

Internet usage, which raises serious constitutional issues.

Next, Congress considered “notice-and-take-down” measures to combat illegal Internet gambling. The Senate passed bills twice that would have authorized law enforcement to notify computer services when an illegal web site was using their services, and require them to take down or block the illegal site. Time has shown that blocking just about anything on the Internet simply does not work, though take-down orders do work for web sites hosted by domestic companies. So we have retained the notice-and-take-down option in the new law where it has a chance of being effective—for gambling web sites hosted or advertised by Internet companies based in the United States.

But take-down orders, and prosecuting gambling businesses that violate State and Federal laws, are completely ineffective for Web sites hosted offshore. The U.S. legal system cannot reach offshore companies, even though their Web sites can reach U.S. consumers. So the gambling operators deliberately locate in jurisdictions that will not cooperate with the U.S. Here, existing laws reach the end of the rope.

We concluded that the only real option, if we want to enforce our gambling laws in the age of the Internet, is to block the financial transactions that pay for illegal online gambling. Banks and payment systems located in the United States are fully within the reach of Federal law, and U.S. citizens usually have to go through them to send money over the Internet. So requiring payment systems to put in place blocking procedures allows us to effectively and efficiently stop the flow of money, even when the gambling business itself is beyond the long arm of our law. Without the money, gambling simply cannot happen.

We needed to pass this law because it is the only way we can effectively enforce State and Federal gambling laws when offshore Web sites offer illegal services to our residents. This is also why the Department of Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board need to write strong regulations that will not be easily evaded. I am proud to have supported this vital law, and I look forward to working with the regulators to ensure they properly reflect Congress’s intent. My only regret is that my friend and colleague JIM LEACH will not be here to assist Congressman GOODLATTE and others in our continued efforts.

IN RECOGNITION OF JUDITH H.
HOPE

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Judith H. Hope, an outstanding New Yorker who has devoted herself to public service and to civic and political engagement. Ms. Hope’s tremendous contributions to American civic life are being recognized this month by the well-known and widely respected public policy advocacy organization, Citizen Action of New York. At a ceremony on December 6, 2006, Ms. Hope is being honored by Citizen Action with its Progressive Leadership Award. Also being similarly honored are our distin-

guished colleague and the dean of the New York State congressional delegation, the Honorable CHARLES RANGEL, and Mr. Bob Masters, a dedicated leader of the Communications Workers of America.

A lifelong activist devoted to the highest ideals of the Democratic Party, Judith J. Hope has exhibited strong, effective and graceful leadership while holding a series of important positions of leadership in the world of politics and public policy. As a founder of the Eleanor Roosevelt Legacy Committee, an organization dedicated to promoting women’s candidacies for local and public office, Judith Hope has encouraged and inspired new generations of women to become deeply involved in public policy and the political process. Since its founding in 2001, the Eleanor Roosevelt Legacy Committee has provided crucial financial, educational and political support to hundreds of women, of whom 285 were successfully elected to public office.

Judith Hope became immersed in public service at an early age. Born and raised in Arkansas, she learned critical lessons and insights from her father, the Speaker of the Arkansas House of Representatives, and her mother, a respected writer and journalist.

After moving to New York, Judith Hope became a civic and community leader and married Thomas A. Twomey, Jr., a Long Island attorney and environmental leader. In the face of tremendous political odds, she was elected Town Supervisor in East Hampton in 1973, the first woman ever to hold that office on Long Island, and the first Democrat to do so in modern history. In 1976, Governor Hugh Carey named her the first woman gubernatorial Appointments Officer in the history of the Empire State. In 1983 and 1985, she was again elected East Hampton Town Supervisor, a position that afforded her national recognition for her innovative and effective policies to preserve open space and environmentally sensitive land. In the political realm, she was elected to the Democratic National Committee in 1989.

Following the election of Mario Cuomo as Governor, Hope became an instrumental figure in the leadership of the New York State Democratic Committee. In 1995, Judith was elected chair of the State committee, becoming the first woman to head a major political party in New York State. She served in that capacity for 7 years and was justly celebrated for her tremendous abilities and effective leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my distinguished colleagues join me in recognizing the enormous contributions to our civic and political life made by Judith Hope, a true leader in the finest traditions of our great republic.

