

their outstanding service. On another day I will say what a great job they have done.

Senator CARDIN and I take our responsibilities for recommending to the President the people of the highest caliber to serve as judges. We believe very strongly in the concept of an independent judiciary, people who will bring to the bench absolute integrity, judicial competence and temperament, a commitment to the core constitutional principles that have made our country great, and also through a history of civic engagement in Maryland—because a judge is not how many Law Review articles they write but can they administer equal justice and continue to honor equal protection under the law. Mr. Chuang and Mr. Hazel meet and exceed these standards.

Mr. Hazel comes with an incredible background. He served as an assistant U.S. attorney to the district court of Maryland. He has been the southern division coordinator on tough issues such as Project Exile, a Federal-State partnership addressing gun and violent crimes in Prince George's County and surrounding areas. He spent 5 years in private practice at Weil, Gotshal & Manges. He is also a man of faith, involved deeply in his church, Metropolitan Baptist Church, where he serves as a deacon.

Most recently, he has worked with the Baltimore State's attorneys office. The Baltimore State's attorney's office faced a lot of challenges. It faced dated technology and difficulties in maintaining chain of custody on evidence. He came in to work with our new State's attorney, which is an elected position, and he is a real reformer. So whether you were a prosecutor or you were a defendant, you knew it was going to be one of the best well-organized offices in Maryland.

Hazel brought that kind of know-how to make sure the apparatus of government worked because that was all part of making sure people got equal justice: Did we have the right guy when we were a prosecutor? Did we have the right evidence? Did the prosecutor have the right tools? Did the public defender or their private counsel have the opportunity to provide the defense of them? We have been able to do that. Also, working in his church he has shown he has been available to provide all kinds of pro bono services.

He is a graduate of a distinguished law school and he is a Morehouse man. I think when he takes the Federal bench and takes that oath, we are going to be proud of the service he does.

Then there is Mr. Chuang, the one who has been under dispute today. Gosh, I wish the whole Senate could meet him as well as Mr. Hazel. This is a new generation coming into the Maryland Federal judiciary. Mr. Chuang's parents and his own story is that of the American dream.

Mr. Chuang's parents came with practically nothing from Taiwan seek-

ing the American dream and a better life for their family. He worked very hard and then went on to some of our most distinguished schools. He went to Harvard Law School and Harvard University. He was a summa cum laude undergraduate and named by Time magazine as one of the high achievers. At Harvard, he was with the Law Review. But as I said, it is not how many Law Review articles one writes; it is, do they right wrongs in our society.

Yes, he has served at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security; yes, he has worked in government positions; yes, he has worked in private practice at Wilmer Cutler; yes, he has been at the Department of Justice; and, yes, he did provide legal counsel to the State Department. I am going to talk about that.

First of all, I am kind of tired of this Benghazi witch hunt stuff, but I am not going to go into that. I respect my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Congress has a right to oversight.

But let me make the record clear: Mr. Chuang's role during his temporary assignment was as legal counsel providing legal advice and representation to his client. His client was the State Department. Although he provided legal advice related to the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, he did not have decisionmaking authority over whether to provide subpoenaed documents to the committee. That was at higher levels. If the committee had a beef with the State Department, they should have taken it up with the Secretary of the State, which I know they did.

During his 6-month detail, the State Department produced a vast majority of documents and witnesses requested by the HOCR.

In the case of the subpoena in question—which was for internal files of the independent Accountability Review Board that conducted the Benghazi investigation—the State Department agreed to produce most of the documents but has to date declined to produce memoranda of interviews of State Department personnel because disclosure of those witness statements may chill cooperation in future ARBs. Although State offered to discuss alternative means of serving the committee's request, the House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform has not actively engaged the State Department on this since the fall of 2013.

Opposition to Mr. Chuang's nomination will have no impact on whether the State Department produces the documents, and he is not a State Department employee.

So I respect my colleagues for wanting to have cooperation. I don't dispute whether they have a legitimate grievance. I leave that in that field and domain, but I would say Mr. Chuang's role was that of a civil servant, providing advice to the leadership of the State Department on this matter. Then the State Department's job, at its highest level, was to negotiate with the

House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform, chaired by Mr. Issa and the ranking member, our very good colleague Congressman CUMMINGS of Baltimore.

So if we are going to vote against Chuang because the Secretary of State did or did not do something, I think we have other problems.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. I ask for 1 additional minute to summarize.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. If we continue to attack people because of the job they did for which they had no decision about, we are going to have a chilling effect on who comes into government.

If these two men whom I am recommending and whom the President has nominated were in private practice, they could be making hundreds of thousands of dollars. Because these two men are duty-driven, with outstanding educations, backgrounds, and experience, they have chosen public service. I hope the Senate chooses them to serve on the Federal bench. This body is going to be very proud of them the way Senator CARDIN and I are in bringing them to the floor's attention. I urge that we invoke cloture.

I yield the floor and ask that we follow regular order.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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 Theodore David Chuang, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Elizabeth Warren, Robert Menendez, Barbara Mikulski, Jack Reed, Richard Blumenthal, Carl Levin, Christopher Murphy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, John D. Rockefeller IV, Jeff Merkley, Richard J. Durbin, Benjamin L. Cardin.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are again voting to overcome Republican filibusters of three highly qualified judicial nominees. Republicans