

other public events, seeking out stakeholders in need of guidance and lending their expertise. In the words of one observer, Garrett and Chris “saved the day for Nevada during the early days of implementation.” They are among the countless pharmacists who deserve recognition for their efforts in Nevada and across the country.

For these deeds, Garrett and Chris are a credit to all of us working toward the success of the new Medicare drug benefit in Nevada.

#### HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

U.S. ARMY SERGEANT DANIEL R. GIONET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to U.S. Army SGT Daniel R. Gionet, a brave young American who gave his last full measure in service to our Nation while deployed with the U.S. Army to Iraq, a land far overseas from his Pelham, NH, roots.

Daniel was a 2001 graduate of Pelham High School where he was a three-season athlete competing on the school's football, baseball, and wrestling teams, winning the sportsmanship award his senior year. Friends say he was a team player and the type of guy who, no matter where you went or what you did, could have fun and make you laugh.

Daniel Webster, speaking of early American leaders said, “While others doubted, they were resolved; where others hesitated they pressed forward.” In this spirit, Daniel joined the U.S. Army when he turned 18 and left for basic training after graduating from high school. He was assigned to the 3rd Battalion, 6th Field Artillery Regiment, Fort Drum in upstate New York and served at Kandahar Air Field, Afghanistan, from July 2003 to May 2004 in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Believing in what he was doing and wanting to make the world a safer place, he reenlisted in the U.S. Army to become a medic after his original tour ended in May 2004. After training at Fort Sam Houston in Texas, he was assigned as a health care specialist in the 1st Battalion, 66th Armored Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 4th Infantry Division, Fort Hood, TX. In December 2005, Daniel deployed with his unit to Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Tragically, on June 4, 2006, this brave soldier, and a comrade from his unit, died of injuries sustained while on patrol in Baghdad, Iraq, when an improvised explosive device detonated near their M1A2 tank during combat operations. Sergeant Gionet's awards and decorations include the Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Army Commendation Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Army Good Conduct Medal, National Defense Service Medal, Iraq Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Army Service Ribbon, Overseas Service Ribbon 2, Combat Medical Badge, and Expert Weapons Qualification Badge.

Patriots from the State of New Hampshire have served our Nation with honor and distinction from Bunker Hill to Baghdad—and U.S. Army SGT Daniel Gionet served in that fine tradition. Honor, humor, and huge hugs, according to family and friends, were among the qualities Daniel shared with others. They remember him as a true patriot, who had a love for his school, his town, and his country. He was dedicated to serving his Nation during these chaotic and violent times because, in his heart, he felt it was his duty.

My heartfelt sympathy, condolences, and prayers go out to Daniel's wife Katrina, to whom he was married in November 2005, as well as to Daniel's parents, Daniel and Denise, brother Darren, sister Alycia, and other family members and many friends who have suffered this grievous loss. The death of Daniel, only 23 years old, on a battlefield far from New Hampshire is also a great loss for our State, our benevolent Nation, and the world. He will be sorely missed by all; however, his family and friends may sense some comfort in knowing that because of his devotion, sense of duty, and selfless dedication, the safety and liberty of each and every American is more secure. In the words of Daniel Webster—may his remembrance be as long lasting as the land he honored. God bless Daniel R. Gionet.

PRIVATE FIRST CLASS JUSTIN KING

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to honor a brave soldier, PFC Justin King. After graduating college and working as a civilian, Private King enlisted in the Army Reserve so he could, in his words, do something “for his country and more than himself.” While in advanced individual training, Justin was diagnosed with terminal cancer.

Although his body has not responded to chemotherapy treatments and his hope to serve in the field will go unrealized, his illness has failed to break his ironclad spirit. The first time Private King's commanding officer visited him in the hospital, Private King insisted on getting into full uniform before she entered the room. He said that he wanted to “look like a soldier and stand like a soldier.”

Since returning to Robinson, IL, to be with his family, Private King told his CO: “I want to serve in some capacity to the best of my ability and until my health fails, as a soldier. I want to tell other soldiers how to deal with a terminal illness, I want to do something useful.”

I am thoroughly impressed by this young man's desire to serve and the resolve he has displayed when faced with adversity. I admire Private King's patriotism, sacrifice, and strong character. He is a role model for all Americans, and I am proud to recognize him today.

