United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, JULY 21, 2006 No. 97

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, July 24, 2006, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, JULY 21, 2006

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, sustainer of our lives, give us courage to not run from difficulties. Help us to see that problems and challenges come with a life of service. In spite of burdens, show us the joys to come that will make the sacrifices worthwhile.

Infuse our Senators with the power of self-denying love. Empower them to help build not only a safer but also a more just world.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2006.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHNNY ISAKSON, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ISAKSON thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 403, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 403) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in a few minutes, we will begin consideration of S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act. Over the last 2 days, we have been working on an agreement which would allow us to conclude that bill on Tuesday. I hope we will be able to work out the final details of that agreement early today, and at that point in time I will announce the schedule for the child custody protection bill for next week.

We had a remarkable day yesterday, finishing last night the debate and vote on the voting rights reauthorization bill, four judges, the child predator legislation, and therefore I announced no rollcall votes for today. I will be updating Members as to Monday and Tuesday's schedules shortly, after we work out a unanimous-consent agreement on several matters for early next week.

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in walking over here just a few moments ago, I ran into my counterpart from the Australian Senate, and we were commenting—or he was commenting—he said: You had a productive day yesterday. And I said: Indeed, we had a very productive day, not only yesterday but over the course of this week.

On Monday and Tuesday, we had a very important debate, a powerful debate on stem cell research, a debate which is uncomfortable to a lot of people because it addresses so strongly that nexus between ethics and morality and religion and faith with science, advancing science, which is moving at breathtaking speed, thank goodness. As a scientist, I see great hope in those dreams which one day can become realities for cures and for treatments that come from the field of science. The issues are tough, though, but very important for us to have in this body, representing the 280 million people

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

around the country, because science will continue to advance and we do have the opportunities to understand the molecular and cellular basis of disease in a way that will improve the lives of everybody listening to me right now. So it is a very important debate.

We will increasingly have those sorts of issues come before this body. It used to be that we would hit these tough ethical issues in science about once every 10 years, and it has gotten down to about once every 5 years, and I predict—again, this is good news because science is developing so quickly, medical science—that we will be debating those issues about once every year. So this body needs to get used to it, get accustomed to it.

We did pass the Fetus Farming Prohibition Act overwhelmingly. The President has already signed that bill into law.

We passed the Stem Cell Therapies Enhancement Act this week, which supports alternative—or alternate—ways of developing these very powerful embryonic stem cell-like cells, what we call pluripotential cells, to support the type of research that can derive those pluripotential cells, short of having to dismember an embryo—exciting research. The House has not yet acted on that particular bill. I hope they do so in the near future so that the President can sign it into law, so that we can further support our research dollars in what to me is very exciting research that, in many ways, if successful—and I believe it will be—will some day eliminate the more contentious debate of having to derive embryonic stem cells from blastocysts themselves.

We also passed the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act, a bill I supported. It was not unanimously supported in this body, but there was overwhelming support in this body. I feel strongly that this particular bill, which supports embryonic stem cell research for blastocysts that are going to be discarded with 100 percent certainty, clearly falls within certain moral and ethical guidelines, and that bill passed I think by 63 votes in the Senate.

On Tuesday evening, we shifted a bit and expressed our support for Israel by passing S. Res. 534 by unanimous consent, expressing strong support in this body for Israel. Hezbollah and Hamas are terrorist organizations, confirmed enemies of the United States, and it is important that they and their state sponsors realize we will stand with Israel and hold them accountable for their actions. This body spoke loudly, boldly, clearly on Tuesday evening.

Later Tuesday evening and on Wednesday, we addressed the Water Resources Development Act under the superb leadership of Chairman JIM INHOFE and Senator KIT BOND and others in the body. But I told Chairman INHOFE again and again that this bill, which I strongly support, which engages and further supports conservation and development of water and water-related resources, which strengthens our Nation's waterways and the infrastructure of our waterways, is going to be a tough bill. There are going to be too many amendments; it is going to take a long time on the floor. But by working very hard in a bipartisan fashion, we limited the number of amendments to the substantive ones and brought it to the floor in a very reasonable, very efficient period of time, so we were able to address that important issue.

Then, as I mentioned earlier, yesterday we reauthorized the expiring provisions of the Voting Rights Act. As we all talked about, we have come a long way in 41 years since it was first enacted. We put aside whatever partisan differences there might be to ensure that discrimination at the voting booth remains a relic of the past, to ensure that no American citizen and no election law of any State could deny access to the ballot box because of race or ethnicity or language minority status. We have ensured that progress continues, that we are protecting the civil liberties of each and every American.

Protecting the vulnerable—that is what the Voting Rights Act did 41 years ago, and that is what the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act will soon do. Last night, we passed that Adam Walsh bill as well. This bill arguably is the most comprehensive child crime and protection legislation in recent history.

The Adam Walsh bill establishes a national sex offender registry which is publicly available and which is searchable by ZIP Code. Parents shouldn't have to live in fear that a neighbor somewhere down the street is waiting for an opportunity to victimize their children. Now parents are going to have those tools they need to protect their children from harm.

Last night, late last night at about 11 o'clock, I received a phone call from two individuals who have worked with Child Help, who started this organization called Child Help, and their call was to congratulate this body for addressing a specific issue that was also in the Adam Walsh bill, and that is the creation of a national child abuse registry. The bill also toughens the penalties for crimes against children, and it cracks down on the growing crisis of Internet predators and child pornography—huge progress in passing this particular bill. It will go to the House of Representatives in the early part of next week, and I am very hopeful the President will be able to sign that bill by July 27, which is the very tragic anniversary of the death of Adam Walsh. But out of that tragedy, if the President signs the bill on that day, there is great hope and a great willingness to address and confront an issue we know is destroying people's lives, with effective tools to combat the tragedies that occur every day in this country in a direct way.

Judicial nominations last night: We confirmed four exceptionally qualified nominees to the Federal bench: Neal Gorsuch, Bobby E. Shephard, Daniel Porter Jordan III, and Gustavo Antonia Gelpi. Next week, we are going to continue our constitutional duty of advice and consent in nominations and take up Jerome Holmes for the Tenth Circuit.

Today as we open, we are beginning debate on legislation that protects vulnerable young women from exploitation. It is the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill prohibits taking a minor across State lines, from State to State, for an abortion in circumvention of a particular State law, and it does so by requiring parental notification for that child's abortion.

Right now, the victims of such exploitation have absolutely no means of restitution within our legal system. It is time to fix that. Thus, we are taking that bill to the floor to do just that. We will have that debate over the course of the morning—we won't be able to complete that debate today—and we will have some understanding here shortly in terms of how that debate will be conducted in the early part of next week.

Next week is going to be a busy week. There will be a lot going on over the course of the week and many challenges in the weeks ahead. We have to finish the Child Custody Protection Act next week, and we have to confirm the nomination of Jerome Holmes.

Last night, language was finalized on another very important issue; that is, energy. I say energy is important because it has national security implications, and it affects each individual in this body and their families and families all across America because it will impact over the long term the price of gas, the price of natural gas, and the price of energy in this country. The issue is deep sea energy exploration in a region called Area 181 in the Gulf of Mexico.

Americans are feeling the pain at the pump. They are feeling it each and every day. And they expect us to act. It is interesting that in that area of 181 and just south of that in an area called 182 in the Gulf of Mexico, there is estimated to be over 1.2 billion barrels of oil—1.2 billion barrels of oil—that would be subjected potentially to exploration; 5.8 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in that area. That is how important it is to obtain that supply. We all know that pricing is a product of supply and demand and that new influx of homegrown, domestic supply will have an impact.

Before the August recess, we need to take up the Department of Defense appropriations. We need to make sure that our troops overseas do have the equipment and technology they need to be safe and successful.

As all of our colleagues know, we are addressing, every day, pensions. We will have that legislation ready before recess. We also need to address the issues surrounding port security, to further secure our homeland, as well as

small business health plans, which also have a direct impact, similar to what we are doing in energy, in affecting the cost of living that squeezes everyday Americans.

If we can lower those health care costs, make health care both affordable and available, that will take some of that squeeze off individuals and their families and they will be able to benefit from what we know is a very productive, growing economy out there with over 5.4 million jobs created in the last 2½ years and unemployment at historically low—4.6 percent—levels. The average American doesn't quite feel how good our economy is because of energy prices, which we are going to address, and because of health care costs, which we are going to address. Americans need to know they are safe and secure. They need to know their futures are safe and that their health care is affordable and secure.

We have a lot of issues to address. Again, we have had a very productive week. If we continue that productivity we will be able to address those issues. It is our job in the Senate to deliver these meaningful solutions to the challenges and the needs of people across this country. It is our duty and our privilege to do just that, and I am confident, by continuing the progress we made this week, that we will be able to do just that.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILD CUSTODY PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I am glad the majority leader has called up and allowed us to consider the Child Custody Protection Act today. I was involved, in 1998, when then-Senator Spence Abraham, later Secretary of Energy Spence Abraham, offered this bill. We had a press conference and made a number of efforts to pass it and always had a good deal of support but, frankly, to my frustration and surprise, it never became law. It has, in every respect, strong support among the American people and in the Congress.

I am pleased that Senator JOHN ENSIGN of Nevada has taken up this piece of legislation. He has directed his considerable talents to pressing it forward. We now have it on the floor. We will soon have a vote on it. I believe it should pass. I expect it to pass. I think those who would object to it have a high burden to show what is unreasonable about the legislation that is before us today.

The Child Custody Protection Act deals with an important subject. It deals with how young girls are being secretly taken across State lines for the purpose of abortion, without the consent of their parents or even the knowledge of their parents, in violation of the laws of the State in which they live. Forty-five States have enacted some sort of parental consent laws or parental notification law. By simply secreting a child across State lines, one can frustrate the State legislature's rules. It is, in fact, effectively subverting and defeating valid, constitutionally approved rights parents have with regard to being involved in the health care of their children, emotionally and physically. It is a very important issue, and I think it is one we need to continue to discuss.

This bill does not in any way deal substantively with abortion or the right to abortion. It does not really expand additional restrictions on abortion. What it does, though, is to stop an abominable practice by which someone—usually an adult, often an adult male who has gotten a young girl pregnant without wanting the parents to know about it—takes them across a State line to some foreign jurisdiction to seek an abortion without the parents' involvement, an abortion that could not be performed in their home State without the approval of the parent.

In fact, the abortion clinics in those States know that they must have a parent's consent. They seek that consent. If they don't have it, they don't perform the abortion—at least most of them don't. That is what the law is and that is what the situation is. But that is being subverted by moving them across the State line.

I submit this is a commonsense proposal. It is consistent with Federal prohibitions on interstate transportation, in violation of law, and it is something we should act on now. It is past due, in fact.

I submit the American people care about this issue. It is something that is important. And well they should because they love their daughters. They care about them. They will be involved with them medically, physically, and emotionally the rest of their lives. It won't be some abortion clinic in some distant State that will be involved with their emotional problems, their psychological problems, their physical problems, which arise from having had an abortion. The parents are the ones who care about their child and have the responsibility to raise her.

As we all know, a child cannot be given an aspirin in a school without parental consent. I have heard recently that you can't even give them sunscreen, in some schools, without parental consent. So we have this kind of legal procedure for a child's medical protection, but we have a circumstance in which a valid parental consent for a very serious procedure such as an abortion can be conducted without parental consent if you go across State lines and avoid the existing State law in the home State.

