

result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 2 on Table 2).

Since my last letter dated September 5, 2006, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (Public Law 109-289). In addition to providing regular defense appropriations for 2007, this act appropriated \$200 million for firefighting activities in fiscal year 2006. Those appropriations were designated as emergency requirements in 2006 and did not affect the current-level totals.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,  
*Acting Director.*

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006, AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget resolution <sup>1</sup>	Current level <sup>2</sup>	Current level over/under (–) resolution
<b>ON-BUDGET</b>			
Budget Authority .....	2,094.4	2,082.5	–11.9
Outlays .....	2,099.0	2,095.0	–4.0
Revenues .....	1,589.9	1,596.5	6.6
<b>OFF-BUDGET</b>			
Social Security Outlays <sup>3</sup> .....	416.0	416.0	0
Social Security Revenues .....	604.8	604.8	*

<sup>1</sup> 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, Public Law 109-208, Public Law 109-234, and Public Law 109-289 (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.

<sup>2</sup> 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.

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

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Note: \* = Less than \$50 million.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT-LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2006, AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2006

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
<b>Enacted in Previous Sessions:</b>			
Revenues .....	n.a.	n.a.	1,607,180
Permanents and other spending legislation <sup>1</sup> .....	1,296,134	1,248,957	n.a.
Appropriation legislation .....	1,333,823	1,323,802	n.a.
Offsetting receipts .....	–479,868	–479,868	n.a.
<b>Total, enacted in previous sessions:</b> .....	<b>2,150,089</b>	<b>2,092,891</b>	<b>1,607,180</b>
<b>Enacted This Session:</b>			
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
Native American Corrections Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-221) .....	23	23	3
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-222) .....	0	0	–10,757
Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act (P.L. 109-227) .....	0	0	–1
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109-234) .....	–111	143	55
Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-235) .....	0	0	1
Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-236) .....	0	0	1
Returned Americans Protection Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-250) .....	4	3	0
An act to provide funding authority to facilitate the evacuation of persons from Lebanon (P.L. 109-268) .....	0	27	0
<b>Total, enacted this session:</b> .....	<b>1,166</b>	<b>1,196</b>	<b>–10,698</b>
<b>Entitlements and mandatories:</b>			
Difference between enacted levels and budget resolution estimates for appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs .....	–68,740	879	n.a.
<b>Total Current Level<sup>1, 2, 3, 4</sup></b> .....	<b>2,082,515</b>	<b>2,094,966</b>	<b>1,596,482</b>
<b>Total Budget Resolution</b> .....	<b>2,144,384</b>	<b>2,161,420</b>	<b>1,589,892</b>
Adjustment to budget resolution for emergency requirements <sup>4</sup> .....	–50,000	–62,424	n.a.
<b>Adjusted Budget Resolution</b> .....	<b>2,094,384</b>	<b>2,098,996</b>	<b>n.a.</b>
<b>Current Level Over Adjusted Budget Resolution</b> .....	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>n.a.</b>	<b>6,590</b>
<b>Current Level Under Adjusted Budget Resolution</b> .....	<b>11,869</b>	<b>4,030</b>	<b>n.a.</b>

<sup>1</sup> P.L. 109-171 was enacted early in this session of Congress, but is shown under “enacted in previous sessions” as requested by the Committee on the Budget. Included in current-level totals for P.L. 109-171 are \$980 million in budget authority and –\$4,847 million in outlays.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant 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
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109-234) .....	94,541	24,184	0
Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109-289) .....	200	0	0
<b>Total, enacted emergency requirements</b> .....	<b>171,747</b>	<b>138,882</b>	<b>–7,111</b>

<sup>3</sup> Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

<sup>4</sup> H. 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 P.L. 109-176, P.L. 109-208, P.L. 109-234, and P.L. 109-289 (see footnote 2 above), 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.

Notes.—n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.  
Source: Congressional Budget Office.

**FIGHTING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay special tribute to the General Federation of Women’s Clubs and their recent work to fight domestic violence. The organization is a gem among our midst. Founded in April 1890, it is one of the world’s oldest and largest women’s volunteer organizations. More than 150,000 women members in 5,000 local and 20 international clubs volunteer over 13 million hours and contribute approximately \$35 million through more than 160,000 club projects. I can’t underestimate how

powerful and influential this corps of volunteers is to the health of our Nation.

I am particularly proud that this year the international president, Jacqueline Pierce, has adopted “Domestic Violence Awareness and Prevention” as her President’s Special Project for 2006–2008. Nannette White, a member from Louisiana, serves as the national chairperson of the President’s Special Project, and with the support of a national committee of women, promotes participation in this project. All across the Nation, local women’s clubs are

adopting battered women’s shelters and donating needed goods such as food, linens, health care items, and more. In Nevada, members sponsored a public service campaign on radio stations to promote important messages about violence prevention. In Mississippi, members distributed 2,000 fliers with information on the National Domestic Violence Hotline and helped raise funds for the Mississippi State Coalition Against Domestic Violence. This is just a small sampling of the good works being done.

As part of this special project, the General Federation of Women's Clubs forged a historic collaboration with the Family Violence Prevention Fund, the National Domestic Violence Hotline, the National Network to End Domestic Violence and domestic violence organizations in communities throughout the United States. Innovative partnerships between the public and private sector, new relationships between organizations—these are the pathways to solutions to our Nation's most pressing problems.

I have spent almost 34 years of my life in Congress and witnessed the transformative impact of powerful Federal legislation. For instance, the Violence Against Women Act improved Federal and State criminal laws and enacted programs that encourage prosecution of abusers, create battered women's shelters and sponsor educational campaigns. Over the past decade, the act's programs have distributed over \$4 billion to States, local governments, and nonprofit organizations. Yet despite this extraordinary success, I am convinced that Federal Government action alone cannot end domestic violence. We desperately need the individual attention and dedication of volunteers. Change happens one woman at a time and one volunteer at a time. The volunteer work done by club members fills an invaluable role. As my mother would say, these are the people who do God's work.

