

NAYS—43

Alexander	DeMint	Murkowski
Ayotte	Graham	Paul
Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Risch
Boozman	Heller	Roberts
Brown (MA)	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sessions
Chambliss	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Johanns	Thune
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Cochran	Lee	Vitter
Collins	Lugar	Webb
Corker	McCain	Wicker
Cornyn	McConnell	
Crapo	Moran	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Snowe

NOT VOTING—5

Blumenthal	Hutchison	Kyl
Enzi	Kirk	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of the bill, the bill is rejected.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PAYCHECK FAIRNESS ACT— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to calendar No. 410, S. 3220.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 410, S. 3220, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 410, S. 3220, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

Barbara A. Mikulski, Harry Reid, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Frank R. Lautenberg, Jeff Bingaman, Sheldon Whitehouse, John F. Kerry, Kent Conrad, Jeanne Shaheen, Bernard Sanders, Tom Udall, Amy Klobuchar, Carl Levin, Mark R. Warner, Mark L. Pryor, Jack Reed, Kirsten E. Gillibrand.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived, and the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to S. 3220 occur at 2:15 p.m., on Tuesday, June 5.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are going to arrange a vote Monday night

on one of the nominees who is trying to become a judge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments this afternoon to do something that has become a bit of a ritual with me; that is, to try to take some time each week to speak about the damage we are doing to our atmosphere, to our oceans, and to our climate with the relentless carbon pollution we are discharging.

As each week goes by, the information continues to pile up about the harms we are causing.

A recent story says rising temperatures could eliminate two-thirds of California's snowpack by the end of this century.

The snowpack that helps provide water for California cities and farms could shrink by two-thirds because of climate change, according to new research submitted to the state's Energy Commission.

Higher temperatures appear likely to wipe out a third of the Golden State's snowpack by 2050 and two-thirds by the end of the century, the Scripps Institution of Oceanography found.

Science Daily reports:

Black carbon aerosols and tropospheric ozone, both humanmade pollutants emitted predominantly in the Northern Hemisphere's low- to mid-latitudes—

That is basically us—

are most likely pushing the boundary of the tropics further poleward—

North and south—

in that hemisphere, new research by a team of scientists shows. . . .

The lead climatologist, Robert J. Allen, says:

If the tropics are moving poleward, then the subtropics will become even drier. If a poleward displacement of the mid-latitude storm tracks also occurs, this will shift mid-latitude precipitation poleward, impacting regional agriculture, economy, and society.

The American people have not been taken in by the campaign of propaganda that primarily the polluting industries have put out. There have been significant reports in the past on ExxonMobil's funding of essentially phony research agencies so they can offer their opinions on this issue without having it be ExxonMobil's opinion. They either create or take over or subsidize organizations that then put out the message, and they sound legit—Heartland Institute, Annapolis Center.

But the American people are not fooled, it turns out. Seventy-one percent of visitors who have come to the Nation's wildlife refuges say they were personally concerned about climate change's effects on fish, wildlife, and habitat. Seventy-four percent said that working to limit climate's effects on fish, wildlife, and habitat would benefit future generations. And 69 percent said doing so would improve the quality of life today.

One of the original researchers on climate change—I quoted an article earlier, describing how over time the facts

have proven his initial predictions accurate—is James Hansen. He wrote an article a few weeks ago in the New York Times headlined "Game Over for the Climate." It begins with these two sentences:

Global warming isn't a prediction. It is happening.

Clearly we see that in measurements and observations around the planet. But what happens if it keeps going? He is talking about the tar sands up in Canada, and he says this:

If we were to fully exploit this new oil source, and continue to burn our conventional oil, gas, and coal supplies, concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would eventually reach levels higher than in the Pliocene era, more than 2.5 million years ago, when sea level was at least 50 feet higher than it is now. That level of heat-trapping gases would assure that the disintegration of the ice sheets would accelerate out of control. Sea levels would rise and destroy coastal cities. Global temperatures would become intolerable. Twenty to 50 percent of the planet's species would be driven to extinction. Civilization would be at risk.

That is clearly, as he admits, a long-term outlook, but it is an outlook that deserves our attention, because when he has given us long-term outlooks in the past, as time has marched forward they have been proven over and over to be true.

It is convenient around here to pretend that none of this is happening. And it would be nice if we could wait until the disaster, the wolf was at the door and then do something about it, but there is a strong likelihood that by the time we take action, it will be too late.

