

SUPPORTING NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH WEEK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 207.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 207) Supporting National Men's Health Week.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 207) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 207

Whereas despite advances in medical technology and research, men continue to live an average of more than 5 years less than women, and African-American men have the lowest life expectancy;

Whereas 9 of the 10 leading causes of death, as defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, affect men at a higher percentage than women;

Whereas between ages 45 and 54, men are over 1½ times more likely than women to die of heart attacks;

Whereas men die of heart disease at 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas men die of cancer at almost 1½ times the rate of women;

Whereas testicular cancer is 1 of the most common cancers in men aged 15 to 34, and, when detected early, has a 96 percent survival rate;

Whereas the number of cases of colon cancer among men will reach almost 49,470 in 2010, and nearly half of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas the likelihood that a man will develop prostate cancer is 1 in 6;

Whereas the number of men who developed prostate cancer in 2010 is expected to reach more than 217,730, and an estimated 32,050 of those men will die from the disease;

Whereas African-American men in the United States have the highest incidence in the world of prostate cancer;

Whereas significant numbers of health problems that affect men, such as prostate cancer, testicular cancer, colon cancer, and infertility, could be detected and treated if awareness among men of those problems was more pervasive;

Whereas more than ½ of the elderly widows now living in poverty were not poor before the death of their husbands, and by age 100, women outnumber men by a ratio of 4 to 1;

Whereas educating both the public and health care providers about the importance of early detection of male health problems will result in reducing rates of mortality for those diseases;

Whereas appropriate use of tests such as prostate specific antigen exams, blood pressure screens, and cholesterol screens, in conjunction with clinical examination and self-testing for problems such as testicular cancer, can result in the detection of many of those problems in their early stages and increase the survival rates to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas women are 2 times more likely than men to visit their doctor for annual examinations and preventive services;

Whereas men are less likely than women to visit their health center or physician for regular screening examinations of male-related problems for a variety of reasons;

Whereas Congress established National Men's Health Week in 1994 and urged men and their families to engage in appropriate health behaviors, and the resulting increased awareness has improved health-related education and helped prevent illness;

Whereas the Governors of all 50 States issue proclamations annually declaring Men's Health Week in their respective States;

Whereas since 1994, National Men's Health Week has been celebrated each June by dozens of States, cities, localities, public health departments, health care entities, churches, and community organizations throughout the United States that promote health awareness events focused on men and family;

Whereas the National Men's Health Week Internet website has been established at www.menshealthweek.org and features Governors' proclamations and National Men's Health Week events;

Whereas men who are educated about the value that preventive health can play in prolonging their lifespans and their roles as productive family members will be more likely to participate in health screenings;

Whereas men and their families are encouraged to increase their awareness of the importance of a healthy lifestyle, regular exercise, and medical checkups;

Whereas June 13 through 19, 2011, is National Men's Health Week; and

Whereas the purpose of National Men's Health Week is to heighten the awareness of preventable health problems and encourage early detection and treatment of disease among men and boys: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the annual National Men's Health Week; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups to observe National Men's Health Week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, June 14, following the 2:15 cloture vote on the Coburn amendment No. 436, as modified, Senator RUBIO of Florida be recognized as in morning business for debate only for up to 20 minutes for the purpose of delivering his maiden speech in the Senate.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h-276k, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Vice Chairman of the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group during the 112th Congress: the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON).

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2011

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate

completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 14; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the majority controlling the first half and the Republicans controlling the final half; that following morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order; further, that the filing deadline for second-degree amendments to the Coburn amendment No. 436, as modified, be at 11:30 tomorrow morning.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, tomorrow at noon, there will be up to two rollcall votes in relation to the Cecchi and Salas nominations. Additionally, at 2:15 p.m. there will be a rollcall vote on the cloture motion Senator COBURN filed on his ethanol amendment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order following the remarks of Senators THUNE and COBURN, who will speak as in debate only.

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

Mr. REID. Just so I have some idea, I ask Senator THUNE, how long does the Senator wish to speak?

