

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.

What is missing today from American foreign policy is a willingness to hold these two thoughts simultaneously, to find a way to move from what "is"—a world with a risk of increasing global disaster—to what "ought" to be, a peaceful, civilized world free of weapons of mass destruction.

The "ought" is an integral part of the political process. Our founding fathers proclaimed the "ought" of American democracy in the Declaration of Independence at a time when we had slavery, property qualifications for voting and second-class citizenship for women.

Yet we steadily moved the undesirable "is" of our society ever closer to the "ought" and thereby strengthened our democracy. When President Gerald Ford signed the Helsinki Final Act in 1975, he was criticized for entering into a process initiated by the Soviet Union. But the agreement reflected a series of humanitarian "oughts," and over the course of the next 10 years, the Soviets were forced by our European friends and us to live up to those "oughts" if they were to attain international legitimacy.

An appreciation of the awesome power of the "ought" should lead our government to embrace the goal of eliminating all weapons of mass destruction.

To this end, President Bush should consult with our allies, appear before the United Nations General Assembly and call for a resolution embracing the objective of eliminating all weapons of mass destruction.

He should make clear that we are prepared to eliminate our nuclear weapons if the Security Council develops an effective regime to guarantee total conformity with a universal commitment to eliminate all nuclear arms and reaffirm the existing conventions covering chemical and biological weapons.

The council should be assigned the task of establishing effective political and technical procedures for achieving this goal, including both stringent verification and severe penalties to prevent cheating.

I am under no illusion that this will be easy. That said, the United States would bring to this endeavor decades of relevant experience, new technologies and the urgency of self-preservation. The necessary technical solutions can be devised. Now, as I can imagine President Reagan saying, let us summon the will.

CAREGIVERS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to commend the ongoing efforts of relative caregivers all over the State of Illinois, who have opened their hearts to children whose homes have been broken. Children are placed into foster care for a variety of reasons stemming from neglect to drug-addicted parents and often suffer the consequences of the separation. The fate of children who are not adopted or reunited with their birth parents often spells a legacy of instability. Relatives who welcome these children into their homes offer them a stability that can rarely be found in the foster care system.

Subsidized guardianship helps to remove some of the barriers to keeping displaced children within the family. The main obstacle faced by guardians is the cost of upkeep of additional children. Subsidized guardianship allows relatives to access the same programs that regular foster parents have. These State programs support permanent guardianship placements with relatives

by offsetting some of the costs of child rearing.

The correlation between relative placement and success of foster children has never been more apparent than in my own office. One of my summer interns attributes her current success to her aunt and uncle who took both herself and sister in when she was 16. This act of generosity prevented her from dropping out of high school to support her sister. Both girls were too old for adoption and hard to place in foster homes. The placement made it possible for the girls to stay in their current school and their community. Relative care was home when they needed one the most.

As of February 2006, there were over 17,000 children placed in substitute care in Illinois. Across the country, more than 6 million children live in households headed by a grandparent or other relative. Kinship care is important because it helps keep children closer to their family and to their sense of normalcy. Supportive programs such as the Subsidized Guardianship Program help children leave the foster care system for the permanent care of nurturing relatives.

Today I offer my formal acknowledgement and deepest appreciation for the ongoing service of these caregivers to our country and our Nation's most valuable asset, our children.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BEVERLY McDAVID

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Beverly McDavid, a teacher from Elliott County High School in Sandy Hook, KY, who is a recipient of the 2006 Disney Teacher Award. Ms. McDavid is being recognized for her commitment to middle school science education. Her ability to inspire her students with creative thinking and innovative teaching methods has resulted in her achieving this prestigious honor.

The Disney Teacher Awards celebrate teachers that enlighten the lives of children by using creativity in the classroom to encourage them to achieve more than they ever thought possible. Award winners are chosen by their peers, which consist of leading educational associations from around the United States and former Disney Teacher Honorees.

Ms. McDavid brings a unique educational experience to her classroom by encouraging free thinking from her students. She also uses various educational strategies to reach out to the diverse learning needs of her students and encourages them to succeed. Her relentless dedication has proven her a deserving recipient of this outstanding award.

I congratulate Ms. McDavid on being a recipient of the Disney Teacher Award. Her love of teaching and devotion to her students make her an exam-

ple to all the citizens of the Commonwealth.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN STROSNIDER

• Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to Dr. John Strosnider of Pikeville, KY, for his induction as the 110th president of the American Osteopathic Association, AOA. His steadfast support reinforces his organization's honorable goal of promoting osteopathic medicine, ensuring quality education and training programs, and preserving basic osteopathic principles.

Dr. Strosnider will lead 56,000 osteopathic physicians and the AOA, an association organized to advance the philosophy and practice of osteopathic medicine by promoting excellence in education, research and the delivery of quality and cost-effective healthcare in a distinct, unified profession.

Dr. Strosnider has been a member of the AOA since 1971 and has served on the board of trustees since 1992. During this time he has served on the Kentucky Board of Medical Licensure and the Get Healthy Kentucky Board. In addition to his leadership roles with the AOA, Dr. Strosnider has served as a member of the Association of Osteopathic Medical Directors and Educators; the Society of Teachers of Family Medicine; the Medical Review Consultants Board of Directors; and the Kentucky Osteopathic Medical Association, KOMA, and was a past president of the Missouri Association of Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons, MAOPS.

Throughout his career, Dr. Strosnider has received numerous honors including the 2005 KOMA Physician of the Year Award and the 1993 MAOPS Medallion Award.

In September of 1996 Dr. Strosnider was appointed as the founding dean of the Pikeville College School of Osteopathic Medicine. The Pikeville College is the 19th college of osteopathic medicine in the United States. Its objective is to improve the delivery of healthcare to the people in the underserved areas of Appalachia. I have been very impressed with the progress the college has made in expanding access to healthcare in eastern Kentucky.

I thank Dr. Strosnider for his dedication and commitment to osteopathy and congratulate him on his new position. His devotion to medicine serves as an example to all citizens of the Commonwealth.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COLUMBUS, NORTH DAKOTA

• Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a community in North Dakota that will be celebrating its 100th anniversary. On July 7 to 9, the residents of Columbus will gather to celebrate their community's history and founding.

Columbus is a small but welcoming community located in the northwest corner of North Dakota. It was originally founded in 1903 but moved 6 miles