In September of 1940, there was an American living in the Philippines with his wife and son. He looked at what was happening over in Europe. He looked at the threat to Britain. He cabled back to the United States his recommendation. He said:

The history of failure in war can almost be summed up in two words—"too late." Too late in comprehending the deadly purpose of a potential enemy. Too late in realizing the mortal danger. Too late in preparedness. Too late in uniting all possible forces for resistance. Too late in standing by one's friends.

The author of that cable was GEN George MacArthur. He continued later on in the cable:

The greatest strategic mistake in all history will be made if America fails to recognize the vital moment, if she permits again the writing of that fatal epitaph "too late."

Of course, General MacArthur was talking about what was becoming World War II, he was not talking about climate change. Yet his warning rings very true against this threat as well. "Too late" will be the epitaph if we do not prepare now. And I very much regret that we are in a situation in which we do not seem able as a body to take this threat seriously. The House shows no indication whatsoever of taking this threat seriously. Even the White House has dialed back its expressions of interest and concern on this issue, probably for the practical reason that the Republican-controlled House does not

want to deal with this issue at all. Period. End of story. But it is happening out there. It is happening out there.

People see the dying forests of the West as the pine bark beetle works its way more and more north because winters are no longer cold enough to kill off the larvae. People see the habitat of quail, of trout, of pheasant, of game animals, change in their lifetimes.

They see the places where they used to be able to go to fish with their grandchildren no longer available. Farmers see changes. Gardeners see changes. Plants that could not grow in certain zones now can. Tropical plants can grow in northern areas because of changes. In Rhode Island we have had winter blooms of some of our fruit trees because it has gotten so warm.

My wife did her dissertation on the species called the winter flounder, which was a very significant cash crop for the Rhode Island fishing industry. It was not very long ago. She wrote her dissertation about it because it was such an important part of the Rhode Island fishing industry, and because it had an interesting connection with a shrimp, *Crangon septemspinosa*, in which one fed on the other until it got big enough, and then the predatory cycle reversed itself and the winter flounder began to eat the shrimp instead of vice versa.

Well, landings of winter flounder in Rhode Island have crashed catastrophically. The reason? The mean winter water temperature of Narragansett Bay is up about 4 degrees. That is enough of an ecosystem shift that the winter flounder is gone. Fishermen now catch scup instead, which is a far less remunerative crop and frankly not as good a fish to eat, in my opinion anyway.

So these changes are happening. It is regrettable that we are unable to address them. The science has been discredited by propaganda campaigns that are deliberately and strategically designed to create doubt in the minds of the public where no doubt should exist. The fact is this science is rock solid.

The notion that when you put lots of carbon dioxide up into the atmosphere it warms the atmosphere has been around since the Civil War. The scientist who discovered it was an English-Irish scientist named John Tyndall. He first reported this phenomenon in 1863. For 150 years we have known this. This is nothing new. We can measure the gigatons of carbon that we are discharging into the atmosphere. Of course, it is going to make a difference. The notion that it does not has been a public relations and propaganda campaign by well-heeled special interests to protect pollution, because it makes money for those companies. But with the damage it is doing to our future, it is very hard to honestly look my children in the eye and say I am doing my job for them here in Washington while we do nothing on carbon pollution.

In fact, we continue to subsidize the biggest polluters. ExxonMobil makes

more money than any corporation has in the history of the world and they still claim a subsidy from the American taxpayer. It is a ridiculous subsidy. And yet we subsidize them. I see the distinguished chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee is here on the floor. I want to conclude my remarks and thank him for the amazing work he and the ranking member, Michael Enzi, did on the FDA bill we just passed with such a strong vote, virtually a unanimous vote. There was a lot of very good work that was done there, so that proves there are areas where we can do good work.

I hope the day comes when we can begin to do good work on the damage we are doing to our atmosphere and to our oceans with our relentless discharge of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, with our relentless subsidy of the polluters. One day we will be called into account for our inaction, and we will have earned the condemnation of history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend from Rhode Island for a very eloquent speech—elegant speech too—eloquent and elegant—in portraying what is so frustrating. And that is science knows what is happening. The scientists know what is happening. We have good data points about what is happening to our climate, our atmosphere, our oceans, and yet it seems we cannot do anything about it.

I say to my friend from Rhode Island, I think I was reading recently in a Scientific American magazine, which I love to read every month, that in terms of this whole global climate change, what is happening is that by the time we recognize it is happening—that is broadly, not just the scientists and others who do know what is happening—by the time it is broadly accepted, it will be too late, that we will have reached that tipping point. But the evidence is there for all to see. It is a shame that we cannot do something about it.