Mr. THUNE. For 10 minutes.

Mr. REID. How much time does the Senator need?

Mr. COBURN. Ten minutes.

Mr. REID. That would be the order. Senator COBURN will be recognized for 10 minutes following the remarks of Senator THUNE, who will speak for up to 10 minutes. They are both for debate only.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ETHANOL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has a strongly held view about ethanol, particularly on this issue, on the VEETC, and I understand that. I understand there are

Members who would like to see that particular tax credit go away. I understand that.

What the Senator from Minnesota and I have come up with is a way for them to achieve that objective, but it does it in a way that is reasonable, measured, and which doesn't totally, in the middle of the year, abruptly disrupt an industry and all of the investment that has been made.

The question I ask my colleague is, does our word mean anything around here? We passed this in December. There were 81 Senators who voted for a package of tax extenders, one of which was the volumetric ethanol excise tax credit. Eighty-one Senators are on record. If you want to do away with it, there are lots of ways you can do that. But the way the Senator from Oklahoma is proposing to do that is to say, tomorrow let's pass this and end it. It is \$2.5 billion we can save the taxpayers. Well, about \$500 million a month is about what this is going to cost. With every month that goes by, there is a little less available to the taxpayer.

What we are saying is that we put in a billion dollars today into this proposal that would go toward debt retirement, and we phase out the tax credit to which the Senator from Oklahoma refers, and we take a very forward-looking, futuristic-type view toward ethanol production in this country, biofuel production in this country. We are going to be capped out at 15 billion gallons, which is the RFS, the renewable fuel standard to which the Senator from Oklahoma referred. We are going to hit that. Then we have to get to the next generation of biofuels.

With all due respect to my colleague from Oklahoma, methanol is not a realistic option. You would have to retool every plant in this country. We have 204 plants in America today that, directly or indirectly, employ 500,000 Americans. Those are the jobs that are impacted. We have had policy on the books now for nearly 30 years that has encouraged the investment in these plants on the belief that we need to get beyond dependence on foreign sources of energy. That ought to be our energy policy, and we ought to be looking to producing more.

I am for oil and gas. The reason I voted against the proposals leveled a couple weeks ago that would have targeted the oil and gas industry is because I think we need all forms of energy—oil and gas, clean coal, biofuels, nuclear, and we need any form of energy we can generate and produce in the United States. I am for it. That is why I think the future of this industry is still very bright, because I think there is an advanced biofuels future out there, and a cellulosic ethanol, next-generation ethanol, whatever you want to call it, where we can make it from switch grass, from blue stem grass, from corn stover, and these types of products. That is out there. But you don't get there unless you

have a corn-based platform to start with.

The Senator talked about a renewable fuel standard and talked about this being redundant public policy. One of our colleagues from South Carolina introduced an amendment to this bill that would end that. I assume—I don't know this for a fact—that my colleague from Oklahoma would support that amendment, which would do away with the renewable fuel standard.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. Certainly.

Mr. COBURN. The Senator obviously didn't hear what I said. I said I support ethanol, and I would not support that. I have been upfront with the Senator in the past, and you know my position on that.

So the question here—and I ask him a question: How do you fit what the people who would get this \$3 billion, who the Senator says they don't want—why would they say that if it is going to have a negative impact on their industry?

Mr. THUNE. Well, I say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I was not aware he said he supports ethanol. I was not aware he supports the RFS. If there is an amendment offered to strike the RFS, which there will be—I am I wrong in saying the Senator would oppose that amendment?

Mr. COBURN. I will oppose that amendment. My worry is because of the process of the Senate, we may not get that amendment to vote on. My colleague, as part of our leadership, would recognize that we have a problem with amendments.

Mr. THUNE. I don't disagree with that. There is an issue I have not argued. It is your prerogative to bring this up and file cloture, which you have done in this circumstance. I think the renewable fuels standard that creates the sort of policy construct we are talking about here today is one aspect of the biofuels policy going forward. The other aspect, going back for long time, historically, is the blenders credit.