HONORING STEWART MANOR
SCHOOL

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Stewart Manor School for having received the prestigious Blue Ribbon School award. The Blue Ribbon Schools Program recognizes schools that make significant progress in closing the achievement gap or whose stu-

dents achieve at very high levels. Stewart Manor School has high expectations. It ranks in the top 10 percent in the State of New York in math and English scores. Stewart Manor School has proven it has outstanding instruction, teacher training and student achievement.

The future of this country depends on the hopes and dreams of its children, and our community and our Nation are enhanced by the contributions of high achieving students like those at Stewart Manor School.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and admiration I offer my thanks and recognition to Stewart Manor School.

SEARCHING FOR VICTORY IN IRAQ

HON. JOHN B. SHADEGG

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to the American public an editorial by former Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich and request that it be included in the RECORD.

Published in the Weekly Standard on November 28, Mr. Gingrich’s piece makes some very important points about the significance and necessity of our victory in Iraq. In comparing our current situation in Iraq to that which George Washington faced during the winter of 1776, Mr. Gingrich concludes that Washington’s motto “Victory or Death” is the motto we must apply to Iraq.

As we review the Iraq Study Group’s (ISG) recommendations, Mr. Gingrich is wise to urge that we examine them closely and ask questions. Most essentially, we must ask whether or not the suggestions will “make a real contribution in helping us win the war against the fanatical wing of Islam. Or will it be simply one more establishment effort to hide defeat so the American political system can resume its comfortable insider games without having to solve real problems in the larger world?”

As I have argued for some time now, Iraq is a pivotal juncture in the Global War on Terror. Iraq is about the larger global war against Islamo-fascists that want to destroy America. Like our former Speaker, I realize that our current approach to Iraq is not working. However, we must disregard any ISG recommendations to abandon Iraq or set a timeline for withdrawal, both of which will only serve to inspire violence from our enemies and distrust from our allies. This is not the time, nor the place to try to save political face. A retreat at this time would have consequences beyond what we can imagine. This is the time and the place to decisively win, to work together as Americans, and defeat terrorists on their turf before they can return the fight to ours.

I urge my colleagues and the American people to read Mr. Gingrich’s insightful piece.

[From the Weekly Standard, Nov. 28, 2006]

(By Newt Gingrich)

SEARCHING FOR VICTORY IN IRAQ—WHY THE BAKER-HAMILTON COMMISSION OUGHT TO VISIT MOUNT VERNON.

The Sunday before Thanksgiving Callista and I took some friends to Mount Vernon to see the new education center. It is an amazing tribute to George Washington and the creation of America.

We watched a movie about George Washington crossing the Delaware on Christmas

Eve and surprising the Hessians (German mercenaries) on Christmas Day in Trenton. As I watched, I was struck by the amazing difference between the attitude of the father of our country and the current attitudes in the city that bears his name.

General Washington had had a long and painful summer and autumn of defeat in 1776. His American Army had been defeated across New York—in Brooklyn, in Manhattan, and in White Plains—and then driven across New Jersey and forced to flee across the Delaware River into Pennsylvania.

Washington's Night Crossing: "Victory or Death"

Washington's forces had dwindled until he had only about 4,000 effective soldiers left. There were another 6,000 men present but they were so sick they were unable to go into battle.

Faced with declining morale, rising desertions, the collapse of political will in the country at large, and a sense of despair, Washington decided to gamble everything on a surprise attack. It would require a night crossing of an icy river against a formidable professional opponent.

But the most telling sign of Washington's mood as he embarked on the mission was his choice of a password. His men said "victory or death" to identify themselves.

What if There Had Been a Baker-Hamilton Commission Advising General Washington?

That night crossing, immortalized in paintings of Washington standing in the boat as Marblehead Fishermen rowed him across the ice strewn river, led to an amazing victory on Christmas Day. That victory led to a surge in American morale and a doubling in the size of the American forces under Washington within two weeks. And that gave Washington the strength to win a second surprise victory at Princeton.

Within two weeks, Washington had gone from defeated, hopeless bungler to victorious American hero and personification of the American cause.

Imagine there had been a Baker-Hamilton commission—the group charged with assessing our options in Iraq—advising Washington that cold Christmas Eve. What "practical, realistic," advice would they have given him? Eleven Key Tests for the Baker-Hamilton Report.

Will the Baker Hamilton Commission make a real contribution in helping us win the war against the fanatic wing of Islam? Or will it be simply one more establishment effort to hide defeat so the American political system can resume its comfortable insider games without having to solve real problems in the larger world? Here are some key things to look for in its report:

(1) Does the commission have a vision for success in the larger war against the dictatorships and fanatics who want to destroy us?

