

these traits and proven he is an officer capable of compassion and dedication to his position as a peace officer in Moffat County community. Advocates-Crisis Support Services has worked diligently alongside officers such as Gary, and has rewarded past officers with similar traits for this important and dubious honor. I am extremely proud of not only Gary but also the crisis organization, as they both are our first responder units in times of hardship and crisis.

Mr. Speaker, as a former law enforcement officer, I am well aware of the dangers and hazards our peace officers face today. These individuals work long hours, weekends, and holidays to guarantee their fellow citizen's rights and protection. They work tirelessly and with great sacrifice to their personal and family lives to ensure our freedoms remain strong in our homes and communities. Their service and dedication deserve the recognition and thanks of this body of Congress, and this is why I bring the name of officers like Gary Nichols to light today. Congratulations on this honor and I wish you all the best, Gary, and good luck in your future.

REMARKS BY FORMER
CONGRESSMAN TOM EVANS

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues that you read some remarks by former Congressman Tom Evans of Delaware he delivered recently at the University of Delaware.

Tom Evans, who played a key role in the passage of the Alaska Lands Act, sets forth compelling reasons why one of America's great treasures, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, should continue to be protected.

I strongly agree with him on the need to preserve that great wilderness area and protect the wildlife there. There are much better and quicker ways to develop energy independence in America without oil drilling in the Arctic Refuge.

PRESERVING THE ARCTIC NATIONAL
WILDLIFE REFUGE

(Delivered by Thomas B. Evans, Jr.)

It's a great pleasure to be here this evening at the University of Delaware. I appreciate the wonderful turnout and am especially grateful for your strong support of the environment and for the work you do here at the University in that area.

As you know, there is a critical vote coming up in the U.S. Senate late in February that has enormous consequences for millions of acres of wilderness and all kinds of wildlife. I will address those things, but first I'd like to go back to 1980 and reflect on what happened then.

Although passage of the Alaska Lands Act took place over two decades ago, I can remember it better than some events that occurred just two weeks ago. This landmark piece of legislation set aside additional millions of acres of land and designated them as wilderness areas. It was a gigantic effort to achieve the preservation of some irreplaceable, pristine areas of wilderness for us and for future generations. I was honored to have been one of the three principal congressional backers and the Republican floor leader for the bill.

The bill passed, and yes millions of acres of land were protected, but there was something that was equally as important. There was a tremendous lobbying effort against it, and millions of dollars were spent. The dollars spent by our Alaska Coalition paled in comparison to the lobbying effort that attempted to prevent passage of the legislation that was designed to protect wild scenic rivers, wetlands, polar bears, songbirds, caribou, ducks and other wildlife of every description.

We won with 60 plus Republicans voting yea. It was, indeed, a true bipartisan effort; and that, unfortunately, does not take place very often in today's political climate. Afterwards, three of us were invited to a very emotional victory celebration hosted by the Alaska Coalition. That coalition consisted primarily of young people who spent the summer in Washington. They came to Washington to protect a great treasure for future generations. John Seiberling of Ohio, who chaired one of the subcommittees with jurisdiction over this issue, and Mo Udall, a dedicated environmentalist from Arizona, and I were deeply touched by their invitation, and the warm reception we received. I believe I can safely say it was certainly one of the best invitations I've received in my lifetime.

Mo Udall and John Seiberling both spoke eloquently and certainly covered the importance of the legislation. I didn't want to repeat them; so I took a slightly different tack and said that victory today was great in terms of conservation and preservation of millions of pristine acres. But there was an equally important victory today—all of you proved that regardless of dollars and political pressure, our constitutional system of government still works. You can still win, and that's the American way."

Today, we may be facing an even sterner test. Some of the arguments made by proponents of drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge sound good on the surface. They call for energy independence and equate that to our national security interest. Well, I also believe in developing energy independence so we won't be dependent on a bunch of sheiks in a very unstable part of the world. And certainly energy independence is inextricably related to national security. But this administration, which most of us strongly support in our country's fight against terrorism, is wrong on the centerpiece of its energy policy. Domestic production of oil should not be the primary focus.

Perhaps it would help us all to better understand the Administration's energy policy if we took a look at how it was developed. Vice President Cheney took the lead, and about half a dozen staff members were specifically assigned to develop a working draft. That staff included two top assistants of Senator Murkowski, the main congressional proponent of drilling in the Arctic, and to the best of my knowledge no one on the task force had any experience or background or demonstrated interest in the protection of the environment.

The group met often with oil company executives and a number of times with Enron officials. No wonder that their plan emphasizes domestic production and contains very little on the conservation side. In fact, Vice President Cheney said that conservation may be a personal virtue, but it does little, if anything, to achieve energy independence. That statement demonstrates an appalling, but predictable, bias in favor of oil drilling. But he's wrong, and each of us conserving small amounts of energy can make a big difference on a cumulative basis.

Let me dispel some myths and make a few points on the need for a balanced energy plan—one that clearly should not include

drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—one of our greatest American treasures!

There is not a tremendous amount of oil in the Arctic refuge. Why develop it simply out of greed when there are so many alternatives?