I commend Madam President Pierce for her leadership and commitment to airing our Nation's "dirty little secret," domestic violence. She has brought a whole new legion of women warriors to help battered women and their children. On behalf of the entire Senate, I thank them for their tireless volunteerism to end domestic violence and giving women what they haven't had before—hope.

#### HOLD EXPLANATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have placed a hold on the nomination of Roger A. Martella, Jr., to be general counsel of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Consistent with my policy of publicly announcing whenever I place a hold on a nomination, I want to notify my colleagues of my objection to allowing Mr. Martella's nomination to be considered under a unanimous consent agreement and to take a few minutes to explain to my colleagues why I am doing so.

After many years of delay, the EPA has finally proposed regulations under the Clean Air Act to protect Americans from toxic air pollutants from cars and trucks and other mobile sources. But instead of proposing a rule that would protect all Americans from these toxic emissions, EPA's proposal would essentially turn the Pacific Northwest into an environmental sacrifice zone.

EPA's analysis shows that the biggest risk from these pollutants comes from benzene which is naturally found

in petroleum products and ends up in the gas tanks of our cars and in the gas cans in our garages. Some of the highest levels of benzene in gasoline are found in the Northwest. In fact, our region of the country has the highest average levels of benzene in gasoline in the United States, more than three times higher than gasoline here on the east coast.

Benzene is a known carcinogen. Exposure to benzene has been shown to cause leukemia and poses other health risks, such as genetic changes. Although the EPA has never set a health standard for benzene in the environment, the Department of Environmental Quality for the State of Oregon has, and we have levels of benzene in Downtown Portland that are 20 times higher than the State's standard. The majority of this benzene comes from gasoline. So it should be good news that EPA is finally acting to regulate the amount of benzene in gasoline.

Unfortunately, EPA has proposed a regulatory scheme that will simply not ensure that these levels are reduced as much as they need to be, and let me explain why.

First, EPA rejected the idea that there should be a maximum level of benzene in gasoline. The current Federal requirements for reformulated gasoline contain a maximum threshold for benzene. The State of California's fuel standards include a provision limiting the percentage of benzene in gasoline sold in California. Canada has a benzene limit. Korea has a benzene limit. Japan has a benzene limit. The European Union has a benzene limit. And according to a recent article in the industry trade press, Vietnam is going to establish a benzene limit. But not EPA.

Instead, what EPA has proposed is the establishment of a national average for benzene in gasoline. Every refinery or gasoline importer is theoretically supposed to sell gasoline that meets this average standard, but there is no maximum level and EPA has coupled this requirement to a credit-trading system. Under EPA's scheme, refineries that make gasoline below the standard will get credits that they can give away, trade, or sell to refineries which make gasoline above the standard. Many refineries that make gasoline with high benzene levels would never have to meet the EPA standard. And again, because under the EPA proposal there would be no maximum level of benzene in gasoline, many refineries are expected to make little, if any, reduction in the amount of benzene in their gasoline and rely instead on credits to meet the standard. According to EPA, five refineries producing gasoline over the EPA standard would take no action whatsoever to reduce their benzene levels.

The reason this is all so important is that Americans don't get their gasoline from a gasoline terminal filled with "average" gasoline. They get their gas from regional refineries and distribu-

tors. In Oregon, we get almost all of our gasoline from refineries on Puget Sound in the State of Washington—refineries which, for the most part, produce gasoline with high benzene levels. Even if everything worked as EPA intended, benzene levels in gasoline in the Northwest would be 40 percent above the national standard. However, the plain fact is that there is no assurance that gasoline in our region will be cleaner because EPA leaves the decision of whether the refineries in Puget Sound reduce their benzene levels up to the companies that own those refineries. If oil companies decide that it is in their economic interest to simply buy their way to compliance by using credits instead of investing in equipment that will actually reduce the amount of benzene in our gas, EPA says they can. The only thing that EPA will care about is that those companies have begged, borrowed, or bought enough credits to meet the national average. And we will continue to have the same high levels of benzene we have now. In fact, without any sort of overall cap on the amount of benzene that can be in gasoline, benzene levels in our gasoline in the Northwest could even go up.

I have focused my remarks on the impact that this proposal has on the Northwest, but it is not just a problem for the Northwest. Other parts of the country will also have gasoline with benzene levels over the national standard, and without any maximum level of benzene no American can be sure of how much benzene might be in their gasoline and in the air they breathe.

I also want to emphasize again that under the EPA approach, it will be the oil companies that decide whether they reduce their benzene levels at any given refinery, not EPA. If EPA's analysis is correct, a single major oil company, which EPA identifies only as "Company No. 2," would be responsible for producing more than a third of all of the gasoline exceeding the proposed national benzene standard. Rather than make the investment in benzene control and removal technology, EPA, from the beginning, simply expects this company to use credits to meet the standard for all of this high benzene gasoline. Who is Company No. 2 and why is EPA proposing to give them this license to pollute?

This would all be bad enough if EPA hadn't actually thought about these problems. They acknowledged in their rulemaking process that there would be regional inequities. They examined alternatives for setting maximum levels of benzene that should be in gasoline. In one case, they looked at the additional cost to Americans of imposing an average maximum level of benzene of 1.3 percent as part of the standard in order to address these problems. EPA's own analysis concluded that this would cost consumers in my region of the country less than one-half of 1 cent a gallon and Americans, nationwide, an additional 5/1000ths of a cent per gallon