

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROSE EILENE GOTTEMÖELLER TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR ARMS CONTROL AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill 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 Rose Eilene Gottemoeller, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security.

Harry Reid, Robert Menendez, Benjamin L. Cardin, Ron Wyden, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Jack Reed, Tom Harkin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Jeff Merkley, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT ACT OF 2014—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. REID. Mr. President, is the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 309, S. 1086, now pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

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

The bill 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 309, S. 1086, the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act.

Harry Reid, Tom Harkin, Barbara A. Mikulski, Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy, Jack Reed, Robert Menendez, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Jeff Merkley, Ron Wyden, Martin Heinrich, Dianne Feinstein, Richard J. Durbin, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

JUDICIAL NOMINEES

Mr. REID. Madam President, I filed cloture on the childcare block grant. I have every assurance from my Republican colleagues that this vote will not be necessary. I hope that is the case. It would be great if we could vitiate that and move and start legislating.

I believe that will be the case. Sometimes it is a long time from today to next Wednesday, when a vote would occur. I really do believe it will not be necessary. I hope that is the case.

I indicated that I would say a few words about the man that does all of the objecting, or a lot of the objecting around here. We had the Senator from Kansas, the junior Senator from Kansas come and say he objected to these judges being approved because the senior Senator from Iowa, the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, asked him to do so.

In recent days Senator GRASSLEY has criticized my management of the Senate floor regarding nominations. The ranking member of the Judiciary Committee has said that I am responsible for the gridlock because of filibuster reform over the overuse of cloture. The past statements and recent actions of my friend, the senior Senator from Iowa, reveal his obvious either misunderstanding of what he said in the past or—I will leave it at that. There are a lot of terms that I could use, but I will not use them.

These are things that he has said in the past that obviously he did not mean at the time or he has forgotten what he said. He once stood on the floor and said he was strongly in favor of up-or-down votes on all nominations. He even said, "Filibustering the nominee into oblivion is misguided warfare and the wrong way for a minority party to leverage influence in the Senate."

That is what the man who is doing all of the objecting said before. He also said:

It is just plain hogwash to say that moving to make sure the rule is to give judicial

nominees an up-or-down vote will hurt our ability to reestablish fairness in the judicial nominating process. It is not going to hurt minority rights.

These are direct quotes from him:

It establishes what we call regular order and as it has been for 214 years. It will be fair both to Republicans and Democrats alike. All the majority leader wants to do is have a chance to vote on those nominees up or down.

He could be easily talking about me. Maybe in the past he was talking about Senator Frist or Senator Lott. But it does not matter who has this job. That is what he is talking about:

All the majority leader wants is to have a chance to vote these nominees up or down. If these individuals do not have 51 votes, they should be rejected. But if these individuals do have 51 votes, then they should be confirmed. That is according to the Constitution.

That is what he said. He said it here in May a few years ago, May 23. He also said—this is another quote.

Let's debate the nominees and give our advice and consent. It's a simple yea or nay when called to the altar to vote. Filibustering a nominee into oblivion is misguided warfare and the wrong way for a minority party to leverage and influence the Senate. Threatening to grind the legislative activity to a standstill if they don't get their way is like being a bully in the schoolyard playground.

He said that. The senior Senator from Iowa said that. He further said:

Let's do our jobs. Nothing is nuclear about asking the full Senate to take an up-or-down vote on judicial nominees.

I'm not making this up. This is what he said, the man who has the audacity to come here to the floor and object, saying what a terrible thing it is that we are having up-or-down votes on these judges.

He went on to say:

It is the way the Senate has operated for years. The reality is that Democrats are the ones who are turning Senate tradition on its head by installing a filibuster against the President's judicial nominees.

That is what he said. He slows down Senate business even on nominees he supports. How do you like that? This week alone, the senior Senator from Iowa repeatedly voted against cloture on nominations he then supported moments later: Beth Freeman, Northern District of California; James Donato, Northern District of California; James Moody, Eastern District of Arkansas; Jeffrey Meyer, Connecticut.

He voted to invoke the filibuster rule and then turns right around and votes for those judges. His obstruction, though, I am sorry to say, is not limited to nominations. When the Senate considered S. 744, the comprehensive immigration bill, Senator GRASSLEY objected to consideration or adoption of Republican or bipartisan amendments on at least four occasions.

When challenged, Senator GRASSLEY admitted to violation of Senatorial courtesy. Here is what Senator LEAHY said:

Is it not a fact that the first amendment that was brought up here was a bipartisan amendment of mine and Senator Hatch? Shortly thereafter, the Senator from Iowa came with an amendment. Following normal courtesy, I allowed mine to be set aside so he could bring up his. So isn't it a fact that we asked if he might set it aside for some non-controversial amendments on either side? He told me he could not. The Senator is correct.

You cannot talk out of both sides of your mouth unless somebody understands they are listening to what you say both times. The ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Iowa, he is talking out of both sides of his mouth. The people of Iowa should check this out and see what he said and what he does.

So he can come and criticize all he wants—criticize me. But it should be based upon facts, not standing his own statements on their head. He can't have it both ways.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ABLE ACT

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wish to discuss the ABLE Act, which is a piece of legislation that has been the subject of enormous and substantial bipartisan support both in the Senate and in the House.