The Supreme Court, I hasten to add, has considered parental consent laws. They have considered a number of those cases. Parental consent laws have been enacted in many big States such as Pennsylvania and Texas. In Planned Parenthood v. Casey, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld consent laws and said they are valid restrictions on abortion. This is not too much of a restriction or an undue burden.

They also say that if somehow the parent is a problem—if there is a question of incest or child abuse or dysfunctional parents—there must be a judicial procedure which allows a judge to bypass the parental consent requirement of that State. So all the State laws in existence that require parents to be notified have a judicial bypass option. If a child does not believe they could tell their parents for whatever reason, they can go to a court and seek court approval without telling that parent, if there is a real basis for it.

In fact, this legislation provides in unusual circumstances that judicial bypass would take place. It is responsible in that regard.

The ability of parents to be involved in the health of their children is a fundamental parental right. It is being undermined today—and we ought to strengthen that right and that responsibility.

In fact, one of the great threats to our Nation is legal undermining of parental rights and parental abdication of responsibility for their children and how they develop. We need to strengthen families, we need to strengthen the responsibility of parents, and we need to protect children. We need better involvement of parents with their children.

Some say this is painful, if we required young people to tell their parents that they are pregnant. But I submit to you that out of that pain can come healing, can come good decisions, can come a change in behavior, a recognition that a child is in trouble and has problems, a recognition by parents, perhaps, that they need to be more involved and more engaged in their children's activities.

How is that bad? How is it bad that a child would be required to engage with their parents once they get in this kind of serious trouble? We are talking about minor children, minor girls, often taken advantage of by much older men.

I think it is the right thing to do. But regardless of that, regardless of how you feel about parental consent, it is State policy by State laws that have been passed in States throughout this Nation that parents should be informed, and in some cases have consent. These constitutional State laws are being undermined in a real way. I will talk about that in a minute and show you some points on it. But it is a very real problem. It is not imaginary.

Let's look at some of the advertisements, fliers, and brochures that are

being passed out around the country to promote interstate transportation of minor children to promote abortion.

Here is one. Metropolitan Medical Associates is in New Jersey which does not have a parental consent law, but many States such as Pennsylvania and others nearby do. Here is the flier:

We accept all insurance and credit cards.

It goes on to say:

All calls and appointments are confidential. Parental consent is not required.

They passed this out in the region to people in surrounding States which do have to have parental consent. The word gets out that they can come and avoid that requirement.

I think that is unhealthy. I think that is an attempt to undermine the laws of the States of this country.

Here is another one, South Jersey Women's Center. It mentions all of their promotions, their abortion procedures. I will highlight this phrase: ''No 24-hour wait. . . .''

In some States, it is required that you wait 24 hours after being informed about the abortion procedures before you go forward. ''No 24-hour wait or parental consent required.''

That is in New Jersey.

Again, there is promotion in the other States to come into that State to obtain an abortion that would otherwise be illegal in the minor's home State.

Here is an advertisement in, I believe, a Pennsylvania phone book. Pennsylvania has a parental consent law. This one is from a clipping in Buffalo, NY. It is Planned Parenthood Women's Health Center. But they run an ad in the Pennsylvania phone book for a Buffalo, NY, abortion clinic. It says: ''No parental consent or waiting period.''

We have many of those. There are lots of those. I just show these ads to show that we are not talking about a rare or insignificant event. There is a studied policy to promote abortion in distant States where parental consent is not required to undermine existing law of the State where the child may have become pregnant.

The attorney for the Center for Reproductive Law and Policy, Kathryn Kolbert, stated:

There are thousands of minors who cross State lines for an abortion every year and who need assistance from adults to do that.

We see several examples of abortion clinics which openly place advertisements in phone books and otherwise.

I chair the Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, and I chaired a hearing in June a couple of years ago where we heard a number of stories that deal with this issue. One particularly moving story involved a young woman named Crystal Lane who exhibited a maturity beyond her years when she testified before the committee. When Crystal was just 13 years old, she was secretly transported across the State line by adults seeking to hide the fact of her pregnancy from her mother. Crystal was taken across State lines from Pennsylvania, a State which had a consent statute, to New York, a State which did not. Crystal testified that she suffered serious complications from this ''legal'' abortion that was botched and which resulted in ''the most terrifying time'' in her life.

Crystal's mother, Mrs. Joyce Farley, testified that her daughter was taken out of State for an abortion by one Rosa Marie Hartford.

Is this just a friend, Mrs. Hartford? Is this just a neighbor trying to take care of her? That is not really the pattern. Mrs. Hartford was actually the mother of a 19-year-old young man whose statutory rape of the then-12-year-old girl caused the pregnancy. In other words, the woman was trying to cover up the criminal activity of her son. The son later pleaded guilty to statutory rape.

Thus, the clinics are openly encouraging evasion of State laws. The Child Custody Protection Act would shut those practices down.

The question of parental notification and consent is an important one. The American people care about it.

I would like to show a chart which shows the depth of the feeling of the American people on this issue, which has remained strong for a decade or more. Just last year, in a Fox NEWS Dynamics Opinion Poll, the question was:

Do you think a female under age 18 should be required by State law to notify at least one parent or guardian before having an abortion?

Seventy-eight percent said yes. Only 17 percent said no.

How about this one, a Quinnipiac University poll of just last year:

Do you favor or oppose requiring parental notification before a minor could get an abortion?

Seventy-five percent say yes; eighteen percent say no.

How about this one, a CNN–USA Today poll conducted by Gallop:

Do you favor or oppose each of the following proposals? How about a law requiring women under 18 to get parental consent for any abortion?

You see how they changed that language a little bit; you would affect the numbers a little bit. It did—73 to 24. But still three-fourths of the people say a parent should know and consent before their minor daughter can get an abortion.

How about this one. This is the Wirthlin Worldwide poll from several years ago:

Do you favor or oppose requiring one parent of a girl who is under the age of 18 years of age to be notified before an abortion is performed on the girl?

Eighty-three percent to fifteen.

Here is another one, the Los Angeles Times:

Should girls under the age of 18 be required to get the consent of at least one parent before having an abortion?

Eighty-two to twelve.

Here is CBS News-New York Times:

Would you favor or oppose requiring parental consent before a girl under the age of 18 could have an abortion?

Seventy-eight to seventeen percent. That one was 1998, 8 years ago.

The numbers have been strong. They haven't gone down. They remain so. Why? Because it is good policy.

For Heaven's sake, shouldn't a parent know if their child is having this kind of medical procedure? I think so. Some may think that a 13-year-old should just be allowed to be taken away by some 29-year-old, some 40-year-old man to have an abortion to cover up his statutory rape. They may think that is good policy. I don't.

But I would just say this: This law that we are considering today, the Child Custody Protection Act, really does not deal with that. It simply says that if a State of this United States passes a law, and someone takes a child across State lines to avoid that law, they would be implicated in a Federal violation. The Federal Government would simply be affirming and supporting the States that choose to have a parental consent law. It does not make any new law. It does not set any parental consent standard. It does not put any new constraints on abortion. It simply says that if you try to avoid the State law, the Federal Government will be of assistance.

I think the statute is drafted in a good way. I was a Federal prosecutor for 15 years and very familiar with many of the questions that come up with regard to prosecuting Federal cases. We have had some recent federalism decisions by the Supreme Court. They basically raise concerns that we in Congress have become too careless in how we draft legislation by attempting to make criminal acts solely within a State that have no interstate connection.

When I was a young prosecutor, some of the first cases I got to prosecute were automobile theft cases. But it is not automobile theft in Federal court, it is interstate transportation of a stolen motor vehicle. That is the crime—interstate transportation of that vehicle. If you just stole a car in Alabama, and you caught the person in Alabama, they never crossed a State line, it is not a Federal crime. It can only be prosecuted in Alabama.

The Supreme Court raised some concerns about that.

Theft from an interstate shipment is also a Federal crime. It is a Federal crime for people to steal from a railroad going through the community, if it is an interstate shipment. But if you steal from a farmer, and you don't get out of State with the produce, it is not a Federal crime. It is theft from interstate transportation of stolen property, ITSP. And that is a Federal offense.

So that is how this statute is written. This statute does not say we are going to micromanage what goes on within a State. What we are saying is, if someone travels in interstate commerce—because the Constitution of the

United States provides that this Congress, this Federal Government, has the authority to regulate interstate commerce—for the purpose of avoiding a State law to help a minor child get an abortion without the knowledge of their loving parents, who are raising the child and will have to raise them in the future, they are guilty a Federal offense.

I think that is perfectly sound constitutionally and something we should do. It is past time we do it. I would urge my colleagues to consider this. If there is one circumstance in which we should be most concerned about abortion, it is that of the young lady I described who testified at our hearing. Crystal Lane was impregnated and having sex with an older man when she was 12 years of age, and had an abortion at 13 years of age, and her parent did not know about it. How did it happen? The young man's mother and young man got together and secreted her across State lines to have an abortion, so he would not be found out, so he would not be prosecuted for statutory rape. This was not done out of any interest in the child's welfare.

That is a very real problem that should not continue. We have the ability to do something about it. I urge my colleagues to study this act and to make sure we stop those who would usurp State law, usurp parental rights, and damage children without the knowledge of their parents.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

Mr. WYDEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. President, I support S. 403, the Child Custody Protection Act. This bill is a commonsense measure that says simply that families, parents, and children are important in America and that we will respect them and protect them. The bill also demonstrates the importance of respecting our citizens who have spoken in State after State by the adoption of parental notification and parental consent requirements before a minor child can be subjected to invasive medical procedures with both physical and emotional consequences.

The Child Custody Protection Act would make it a Federal misdemeanor to transport a minor across State lines to obtain an abortion, in order to circumvent a home State law requiring notification of one or both parents prior to an abortion.

This bill does not permit the prosecution of the child or his parents, but it does permit the prosecution of outside third parties who would interfere with the parent-child relationship in order to further a political or ideological agenda.

In addition to criminal penalties, the bill allows any parent who suffers harm from a violation of this act may seek and obtain an appropriate civil remedy.

At a time when children in public schools cannot obtain so much as an aspirin from a school nurse without parental consent, America has overwhelmingly insisted that before permitting minors to undergo a major medical procedure, such as an abortion, their parents should consent or at the very least, be notified. Thirty-four States have enacted parental consent or notification laws. Parental notification is supported by 83 percent of the American people.

Yet, too often, outside third parties have intentionally sought to circumvent these profamily State laws and invade the parent-child relationship by transporting children across State lines for the purpose of having an abortion.

This bill will serve as a real deterrent to such efforts. It reaffirms the parent-child relationship which is so important to the overwhelming majority of Americans. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

I yield back.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

INTERNET NEUTRALITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have already announced that I will do everything I can to block Senate consideration of the major overhaul of the telecommunications laws until it contains language to ensure there cannot be discrimination on the Internet.

Last week, I outlined a number of examples of the kind of discrimination that could take place unless there is language known as Net neutrality in the legislation. I am going to give additional examples this morning of what will happen if discrimination is allowed on the Net. I also intend to start laying out answers to some of the most frequently asked questions about Net neutrality.

The major phone and cable companies that are now spending enormous sums trying to prevent Net neutrality so outspend the folks who share my views that I think it is important for the Senate to get a sense of what is going on. That is why it is my intent to come to the floor of the Senate again and again and again to outline what is at stake with respect to ensuring that the Internet is kept free of discrimination.