The Senator mentioned the fish catch in Rhode Island. I think also in the recent issue of Scientific American was a story about the fisheries and oceans at large, and there were three pictures. One was a picture taken on a pier in Key West in the 1950s showing the size of the fish that were caught. Big. I think the average weight was like 30-some pounds. Then there was a picture taken in the 1970s—late 1970s, early 1980s—now it is down to maybe 15 pounds. Same pictures, same pier, same dock and everything, and now the catch is down to teeny little fish. Same place, same ocean, same waters.

The article went on to point out how, if you look at the first picture, people are very happy. They are happy with this big fish. Then the second page, people are happy with what they

caught. And now you have got this little teeny fish and people are still happy, because we kind of tend to accept what it is right now and be happy with what we have got without realizing what we have lost in the past.

Again, I thank the Senator for his speech. We need to do more of that around here. We need to focus on this. We seem to be drifting. You are right, our grandkids are going to wonder why we did not do something.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I would suggest that it is more than just that we are drifting. I would suggest we are being drifted by politics and by the money in politics, particularly the big money the big polluters can throw into politics, not only directly by giving campaign contributions to people but by flooding money into phony so-called scientific organizations that then parrot their message, but without people being able to say: Wait a minute, this is ExxonMobil telling me; maybe I should be a little more guarded about it. So they launder it through a legitimate-sounding organization—not one, dozens—and we get bombarded with false propaganda. Scientists are not good at propaganda. It is not why they went to graduate school. It is not why they got their Ph.D. It is not what they do when they are out in the field taking measurements. So you put them up against a company such as ExxonMobil with all of its money and its propaganda skills and it is not an even contest.

As the Chairman points out, by the time we are looking around and seeing, oh, my gosh, what have we allowed to happen—now we are awake—we reject the propaganda. We have to do something about this, and it will probably be, as General MacArthur said, too late. That is the great danger.

I thank the chairman for his recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FRANKEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING SENATOR JAMES ABDNOR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a former Member of this body and my long-time friend and mentor, Senator Jim Abdnor of South Dakota. Senator Abdnor passed away last Wednesday, May 16, 2012, in South Dakota in the company of friends and family.

We are both products of the dusty short-grass country just west of the Missouri River on the plains of central South Dakota. Jim was a product of the active and civically-minded political culture of Lyman County and I was from next door Jones County. Despite these counties' sports rivalries over the years, Jim took me under his wing and introduced me to the American political process. If not for Jim Abdnor, I would not be standing here today.

After a basketball game when I was a freshman in high school, Jim struck up a conversation with me that would change the course of my life. I went to work for Jim as a legislative assistant when he was a Senator and later at the Small Business Administration. When I first ran for office, Jim's guidance and support were invaluable to me.

This past weekend, hundreds of South Dakotans came out to honor Jim Abdnor and remember his great love for them and his state. His funeral was held in a Lutheran church in the shadow of the State capital in Pierre, where Jim first served in statewide office as Lieutenant Governor. Jim was buried just outside of his small hometown of Kennebec near where his immigrant father first homesteaded.

Mr. President, Jim leaves us with many legacies and I want to mention a few of them here today.

First and foremost, Jim's was an American story. It started as the tale of an immigrant who boarded a ship for the United States not even knowing the English language but knowing he was heading for the land of opportunity. That immigrant, Jim's father Sam Abdelnour, wanted to escape the growing authoritarianism of his native Lebanon, for American freedom.

Jim's story is also a frontier story. His father Sam settled in Lyman County, South Dakota. Sam Abdnor became a homesteader and planted corn and wheat. He also peddled his wares to the other farmers in the area and when Kennebec was organized as a town, Sam was one of the first people to establish a business on main street. Jim grew up learning how to balance the books in a small town store and knowing how to work the family farm. He learned financial responsibility and hard work and how one can climb the ladder of success in America.

Jim's story is also a story of the land and farming. Some of us who knew Jim through politics may forget that before he was elected to Congress Jim had owned and run the family farm for three decades. Jim was very proud of the fact that he was good at representing South Dakota agriculture because he was an active farmer who did the planting and hauled his grain to the elevator in the fall. When he was in Congress, South Dakota was ranked as the most agricultural state in the Nation and Jim was the first farmer elected to Congress from South Dakota. Jim was proud of that correlation and he never forgot his farming roots.

During the 1970s, when people were organizing sit-ins and teach-ins and other protests, Jim helped organize a "beef-in." He brought 100 West River ranchers to Washington, DC, to talk about farm issues. They set up pens of cattle on the Washington mall and met with agriculture officials. Jim didn't rest until these ranchers had their voices heard.

