

began in a time when oil was around \$16 a barrel, and now is one that has been reconfigured into one that gives out subsidies when the price of oil is \$70 a barrel.

Back when that energy conference got together in the summer of 2005, those Members of the Senate and the other body should have said: This is the time to draw the line. This royalty relief program does not pass the smell test. It makes absolutely no sense to be dispensing billions and billions of dollars of royalty relief to the oil companies on top of everything else they already receive.

What I hope now, with the promising action that was taken in the House of Representatives late last night, is I hope it is possible for some common sense, some practical action on behalf of taxpayers, to win bipartisan support in the Senate. That is what caused me to come to this floor several weeks ago and stay in this spot for almost 5 hours.

I am about done now because I think we have made the point, and I don't think we need to spend 5 hours on it today. But I will tell you that a program like this, which was useful back when prices were low, makes no sense, no sense at all anymore.

You can argue for government subsidies at a time when, for example, oil prices are low, and when we are talking about the need to stimulate production, when the American economy needs a shot in the arm. But you certainly don't need billions of dollars of royalty relief for companies at a time when you have record profits, record costs, and record tax breaks.

I am very hopeful that when the Senate comes back next week, we will begin a bipartisan effort to put in place legislation very much along the lines of what passed the House of Representatives late last night. There will be an opportunity to support the kind of commonsense reform I have been talking about, which passed the House last night, when the Interior appropriations bill comes to the floor.

I also appreciate particularly the efforts of Senator KYL of Arizona who has worked with me on this cause. He

was a very active colleague during the debate, and since then has worked with me to try to find a way to advance this cause in the Senate.

We now have a new opportunity to protect the interests of taxpayers and to modernize our energy policy.

Talk about not keeping up with the times. How can you argue in favor of a program that began when oil was \$16 a barrel? That is what we are dealing with. We are subsidizing the price of this commodity at a time when it hovers around \$70 a barrel using a program that began decades ago when the price of oil was \$16 a barrel. It makes no sense.

I am going to be back on this floor at the first possible opportunity to see if it is possible, on a bipartisan basis, to accomplish what I and Senator KYL were not able to do on a bipartisan basis a couple of weeks ago. I hope in the Senate there will be a new interest in saving our taxpayers' money and promoting fiscal responsibility by reigning in further royalty relief for oil companies. We ought to stipulate that if the price goes down, or America faces some kind of supply disruption, we could revisit it. But until then, we ought to roll back this oil company royalty relief and save our citizens' hard-earned taxpayer dollars for more worthy causes.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I hereby submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report prepared by the Congressional Budget Office under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended. This report meets the requirements for Senate scorekeeping of section 5 of S. Con. Res. 32, the first concurrent resolution on the Budget for 1986.

This report shows the effects of congressional action on the 2006 budget through May 17, 2006. The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of the 2006 concurrent resolution on the budget, H.

Con. Res. 95. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the attached report excludes these amounts.

The estimates show that current level spending is under the budget resolution by \$11.785 billion in budget authority and by \$4.226 billion in outlays in 2006. Current level for revenues is \$6.531 billion above the budget resolution in 2006.

Since my last report dated April 6, 2006, Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005, Public Law 109-222, which reduced 2006 revenues.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying letter and material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 18, 2006.

Hon. JUDD GREGG,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed tables show the effects of Congressional action on the 2006 budget and are current through May 17, 2006. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions for fiscal year 2006 that underlie H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006. Pursuant to section 402 of that resolution, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 on Table 2).

Since my last letter dated April 5, 2006, Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-222), which reduces 2006 revenues by an estimated \$10.8 billion.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006, AS OF MAY 17, 2006

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution ¹	Current Level ²	Current Level Over/Under (-) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	2,094.4	2,082.6	-11.8
Outlays	2,099.0	2,094.8	-4.2
Revenues	1,589.9	1,596.4	6.5
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ³	416.0	416.0	0
Social Security Revenues	604.8	604.8	*

¹ H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed \$50.0 billion in budget authority and \$62.4 billion in outlays in fiscal year 2006 from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current-level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in the previous session and the emergency requirements in Public Law 109-176 and Public Law 109-208 (see footnote 2 on Table 2), the budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

² Current level is the estimated effect on revenue and spending of all legislation that the Congress has enacted or sent to the President for his approval. In addition, full-year funding estimates under current law are included for entitlement and mandatory programs requiring annual appropriations, even if the appropriations have not been made.

³ Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are also off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006, AS OF MAY 17, 2006
[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in Previous Sessions:			
Revenues	*	*	1,607,180
Permanents and other spending legislation ¹	1,296,134	1,248,957	*
Appropriation legislation	1,333,823	1,323,802	*
Offsetting receipts	-479,868	-479,868	*
Total, enacted in previous sessions	2,150,089	2,092,891	1,607,180
Enacted This Session:			
Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-176)	250	250	0
An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act for the Low-income Energy Assistance Program for 2006 (P.L. 109-204)	1,000	750	0
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-222)	0	0	-10,757
Total, enacted this session	1,250	1,000	-10,757
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	-68,740	879	*
Total Current Level ² ³ ⁴	2,082,599	2,094,770	1,596,423
Total Budget Resolution	2,144,384	2,161,420	1,589,892
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements ⁴	-50,000	-62,424	*
Adjusted Budget Resolution	2,094,384	2,098,996	*
Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution	*	*	*
Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution	11,785	4,226	6,531*

Notes: * = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

¹P.L. 109-171 was enacted early in this session of Congress, but is shown under "enacted in previous sessions" as requested by the Budget Committee. Included in current level for P.L. 109-171 are \$980 million in budget authority and -\$4,847 million in outlays.²Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current-level totals exclude the following amounts:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Emergency requirements enacted in previous session	74,981	112,423	-7,111
Katrina Emergency Assistance Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-176)	-250	0	0
National Flood Insurance Enhanced Borrowing Authority Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-208)	2,275	2,275	0
Total, enacted emergency requirements	77,006	114,698	-7,111

³Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.⁴H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, assumed \$50,000 million in budget authority and \$62,424 million in outlays in fiscal year 2006 from emergency supplemental appropriations. Such emergency amounts are exempt from the enforcement of the budget resolution. Since current-level totals exclude the emergency requirements enacted in the previous session and the emergency requirements in Public Law 109-176 and Public Law 109-208 (see footnote 2 above), the budget authority and outlay totals specified in the budget resolution have also been reduced (by the amounts assumed for emergency supplemental appropriations) for purposes of comparison.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK 2006

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, many of our Nation's law enforcement officers have come to Washington, DC, to commemorate National Police Week. I would like to take this opportunity to recognize all Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials for their outstanding service and their vital contributions to the safety of our communities. I would also like to honor the memory of those who gave their lives in the line of duty. These officers, and their families, have paid the ultimate sacrifice for the safety of others.

The first National Police Week was celebrated in 1962 when President John F. Kennedy signed an Executive order designating May 15 as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that date falls as "Police Week." The weeklong tribute to our Nation's local, State and Federal police officers honors those who died in the line of duty and those who continue to serve and protect us every day at great personal risk. According to the National Law Enforcement Memorial Fund, 1,635 law enforcement officers have been killed in the line of duty in the last 10 years. In 2005 alone, 155 officers lost their lives, including 5 from Michigan. The names of these officers have been permanently engraved on the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial along side more than 17,000 others.

Sadly, more police officers have lost their lives to guns than to any other cause over the last 10 years. In 2005, 59 officers were shot to death while in the line of duty. This year's Police Week activities occur shortly after the horrific shooting of Detective Vicky

Armel and Officer Michael Garbarino at a police station in nearby Fairfax County, VA. Last Monday afternoon, Detective Armel and Officer Garbarino were ambushed in the parking lot of the police station by an 18-year-old reportedly armed with an AK-47 military-style assault rifle, a high-powered hunting rifle, and five handguns. During the course of the shootout with Detective Armel, Officer Garbarino, and other officers, the gunman fired more than 70 times. Tragically, Detective Armel died later that day and Officer Garbarino passed away early Wednesday morning.

It is not enough to simply mention those, like Detective Armel and Officer Garbarino, who have given their lives protecting our communities. In order to truly honor their service and sacrifice, we should take up and pass commonsense gun safety legislation to help protect law enforcement officials from the threat posed by military style firearms.

The sale of assault rifles like the AK-47 used in last week's shooting were prohibited under the 1994 assault weapons ban. Unfortunately, the President and the Republican congressional leadership allowed this legislation to expire on September 13, 2004, allowing 19 previously banned types of assault weapons and other firearms with military style features to once again be legally sold. Recognizing the especially lethal nature of these military style firearms, I have cosponsored legislation to restore and strengthen the assault weapons ban.

I am also a cosponsor of legislation to prohibit the sale of the Five-Seven

armor-piercing handgun and its ammunition in the United States. A number of national law enforcement organizations have publicly called for a ban on these firearms because of the threat they pose to police officers, even those wearing body armor. According to the manufacturer's Web site, the Five-Seven weighs less than 2 pounds fully loaded and measures only 8.2 inches in length, making it easily concealable. A statement which previously appeared on the Web site boasted "Enemy personnel, even wearing body armor can be effectively engaged up to 200 meters. Kevlar helmets and vests as well as the CRISAT protection will be penetrated." These military style pistols clearly have no sporting purpose and pose a great threat to the lives of our law enforcement officers.

We can and should do more to support and protect those who are working to ensure the safety of our communities. The names of law enforcement officers from Michigan who were added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial this year are:

Detective Lavern Steven Brann of Battle Creek, Died May 9, 2005
Officer Owen David Fisher of Flint, Died July 16, 2005
Commander Dale Francis Bernock of Dearborn, Died October 3, 2005
Officer Scot Andrew Beyerstedt of Mattawan, Died July 26, 2005
Sergeant Michael Allen Scarbrough of Wayne County, Died February 9, 2005
Deputy Sheriff Paul Lee Mickel of Wayne County, Died November 18, 1973