

meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth." In my humble estimation, the fate of Africa depends, in large part, on the education of young men and women who learn to lead their communities with wisdom and integrity.

I am filled with hope when I see individuals and communities coming together to respond to perhaps one of the greatest crises of our time, and I am encouraged when such initiatives emerge from transcontinental friendships. I believe the United Orphanage and Academy embodies the values and provides the tools necessary to equip Africa's youth to embrace a world of challenges and possibilities.

#### LIFTING HOLD ON NOMINATION OF DENNIS SCHRADER

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, on June 18, I announced my intention to object to any unanimous consent request for the Senate to take up the nomination of Dennis Schrader to be Deputy Administrator for National Preparedness in the Department of Homeland Security. I did so because, prior to his confirmation as Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Michael Chertoff told me in my office that if confirmed, he would move expeditiously to implement the National Emergency Technology Guard—NET Guard program. Unfortunately, Secretary Chertoff had failed to honor that pledge.

Today, I received a letter from Secretary Chertoff describing how the Department is moving forward with 12-month NET Guard pilots beginning in September 2007, and how the DHS will be requesting funds to continue the program in its 2009 budget request to the Office of Management and Budget.

The Secretary also communicated to me that the Department of Homeland Security will be publicizing NET Guard and seeking involvement from the private sector, a step critical to the success of this vital program.

The Department has also set aside funds to run the pilots for the year and convened a working group of subject matter experts to guide the design of NET Guard. These activities and Secretary Chertoff's letter indicate that he is making a good-faith effort to get NET Guard off the ground.

In light of these actions, I will no longer object to any unanimous-consent request for the Senate to take up Mr. Schrader's nomination. I will, however, continue to closely monitor DHS's actions on NET Guard.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Secretary Chertoff's letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY,  
Washington, DC, August 1, 2007.

Hon. RON WYDEN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WYDEN: Thank you for taking time this morning to discuss the Department of Homeland Security's plans for the National Emergency Technology Guard (NET Guard) program. Following my June 29, 2007 letter to you that outlined our program approach, and as a prelude to our discussion, members of the Department's NET Guard team briefed your staff on our proposed plan. The positive feedback from your staff, coupled with your positive feedback this morning and the positive feedback that we have received from State, local, and private sector stakeholders, gives us confidence that we are taking the right approach to implementing this important disaster response program.

Accordingly, the Department is moving forward with plans to implement 12-month NET Guard pilots beginning in September 2007. The recommendation to establish pilots in September is consistent with the NET Guard Scoping Initiative Report, which I will provide to you upon its completion this month. To fund our efforts in fiscal years 2007 and 2008, we will continue to work with Congressional appropriators. I will also submit a request to the White House Office of Management and Budget to fund the NET Guard program in fiscal year 2009. On these and other program matters, the Department's Office of Legislative Affairs will keep your staff apprised of our progress.

I appreciate your interest and support of the Department's disaster response mission and look forward to working with you on this and other issues.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CHERTOFF.

#### INTERNET GAMBLING

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I would like to share a letter received by our colleagues in the House of Representatives on the issue of Internet gambling from the National Football League, Major League Baseball, National Basketball Association, National Hockey League, and National Collegiate Athletic Association. I would like to include this letter in the RECORD, which alerts us to the serious threat that H.R. 2046 poses to the integrity of American athletics, as well as our national sovereignty over gambling regulation.

Many of us on this side of the Capitol may not be aware that there are efforts afoot in the House of Representatives to legalize Internet gambling, less than a year after we enacted the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006. I strongly supported UIGEA, and supported its inclusion in the SAFE Ports Act, so that after more than 10 years of overwhelming bipartisan support for doing something to stop illegal Internet gambling in this country, we finally have an enforcement law with teeth.

But now, before the regulations for UIGEA have even been written, international gambling interests are telling our colleagues in the House that Internet gambling can never be stopped, so we might as well legalize, regulate, and tax it. We might as well decide that ev-

eryone speeds on the George Washington Parkway, so we should just eliminate the speed limits and make it a toll road. Internet gambling is just as dangerous—its 24/7 accessibility from any location, speed, and anonymity make it the "crack cocaine" of gambling, leading to addiction, young people wrecking their financial futures, family breakdown, and even crime and suicide. The answer is stepping up enforcement efforts, not abandoning the law and government feeding off the trough of personal tragedy.