Jim's story is also about water. We all live comfortably now with running water and hot showers, but that's not

how Jim grew up. He grew up on his family's windy, dry-land farm in Lyman County. He lived through the droughts of the 1930s. He understood the importance of water. He never stopped working on the issues of water access—including being a champion of the WEB water project in Walworth, Edmunds, and Brown counties in north central South Dakota that began in 1983.

The question of water was never far from Jim's mind and I think it had something to do with his heritage. That's certainly true of his Lyman County roots, which is where the humid Midwest begins to turn into the arid High Plains, but also of his roots in Lebanon, where water is also scarce. His family's home village of Ain Arab was founded because it was a watering hole. Ain Arab literally means "spring" or "well." More specifically, it means "spring of the Arab." When they had enough water in Ain Arab they would grow wheat, just like the Abdnors would do out in Lyman County.

Jim's is also a story about organizing. As soon as he came home from college, he started organizing Republicans in Lyman County and became head of the Lyman County Young Republicans. He helped organize and found the Elks lodge in Pierre in 1953. He joined every organization he could and he brought as many people into community affairs and politics and civic organizations as he could.

Jim also pushed other people to organize. He liked to tell the story of the people in Faith, SD, who wanted a new grandstand at their rodeo grounds. They took one look at the Federal regulations involved with some grant program and promptly did everything themselves, raising all the money they needed from local sources and fundraisers and did it at 10 percent of the cost. They put in 4,000 hours of their own time and made it happen themselves and Jim appreciated that. He liked communities working together to solve their own problems.

During the 1970s, when tensions in the Middle East worsened, Jim called for his fellow Arab-Americans to become more involved in the political process. He opposed what he saw as their tendency toward isolation and self-segregation. He said his ethnic compatriots should "get out and mix." "They should become more involved," he said, "become part of the community." Jim never stopped believing in the importance of being involved and working with others to make life better.

This is why Jim had so many friends. He never stopped working to meet people and bring them together around issues and simply to socialize. A friend of mine says that he doesn't think anyone in the State of South Dakota has ever attended more weddings, graduations, ceremonial dinners, or basketball, baseball, and football games than Jim.

As someone from the wide open plains who wanted groups of people to come together to solve problems on their own, Jim was always resisting Federal encroachment on local control. As the son of a small businessman, Jim was sensitive to the growing encroachment of Federal regulations and how much this encroachment cost small businesses. For many years, Jim was especially incensed about OSHA mandating rules for small stores on South Dakota main streets. In the 1970s, Jim also had a big fight with OSHA because it was trying to mandate that South Dakota wheat farmers maintain portapotties in the fields, which a practicing wheat farmer from Lyman County, South Dakota knew was the definition of absurd.

As a small businessman and farmer, Jim was always worried about the bottom line and he constantly tried to apply these concerns in the area of the Federal budget. Jim was sounding the alarm bell in the 1970s when the Federal Government spent less than \$400 billion a year, which today seems laughably small given our current state of affairs. Back then, he was attacking deficits of \$70 billion. He was also adamantly opposed to the Federal Government bailing out New York City in the 1970s because he said it would set a bad precedent. He attacked a Federal debt ceiling limit of \$500 billion as being highly irresponsible. He criticized the fact that each American owed \$2,000 because of the Federal Government's debt. Jim liked to quote the editor of the Freeman Courier, who asked "how can it be that a government which is unable to balance its own budget and lives far beyond its means, has the authority to tell a businessman" how to run his business.

Jim wasn't afraid to make hard votes to fix our problems, votes that probably cost him his Senate seat. But Jim Abdnor had the moral courage to make the tough decisions.

Mr. President, Jim Abdnor leaves us with a critical reminder. He embodied the American dream. He was the son of a poor Lebanese peddler who built a successful business and raised a great family, including a son who ascended the heights of American politics and became a U.S. Senator. Jim Abdnor shows how hard work and diligence can pay off.

On this occasion of remembrance and during this time of honoring my good friend Jim Abdnor, I hope we can remember our solemn duty to protect the American dream that the Abdnor family represented.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BEGICH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5652

Mr. REID. Mr. President, last month, the Senate passed the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization on a strong bipartisan vote of 68 to 31. Fifteen Republican Senators—including all the women on the other side of the aisle—joined Senate Democrats to support this important legislation. Senate Democrats strongly stand behind the bill we passed. It makes clear that all victims of domestic violence and sexual assault should enjoy the protections of the Violence Against Women Act. We don't believe we should be in the business of picking and choosing which victims deserve protection.