If Iraq were only a one-step process, the answer would be to leave. But the reality is that Iraq is a single campaign within a much bigger war and within a power struggle both over the evolution of Islam and over the rise of dictatorships seeking nuclear and biological weapons to enable them to destroy America and her allies. If the Baker-Hamilton commission does not take this into account, it is a dangerously misleading report.

(2) Does the commission recognize that the second campaign in Iraq has been a failure?

This is the hardest thing for Washington-centric bureaucracies to accept. There was a very successful 23-day campaign to drive Saddam out of power. It used America's strengths and it worked. The second campaign has been an abject failure. We and our Iraqi allies do not have control of Iraq. We cannot guarantee security. There is not enough economic activity to keep young

males employed. If the Baker-Hamilton commission cannot bring itself to recognize a defeat as a defeat, then it cannot recommend the scale of change needed to develop a potentially successful third campaign.

(3) Does the commission recognize the scale of change we will need to be effective in a world of enemies willing to kill themselves in order to kill us?

We need fundamental change in our military doctrine, training, and structures, our intelligence capabilities, and our integration of civilian and military activities. The instruments of American power simply do not work at the speed and detail needed to defeat the kind of enemies we are encountering. The American bureaucracies would rather claim the problem is too hard and leave because being forced to change this deeply will be very painful and very controversial. Yet we have to learn to win. Learning, to win requires much more than changes in the military. It requires changes in how our intelligence, diplomatic, information, and economic institutions work. It requires the development of an integrated approach in which all the aspects of American power can be brought to bear to achieve victory. Furthermore this strategy for victory has to be doubly powerful because for three years we have failed to build an effective Iraqi government and we now have a shattered local system with many players using violence in desperate bids to maximize their positions. The plan has to be powerful enough to succeed despite Iraqi weaknesses and not by relying on a clearly uncertain and unstable Iraqi political system.

(4) Does the commission describe the consequences of defeat in Iraq?

What would the withdrawal of U.S. troops in Iraq look like? Frederick Kagan of the American Enterprise Institute recently offered this chilling picture: "The pullback of U.S. forces to their bases will not reduce the sectarian conflict, which their presence did not generate—it will increase it. Death squads on both sides will become more active. Large-scale ethnic and sectarian cleansing will begin as each side attempts to establish homogeneous enclaves where there are now mixed communities. Atrocities will mount, as they always do in ethnic cleansing operations. Iraqis who have cooperated with the Americans will be targeted by radicals on both sides. Some of them will try to flee with the American units. American troops will watch helplessly as death squads execute women and children. Pictures of this will play constantly on Al Jazeera. Prominent 'collaborators,' with whom our soldiers and leaders worked, will be publicly executed. Crowds of refugees could overwhelm not merely Iraq's neighbors but also the [Forward Operating Bases] themselves. Soldiers will have to hold off fearful, tearful, and dangerous mobs."

(5) Does the commission understand the importance of victory? Winning is key. We are in a power struggle on a worldwide basis with dictators who want to defeat us (Iran, Syria, Venezuela, Cuba, North Korea) and with fanatic organizations that want to kill us (al Qaeda, Hezbollah, Hamas, etc.). In a struggle like this, the goal has to be to win. Anything less than victory is very dangerous because it allows our enemies to gather more capabilities and prepare for more dangerous campaigns. Time is not on our side. Time is on the side of those seeking nuclear and biological weapons to use against the civilized world.

(6) Does the commission define what it means to win or simply find a face-saving way to lose?

Winning is very definable. Can we protect our friends and hurt our enemies? Are they more afraid of us or are we more afraid of

them? The recent Syrian assassination of a Lebanese Christian leader who was pro-Western is a signal that they are not afraid of us. The North Korean decision to launch seven missiles on our Independence Day and to set off a nuclear weapon were signs they have contempt for our warnings. The statements of Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez indicate how confident they are. Today the enemy thinks they are winning and our elites seem to be seeking face-saving cover behind which to accept defeat. Does the Baker-Hamilton commission have a proposal for victory or a proposal for accepting defeat gracefully? Will it offer a diplomatic deal allowing us to pretend we are okay while our enemies gather strength?

(7) Does the commission acknowledge that winning requires thinking regionally and even globally?