Let me begin by first addressing this question of what exactly is Net neutrality. If you listen to some of the so-called experts about communications, they would suggest this is so complicated, so arcane, so difficult for anybody to understand, you ought to let the lawyers and the lobbyists sort this out. Of course, that is traditionally what has gone on in this field. You have lawyers and lobbyists being paid very handsomely to battle it out with each other, usually in Washington, DC, or in courtrooms across the country.

Somehow, the typical person, the typical citizen, who has become empowered using the Internet, does not get to participate in these discussions. I will tell you, Mr. President, I do not think the American people are going to buy that any longer. The Internet, which, of course, has opened up so many doors for our citizens in terms of health care and business opportunities, education, and culture, has also ensured they get a lot of information about these communications debates that used to be reserved for lawyers and lobbyists.

The people of this country—and the hundreds and hundreds of organizations that want to keep the Internet discrimination free—are no longer going to accept a notion that a handful of insiders in Washington, DC, can have these debates about the future of the communications systems they depend on, and that the people of this country will have to take what these so-called experts decide. So this is going to be a debate, in my view, that is going to be driven by the grassroots of this country, by thousands of people getting involved and coming to their legislators, and others, to talk about the future of telecommunications—why so much communication power is concentrated in so few hands.

I am going to try to advance this debate here on the floor of the Senate every so often so we can make sure somebody is getting the message out about what is at stake, other than those big cable and phone companies that seem to be spending almost $150 for every $1 spent by folks who share my views.

The first question I want to talk about this morning is what exactly is Net neutrality? It is not that complicated. It is a pretty straightforward proposition. What Net neutrality means is you cannot discriminate on the Internet. The people who are against Net neutrality—I call them ''the discriminators'' because that is their agenda—want to discriminate. They want to be in a position to play favorites. They want to say: We will give certain people a good deal, both in terms of service and all the considerations that go into folks making their choices on line.

I do not think we should have that kind of discrimination. I think it ought to be, as it is today, possible for our citizens to go with their browser where they want to go, when they want to go, and everybody would be treated equally. That is the way it works today. I do not think there ought to be any changes.

Today, somebody pays a fee to get on the Net. They go where they want,

when they want. And if you want to buy something online from Harry & David—their wonderful fruit, which we know a lot about in the State of Oregon—you pay your Internet provider for the connection, Harry & David pays its Internet provider for its connection, and that is that. Once you pay your Internet access fee, no one stops you from shopping at Harry & David because you did not pay an extra fee.

Without a clear policy preserving Net neutrality and ensuring there is no discrimination on the Net, the Net would be forever changed. And, in my view, it would be forever changed if discrimination is allowed on the Internet.

So that is why I have indicated I am going to use every procedural tool I have as a Senator to block Senate consideration of the telecommunications overhaul until it ensures there is Net neutrality and no discrimination online.

Now, a second question I am often asked is people want to know, as a consumer: How will Net neutrality affect me? For starters, keeping things the way they are, keeping Net neutrality, is not going to change anything about the Net for millions and millions of our consumers who rely on it. Net neutrality has been the way we have enjoyed the Net since day one. And it is only in the last year that there has been this new front opened up where folks say: We have to be allowed to discriminate. It has only been in the last year where the basic nondiscriminatory nature of the Internet has been under attack.

So it is not going to change the world for the consumer if Net neutrality is preserved. But I will tell you, it is surely a troubling question for consumers if we do not have Net neutrality. Consumers, in my view, without Net neutrality, would immediately feel the effects. They would have fewer choices, and they would pay higher prices. And I am going to try, again, to use some examples this morning of why that is the case.

Currently, consumers pay a fee for connecting to the Internet. The fee is for a certain amount of bandwidth. The more bandwidth you buy, the faster the speed with which you connect to the Internet. So with a dial-up connection at 56 kilobits per second of bandwidth, it is going to take a lot longer to get your favorite Web sites than with a high-speed connection at 6 megabits per second. That is why some folks call broadband high speed. A broader bandwidth can accommodate more bits, and they can move faster down the pipes. A growing number of our citizens want the higher speed or broadband connection to the Net.

If the large phone and cable lobbies are able to stop Net neutrality, consumers would no longer have access to all the content available on the bandwidth they buy. Rather, those that provide content on the Net—and that is everybody with a Web site, from small nonprofits and universities to large corporations—would be forced to pay the big phone and cable companies an extra fee for access to the consumer's bandwidth. If they did not pay or could not afford to pay these extra fees, their content would be waylaid, it would be off on the Internet slow lane.

This would mean consumers would have fewer Web site choices. Some small businesses that depend on the Net for sales, in my view, will end up closing down. Many of the bloggers—and we know that now blogging is awfully popular; these are folks who write just to be heard—they are going to find it hard to continue without Net neutrality if they have to pay those extra fees. Nonprofits—I am not sure we will see all their Web sites. At the end of the day, without Net neutrality, consumers will be left with fewer choices.

That is not all that consumers will be left with. Because the loss of Net neutrality is double-barreled discrimination, consumers would also be left with higher prices. Those companies that choose to pay fees to the larger phone and cable companies are going to pass those fees on to the consumer. The price of goods sold online is going to rise because companies will pass on the fees to consumers. And because no one can determine now how high the fees are going to go, no one can predict how high the price of goods sold online would go either.

So that is a little bit of what all this means to the typical consumer. It does mean, in my view, higher prices and fewer choices for the reasons I outlined. But I thought I would continue what I started last week; that is, bringing some specific examples I think we will see on the Internet if there is an absence of Net neutrality.

The first example I am going to cite this morning is somebody I am going to call Josh Nelson. Josh Nelson wants to get Internet broadband for himself and his family at home. ''Local Cable'' is the only choice for Internet access, and we will say it charges $49.99 for a 6 megabit per second connection.

In a world with Net neutrality, when Josh buys his connection from ''Local Cable,'' he gets to visit any Web site he wants, when he wants, and how he wants. If he wants, for example, to download movies from the popular Vongo for $10 a month, he can do that. If he wants to search the Web using Yahoo or book a family vacation online at Travelocity, Josh can do that, too.

Under the bill that has come from the Senate Commerce Committee—the bill that does not protect Net neutrality—Josh will not be able to do any of those kinds of things I have described unless content providers pay a new priority access fee on top of the $49.99 Internet access charge Josh already pays, and the fees the content providers pay to get on the Net.

Unless Travelocity pays the additional priority fee, booking that vacation at Travelocity could take 20 minutes to process because they are not paying the extra fee to ''Local Cable'' for priority access. Downloading movies at Vongo could cost more as well, could cost $20 rather than $10 because Vongo is passing on the costs of paying ''Local Cable'' the priority access fee.

Josh at this point—and this is as sure as night follows day in terms of what is ahead—is going to want to switch to another broadband provider, given all these extra costs he would have to eat. But he is stuck. There are no other choices for many people across the land.

The second example I want to outline involves somebody I am calling Mary Smith. Mary goes on line now through a broadband connection with a local Bell company to purchase a television from her local electronics store, Barnes Electronics. In a world with net neutrality, when Mary goes to Barnes Electronics web site, the site works properly and she can purchase the new television with ease. Under the legislation that came from the Senate Commerce Committee, it is going to be a different world for Mary. When she types in the web address for Barnes Electronics, the site may not immediately load. Instead a page could load asking her if she would prefer to shop at Big Box Electronics web site which paid the local Bell to interrupt Mary's browsing. After clicking no, she is directed to Barnes Electronics web site. However, the site takes a long time to load and she becomes so frustrated, she says: Well, I will just go shopping at Big Box and eat all those higher prices.

In each of these examples, those who own the pipes extend their reach to the detriment of the American people. According to the business plans—and these have not exactly been hidden—of the big phone and cable companies and what they tell Wall Street, the kind of world I describe is what we are heading for. Without net neutrality, neither of the people in the examples I just outlined would enjoy the Internet the way they enjoy it today.

One last question for purposes of this morning. I am often asked now: If we have net neutrality, does that mean we are not going to have sophisticated communications networks built in my neighborhood? Of course, we all want these sophisticated communications systems. Folks want them in Georgia, in Oregon, across the land. We all understand the value of constantly trying to upgrade our communications systems. Nobody wants policies that create disincentives to building new and improved communications networks. For years cable companies have been digging up the streets in neighborhoods across the land to build more sophisticated networks, even though net neutrality protections were in place. For all these years, when we have said we were not going to allow discrimination on the Internet, we have had the cable companies out there digging up the streets putting in these systems. So it is not as if we don't have some evidence of what you can do when the Internet is free of discrimination.

We have seen these sophisticated networks built by cable companies right now. They are doing it when there is an absence of discrimination on the net. The reason I cited this is, it proves that if consumers demand it, the communications companies are going to build it because they can make a profit. The Bells, for example, would rather build a network with discrimination in it because they can make billions of dollars of extra profit. That is why they are threatening not to build networks and to try to hold hostage consumers and businesses across America. I don't think that is right. There is concrete evidence that this notion that we will not have sophisticated communications networks unless we allow discrimination on the net makes no sense at all.

I have tried to make a focus of my career in public service to keeping the Internet free from discrimination. It has paid real dividends already, particularly in regard to taxation. I was a Senate sponsor of the legislation that prohibited discrimination in taxes on line. When we started, it was a very simple proposition. We would see, for example, that if you bought a newspaper on line, you paid taxes. But if you bought the snail mail version of that newspaper, you didn't pay any taxes. So Congress came together on a bipartisan basis and said: We are not going to allow discrimination and taxation with respect to the Internet. We have done it. It has made sense.

For all those who claimed there were going to be dire consequences, that the States and localities wouldn't have any money, that it was going to kill the traditional retailer, the main street retailer, we haven't seen any of that. The Internet Nondiscrimination Act as it relates to taxation has made a huge difference. I worked with Senator ALLEN on the other side of the aisle on that. Our mutual friend, former Congressman Chris Cox, who now heads the Securities and Exchange Commission, he and I began this effort when he was serving in the other body. We have seen already, with respect to ensuring that the net is free from multiple and discriminatory taxes, why it makes sense to keep the Internet a discrimination free zone.

For the life of me, I can't figure out why we want to bring discrimination back to the telecommunications world, which is what this telecommunications overhaul will do, unless net neutrality is protected. The major cable and phone companies have spent more than $40 million since January of this year to make the American people think that net neutrality is what they call a lose-lose proposition. I am here to say that the absence of net neutrality will be the lose-lose proposition. The American people will see discrimination in Internet content, higher prices for consumers, and that is why hundreds of organizations that span the political spectrum, who disagree with each other on virtually everything, have come together to say: We are going to pull out all the stops to try to protect the Internet from discrimination.

I do not want to see the American consumer face the double barrel discrimination on the net of reduced choices in content, diminished services, and the additional prospect of higher prices. As a result, it is my intent to keep my hold on this major telecommunications rewrite until it ensures true net neutrality and an Internet free of discrimination.

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS FOR KIDS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, earlier this week, I introduced the America's Opportunity Scholarships for Kids Act, S. 3682, on behalf of President Bush. I was joined in introducing this legislation by Senators ENSIGN, GREGG, and SANTORUM. This bill provides meaning to the promise of the No Child Left Behind Act by giving low-income families whose children are stuck in low-performing schools the same opportunities other families already enjoy.