In contrast, the bill passed by House Republicans fails to include crucial protections for Native American women—I have 22 tribal organizations in my State, for example—gay and lesbian victims, battered immigrant women, and victims on college campuses and in subsidized housing. The House bill would roll back many important and longstanding protections in current law for abused immigrant victims—protections that have never been controversial and previously have enjoyed widespread bipartisan support.

So there are many differences to be worked out between the House and the Senate in this crucial piece of legislation. The right place to work out these differences is in conference. That is why we seek today to go to conference with the House on this important legislation, and that is why we object to simply passing the House bill that has been sent to us.

The House has raised, I think unfortunately, the so-called blue slip problem, which seems to be an issue they raise all the time when there is a bill they do not like.

Having said that, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5652, Calendar No. 398; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the language of S. 1925, the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization, as passed by the Senate on April 26 by a vote of 68 to 31, be inserted in lieu thereof; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses; and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with all the above occurring with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4970

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, let me make a few observations and then I intend to offer a consent request myself.

This is a problem that has been created by the majority, and I am sorry they will not accept our offer to fix their problem so we can move forward on this legislation. We have all known

for literally years when the Violence Against Women Act was going to expire. We have known that for years. During this time, Democrats controlled the Senate. Yet our friends on the other side waited until February of this year—nearly 6 months after the current authorization expired—before they even reported a bill out of committee, and they chose to wait almost 3 months more to bring a bill to the floor.

I don't know why that decision was made. Press reports indicate that members of the Democratic leadership thought they could use VAWA as a campaign issue. When they finally chose to bring this bill to the Senate floor, Republicans consented to going to the bill, Republicans consented to bringing the debate to a close, and Republicans consented to limiting ourselves to just two amendments—just two. Our Democratic colleagues also added an amendment. It was a complete substitute. They offered it at the last minute.

This substitute was a couple hundred pages long and it added new sections to the bill. One of those sections would generate revenue by assessing new fees on immigration visas. I gather our Democratic colleagues did this because their bill, unlike the Hutchison-Grassley bill, would add over \$100 million to the debt.

Including this provision is obviously a problem, in that adding a revenue provision in a Senate bill violates the Origination Clause of the U.S. Constitution. If we sent the Senate bill to the House in its current form, it would trigger a blue slip point of order, as it always does.

It is not our fault Senate Democrats waited until well after VAWA expired to start moving a bill. It is not our fault their bill would add to the debt. It is not our fault our friends waited until the last minute to try to fix the problem, and, in the course of doing so, they created yet another problem. We have offered to help them fix their problem. They do not have to accept our help, but they should stop demagoguing the issue and blaming others.

Therefore, I would offer another consent: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 406, H.R. 4970, the House-passed Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act; provided further that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of the Senate-passed Violence Against Women bill, S. 1925, with a modification that strikes sections 805 and 810 related to the immigration provisions; that the bill be read three times and passed, the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate with a ratio agreed to by both leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Republican

leader is now proposing an amendment to the Senate-passed bill—a Senate-passed bill that we are very proud of. It has been engineered and advocated by all Democratic Senators but mainly by the 12 women who are part of our caucus. This is an important piece of legislation. We all feel very strongly about this.

I haven't looked at all the details of this amendment, but I understand it. My first response is that the amendment is something the conferees should be working on. We can't do that without the proper input from all the interested parties, and we have 52, other than myself, on my side of the Capitol. That is why I have sought to go to conference with the product the Senate passed.

It may be that sometime in the future, after we evaluate all these pieces that have been suggested by my friend, the Republican leader, we may be able to proceed along this route, if, in fact, we get to conference. But we have to get to conference, and we have to have wider discussions airing the proposed amendment we have had just a little time to look at, at this stage.

I understand my friend's proposal, and I object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING BILL STEWART

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, before I speak today about the bill before us, I want to commemorate the life of a dear friend and a true West Virginian, Bill Stewart.

Bill was taken from us 2 days ago at the age of 59, but he left behind a lifetime of memories and love for our State.

Bill Stewart was a proud West Virginian in every sense of the word, and he was the best cheerleader this State ever had. Whether it was playing ball at Fairmont State—where I first met him—or coaching West Virginia University to a Fiesta Bowl win—where he took an underdog team to a thrilling victory—you never had to worry about Bill's enthusiasm; he had enough for all of us. In fact, you were either a friend of Bill Stewart's or he hadn't met you yet.

Bill was raised in New Martinsville and was a West Virginian through-and-through. Countless young men thrived under his coaching, but he was also truly dedicated to his family—his wife Karen and his son Blaine. I hope Karen and Blaine know just how much Bill meant to the people of our State, how much we loved him and how much we all will miss him.