I will tell you—because the statement you made is all the people who get this don't want it—well, that is not true. The large integrated oil companies, which are also refiners and, in many cases, retailers of refined gasoline, don't want it, maybe. I understand you have a letter to that effect. But there are lots of smaller refiners who do want it.

There are also an awful lot of—the blenders credit gets passed on to the retailer, which gets passed on to the consumer, hopefully. The people who will be impacted by this are not just the large integrated oil companies. If you talk about the large integrated oil companies, saying they don't want this—they said in hearings before congressional committees a few years ago they didn't want the oil subsidies they get in the Tax Code today. They are on the record saying that. Yet we voted to keep those in place just a few weeks ago.

Mr. COBURN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THUNE. Yes.

Mr. COBURN. Would the Senator define what a subsidy is to him, because part of the problem with the debate is that we keep saying "subsidies." We don't have subsidies—not in the Senator's State or in Oklahoma. We have accelerated depreciation, which even if you took that away, the dollars to the Federal Government would not increase. How is there a subsidy to the oil and gas industry?

Mr. THUNE. When we characterize what you called tax expenditures, there are a bunch that fall into that category. I know the Senator is familiar with that as he served on the President's debt commission. It is about \$1.1 trillion a year. In some way or another, we reduce the tax liability of various individuals and businesses around the country. I don't disagree with you. In fact, I will work with the Senator on a proposal that would address this and look at all those types of tax expenditures.

I think it is punitive to single out one and say we are going to kill this one, after we committed in December, with 81 votes, that we are for this. I don't know how we can, in good faith, go to this industry, which employs 500,000 Americans, and say we are going to pull the rug out from under you after 6 months.

That being said, I would characterize it as anything that reduces the tax liability that is public policy. I think it is characterized as tax expenditures. The oil depletion allowance and the intangible drilling costs—those are all things that are unique to the oil industry.

Mr. COBURN. Does it include charitable contributions—a subsidy, the same category?

Mr. THUNE. If it is under the definition of tax expenditure, sure. Oil depletion allowances and intangible drilling costs are characterized, for subsidy purposes, the same way as the ethanol tax credit. We have lots of what we would characterize as tax credits and earned income tax credits in the Tax Code. We have lots of what is characterized as tax expenditures. You may characterize it differently, and that is accelerated depreciation, but in fact for the purposes of description, as we describe things here, it fits into that category.

The oil industry came in front of congressional committees and said they didn't want those. So for them to say they don't want this particular blenders credit—and my view certainly isn't determinative, but I think the large integrated oil companies that get the blenders credit also view ethanol as a threat. Like it or not, today the only viable alternative to petroleum—the only one we have—is 10 percent of our fuel supply in this country.

I am not debating the Senator from Oklahoma about whether the merits of this particular policy—at least in its current form—should not be transformed and should be reformed; I am

saying that we should. I have come to the Senator with a proposal to do that. That is not something, obviously, that he agrees to. That is fine. He is entitled to not support that. But I believe we ought to reform it. I think the way we reform it is do it in a reasonable way that doesn't cut it off tomorrow but, rather, phases it out.

I think that for the Senator from Oklahoma, to me, it is something that is a win for him as well. He gets what he wants. He gets the phaseout, plus \$1 billion in debt reduction, and if this thing goes to the end of the year, we get zero. We get goose-egged.

This thing expires at the end of the year. Whether it gets extended or not remains to be seen. But one thing we know with certainty is that I am putting a proposal on the table today that gets \$1 billion in reduction, that provides some certainty at least in phasing out the VEETC and also makes an investment in blender pumps, which is something that is very important to the future of the industry.

So I think it is a reasonable way to deal with this issue.

The Senator from Oklahoma and I have a disagreement, and that is probably not going to change. But I am offering what I think is a reasonable proposal that gets you where you want to end up and I think also is a way in which we can keep this industry from having the rug pulled out from under them after we made a commitment to them in December of last year.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, let me make a couple of points.

When the Federal Government writes a tax credit, that means we take money from our Treasury, which is empty; therefore, we borrow it, and we write a check to people. When we have an "accelerated appreciation," what we do is allow people to pay less back in, a big difference.