President Bush proposed the America's Opportunity Scholarships Program as part of his fiscal year 2007 budget. The bill authorizes $100 million in competitive grants to State and local educational agencies or private nonprofit groups to provide low-income students in low-performing schools with scholarships to attend the school of their choice or receive tutoring. Thousands of eligible students would receive up to $4,000 in scholarship funds to apply to tuition and costs at the school of their choice or up to $3,000 worth of intensive tutoring to help them improve their academic achievement.

Eligible low-income students are those who attend schools in ''restructuring,'' which means they have missed their student achievement goals under No Child Left Behind for 6 years in a row. The U.S. Department of Education reports that in the 2004–2005 school year, 1,065 schools were identified for restructuring. Preliminary estimates suggest that an additional 1,000 schools will be identified for restructuring in the 2005–2006 school year.

Parents want the best possible schools for their children. A recent survey by the Educational Testing Service showed that 62 percent of public school parents either transferred a child out of one school into a better school or have decided where to live based on the schools in that district. This bill offers a way out for students whose families don't have the money for tuition or the luxury of moving.

For those who think school choice is not important, I ask you to consider what you would do if the government or circumstances said you had no choice in the matter. Imagine what would happen if we passed a law that said that no American parent could choose a school for their child, and instead the government assigned each child to a specific public or private school. There would be a revolution in this country by middle- and upper-income parents who want to preserve their right to choose what is best for their child's education.

Low-income parents are increasingly voicing a demand for the same quality educational options that wealthier families have. In Milwaukee, WI, low-income families' demand for better choices led to the creation of a citywide private school choice program in 1990. Today, Milwaukee is one of the most vibrant education marketplaces in the Nation, and parents can choose from traditional public schools, charter schools, and private schools. Here in Washington, DC, frustrated low-income parents led an active campaign to establish the DC School Choice Incentive Program, which increases educational options for low-income students, including scholarships to attend private schools. Over 2,600 applications were received for 1,200 available scholarships in 2004, the first year of that program. This school year, 1,713 students are enrolled at the private school of their choice. Their parents report significant improvements in their children's academic performance, behavior, and prospects for the future.

Our Nation gives families choices in educational institutions nearly everywhere but in grade school and high school. After World War II, the GI bill enabled veterans to attend the educational institutions of their choice—public or private, secular or nonsecular. Today, Federal dollars for higher education still follow students to the school of their choice. It is this choice—along with autonomy and competition—that has made our system of higher education the best in the world. We also allow Federal funding to follow preschoolers to the childcare program of their choice.

Unfortunately, we have gotten in a rut with K–12 schools. We have created local monopolies where dollars flow directly to schools with little or no say from parents. The ones paying the highest price are the poor children of America.

America's opportunity scholarships are a way out for families who have waited too long. I hope my colleagues will support this important legislation so we can help our neediest children achieve a brighter future.

GUN SAFETY EDUCATION

Mr. President, high profile school shootings across this country in recent years have focused the Nation's attention on easy access to guns by children, especially in the home. Each day in the United States, an average of 80 people die as a result of homicide, suicide, and unintentional injuries that involve a firearm. Even more tragically ten of those who die everyday are children. The epidemic of firearm violence affects us all.

Steps to Prevent Firearm Injury In the Home, STOP 2, developed by the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, supplies health care providers across a wide range of disciplines including nurses, social workers, psychologists, health educators, and counselors, with the tools to educate diverse populations about the dangers of guns in the home and proper gun storage. Health care providers routinely discuss ways to prevent many types of injury, such as using child car seats, wearing bicycle safety helmets, and locking up prescription drugs. STOP 2 helps health care providers incorporate firearm injury prevention along with these other safety messages. Health care providers, as important messengers of health and safety information, are able to speak with patients and their families about the dangers of guns in their own homes as well as the homes of relatives or friends they visit. The program also assists health care providers in alerting families to the typical warning signs of gang involvement and suicide, and outlines action steps that can help prevent these possible tragedies.

STOP 2 expands on the original STOP program, which was launched in 1994 as a joint effort of the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, CPHV, and the American Academy of Pediatrics. STOP was designed specifically for pediatricians. STOP 2 broadens the program's scope to include other health care providers and health educators who work in a wide range of disciplines with diverse populations. With funding through the Metropolitan Life Foundation, CPHV is providing STOP 2 kits free of charge to the health care community. Health care providers can request a free STOP 2 kit that contains patient/client brochures, waiting room posters, and other gun violence prevention information, by contacting the Center to Prevent Handgun Violence.

I commend all of those who fight gun violence through safety education. Their common sense approach provides parents with practical steps to help protect themselves and their families from tragedy. I am hopeful that the 109th Congress will do more to support their efforts by taking up and passing sensible gun safety legislation.

COMMITMENT TO ISRAEL

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. President, we have all learned in our personal lives that in times of difficulty and challenge, all the extraneous matters of life disappear and we wisely cling to those relationships and values we hold most dear. As we as a nation confront a dangerous set of circumstance in the Middle East, we would be wise to do the same thing.

The United States made a solemn, unequivocal, irrevocable commitment to the State of Israel in 1948. We did so for two reasons. First, we were responding in moral revulsion to centuries of persecution of the Jewish people around the world and specifically in Nazi Germany. Second, we were affirming the formation of a democratic society in the Middle East because we believed, then and now, the democracy is, in Lincoln's words, ''the last best hope of Earth.''

That commitment had absolutely nothing to do with politics, partisanship or the price of a gallon of gasoline. Today on this floor we renew that commitment to Israel, and by doing so, remain faithful to our own creeds and national moral identity.

We as a nation are committed to democracy and the rule of law. We believe that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. We know from our own history that many disagree with that commitment. We know that those values are not self-actualizing. Sometimes free nations have to fight violent people to preserve the circumstances under which they can live in peace and freedom. We stand with Israel today to support its right to defend itself against terrorists and those who support them.

Israel is a small country, surrounded by many who are hostile to their existence. Over the last six decades, Israel has made risky territorial concessions to its neighbors in hopes that moderate Arab voices would prevail over extremists. Those extremists' view of peace in the Middle East are predicated on the destruction and removal of Israel.

Despite the fact that southern Lebanon and the Gaza Strip have been the launching point for violence against Israel in the recent past, Israel agreed to withdraw from them in the hope of peace. That hope has been dashed by Hamas and Hezbollah, both in the abduction of Israeli soldiers and the launching of rocket attacks.

Some in the European community and even in the United States have said criticized Israel's response as ''disproportionate'' and urged Israel to negotiate. When their very survival is at stake, how do you measure proportionality? With whom do they suggest Israel negotiate?

I am not saying there is not role for diplomacy or a diplomatic solution.

But the foundation of such a solution must be No. 1, Israel has an absolute right to defend itself and No. 2, we must make absolutely certain that our actions do not embolden terrorists to continue their inexcusable tactics.

No one supports armed conflict or the injury of civilians. A terrible price is always paid by those who bear the least guilt for the battles. But when Israel is faced with terrorists who work for its destruction, firm steps must be taken.

I commend the President for his active work with the leaders in the region, the United Nations and Europe. This is a situation where public statements should be few and maximum influence exerted in private networks of diplomacy.

I believe the President is honoring our Nation's commitment to Israel and forcefully pursuing our Nation's wider objectives in the War on Terror in this situation.

I think the American people can be reassured and proud that the United States is acting as a great power, in pursuit of high moral principles. We hope that through our strength and advocacy, those who initiated this conflict in Lebanon and Gaza will cease their actions, that their ability to continue to inflict terror and destabilize the region is eliminated or at least severely curtailed, and those who work for peace can regain control.

Israel is the only democracy in the region and they need our friendship and support right now. By demonstrating our resolve, we help ensure that our other friends in the region will work for a solution which is best for Israel and all the legitimate forces in the Middle East.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO REAR ADMIRAL JAMES E. MCPHERSON

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to RADM James E. McPherson, the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Navy. Admiral McPherson will retire from the Navy on July 28, 2006, having completed over 27 years of distinguished service to our Nation.

Admiral McPherson, a native of San Diego, is a graduate of San Diego State University and University of San Diego Law School. He also earned a master of laws degree from the U.S. Army Judge Advocate General's Legal Center and School.

Admiral McPherson began his military career as an enlisted man in the U.S. Army. He served over 3 years as a military policeman at the Presidio of San Francisco, with the Eighth Army in South Korea, and with the First Infantry Division. Notably, he is the first Navy Judge Advocate General to begin his career as an enlisted man. After receiving his commission as an ensign and completing Naval Justice School in Newport, RI, Admiral McPherson was assigned as an Assistant Force Judge Advocate for Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. He continued his distinguished career with assignments at the Naval Legal Service Office in Norfolk, VA; the Naval Air Station, Cubi Point in the Philippines; and as Command Judge Advocate onboard the USS *Theodore Roosevelt*. Following completion of graduate school, Admiral McPherson returned to the Naval Legal Service Office in Norfolk and served tours as senior defense counsel and senior trial counsel. He was then assigned as Force Judge Advocate for Commander, Submarine Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet; the assistant for legal and legislative matters for the vice chief of Naval Operations; and as special counsel to the Chief of Naval Operations. In September 2000,

Admiral McPherson assumed command of Trial Service Office East in Norfolk, and in October 2002, he was promoted to rear admiral and assigned as the Deputy Judge Advocate General and Commander, Naval Legal Service Command. Admiral McPherson assumed his current duties as the 39th Judge Advocate General of the Navy in November 2004.

The Nation, the United States Navy, and the Judge Advocate General's Corps have been fortunate to enjoy the talents and dedication of such a distinguished and wonderful gentleman. Admiral McPherson's commitment to the rule of law strengthened the Navy, and he has served this Nation well. I know all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Admiral McPherson on the occasion of his retirement, and we wish him fair winds and following seas.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5684. An act to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 448. Concurrent resolution commending the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the completion of the Space Shuttle's second Return-to-Flight mission.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 3711. A bill to enhance the energy independence and security of the United States by providing for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources in the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. COLLINS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 2146. A bill to extend relocation expenses test programs for Federal employees (Rept. No. 109–289).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DEWINE:

S. 3712. A bill to redesignate the Dayton Aviation Heritage National Historical Park in the State of Ohio as the ''Dayton Wright Brothers-Dunbar National Historical Park'', and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3713. A bill to protect privacy rights associated with electronic and commercial transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID):

S. Res. 538. A resolution to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Rockefeller v. Bingaman, et al; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mrs. DOLE):

S. Con. Res. 113. A concurrent resolution congratulating the Magen David Adom Society in Israel for achieving full membership in the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 666

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to protect the public health by providing the Food and Drug Administration with certain authority to regulate tobacco products.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to establish national standards for discharges from cruise vessels into the waters of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1035

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1035, a bill to authorize the presentation of commemorative medals on behalf of Congress to Native Americans who served as Code Talkers during foreign conflicts in which the United States was involved during the 20th century in recognition of the service of those Native Americans to the United States.

S. 1046

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1046, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, with respect to the jurisdiction of Federal courts over certain cases and controversies involving the Pledge of Allegiance.

S. 2145

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2145, a bill to enhance security and protect against terrorist attacks at chemical facilities.

