ukraine wasn't joining the European Union. Ukraine wasn't proposing cutting off its economic and political ties with Russia. Ukraine was simply contemplating signing a long-negotiated trade agreement with the European Union. For that rationale alone, Vladimir Putin decided to militarily invade and occupy Ukraine.

I know Mr. Putin says he was protecting Russian citizens, but there have been no credible examples of threats to any Russian citizens in Ukraine. In fact, the New York Times reported this week that Russian tourists have been sent to eastern Ukraine, where they are stirring up anger and resentment against the Ukrainian Government in Kiev. Arguing that Russia can militarily invade another country any time to protect the Russian people is an ominous suggestion that raises alarms for independent sovereign nations all along the Russian borders, and it also raises the chapters of history back in the middle of the 20th century which we need not recount in detail.

One need only look at the two regions of Georgia—South Ossetia and Abkhazia—that have been militarily occupied by Russia since 2008. Russia continues to illegally occupy these areas and has erected fences along administrative lines and permanent military bases in violation of the cease-fire agreement negotiated with the European Union. I have been there myself, and I have seen the deeply troubling permanent bases and boundary fences in Georgia.

The Prime Minister of the Republic of Georgia came to see me the day after the final Olympic ceremonies at Sochi, and he said there was a report that morning after the final ceremony that the Russians were stringing barbed wire around the perimeters of the places they were occupying in Georgia. Russia even stopped some of the demarcation during the Olympics but started again, as I have said, after the games' conclusion. Russian actions in Ukraine and Georgia are a clear violation of international obligations and treaties.

For example, Russia was a signatory to the 1994 Budapest Memorandum that