We know that a lot of families have relied upon and have really benefited from the so-called 529 plans—a section of the IRS Code that allows families to save tax-free for education. What we are trying to do with the ABLE Act is to replicate that opportunity so that families who have a loved one with a disability—it may be one disability or it may be more than one, but every family who has a loved one with a disability should have the opportunity to save just as they might for education in a tax-free manner, in a tax-advantaged way.

We have been working on this legislation for a number of years. Senator RICHARD BURR, the senior Senator from North Carolina, and I have led this effort in the Senate. As I said, it would build upon that 529 model for education.

The ABLE Act enjoys the support of 63 Senators, 63 cosponsors. In the House, it is up to 335 Members. That is why we mentioned that over 400 Members of Congress agree. That is why the hashtag #passtheABLEact! is important to highlight.

There are few measures which come before the Senate or the House which enjoy that kind of bipartisan support. In the Senate there are no more than 5 bills that enjoy the support of 63 or more Senators. We are pleased about

that, but we are not done yet. We still have a long way to go to get this legislation done.

So as important as it is to highlight the numbers, it is also important to highlight the people who did the hard work to get us there. I want to commend Members of the House and Senate, but the ones who are worthy of even more substantial commendation would be a lot of individuals, some of whom are here in Washington this week: The National Down Syndrome Society. I was just with folks from the National Down Syndrome Society this morning over on the House side. They allow a Senator to go across to the House side. Our current Presiding Officer knows this, as she served there. Once in a while we get to go over there, and they were kind enough to invite us over there this morning. They have done remarkable work on this legislation and are continuing their advocacy today, even as we speak. We are grateful for their work.

Autism Speaks is another great organization that has done enormous work to bring us to where we are today, and the Arc as well. So many Americans know a lot about the Arc, the National Down Syndrome Society, as well as Autism Speaks. So we are grateful for that support, but we still have a ways to go.

One of the best ways to ensure this legislation will get over the goal line—I don't want to use too many football analogies here—but if we are getting close, even if we are in the so-called red zone, we are not in the end zone yet. We have a ways to go. But one of the best ways to make sure that happens is to talk about the real people that legislation like this would affect.

I mentioned the number of supporters we have, but I didn't mention the full name of the bill: Achieving a Better Life Experience. That is what the acronym ABLE stands for. But I like to think about it in this way as well.

I have a constituent, Sara Wolff, who is with us here today. She knows the rules don't allow me to indicate where she is today, but she is very close by, and she is with us today. I am grateful Sara is with us because she is a great example of someone who has a disability but is very able. She has a disability, but on a regular basis—hour after hour, day after day—she finds a way to overcome her disability or to manage it as best she can. She is a remarkable speaker. She gives as many speeches in a week as I give, and I am an elected official. She is well-known in northeastern Pennsylvania where we live. We live in the same county, but I live in Scranton and she lives in Moscow. She works for the O'Malley & Langan Law Offices. She is a law clerk there.

But as smart as she is on the law and these issues, probably the most significant part of her whole personality is the dynamism she brings to issues. She is a dynamic person. She does some-

thing few of us do well—even people who work here as elected officials—because she knows how to engage with people. She knows how to deliver a message. She knows how to be candid and direct but to do it in a way that is engaging and warm and friendly. So once in a while I will take instruction from Sara Wolff. But even more than that, I take inspiration from her.

Sara is someone who is very able and talented and committed, but she is among the many Americans—Pennsylvanians in my case—asking us to pass this legislation so that if a family such as hers wants to begin to save to help pay for a whole range of services for an individual with a disability, they can do so in a tax-advantaged environment in order to save over time, and do it in a manner that doesn't put them at a disadvantage from a tax standpoint down the road.

So Sara is a great example of why the ABLE Act should pass, and she is doing more than her share to make sure that it does pass. So I am grateful to Sara Wolff for doing that, and I am especially grateful to people like Sara, who like a lot of us at some point in our lives have to overcome a tragedy. Sara lost her mother Connie not too long ago to a sudden and rapid illness. But she has been able to deal with that tragedy and still help us day in and day out to get the ABLE Act passed.

I will highlight one more story and then I will conclude. Angie Cain is a 28-year-old who lives in Indianapolis, IN, and like Sara Wolff she lives with Down syndrome. Angie has five different jobs and works 5 days a week. She works paid positions at Kohl's on Mondays and at the YMCA on Fridays. On Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays she volunteers for several organizations, including a hospital, a Down syndrome office in Indiana, and the Alzheimer's unit of an assisted living facility.

Unfortunately, like so many Americans with disabilities, Angie is unable to save enough to cover her future needs—the same problem I just highlighted—if we don't change the law with the ABLE Act. Under current law, she must have less than \$2,000 in assets in order to be eligible for Supplemental Security Income. That doesn't make a lot of sense, and that is one of the reasons we have to change the law. Angie is, therefore, forced to limit the amount of money she earns and work multiple paid and volunteer positions in order to benefit from the steady benefits that SSI provides.

Angie would like to live independently and, at the same time, she knows that she has limitations in that regard because without adequate savings and income, because of the current state of the law, she is forced to live with her family. She would like to be independent. That is something we all yearn for at some point in our lives. Angie's family is worried about her living and financial situation, especially down the line, years from now, when