In Afghanistan we are engaged in an Afghanistan-Waziristan war in which our enemies retreat into Waziristan in northwest Pakistan and rearm, reequip, retrain, and rest before coming back into Afghanistan. We will never win that war by engaging only in Afghanistan. In Iraq, the problems may require much more direct confrontation with Iran and Syria. In Lebanon, it is impossible to create a stable democratic government and disarm Hezbollah as long as Syria and Iran are deeply involved in killing Lebanese leaders and supplying Hezbollah.

(8) Any proposal to ask Iran and Syria to help is a sign of defeat. Does the commission suggest this?

Iran and Syria are the wolves in the region. They are the primary troublemakers. You don't invite wolves into the kitchen to help with dinner or you become dinner. The State Department Report on Terrorism in April 2006 said: "Iran and Syria routinely provide unique safe haven, substantial resources and guidance to terrorist organizations." It went on to say, "Iran remained the most active state sponsor of terrorism." It noted that in Iraq the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps (an arm of the Iranian dictatorship) "was increasingly involved in supplying lethal assistance to Iraqi militant groups which destabilize Iraq." How can the Baker-Hamilton commission seriously suggest that two dictatorships described like this are going to be "helpers" in achieving American goals in the Middle East?

(9) Does the commission believe we can "do a deal" with Iran?

The clear effort by the Iranians to acquire nuclear weapons, and Ahmadinejad's assertion that it is easy to imagine a time in the near future when the United States and Israel have both disappeared, should be adequate proof that the Iranian dictatorship is the active enemy of America. Couple that with the fact that the Iranians lied to the International Atomic Energy Agency for 18 years while trying to develop a nuclear weapon. Either this is a dangerous regime we need to fundamentally change, or it is a reasonable regime with which we can deal. Presidential speeches and State Department documents clearly indicate it is a dangerous regime yet, there is a permanent Washington establishment desire to avoid conflict and confrontation by "doing a deal." In the 1930s, that model was called appeasement, not realism, and it led to a disaster. We need a Churchill not a Chamberlain policy for the Middle East.

(10) Does the commission believe we are more clever than our enemies?

The al-Assad family has run Syria since 1971. Hafiz Assad arranged for his son Bashar to succeed him. This family and its Alawite supporters represent a small minority of the Syrian people, but they maintain a relentlessly tough internal dictatorship which keeps power in their hands. In some ways,

there are parallels between Bashar Assad and Kim Jong Il—they both maintain family dictatorships with the support of a key system of internal controls. After 35 years of defying the United States, there is no reason to believe our diplomats are more clever than their ruthlessly survivor-oriented systems. Negotiating with them is an invitation to be taken to the cleaners and to extend the power and prestige and influence of our mortal enemies in the region. Recent talk of reaching out to Syria has been met by the assassination of a Lebanese minister and the intensifying of the Hezbollah blackmail tactics in Lebanon. Weakness from America leads to greater aggression from our enemies. The Baker-Hamilton commission should focus on how to contain or defeat Syria not on how to rely on them for help.

(11) Does the commission recognize the importance of working with the Democratic majorities on a strategy for victory?

The Democratic victory in the 2006 election should not be used as an excuse to do the wrong thing. The Democrats are now confronting the responsibility and burden of power. Given the right information about Iran, Syria, and Iraq there is every reason to believe a bipartisan majority can be formed in both the House and Senate for a rational strategy for victory. Opposition to continuing the failed second campaign should not be translated into opposition to an American victory. The Bush administration should reach out to moderate Democrats and forge a bipartisan agenda for victory and by March 2007 pass a bipartisan resolution for victory in Iraq and for stopping Iranian efforts to get nuclear weapons. That will then set the basis for appropriations to continue the effort. The passage of a solid bipartisan bill in March would send a signal to the world that Americans are overwhelmingly in favor of defeating terrorism and defending America. That will dramatically lower the morale and confidence of our enemies.

These 11 steps would be a powerful basis on which to move forward in Iraq and in the world. What's more, they reflect the spirit of General Washington when he chose "victory or death" as the motto of the campaign which led to the founding of America despite overwhelming odds.

STEVEN JACKSON, GOOD
SAMARITAN

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, every day we hear of rising crime rates and countless acts of criminal activity. The question is often asked—Is there any good left in the world? On December 5, 2006, in the city of Humble, Texas, a man by the name of Steven Jackson showed us all that goodwill still exists.