H.R. 2046 would license Internet gambling companies to do business with U.S. customers and override every other Federal or State law that would interfere with this business. The proponents of this legalization scheme will argue that the bill allows States and sports leagues to "opt out" of legalization, but don't be fooled. The "opt-outs" are vulnerable to legal challenge, both in U.S. courts and in the World Trade Organization. And if the opt-outs fall, H.R. 2046 would result in the greatest expansion of gambling ever enacted in the history of the United States.

The sports organizations are very concerned because H.R. 2046 would reverse decades of Federal policy by endorsing sports gambling. We have all seen in the past couple of weeks how damaging gambling can be to the integrity and image of professional sports. When a player or a referee taints the game for gambling profits, all of the participants and all of the fans are betrayed. And even when there is no fraud, pervasive gambling on a sport robs its character as family entertainment celebrating the pursuit of athletic achievement, turning it into a seedy vehicle for making money at the expense of others. Congress must not in any way endorse this degradation of our national pastimes.

I hope that my colleagues here in the Senate will join me on the lookout for Internet gambling legalization efforts and will firmly reject and rebuff any such proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter prepared by the professional and collegiate sports associations.

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

JULY 30, 2007.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Sports betting is incompatible with preserving the integrity of American athletics. For many decades, we have actively enforced strong policies against sports betting. And the law on this point is consistent. Federal statutes bar sports betting, especially the 1961 Wire Act and the 1992 Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act. Enforcement of these laws against sports betting was also a significant motive for enacting the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 (UIGEA).

Accordingly, we urge you to reject current proposals to legalize Internet gambling, such as H.R. 2046 sponsored by Rep. Barney Frank. This legislation reverses federal policy on sports betting and would for the first time

give such gambling Congressional consent. The bill sends exactly the wrong message to the public about sports gambling and threatens to undermine the integrity of American sports.

On a related point, we believe the Congress should not consider any liberalization of Internet gambling until the U.S. Trade Representative successfully resolves our trade disputes in this area. A rush to judgment on this subject could result in irreversible damage to U.S. sovereignty in the area of gambling regulation, including the capacity to prohibit sports bets.

Though Internet gambling on sports has never been legal, easy access to offshore Internet gambling web sites has created the opposite impression among the general public, particularly before Congress enacted UIGEA last fall. UIGEA emerged from more than a decade of Congressional consideration, in which stand-alone legislation aimed at restricting Internet gambling passed either the Senate or the House in each of five successive Congresses, each time by overwhelming bi-partisan votes. UIGEA also enjoyed a broad array of supporters, including 49 state Attorneys General and other law enforcement associations, several major financial institutions and technology companies, dozens of religious and family organizations, and of course our sports organizations.

Enactment of UIGEA was grounded on concerns about addictive, compulsive, and underage Internet gambling, unlawful sports betting, potential criminal activity, and the wholesale evasion of federal and state laws. When it passed the House a year ago, the vote was 317-93, including majorities of both caucuses and with the affirmative votes of both party leaders.

The final product was a law that did not change the legality of any gambling activity—it simply gave law enforcement new, effective tools for enforcing existing state and federal gambling laws. UIGEA and its predecessor bills could attract such consensus because they adhered to this principle: whether you think gambling liberalization is a bad idea or a good one, the policy judgments of State legislatures and Congress must be respected, not de facto repealed by deliberate evasion of the law by offshore entities via the Internet.

By contrast, H.R. 2046 would put the Treasury Department in charge of issuing licenses to Internet gambling operators, who would then be immunized from prosecution or liability under any Federal or State law that prohibits what the Frank bill permits. The bill would tear apart the fabric of American gambling regulation. By overriding in one stroke dozens of Federal and State gambling laws, this would amount to the greatest expansion of legalized gambling ever enacted.

This legislation contains an “opt-out” that appears to permit individual leagues to prohibit gambling on their sports. But regardless of the “opt-out,” the bill breaks terrible new ground, because Congress would for the first time sanction sports betting. That is reason enough to oppose it. In addition, the bill’s safeguard opt-out for sports leagues as well as the one for states may well prove illusory and ineffectual. They will be subject to legal challenge before U.S. courts and the World Trade Organization.

In addition, this legislation would dramatically complicate current trade negotiations concerning gambling. In 1994, the United States signed the General Agreement on Trade in Services, which included a commitment to free trade in “other recreational services.” In subsequent WTO proceedings, the United States has claimed this commitment never included gambling services. The United States has noted that any such “commitment” would contradict a host of federal

and state laws that regulate and restrict gambling. The WTO has not accepted this argument.