#### CLEAN WATER ACT CHALLENGES

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Supreme Court's decision earlier this week in the consolidated cases of *Rapanos v. United States* and *Carabell v. Army Corps of Engineers* should be a source of great concern in this body and this Nation. The plurality opinion, while it did not win the support of a majority of the court, is completely at odds with the text and purpose of the Clean Water Act, would put much of the Nation's waters in jeopardy, and as many have noted, will likely lead to increased litigation.

To prevent further legal wrangling about what Congress meant when it passed what has come to be one of the country's fundamental public health and environmental statutes, Congress must pass the Clean Water Authority Restoration Act. This legislation, S. 912, which I most recently introduced in April 2005, reestablishes protection for all waters historically covered by the Clean Water Act. It also makes clear that Congress's primary concern in 1972 was to protect the Nation's waters from pollution, rather than just sustain the navigability of waterways, and it reinforces that original intent.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues—the 85 who are not cosponsors of the bill—will now join me, in light of this week's Supreme Court ruling, to clarify that all of the Nation's waters are important for the health and vitality of our country by supporting passage of the Clean Water Authority Restoration Act.

#### TRIBUTE TO BONNY JAIN

Mr. OBAMA. Mr. President, I rise today to note with pride an accomplishment of one of my constituents. Bonny Jain, of Moline, IL, won the National Geographic Bee here in Washington, DC, on May 24 by correctly identifying the Cambrian Mountains on a map. I don't know if they have “phone a friend” in the bee, but it is good that he didn't call me because I thought a Cambri was a small Toyota.

His victory in this competition demonstrates a laudable dedication to scholarship. As technology makes the world smaller, knowledge of other peoples and cultures becomes more important. And cultures are shaped by geography. Geography is often the main factor in the path of national borders. Under the influence of geography, wars are won and lost, and civilizations rise and fall.

Bonny's path to victory in the 2006 bee was a long one. I am impressed not only by his comprehensive knowledge of geography but by his steady ascent through 4 years of competition. From second place at his individual school's geography bee, he rose to the national competition last year and to victory last month.

I am proud to have this young man and his family as constituents. I give them my heartiest congratulations and

wish Bonny well in high school and beyond.

# OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the attached letter printed in the RECORD in support of my amendment No. 4064, to S. 2611.

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

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 1812,  
Washington, DC, May 24, 2006.

Hon. JAMES M. INHOFE,  
Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR INHOFE: As President of AFGE Local 1812, which represents employees at the Voice of America, I want to thank you for your support of making the English language the official language of the United States. Along with 86 percent of the general public, I agree with you on this issue. In this regard, I would also like to bring to your attention another issue that deals with the English language: as a result of the President's 2007 budget request process, the Broadcasting Board of Governors (BBG) plans to eliminate the Voice of America's global English radio broadcasts, VOA News Now.

Since you realize the importance of the English language to this country, I believe you will agree that it is critically important that we communicate with the rest of the world in our de facto national language, in particular because English is the language of business, higher education, youth, international diplomacy, aviation, the Internet, science, popular music, entertainment, and international travel. Other countries realize the importance of broadcasting in English. In fact, China, Russia, and France had all recently increased their international broadcasts in English.

I have attached an article by Georgie Anne Geyer regarding the proposed elimination of the VOA's global English broadcasts. I am hoping you can help stop this decision, which will negatively impact U.S. public diplomacy and America's position in the world.

Sincerely,

TIM SHAMBLE,  
President.

## AMBASSADOR MAX KAMPELMAN

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to call attention to an article published in the New York Times earlier this spring titled "Bombs Away," authored by my dear friend, Ambassador Max Kampelman, and to offer it into the Senate record. Ambassador Kampelman exemplifies the American tradition of bipartisan service in foreign affairs. After coming to Washington as an aide to Senator Hubert Humphrey, he was appointed by President Carter to serve as Ambassador and head of the U.S. Delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. President Reagan reappointed him to that position.

For his long and distinguished service, Ambassador Kampelman was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Clinton and

the Presidential Citizens Medal from President Reagan.

Now Ambassador Kampelman has penned this insightful essay on the goal of globally eliminating all weapons of mass destruction. He believes that this goal is even important in an age of nuclear proliferation. He speaks from the heart and head and from his long experience as a hardnosed negotiator.