On the evening of December 5, an evildoer, without regard for human life, went into a Humble gas station with a gun. This man robbed the attendant at gun point, took a few hundred dollars, and forced her to wait in the back room until he escaped.

After the robber left the gas station, the attendant went outside and saw him walking across the street to his getaway car. Upon this discovery, she started screaming that the man had robbed her and was getting away, which caught the attention of Steven Jackson.

Steven Jackson, a volunteer firefighter with the Kingwood and Porter volunteer fire depart-

ments, had been filling up his car that evening—a routine action we all do. On this evening, while doing an ordinary task, Steven decided to do something extraordinary. As the attendant pleaded for help, Steven got into his car and began following the robber while calling 911.

According to the Humble Police Department, it appears that the criminal knew Steven was following him. At some point, a few miles from the gas station, the robber stopped his car, approached Steven's car, and shot him twice in the torso.

As Steven's car left the road, he was able to tell the 911 dispatcher that he had been shot. Unfortunately, those words were the last this world would ever hear from Steven Jackson—his life cut short for a few hundred dollars.

The fine officers of the Humble Police Department are currently investigating this case. The outlaw who took Steven's life is still at large. It is my hope that he is brought to a swift and fitting justice.

That's Just the Way It Is.

IN HONOR OF HAROLD HURVERS
AND THE 194TH LIGHT TANK
BATTALION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the bravery and determination of Minnesota men who served in the U.S. Armed Forces in the Philippines during World War II. In particular, I want to note the contributions of the 194th Light Tank Battalion.

On Easter Monday, 1941, 83 St. Paulites reported for induction into the U.S. Army, joining 163 men from Hennepin County. Seventy-seven of these men joined the 194th stationed at Fort Lewis, Washington. They were trained and deployed to the Philippine Islands.

At 12:30 p.m. on December 8, 1941, the day after the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Philippine Islands were attacked by Japanese planes, placing U.S. Armed Forces on wartime status. The air strikes destroyed U.S. airplanes stationed at Clark Field, leaving U.S. forces and Philippine Scouts trapped and with few supplies. Despite these great hardships, the 194th Light Tank Battalion fought on bravely for the next four months, delaying the Japanese offensive. Ultimately, U.S. forces were forced to evacuate to the Bataan Peninsula after relentless attacks by Japanese forces. April 9, 1942 marked the beginning of the notorious Bataan Death March.

Following heavy land attacks and after withstanding hundreds of raids from the air by Japanese forces, the Fall of Corregidor, forced American forces to surrender on May 6, 1942. Courageous American forces held out in spite of supply shortages, hunger, disease, and exhaustion. In the days that followed, many Minnesota military personnel from the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Corps, and the Nurse Corps were added to the rolls of prisoners of war. More than 75 percent of the men who were in service December 8, 1941 perished.

Those who survived faced 3½ years of imprisonment until they were liberated in August and September, 1945.

Many veterans of the Philippine Campaign, the Bataan Death March and Japanese Prisoners of War are known only to history, their individual identities lost in the aftermath of war, but I want to recognize Harold Hurvers of St. Paul, the last survivor of the draftees. Through his stories of this horrific ordeal, Americans can learn volumes about the great sacrifices made by our veterans. All Minnesotans, indeed, all Americans owe Mr. Hurvers and all veterans a debt of gratitude for their service.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Mr. Hurvers and the Minnesota Draftees of the 194th Light Tank Battalion.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLIE NORWOOD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, Nonprofit Athletic Organization Protection Act, had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

HONORING WOMEN'S FEDERATION
FOR WORLD PEACE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 7, 2006

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor and applaud the Women's Federation for World Peace, USA for their commitment to women and world peace. This extraordinary organization provides women with the opportunities to create peace around the world. Their remarkable work highlights and enhances the role of women in establishing a world without terror and violence.

In these troubling times, the cries for peace on Earth are needed more than ever. Women's Federation for World Peace continues their fight by bringing women from all walks of life together to conquer a common goal. Their outstanding dedication and strong will to the enhancement of the world's women and peace will no doubt serve as a valuable component throughout the world.

As women we must be persistent, vigilant, and a strong force to help rid the world of violence. Although change will not come from one group, gender, or political party, but from all who are interested in helping to create a better world. An organization as the Women's Federation of World Peace is just one illustration in helping to create a better world for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank the Women's Federation for World Peace for their dedication and commitment they have put forth. I truly admire this organization for improving the world's women and peace throughout the world.