Accordingly, the U.S. Trade Representative has initiated negotiations to withdraw gambling from U.S. GATS commitments. Before withdrawal can be finalized, agreement must be reached on trade concessions with interested trading partners. Few concessions should be required because there was never a legal market in Internet gambling in the U.S. If Congress creates a legal market before withdrawal is complete, the withdrawal will become much more complicated and costly. Therefore, we oppose any legislation that would imperil the withdrawal process.

Finally, we have heard the argument that Internet gambling can actually protect the integrity of sports because of the alleged capacity to monitor gambling patterns more closely in a legalized environment. This argument is generally asserted by those who would profit from legalized gambling and the same point was raised in 1992 when PASPA was enacted. Congress dismissed it then and should dismiss it now. The harms caused by government endorsement of sports betting far exceed the alleged benefits.

H.R. 2046 sets aside decades of federal precedent to legalize sports betting and exposes American gambling laws to continuing jeopardy in the WTO. We strongly urge that you oppose it. Thank you for considering our views on this matter.

Sincerely,

RICK BUCHANAN,  
*Executive VP and  
General Counsel,  
National Basketball  
Association.*

ELSA KIRCHER COLE,  
*General Counsel, National  
Collegiate Athletic Association.*

WILLIAM DALY,  
*Deputy Commissioner  
National Hockey  
League.*

TOM OSTERTAG,  
*Senior VP and General  
Counsel, Major  
League Baseball.*

JEFFREY PASH,  
*Executive VP and  
General Counsel,  
National Football  
League.*

---

#### DARFUR

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, genocide has only one morally tenable answer. This week, the United Nations found that answer: decisive and forceful action to protect the innocent. Tuesday’s Security Council resolution put real teeth in the world’s effort to stop the Darfur genocide: A paltry contingent of 7,000 African Union peacekeepers will swell with 26,000 more troops in a combined UN/AU force.

The peacekeepers will take command of the region by the end of the year, and their arms will help to shield the people of Darfur from continued murder and rape and displacement.

I applaud this resolution. We all know that it comes 450,000 lives too late. But the UN’s action looks positively instantaneous when set against the delay and the equivocation of our own Government. Special Envoy Andrew Natsios assured the world that American action was “imminent” 7

months ago. And it was 2 years ago that President Bush declared the crimes in Darfur “genocide.”

But there is still time for America to act, and a vital role for America to play. The Security Council’s force resolution, as valuable as it is, came at a price: To mollify China and several African member states, its provisions for multilateral sanctions on Sudan were significantly softened. We can, and must, fill the gap with unilateral sanctions of our own.

Multilateral force combined with American sanctions would show the international system working at its best. The world community has agreed to act against genocide; now, the United States can work in the spirit of that resolution and do its own part to bring the suffering to an end. Our economic muscle can be a potent weapon.

Three sanctions bills are before the Senate. Two S. 831—the Sudan Divestment Authorization Act of 2007, and S. 1563, the Sudan Disclosure and Enforcement Act of 2007—have been authored by my friend and colleague, Senator DURBIN. From the very start, his voice has been the strongest in the Senate on the Darfur genocide, and his tremendous leadership stands in stark contrast to this administration.

A third sanctions bill—H.R. 180, the Darfur Accountability and Divestment Act of 2007—has been authored by Representative BARBARA LEE, whose leadership ranks with Senator DURBIN’s. I have asked the majority leader to expedite consideration of all of these bills.

I would like to focus for a moment on Representative LEE’s bill. It aims to punish the bloodstained Government of Sudan by assisting divestment from companies that—knowingly or not—have helped to fund the genocide. H.R. 180 requires the Department of the Treasury to develop a list of companies investing in specific sectors of the Sudanese economy: power production, mineral extraction, oil-related industries, and military equipment industries.

Before being put on the list, companies are given 30 days to either rebut the designation or to say that they will be suspending such activities within a year. The bill also removes specific legal barriers to enable mutual fund and corporate pension fund managers to cut ties with these listed companies.

And it allows States and localities to divest their public pension funds from those companies whose financial operations help support the genocidal practices of the Sudanese Government.

In ultimately leading to the withdrawal of funds from the Sudanese military machine, the bill does valuable work. But I am concerned that it entrusts the compilation of the list of companies to the wrong agency, Treasury’s Office of Foreign Asset Control. OFAC is an enforcement agency, and such investigation is not in its mission.

I believe the job is better entrusted to an interagency task force combining