How many of the ethanol refineries and blenders are not represented by this group? It is about 11 percent. They all reside in the upper Midwest. That is why there is such a resistance to it.

When I met with the representatives of the ethanol industry, the reason they don't want the credit to go away is because they are afraid that they won't be able to drive as hard a bargain with the large blenders of gasoline, that they will actually be able to determine what their grind cost is—in other words, what their true cost is.

The difference between what the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from South Dakota offer is \$2 billion. That is the only difference. Theirs is just denial and spend \$1 billion on

pumps and infrastructure—money we don't have—and mine is to say quit doing it because we are going to blend the ethanol anyway. That is the only difference in the two programs. One continues to subsidize noneconomic blenders, obviously, because they want it—a very small portion. But the vast majority of people are producing ethanol-blended gasoline. And they say: How did they ever get to the point in our country where the Federal Government is going to tell you that you have to buy a gasoline that is only 65 percent as efficient as the gasoline you were buying? And, oh, by the way, because it is only 65 percent efficient, it actually pollutes more. That is why in this list of people supporting this are all the environmental groups, because they know it is bad policy.

The reason I support a mandated level of ethanol is that until we have a cogent drilling policy in this country that says we are going to actually utilize our own resources, we need to keep ethanol. But what really ought to happen is we ought to let markets determine it. We will all be better off. We will have less government regulation, we will have less Tax Code expenditure and the markets will determine what the most efficient product is by what people will buy—what people will buy, what they want to buy. It is called freedom.

We have gotten ourselves in this mix where, actually, what people don't realize is we are down to only 47 percent of our oil coming into this country is coming from outside now. We have moved from 62 down to 47 percent, and the reason is because the oil and gas industry has actually gone out there and found an environmentally smart way to produce tons of gas liquids, which are easier to convert into fuel than anything—easier than oil, easier than any other product we have.

So the Senator didn't really answer why the people who are getting the money don't want it and yet we should continue sending it to them.

Ask yourself the question. We are broke, we are going to run a \$1.4 or \$1.5 or \$1.6 trillion deficit this year and here is a way to save \$3 billion, and the people we are going to send the money to—and borrow the money to be able to send it to them—don't want it. Yet they cannot answer why they do not want it. This represents 97 percent of all the blending in the country. They don't want the money and we are going to sit here as a body and continue to send them money they do not want? Go home and explain that to your constituents.

From which child are we going to take opportunity because we do not have the courage to do the smart

thing? We have a mandate. They have to blend it. They are making a ton of money.

One final point, and I will let the Senate staff go home. Every time you go home to buy a gallon of gasoline today, the price you pay at the pump is not the price you pay. If you look at all the subsidies that are going to ethanol, when you go look at that \$3.75—or that \$4 around here, \$3.50 in Oklahoma and Colorado—add \$1.72 per gallon to it because that is what you paid in terms of the government support for the ethanol program in terms of subsidies, \$1.72 a gallon. You buy it for \$3.50, add \$1.72, and you are paying \$5.22 a gallon. You just don't know that we have picked your pocket through the government expenditures. Out of your taxes you paid, we pay them \$1.72 per gallon. It makes no sense. What this does is eliminate 45 cents of that. It doesn't take it all away, the grants and the loans, the low-interest loans.

The other thing people do not recognize is most of the ethanol plants, even with this subsidy, have been bought out because they were not economical because they did not know how to run them. That is why most of them ended up with the large companies, because they did not know how to run them, they were not efficient, and now they are profitable even without the blenders credit.

It is a simple question: Do we save \$3 billion or save \$1 billion? I tell you, with what is in front of us as a Nation with our \$14.3 trillion debt, I am going to opt for the kids who follow us and the grandkids. I am going for the \$3 billion, not \$1 billion.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 14, 2011, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE SHEILA C. BAIR, RESIGNED.

MARTIN J. GRUENBERG, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 27, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KENNETH J. KOPCIS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE PETER SILVA SILVA, RESIGNED.