S. 2385

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2385, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand eligibility for Combat-Related Special Compensation paid by the uniformed services in order to permit certain additional retired members who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for that disability and Combat-Related Special Compensation by reason of that disability.

S. 3128

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 3128, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 3650

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3650, a bill to include costs incurred by the Indian Health Service, a Federally qualified health center, an AIDS drug assistance program, certain hospitals, or a pharmaceutical manufacturer patient assistance program in providing prescription drugs toward the annual out of pocket threshold under part D of title XVIII of the Social Security Act and to provide a safe harbor for assistance provided under a pharmaceutical manufacturer patient assistance program.

S. 3667

At the request of Mr. BURNS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3667, a bill to promote nuclear nonproliferation in North Korea.

S. 3681

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3681, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 to provide that manure shall not be considered to be a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant.

S. 3682

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. FRIST), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT)

were added as cosponsors of S. 3682, a bill to establish the America's Opportunity Scholarships for Kids Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 4686

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4686 proposed to H.R. 4472, an act to protect children from sexual exploitation and violent crime, to prevent child abuse and child pornography, to promote Internet safety, and to honor the memory of Adam Walsh and other child crime victims.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 538—TO AUTHORIZE REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF ROCKEFELLER V. BINGAMAN, ET AL.

Mr. FRIST (for himself and Mr. REID) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 538

Whereas, in the case of Rockefeller v. Bingaman, et al., Case No. 06–CV–0198 (D.N.M.), pending in the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico, the plaintiff has named as defendants Senator Jeff Bingaman and the United States Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend the Senate and Members, officers, and employees of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Jeff Bingaman and the United States Senate in the case of Rockefeller v. Bingaman, et al.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 113—CONGRATULATING THE MAGEN DAVID ADOM SOCIETY IN ISRAEL FOR ACHIEVING FULL MEMBERSHIP IN THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS AND RED CRESCENT MOVEMENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. CLINTON (for herself and Mrs. DOLE) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 113

Whereas international humanitarian law is, quintessentially, about principle, establishing standards of conduct that can not be breached under any circumstance, or for any calculation of political efficacy or utility;

Whereas the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement is a worldwide institution in which all national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies have equal status, whose mission is to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found, without discrimination;

Whereas the Magen David Adom (Red Shield of David) Society is the national humanitarian society in Israel and has performed heroically, aiding all in need of assistance, on a purely humanitarian basis, without bias, even those responsible for acts of horrific violence against Israeli civilians;

Whereas, since 1949, the Magen David Adom Society has been refused admission into the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and has been relegated to observer status without a vote because it has used the Red Shield of David, the only such national organization denied membership in the Movement;

Whereas the red cross symbol was intended as the visible expression of the neutral status enjoyed by the medical services of the armed forces and the protection thus conferred, and there is not, and has never been, any implicit religious connection in the cross;

Whereas, since its establishment in 1930, the Magen David Adom Society has worked under its own symbol, the Red Star of David, as an expression of the humanitarian values the Magen David Adom Society shares with the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies;

Whereas Israel acceded to the Geneva Conventions in 1951 with a reservation specifying their intent to continue to use the Magen David Adom;

Whereas international consultations among nations and national Red Cross Societies ensued until 1999, when the International Committee of the Red Cross formally called for adoption of a protocol to the Geneva Conventions creating a third neutral symbol, allowing the use of either the Red Cross, the Red Crescent, or the third neutral symbol, and allowing for the third neutral symbol to be used in combination with other national Red Cross Society symbols, including the Magen David Adom;

Whereas a diplomatic conference to adopt this proposal into the Geneva Conventions was scheduled for October 2000, but was prevented by the outbreak of the second Palestinian intifada;

Whereas the United States, the American Red Cross, and the American Friends of Magen David Adom have worked ceaselessly to resolve the issue of the third neutral symbol and achieve full membership in the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement for the Magen David Adom Society;

Whereas Congress has insisted that funds made available to the International Committee of the Red Cross be contingent on a certification by the Secretary of State confirming that the Magen David Adom Society is a full participant in the activities of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement;

Whereas the American Red Cross has stood alone among all the national humanitarian aid societies, and has withheld over $45,000,000 in dues to the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies to protest the exclusion of the Magen David Adom;

Whereas the Government of Switzerland, the depositary state for the Geneva Conventions, convened a Diplomatic Conference of the states party to the Geneva Conventions in December 2005 for the purpose of adopting a Third Additional Protocol and rightly resisted efforts to block the broad international consensus in favor of resolving the third neutral symbol question;

Whereas the efforts by the United States and the American Red Cross at the Diplomatic Conference in December 2005 were critical to achieving both an overwhelming positive vote in favor of adopting the Third Additional Protocol, as well as an extremely important memorandum of understanding between the Magen David Adom and the Palestinian Red Crescent Society;

Whereas sustaining international support for the adoption of the third neutral symbol against efforts to divert the conference into unrelated political matters required extraordinary diplomatic efforts by the United States and the American Red Cross;

Whereas the Third Additional Protocol adopted in Geneva in December 2005 established the new third neutral symbol, the ''red crystal'' that can be used in conjunction with the Red Shield of David and cleared the way for Israeli membership in the international movement;

Whereas, in June 2006, the states party to the Geneva Conventions, the national humanitarian aid societies, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and the International Committee of the Red Cross met in Geneva to adopt rules implementing the Third Additional Protocol; and

Whereas, at the June 2006 meeting in Geneva, the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement accepted the Magen David Adom Society as a full member: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) commends the Magen David Adom Society for its long and distinguished record of providing humanitarian assistance to all those in need of aid, even those responsible for heinous atrocities against Israeli civilians;

(2) congratulates the Magen David Adom Society, and the Government and people of Israel, for securing full membership in the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, 57 years past due;

(3) thanks the President, the Secretary of State, and United States diplomatic representatives for their tireless pursuit and maintenance of the international consensus that culminated in the recent acceptance of the Magen David Adom Society as a full member in the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement;

(4) thanks the American Red Cross for its unwavering and unyielding insistence within the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement that the principles of international humanitarian law could not be reconciled with continued exclusion of the Magen David Adom Society;

(5) thanks the Government of Switzerland and officials of the International Committee of the Red Cross for helping to prepare the necessary consensus and carrying to completion the adoption of the Third Additional Protocol by the states party to the Geneva Conventions and the rules for its implementation; and

(6) commends the President for—

(A) submitting the Third Additional Protocol to the Senate for its advice and consent; and

(B) pending approval by the Senate, preparing for congressional consideration and enactment of legislation necessary to carry into effect the Third Additional Protocol.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Friday, July 21, 2006, at 10 a.m. to hold a hearing on the US–UK Extradition Treaty.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 403

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of S. 403, the child

custody protection bill, immediately following morning business on Tuesday, July 25, and that it be considered under the following limitations: that the only amendments in order be the following: Feinstein, clergy and grandparent exemption, 2 hours equally divided; from the Democratic side, teen pregnancy prevention, 90 minutes equally divided; Boxer, parental incest, cannot sue, 2 hours equally divided; Ensign or designee, incest, to be voted on before the Boxer amendment, 2 hours equally divided; that there be 1 hour equally divided for general debate; and that following the disposition of the above-listed amendments and the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate proceed to passage of the bill, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, July 24, at a time determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 764, Jerome Holmes to be U.S. circuit judge for the Tenth Circuit. I further ask unanimous consent that there be 2 hours equally divided between the chairman and ranking member, or their designees, to be used on Monday and another 2 hours equally divided for debate to be used on Tuesday, July 25. I further ask unanimous consent that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate; further, I ask unanimous consent that following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL AUTHORIZATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 538, which was submitted earlier today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 538) to authorize representation by the Senate legal counsel in the case of Rockefeller versus Bingaman et al.

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

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a pro se civil action filed against Senator JEFF BINGAMAN, the United States Senate, Representative STEVE PEARCE, and the United States House of Representatives, in which plaintiff challenges as unconstitutional the fact that he does not have a guaranteed right to have his appeals heard by the United States Supreme Court nor a right to have a three-judge district court hear his challenges to Federal statutes at the trial court level. Plaintiff complains that permitting the Supreme Court discretion as to which appeals to hear and allowing single-judge district courts to decide cases challenging the constitutionality Federal statutes violates the Constitution's separation of powers. Plaintiff seeks an injunction against the operation of the statutes that provide for petitioning the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari and for convening a three-judge district court to hear a case.

This suit is subject to dismissal as defective on both threshold jurisdictional grounds and as failing to state a claim on the merits as a matter of law. This resolution authorizes the Senate Legal Counsel to represent Senator BINGAMAN and the United States Senate in this suit an to. move for its dismissal.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 538) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 538

Whereas, in the case of Rockefeller v. Bingaman, et al., Case No. 06–CV–0198 (D.N.M.), pending in the United States District Court of the District of New Mexico, the plaintiff has named as defendants Senator Jeff Bingaman and the United States Senate;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(1) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C., §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(1), the Senate may direct its counsel to defend the Senate and Members, officers, and employees of the Senate in civil actions relating to their official responsibilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent Senator Jeff Bingaman and the United States Senate in the case of Rockefeller v. Bingaman, et al.

COMMENDING THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 448, which was received from the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) commending the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the completion of the Space Shuttle's second Return-to-Flight mission.

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

Mr. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, the House has passed and sent to the Senate, H. Con. Res. 448, which commends NASA and the crew of the Space Shuttle *Discovery* on the successful completion of the STS–121 mission earlier this week.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to join with me and provide the Senate concurrence to this resolution. I also note that the House passed this resolution on July 20, the 37th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* lunar landing, adding special significance to the action we are being asked to endorse.

The resolution recognizes and applauds the very successful STS–121 mission, which accomplished all of its test objectives regarding on-orbit repair procedures, as well as delivering 14 tons of equipment and supplies to the International Space Station, and a third space station crew member. This restores the space station to its full crew complement since the *Columbia* accident and allows for additional crew time to be spent doing on-orbit research.

The mission also demonstrated that changes made to the external tank, while still not fully completed, resulted in the least amount of foam shedding during lift-off and the cleanest, most undamaged underside of the shuttle yet seen.

The successful completion of this second Return-to-Flight test mission is especially significant because it means the Shuttle Program is once again on the threshold of completing the important work of assembling the International Space Station.

If all goes as expected, the next mission to the Space Station will take place in just a little over 5 weeks from now, near the end of August. That mission will deliver additional supplies and equipment to the space station, including a new structural truss element and an additional set of solar arrays. Once the solar arrays are deployed, they will not only provide additional power to the space station, which can be used for an increasing number of scientific experiments during the ongoing assembly period, but they will begin to make the space station one of the brightest objects in the night sky. By the time the space station is completed, it will be brighter than any other object in the night sky besides the Moon, an ever-present reminder that we are a species no longer confined to the Earth and able to make use of that unique environment of low-Earth orbit for research that can benefit all of humanity.

I applaud the crew of *Discovery* and the team at NASA who all worked together to restore this Nation's ability

to conduct the human exploration and utilization of space.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 448) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 3711

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3711) to enhance the energy independence and security of the United States by providing for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources in the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is noted.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on today's Executive Calendar: Calendar Nos. 767, 768, 786 through 810, and all nominations on the Secretary's desk. I further ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then return to legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Martin J. Jackley, of South Dakota, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for the term of four years.