Ambassador Kampelman argues that we can reach this objective by distinguishing between what "is" and what "ought" to be, utilizing both realism and idealism. He recalls President Regan's successful deployment of the MX missile in Europe to deter Soviet aggression and his ability to recognize new openings, such as the willingness of Mikhail Gorbachev to negotiate steep reductions in nuclear arsenals—with the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons.

We all recognize that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is an extraordinarily difficult journey in a world where nuclear technology continues to spread and distinction between civilian and military nuclear development can be opaque. Nonetheless, it is important that we envision this worthy goal, however idealistic it may seem today. Ambassador Kampelman stared down the very real prospect of nuclear annihilation during the Cold War. With this article, he offers us hope that with wisdom and constancy, we have a chance to make this world safer for our children and grandchildren.

I therefore request unanimous consent that the attached article by Ambassador Max Kampelman be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 2006]

### BOMBS AWAY

(By Max M. Kampelman)

In my lifetime, I have witnessed two successful titanic struggles by civilized society against totalitarian movements, those against Nazi fascism and Soviet communism. As an arms control negotiator for Ronald Reagan, I had the privilege of playing a role—a small role—in the second of these triumphs.

Yet, at the age of 85, I have never been more worried about the future for my children and grandchildren than I am today. The number of countries possessing nuclear arms is increasing, and terrorists are poised to master nuclear technology with the objective of using those deadly arms against us.

The United States must face this reality head on and undertake decisive steps to prevent catastrophe. Only we can exercise the constructive leadership necessary to address the nuclear threat.

Unfortunately, the goal of globally eliminating all weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical and biological arms—is today not an integral part of American foreign policy; it needs to be put back at the top of our agenda.

Of course, there will be those who will argue against this bold vision. To these people I would say that there were plenty who argued against it when it was articulated by Mr. Reagan during his presidency.

I vividly recall a White House national security meeting in December 1985, at which the president reported on his first "get acquainted" summit in Geneva with President Mikhail Gorbachev of the Soviet Union the previous month.

Sitting in the situation room, the president began by saying: "Maggie was right. We can do business with this man." His reference to Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher prompted nods of assent. Then, in a remarkably matter-of-fact tone, he reported that he had suggested to Mr. Gorbachev that their negotiations could possibly lead to the United States and the Soviet Union eliminating all their nuclear weapons.

When the president finished with his report, I saw uniform consternation around that White House table. The concern was deep, with a number of those present—from the secretary of defense to the head of central intelligence to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—warning that our nuclear missiles were indispensable. The president listened carefully and politely without responding.

In fact, we did not learn where he stood until October 1986, at his next summit meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, which took place in Reykjavik, Iceland. There, in a stout waterfront house, he repeated to Mr. Gorbachev his proposal for the abolition of all nuclear weapons. Though no agreement was reached, the statement had been made.

More remarkably, it had been made by someone who understood the importance of nuclear deterrence.

In March 1985, before Reagan's first meeting with Mr. Gorbachev, I received a telephone call on a Friday from the president's chief legislative strategist telling me that the administration's request for additional MX missiles was facing defeat in the House of Representatives, and that the president wanted me to return from Geneva (where I was posted as his arms negotiator) for a brief visit. The hope was that I might be able to persuade some of the Democrats to support the appropriation.

I was not and never have been a lobbyist, but I agreed to return to Washington. I wanted my first meeting to be with the speaker of the House, Tip O'Neill, who, I was informed, was the leader of the opposition to the appropriation.

So there I was on Monday morning in O'Neill's private office. I briefed the speaker on the state of negotiations with the Soviets. I made the point that I too would like to live in a world without MX missiles, but that it was dangerous for us unilaterally to reduce our numbers without receiving reciprocal reductions from the Soviets. I then proceeded with my round of talks on the Hill.

At the end of the day, I met alone with the president and told him that O'Neill said we were about 30 votes short. I told the president of my conversation with the speaker and shared with him my sense that O'Neill was quietly helping us, suggesting to his fellow Democrats that he would not be unhappy if they voted against his amendment.

Without a moment's hesitation, the president telephoned O'Neill, and I had the privilege of hearing one side of this conversation between two tough Irishmen, cussing each other out, but obviously friendly and respectful.

I recall that the president's first words went something like this: "Max tells me that you may really be a patriot. It's about time!" Suffice it to say that soon after I returned to Geneva I learned that the House had authorized the MX missiles.

There is a moral to these stories: you can be an idealist and a realist at the same time.