Brett L. Tolman, of Utah, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of four years.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Sue C. Payton, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Charles E. McQueary, of North Carolina, to be Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Department of Defense.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Gregory A. Biscone, 0000
Colonel Edward L. Bolton, Jr., 0000
Colonel Joseph D. Brown, IV, 0000
Colonel Gregory L. Brundidge, 0000
Colonel Timothy A. Byers, 0000
Colonel Michael W. Callan, 0000
Colonel David S. Fadok, 0000
Colonel Craig A. Franklin, 0000
Colonel David L. Goldfein, 0000
Colonel Francis L. Hendricks, 0000
Colonel John W. Hesterman, III, 0000
Colonel James W. Hyatt, 0000
Colonel John E. Hyten, 0000
Colonel Michelle D. Johnson, 0000
Colonel Richard C. Johnston, 0000
Colonel Joseph A. Lanni, 0000
Colonel Kenneth D. Merchant, 0000
Colonel Michael R. Moeller, 0000
Colonel Harry D. Polumbo, 0000
Colonel John D. Posner, 0000
Colonel James O. Poss, 0000
Colonel Mark F. Ramsay, 0000
Colonel Mark O. Schissler, 0000
Colonel Charles K. Shugg, 0000
Colonel Marvin T. Smoot, Jr., 0000
Colonel Alfred J. Stewart, 0000
Colonel Everett H. Thomas, 0000
Colonel William W. Uhle, Jr., 0000
Colonel Dartanian Warr, 0000
Colonel Brett T. Williams, 0000
Colonel Tod D. Wolters, 0000

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. N. Ross Thompson, III, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas R. Turner, II, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Douglas E. Lute, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Charles H. Davidson, IV, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grades indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brigadier General Steven R. Abt, 0000
Brigadier General James A. Hasbargen, 0000
Brigadier General John P. McLaren, Jr., 0000
Brigadier General William Monk, III, 0000
Brigadier General James W. Rafferty, 0000

To be brigadier general

Colonel Craig A. Bugno, 0000
Colonel Harold G. Bunch, 0000
Colonel Walter B. Chahanovich, 0000
Colonel Christopher T. Cline, 0000
Colonel David S. Elmo, 0000
Colonel Robert N. Hipwell, 0000
Colonel Alexander I. Kozlov, 0000
Colonel Jon J. Miller, 0000
Colonel David L. Smalley, 0000
Colonel Robert P. Stall, 0000
Colonel Jonathan Woodson, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Stanley A. McChrystal, 0000

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jimmy G. Welch, 0000

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Richard F. Natonski, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Keith J. Stalder, 0000

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. James F. Amos, 0000

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. John F. Sattler, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Charles M. Gurganus, 0000

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) David J. Dorsett, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Richard E. Cellon, 0000
Rear Adm. (lh) Wayne G. Shear, Jr., 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Michael C. Bachmann, 0000

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark A. Handley, 0000
Capt. Christopher J. Mossey, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Thomas P. Meek, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William D. Sullivan, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. William D. Crowder, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Albert M. Calland, III, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. David J. Venlet, 0000

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Jonathan W. Greenert, 0000

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1775 AIR FORCE nomination of Julio Ocampo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1776 AIR FORCE nomination of John L. Putnam, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1794 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning JOHN D. ADAMS, and ending DIANE HUEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1795 AIR FORCE nominations (30) beginning JOHN D. ADAMS, and ending KARL WOODMANSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1796 AIR FORCE nominations (13) beginning MARK D. CAMPBELL, and ending GARY J. ZICCARDI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1797 AIR FORCE nominations (29) beginning MICHAEL J. APOL, and ending DAWN M.K. ZOLDI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

IN THE ARMY

PN1602 ARMY nominations (30) beginning DAVID W. ACUFF, and ending MICHAEL E. YARMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2006.

PN1738 ARMY nomination of Barry L. Williams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1739 ARMY nominations (2) beginning GERALD P. COLEMAN, and ending DAVID E. ROOT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1740 ARMY nominations (3) beginning ROBERT T. DAVIES, and ending CURTIS E. WELLS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1741 ARMY nominations (15) beginning MICHELLE A. COOPER, and ending DAVID W. TOWLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1742 ARMY nominations (3) beginning RICKIE A. MCPEAKE, and ending EUGENE J. PALKA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1743 ARMY nomination of Paul A. Carter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1777 ARMY nomination of Maritza S. Ryan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1778 ARMY nominations (32) beginning ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR., and ending MICHAEL S. WALL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1779 ARMY nominations (335) beginning BRIAN E. ABELL, and ending CUTTER M. ZAMBONI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1800 ARMY nominations (69) beginning ROBIN M. ADAMS, and ending EDWARD E. YACKEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1801 ARMY nominations (17) beginning RICHARD E. BAXTER, and ending BARRY D. WHITESIDE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1802 ARMY nominations (62) beginning CHRISTOPHER G. ARCHER, and ending PAUL H. YOON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1803 ARMY nominations (106) beginning WADE K. ALDOUS, and ending ESMERALDO ZARZABAL, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1805 ARMY nominations (10) beginning JOHN C. BEACH, and ending LLOYD T. PHINNEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

PN1629 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION nominations (67) beginning PHILIP A GRUCCIO, and ending JAMIE S WASSER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 24, 2006.

IN THE NAVY

PN1744 NAVY nominations (24) beginning CAL ABEL, and ending THOMAS J. ZERR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 26, 2006.

PN1 780 NAVY nomination of David E. Bauer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 29, 2006.

PN1804 NAVY nomination of Cathy L. Trudeau, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

PN1806 NAVY nominations (3) beginning WALTER J. LAWRENCE, and ending RONALD L. RUGGIERO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 12, 2006.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now return to legislative session.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 24, 2006

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 24; I further ask that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each until 3 o'clock; further, I ask that at 3 o'clock, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the Holmes nomination, as under the previous order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, on Monday, we will turn to the nomination of Jerome Holmes to be a circuit court judge for the Tenth Circuit. Under the order, we will spend 2 hours of debate on Monday and then have an additional 2 hours of debate on Tuesday, to be followed by a vote on confirmation of the nomination. This vote on Tuesday will be the first vote of the week. Next week we will have a very busy week. We will continue with the Child Custody Protection Act. Under the agreement, we will have a limited number of amendments which we will consider on Tuesday. We will finish the child custody bill on Tuesday. That is going to require a number of votes throughout the afternoon and possibly into the evening. I ask my colleagues to adjust their schedules accordingly.

Next week I expect we will have other nominations and legislative items to complete. It will be a very busy week.

SENATE PROGRESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we have had a productive week. I don't know if I could say an unusually productive week, as we always have good weeks, but a very strong week in terms of both the range of issues that we have debated on the floor as well as pieces of legislation, important pieces of legislation that have passed. The range is quite remarkable. As I outlined earlier this morning, we began this week studying and talking about and discussing and debating three bills that addressed issues that are challenging in that they address the ethical concerns surrounding science and the tremendous and remarkable advances in science. I have been a beneficiary of this because of my profession as a doctor and as a scientist. We all recognize

the great power and the great potential for science to bring cures, to bring treatment, and to bring a better quality of life to people in this country and, indeed, around the world. Our challenge is to make sure that as we allow that science to advance, not just allow it, we propel it, we push it, we do so in a way that is consistent with our moral values and with a framework of ethics that we all respect. It is a challenge. It is the sort of thing that traditionally legislators have not had to deal a lot with it. They would deal with it on a periodic basis.

Now the reality is, with science moving so fast, we are going to have to be accustomed to dealing with these tough issues, struggling with them. We all struggle with them. It is easy to vote yes or no at the end of the day. But those ''yes'' or ''no'' votes do represent real struggles, both internally and as we talk to family and talk to friends, and as we talk to scientists. It is clearly something that is very powerful in our own lives.

We moved through confirming four judges—I mentioned that last night—the Water Resources Development Act, which we passed under the leadership of Chairman INHOFE last night—yesterday afternoon, last night—and passing the Voting Rights Act after 41 years of real success. Then we went on this child custody protection bill which has to do with parental consent, with people taking minors across the border, without their parents' consent, for an abortion. That is a very important issue. That comes on the heels of an issue we passed last night, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act, which arguably could be considered the most comprehensive child crime protection bill that we passed in a generation. So it is quite remarkable as well.

VISITING FAMILY

Mr. FRIST. I am blessed today to have with me, although I haven't seen them yet—I will be with them here in about 3 or 4 minutes—members of my own family. I say that in part because it is a real pleasure and honor for us to be here, occupying these positions, whether it is majority leader, which I clearly understand I am here for just a period of time in this position, or having that opportunity to serve our 6 million constituents back in Tennessee or as Senators representing, indeed, the entire Nation, for us to be able to welcome visitors here or family members here and share with them the enduring values of freedom and democracy that are represented in this Capitol building as we walk through it and work through this working edifice, this emblem and symbol of democracy around the world but also a working building where we conduct the Nation's business that I just outlined, or I go down the hall to my office, the Howard Baker Majority Leader's Suite. And as I work there all day and a lot of nights, I look out that window and look out on that expansive mall with the Smithsonian Institutions on either side and the Washington Monument reaching for the sky and the Lincoln Memorial. That is all right here.

So I have with me today my niece, Mary Lauren Allen, the daughter of my sister Mary, and her husband Lawson Allen, and for the first time together, they have all three of their children, Cole Allen, Frist Allen, and Harrison Allen. They have been here separately. And it is so much fun for me to walk them over to that window and look out at the Smithsonian and look out at that Lincoln Memorial out there and the Washington Monument. It is a real honor and delight for me to have Mary Lauren and Lawson and especially Harrison and Frist and Cole to walk them through these marble halls in the great Rotunda. Lawson's parents Sam and Phyllis are here as well. I have had the pleasure of having them in the past and hosting them here as well. It is a big family.

THANKING THE PAGES

Mr. FRIST. I thank the pages who are here. I think we have almost 50 pages who are here for a part of the summer. The pages, I am talking to them most of the time in here on both sides of the aisle. I talked to them about an hour ago and had the chance to welcome each of them and to thank them for their tremendous service in making this place click. When we hand these papers up and they are taken over to the Chair or the Parliamentarian, it is by those pages. They are here before we start every day, and they are here until after we leave every day. So I wanted to thank them, which I had the opportunity to do earlier as well.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 2 P.M. MONDAY, JULY 24, 2006

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:13 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 24, 2006, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 21, 2006:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

BIJAN RAFIEKIAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2007, VICE LINDA MYSLIWY CONLIN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

SHARON LYNN HAYS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE KATHIE L. OLSEN.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ROBERT W. JOHNSON, OF NEVADA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF RECLAMATION, VICE JOHN W. KEYS, III, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

JAMES R. KUNDER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE FREDERICK W. SCHIECK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KAREN B. STEWART, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS.

MARY MARTIN OURISMAN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO BARBADOS, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ST. KITTS AND NEVIS, SAINT LUCIA, ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA, THE COMMONWEALTH OF DOMINICA, GRENADA, AND SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES .

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

JANE M. DOGGETT, OF MONTANA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2012, VICE STEPHEN MCKNIGHT, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RONALD J. JAMES, OF OHIO, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE REGINALD JUDE BROWN.

MAJOR GENERAL TODD I. STEWART, USAF, (RET.), OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE ARTHUR JAMES COLLINGSWORTH, TERM EXPIRING.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

GREGORY R. BART, 0000
JAMES P. BENOIT, 0000
TERRENCE W. COSTELLO IV, 0000
ROBERT J. CROW, 0000
KRISTA J. DELLAPINA, 0000
HENRIQUE M. DEOLIVEIRA, 0000
THOMAS L. DORWIN, 0000
TIMOTHY P. JENNINGS, 0000
MARK F. KLEIN, 0000
SHANNON H. KOPPLIN, 0000
ANDREW D. LEVITZ, 0000
EVA M. LOSER, 0000
MICHAEL R. MAULE, 0000
CAREN L. MCCURDY, 0000
ANN K. MINAMI, 0000
JOHNNY M. NILSEN, 0000
EDWARD B. OBRIEN III, 0000
BETHANY L. PAYTONOBRIEN, 0000
MEREDITH L. ROBINSON, 0000
GREGORY J. SMITH, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RICKIE V. ADSIDE, 0000
CHRIS A. ANDERSON, 0000
ALBERT R. BAKER, 0000
ROBIN L. BARNES, 0000
DOUGLAS M. BRIDGES, 0000
JUANITO R. BUCKLEY, 0000
RICHARD C. BUELL, 0000
ERIC H. BURKS, 0000
RICARDO BYRDSONG, 0000
CHARLES W. COLBERT, 0000
ROBERT CSORBA, 0000
ROBERT E. DARE, 0000
JEFFERY P. DAVIS, 0000
ROBERT K. DEGUZMAN, JR., 0000
DAVID W. EGGE, 0000
SEAN M. EGGE, 0000
THOMAS S. FULFORD, 0000
PRESTON L. GILL, 0000
BARRY L. GOLDEN, 0000
MARIE E. GREEN, 0000
SAMANTHA J. GREEN, 0000
GENE A. HAWKS, 0000
GARY HAYMAN, 0000
JONATHAN B. HAYNES, 0000
DANIEL B. HODGSON, 0000
DAVID K. HOWELL, 0000
BARON D. JOLIE, 0000
ELENA A. KUTNEY, 0000
DAVID M. LOCKNEY, 0000
ROBERTO Q. MAGALLANO, 0000
SETH A. MANTI, 0000
RAMON O. MARIN, 0000
DARRELL L. MATHIS, 0000
JAMES R. MATTHEWS, 0000
RICHARD K. MCCARTHY, 0000
MARVIN H. MCGUIRE IV, 0000
WILLIAM D. MITCHELL, 0000
MARK W. MORGAN, 0000
JEFFREY M. NARWOLD, 0000
KARL E. OETTL, 0000
MATTHEW N. OTT III, 0000
ERIC OXENDINE, 0000
JOSEPH W. PARRAN, 0000
BOBBY R. PITTS, 0000
JEFFERY T. RATHBUN, 0000
DAVID J. RHONE, 0000
DAVID E. SMITH, 0000
WILLIAM B. STEVENS, 0000
SHANE A. THRAILKILL, 0000

LUTHER K. TOWNSEND, JR., 0000
COURTNEY A. TURNER, 0000
LORENZO E. WILLIAMS, 0000
ROBERT L. WILLIAMS, JR., 0000
JOHN H. WINDOM, 0000
MICHAEL J. ZERBO, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

ANIBAL L. ACEVEDO, 0000
MARIA AGUSTIN, 0000
JANINE D. ALLEN, 0000
PAUL B. ARP, 0000
DIXIE L. AUNE, 0000
CINDY M. BAGGOTT, 0000
AMY H. BRANSTETTER, 0000
REBEKAH R. BROOKS, 0000
MARY M. BROWN, 0000
NANETTE K. BROWN, 0000
JEFFREY S. BUDGE, 0000
NEWTON J. CHALKER, 0000
TANI L. COREY, 0000
MAX C. CORMIER, 0000
MARTHA A. CUTSHALL, 0000
CAROLE A. DANIEL, 0000
ERIC J. DAVIS, 0000
TOMMIE E. DAVIS, JR., 0000
JANET L. DEWEES, 0000
GEORGE L. DYER III, 0000
ELIZABETH M. ENGELMAN, 0000
LORRAINE A. ENGLISH, 0000
TIMOTHY T. FOSTER, 0000
JAMES C. GAY, 0000
HEATHER K. GILCHRIST, 0000
DENNIS E. GLOVER, 0000
JOSE R. GONZALEZ, 0000
MARY B. GREENBERG, 0000
ANNA M. GRUETZMACHER, 0000
CHRISTINE B. GRUSCHKUS, 0000
STACY D. HAM, 0000
ELIZABETH A. HAYDON, 0000
JULIE A. W. HENDRICKSON, 0000
PATRICIA A. HETRICK, 0000
JULIE M. HILLERY, 0000
SHARI F. JONES, 0000
CYNTHIA L. JUDY, 0000
TONJIA L. H. KELSCH, 0000
DUANE M. KEMP, 0000
SHARON W. KINGSBERRY, 0000
TERRI A. KINSEY, 0000
REBECCA A. KISER, 0000
RUTH KLINE, 0000
CYNTHIA A. KUEHNER, 0000
LINDA M. LAKE, 0000
LISA L. LEWIS, 0000
CHERYLYNN A. LILLVIK, 0000
JEAN L. P. LORD, 0000
ALAN S. LOVEJOY, 0000
MICHAEL P. LYNN, 0000
MARK G. MARINO, 0000
AMY MCBRIDE, 0000
MEGGAN C. MCGRAW, 0000
DAVID B. MCMINDES, 0000
VALERIE A. MORRISON, 0000
BETH A. MOVINSKY, 0000
KIMBERLY J. NEWELL, 0000
GREGORY G. NEZAT, 0000
MICHAEL L. NICK, 0000
KENNETH A. PAGE, 0000
ROSEMARY PERDUE, 0000
NICOLE K. POLINSKY, 0000
STEPHANIE M. PRIDEMORE, 0000
DALE D. RAMIREZ, 0000
AVEMARIA REED, 0000
JANELLE A. RHODERICK, 0000
MARCIA A. RIPLEY, 0000
DEBORAH E. ROY, 0000
THOMAS N. SANTA, JR., 0000
ANGELA R. SAUNDERS, 0000
ASSANATU I. SAVAGE, 0000
SARAH A. M. SHEA, 0000
DAVID A. SHEPPARD, 0000
ADRIENNE J. SIMMONS, 0000
EILEEN M. SIROIS, 0000
ROSEMARY S. SKIDMORE, 0000
TODD M. STEIN, 0000
MARK D. SULLIVAN, 0000
ELIZABETH A. H. TEWELL, 0000
CARLA K. THORSON, 0000
KAREN J. THURMAN, 0000
TWANDA TOLIVER, 0000
GENE D. TRUESDELL, 0000
JOANNE M. TUIN, 0000
SUSAN R. TUSSEY, 0000
SUSAN E. ULLOA, 0000
MARY P. WHITE, 0000
THERESA M. WOOD, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

THOMAS M. DAILEY, 0000
DENNIS E. EDWARDS, 0000
CHARLES L. JONES, 0000
TOBY C. SWAIN, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KEVIN J. BARTOE, 0000
MICHAEL P. CAPUANO, 0000
JOHN W. CARSON III, 0000
PHILLIP G. CYR, 0000
JOHN M. ELLWOOD, 0000
JASON B. FAUNCE, 0000
SHAWN A. FOLLUM, 0000
MARTIN B. HARRISON, 0000
KEVIN L. HUTSELL, 0000
STEPHEN B. JACKSON, 0000
HOLLY M. JOHNSON, 0000
MICHAEL T. JONES, 0000
STANLEY A. KLOSS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER M. KNUDSEN, 0000
DAN C. LEWIS, 0000
TIMOTHY C. LIBERATORE, 0000
PHILLIP S. LODGE, 0000
PAUL S. MCCOMB, 0000
EDWARD S. MCGINLEY, 0000
JANET E. MERRIMAN, 0000
MICHAEL MONREAL, 0000
CHARLENE H. MOWERY, 0000
DONALD D. NAISER, JR., 0000
KRISTINA M. NIELSEN, 0000
SCOT T. SANDERS, 0000
MICHAEL R. SAUM, 0000
LEONARD C. SCHILLING, 0000
ANDREW J. SCHULMAN, 0000
DALE L. SEELEY, 0000
MICHAEL T. TEATES, 0000
DEAN A. VANDERLEY, 0000
MACHELLE A. VIEUX, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KEVIN L. ANDERSON, JR., 0000
FRANCIS P. FOLEY, 0000
TERRY C. GORDON, 0000
MICHAEL E. HALL, 0000
RAYMOND J. HOUK, 0000
BRENT D. JOHNSON, 0000
FREDERICK A. MCGUFFIN, 0000
PATRICK J. MCLAUGHLIN, 0000
WILLIAM J. MUHM, 0000
EDWARD J. NASH, 0000
EDWARD S. PEASE, 0000
GORDON D. RITCHIE, 0000
PAUL J. SHAUGHNESSY, 0000
THOMAS B. WEBBER, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

REBECCA L. BATES, 0000
DAVID N. BREIER, 0000
PAUL J. BROCHU, 0000
DAVID A. BYMAN, 0000
GREGORY R. CADLE, 0000
GREGORY R. CARON, 0000
JAMES R. CASSATA, 0000
JOSEPH D. COLEMAN, 0000
DAVID C. COLLINS, 0000
VICTOR D. DELAOSSA, 0000
DONALD R. DELOREY, 0000
SCHULTZ A. P. DION, 0000
CATHLEEN M. DONOHUE, 0000
RICHARD P. ERICKSON, 0000
ROLAND L. FAHIE, SR., 0000
KIMBERLY A. FERLAND, 0000
LUIS FERNANDEZ, 0000
ROBERT S. FRY, 0000
RICHARD A. GUSTAFSON, 0000
THINH V. HA, 0000
RICHARD G. HAGERTY, 0000
TONYA A. HALL, 0000
DAVID J. HANLEY, 0000
DAVID W. HARDY, 0000
MATTHEW W. HEBERT, 0000
GARY B. HOYT, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. IRWIN, 0000
DONNA M. JEFCOAT, 0000
DALE A. JENSEN, 0000
BRENT M. KELLN, 0000
ALISON C. LEFEBVRE, 0000
STEVEN L. LOBERG, 0000
CHRISTINE W. MANKOWSKI, 0000
KIMBERLEY A. MARSHALL, 0000
DANIEL L. MEYERS, 0000
BRUCE M. MILLER, 0000
JULIE K. MILLER, 0000
CHERYL A. NAVARRO, 0000
ALAN F. NORDHOLM, 0000
CESAR A. ODVINA, 0000
PATRICK W. PAUL, 0000
FRANK P. PEARSON, 0000
STEVEN D. PIGMAN, 0000
BRIAN D. POMIJE, 0000
MICHAEL D. ROSENTHAL, 0000
ALBERTO A. RULLAN, 0000
CARL J. RUOFF, 0000
EDILBERTO M. SALENGA, 0000
PHILLIP M. SANCHEZ, 0000
TODD C. SANDER, 0000
FREDRIK D. SCHMITZ, 0000
JEOSALINA N. SERBAS, 0000
MARY S. SEYMOUR, 0000
RITA G. SIMMONS, 0000
THEODORE J. STJOHN, 0000
DANIEL E. SZUMLAS, 0000
RUBY M. TENNYSON, 0000
GINA F. TROTTER, 0000
SORAYA M. C. VILLACIS, 0000
JEFFREY A. WALTERS, 0000
MARGARET A. WEBB, 0000
KENNETH J. WHITWELL, 0000
JONATHAN P. WILCOX, 0000
FRANCIS T. WILLIAMS, 0000
KELLY A. WILLIAMS, 0000
TIMOTHY J. WOLFKILL, 0000
ALBERT Y. WONG, 0000
HENRY X. YOUNG, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

EROL AGI, 0000
JOSEPH E. ANDREWS, 0000
TIMOTHY S. BARTLETT, 0000
DANIEL L. BOWER, 0000
WALTER D. BRAFFORD, 0000
MICHAEL M. CARSON, 0000
KARINA J. DICK, 0000
WILLIAM L. FOSTER, 0000
DAVID S. GILMORE, 0000
RICHARD A. GUERRA, 0000
SANDRA M. HALTERMAN, 0000
BRENDA R. HAMILTON, 0000
DANIEL E. KIRKWOOD, 0000
RICHARD A. LAING, 0000
CHAD A. LEE, 0000
SYLVIA I. NAGY, 0000
BRENDA L. NELSON, 0000
TRENT L. OUTHOUSE, 0000
ALBERT W. PARULIS, JR., 0000
PRASHANT M. REDDY, 0000
ALAN G. SHELHAMER, 0000
DARREL G. VAUGHN, 0000
WALTER R. WITTKE, 0000

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JULIANN M. ALTHOFF, 0000
SARAH J. ARNOLD, 0000
DENIS E. ASHLEY, 0000
JOSEPH P. BARRION, 0000
JACQUELINE M. BERNARD, 0000
ROBERT J. BETTENDORF, 0000
AVERY A. BEVIN, 0000
FRANK M. BISHOP, 0000
JEFFREY W. BITTERMAN, 0000
DAVID L. BLAZES, 0000
CLIFFORD A. BLUMENBERG, 0000
JOHN F. BOGARD, 0000
TROY F. BOREMA, 0000
RONALD J. BOUCHER, 0000
NICHOLAS M. CARDINALE, 0000
LISA M. CARTWRIGHT, 0000
JEFFREY A. CASSIDY, 0000
JERRY R. CASTRO, 0000
ALEXANDER B. CHAO, 0000
TIMOTHY A. COAKLEY, 0000
DAVID R. CONGDON, 0000
JENNIFER L. CROOK, 0000
VALENTINE W. CURRAN, 0000
WALTER W. DALITSCH, 0000
VINCENT L. DECICCO, 0000
TIMOTHY F. DONAHUE, 0000
KEVIN A. DORRANCE, 0000
TRENT D. DOUGLAS, 0000
RITA W. DRIGGERS, 0000
RUTH H. DUDA, 0000
MARK R. DUNCAN, 0000
ANGELA S. EARLEY, 0000
COLETTE L. EHNOW, 0000
JAMES W. ELLIOTT, 0000
ROBERT P. ENGLERT, 0000
CLARE E. FEIGL, 0000
ELIZABETH FERRARA, 0000
STEPHEN L. FERRARA, 0000
JOSEPH C. FINLEY, 0000
EUGENE H. FLETCHER, 0000
JERRY R. FOLTZ, 0000
THOMAS G. FRIEDRICH, 0000
KIMBERLY S. FRY, 0000
DEAN T. GIACOBBE, 0000
MARK T. GOULD, 0000
COLETTE M. GRABILL, 0000
JULIE GREEN, 0000
JAMES M. GRIMSON, 0000
PATRICK N. GROVER, 0000
ELIZABETH HARBISON, 0000
DALE R. HARMAN, 0000
JAMES M. HARRIS, 0000
PAMELA C. HARVEY, 0000
THOMAS W. HASH, 0000
ERICH R. HEINZ, 0000
LEONARD R. HENRY, 0000
MATTHEW J. HICKEY, 0000
KURT H. HILDEBRANDT, 0000
SCOTT W. HINES, 0000
CHRISTOPHER J. HOGAN, 0000
DANIEL J. HOHMAN, 0000
EILEEN M. HOKE, 0000
ROMEO C. IGNACIO, 0000
HAYDEN O. JACK, 0000
RONNY L. JACKSON, 0000
VIVIANA V. JOHNSON, 0000
STEPHANIE A. KAPFER, 0000
REX A. KITELEY, 0000
CHRISTOPHER KOCHER, 0000
SUSAN M. KRIZEK, 0000
JAYDE E. KURLAND, 0000
GABRIEL LEE, 0000
REES L. LEE, 0000
FRED W. LINDSAY, 0000

CHRISTOPHER C. LUCAS, 0000
BRUCE B. LUDWIG, JR., 0000
KIMBERLY L. MAINO, 0000
ROSEMARY C. MALONE, 0000
JOHN R. MANSUETI, 0000
MICHAEL J. MATTEUCCI, 0000
KARLWIN J. MATTHEWS, 0000
BILLY J. MCCARTY, 0000
WILLIAM P. MCCULLOUGH, 0000
MICHAEL J. MEIER, 0000
KYLE A. MENZEL, 0000
MARK W. MILLER, 0000
STEVEN R. MILLER, 0000
ROBERT A. MORGAN, 0000
TIMOTHY F. MOTT, 0000
JOSEPH G. OBRIEN, 0000
ELOY OCHOA, 0000
JEFFREY D. ODELL, 0000
DAVID M. OLIVER, 0000
PIERRE A. PELLETIER, 0000
SCOTT J. PUSATERI, 0000
DAVID P. REGIS, 0000
TIMOTHY A. ROBERTS, 0000
DOUGLAS J. ROWLES, 0000
RICHARD C. RUCK, 0000
RICHARD SAMS, 0000
ERIC S. SAWYERS, 0000
CHRISTOPHER D. SCIBELLI, 0000
WILLIAM T. SCOUTEN, 0000
GARRY H. SIMONS, 0000
BRADFORD L. SMITH, 0000
BRIAN A. SMOLEY, 0000
MATTHEW W. SOUTHWICK, 0000
GREGORY R. SPURLING, 0000
ALEXANDER E. STEWART, 0000
SCOTT W. STUART, 0000
JANOS TALLER, 0000
JOHN E. TALLMAN, 0000
EDWIN E. TAYLOR, 0000
KEITH K. VAUX, 0000
JAMES F. VERREES, 0000
ANNETTE M. VONTHUN, 0000
JEFFREY B. WALKER, 0000
JEFFREY S. WEISS, 0000
BRIAN P. WELLS, 0000
NECIA L. WILLIAMS, 0000
GEOFFREY A. WRIGHT, 0000
JOHN WYLAND, 0000
CATHERINE M. YATES, 0000
MICHAEL R. YOCHELSON, 0000

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Friday, July 21, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MARTIN J. JACKLEY, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

BRETT L. TOLMAN, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUE C. PAYTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

CHARLES E. MCQUEARY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL GREGORY A. BISCONE
COLONEL EDWARD L. BOLTON, JR.
COLONEL JOSEPH D. BROWN IV
COLONEL GREGORY L. BRUNDIDGE
COLONEL TIMOTHY A. BYERS
COLONEL MICHAEL W. CALLAN
COLONEL DAVID S. FADOK
COLONEL CRAIG A. FRANKLIN
COLONEL DAVID L. GOLDFEIN
COLONEL FRANCIS L. HENDRICKS
COLONEL JOHN W. HESTERMAN III
COLONEL JAMES W. HYATT
COLONEL JOHN E. HYTEN
COLONEL MICHELLE D. JOHNSON
COLONEL RICHARD C. JOHNSTON
COLONEL JOSEPH A. LANNI
COLONEL KENNETH D. MERCHANT
COLONEL MICHAEL R. MOELLER
COLONEL HARRY D. POLUMBO
COLONEL JOHN D. POSNER
COLONEL JAMES O. POSS
COLONEL MARK F. RAMSAY
COLONEL MARK O. SCHISSLER
COLONEL CHARLES K. SHUGG
COLONEL MARVIN T. SMOOT, JR.
COLONEL ALFRED J. STEWART
COLONEL EVERETT H. THOMAS
COLONEL WILLIAM W. UHLE, JR.
COLONEL DARTANIAN WARR
COLONEL BRETT T. WILLIAMS
COLONEL TOD D. WOLTERS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. N. ROSS THOMPSON III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS R. TURNER II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DOUGLAS E. LUTE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES H. DAVIDSON IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL STEVEN R. ABT
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES A. HASBARGEN
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHN P. MCLAREN, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM MONK III
BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES W. RAFFERTY

To be brigadier general

COLONEL CRAIG A. BUGNO
COLONEL HAROLD G. BUNCH
COLONEL WALTER B. CHAHANOVICH
COLONEL CHRISTOPHER T. CLINE
COLONEL DAVID S. ELMO
COLONEL ROBERT N. HIPWELL
COLONEL ALEXANDER I. KOZLOV
COLONEL JON J. MILLER
COLONEL DAVID L. SMALLEY
COLONEL ROBERT P. STALL
COLONEL JONATHAN WOODSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STANLEY A. MCCHRYSTAL

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JIMMY G. WELCH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD F. NATONSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KEITH J. STALDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES F. AMOS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JOHN F. SATTLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHARLES M. GURGANUS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID J. DORSETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RICHARD E. CELLON
REAR ADM. (LH) WAYNE G. SHEAR, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL C. BACHMANN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK A. HANDLEY
CAPT. CHRISTOPHER J. MOSSEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. THOMAS P. MEEK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM D. SULLIVAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. WILLIAM D. CROWDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. ALBERT M. CALLAND III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DAVID J. VENLET

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JONATHAN W. GREENERT

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JULIO OCAMPO TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN L. PUTNAM TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN D. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH DIANE HUEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN D. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH KARL WOODMANSEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK D. CAMPBELL AND ENDING WITH GARY J. ZICCARDI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. APOL AND ENDING WITH DAWN M. K. ZOLDI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ACUFF AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL E. YARMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BARRY L. WILLIAMS TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GERALD P. COLEMAN AND ENDING WITH DAVID E. ROOT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT T. DAVIES AND ENDING WITH CURTIS E. WELLS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHELLE A. COOPER AND ENDING WITH DAVID W. TOWLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICKIE A. MCPEAKE AND ENDING WITH EUGENE J. PALKA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PAUL A. CARTER TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARITZA S. RYAN TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARMANDO AGUILERA, JR. AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL S. WALL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 29, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN E. ABELL AND ENDING WITH CUTTER M. ZAMBONI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 29, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBIN M. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH EDWARD E. YACKEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD E. BAXTER AND ENDING WITH BARRY D. WHITESIDE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER G. ARCHER AND ENDING WITH PAUL H. YOON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WADE K. ALDOUS AND ENDING WITH ESMERALDO ZARZABAL, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN C. BEACH AND ENDING WITH LLOYD T. PHINNEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHILIP A. GRUCCIO AND ENDING WITH JAMIE S. WASSER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 24, 2006.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAL ABEL AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. ZERR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 26, 2006.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID E. BAUER TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CATHY L. TRUDEAU TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WALTER J. LAWRENCE AND ENDING WITH RONALD L. RUGGIERO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 12, 2006.