There is a much better way to achieve energy independence without doing irreparable, irreversible harm to the most environmentally sensitive area of one of the most pristine areas of the world—the narrow coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Alternative sources of energy, including renewable sources of energy, are available, while oil is a finite resource. Fossil fuels will be exhausted some day, but the wind and sun will always be around.

Fuel economy standards for cars and trucks hold be raised. Even a very modest mile or two per gallon would make a huge difference. We should also provide incentives for conservation, more efficient power plants, development of fuel cells, better insulation for homes and office buildings and more energy-efficient appliances.

There are also secure alternative sources of oil and gas outside the Middle East. Russia is a prime example, and I recently spent ten days in that country assessing its potential.

It will be seven to ten years before oil from the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge comes on stream. Yet, you may recall that proponents of drilling initially used the argument that implied that the California energy problem could be resolved if we drilled in ANWR. Well, California solved its problem in other ways—including conservation—so now the drilling proponents are invoking the national security argument. That's an absurd argument as well!

New pipelines will have to be built that would be exposed to terrorists. Several months ago, a high-powered rifle shot took out an existing pipeline for several weeks.

And don't be fooled by the argument that technology has developed to the point where oil wells could be drilled on only 2,000 acres of the 19 million in ANWR. That's not the full picture. You also have to take into account the logistics that support the oil wells—oil derricks, trucks, helicopter pads, people, roads, pumping stations and networks of oil field pipelines, even without the toxic spills and air pollution that are endemic in such fields, destroy wilderness and imperil wildlife. And remember that when you damage the tundra, you may destroy it for 100 years or more. What we grow in our climate in a year takes decades there.

We have treated Native Americans harshly from the beginning. Now, we are doing it again. The Gwichin Indian tribe live in the Arctic Refuge, and they view the land as sacred. Certainly, oil drilling on this land is inconsistent with preserving it as a sacred place.

As Barrons, the well known financial publication, pointed out recently, "we are entering a period when there is a glut of oil." The publication's cover proclaimed "The Coming Glut of Oil."

Therefore, we should ask the question, is it necessary to drill now? If, in the future, we are unable to develop alternative sources of energy (I believe we can, given the right commitment), if gasoline is \$10 a gallon with long lines to even get gas, then it might be something we should consider, but certainly not now! Don't approve something that will do irreparable harm, something that cannot be reversed. Drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should be considered only as a last resort!

So, ladies and gentlemen, let me end by saying as I did over twenty years ago that in spite of the money, the political influence,

and the greed, you can make a difference. Let history record—say, 50 to 100 years from now—that this generation cared, that we persevered, that we preserved, and that we recognized that important decisions should be made not just for today and not just for a few—but very importantly—for future generations of Americans as well!!

IN MEMORY OF THE HONORABLE
DEOTIS GAY OF LA PORTE, TEXAS

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of a longtime friend and respected former member of the La Porte City Council of La Porte, Texas, Deotis Gay, who passed away at his home on February 21, 2002. The community of La Porte has lost one of their most beloved and respected citizens. Deotis was a constituent, colleague, and friend with whom I was privileged to know and work with. I will miss his wisdom and guidance.

Mr. Gay was born December 19, 1931, in Kilgore, Texas, and moved to La Porte with his family when he was nine years old. He retired after working for Rohm and Haas Deer Park for 35 years. Besides his 20 years of service on the La Porte City Council that ended just this past year, Deotis was active in the National League of Cities, the Texas Municipal League, the Texas Black Caucus and the La Porte Community Civic Club. He was also a Mason and a member of the board of trustees of Zion Hill Baptist Church.

Deotis was more than just a great civic leader; he was also a great Texan, a loyal friend, and a devoted husband, father and grandfather. I offer my sincere condolences to his wife, Mary; his sons, Deotis Gay, Jr. and Anthony Gay; his daughter Cheryl Gay, his seven grandchildren, and his entire extended family. We feel for their loss as we mourn the passing of this exceptional man. Deotis was a true friend to everyone in La Porte and to me personally.

ARTICLE COMPARES INDIA TO
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY—INDIA IS
HEADING FOR SIMILAR BREAK-
UP

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article by Steve Forbes in the March 4 issue of Forbes magazine called "India, Meet Austria-Hungary." In the article, Mr. Forbes compares present-day India to the old Austro-Hungarian Empire. Like Austria-Hungary, India is a multi-ethnic, multinational country. Such countries are unstable, as Mr. Forbes notes, and they face a similar peril.

The article notes that some leaders in India are "itching to go to war with Pakistan, even though Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf has taken considerable political risks by moving against Pakistani-based-and-trained anti-India terrorist groups." At the same time, ac-

cording to a January 2 article in the Washington Times, India continues to sponsor cross-border terrorism against Pakistan. The article notes that when the Austro-Hungarian monarchy attacked Serbia in 1914, it launched a war in which the Hapsburgs lost their empire. Today, several countries exist where the Austro-Hungarian Empire once was.

India is in similar circumstances. It should learn from the example of Austria-Hungary, the Soviet Union, and other multinational empires. It should realize that the breakup of such states is inevitable. The Soviet Union and Austria-Hungary had a stronger, more stable political structure and they fell apart because such multinational states cannot be held together. In fact, Indian Home Minister L.K. Advani recently said that if Kashmir gets its freedom, India will unravel.

Yet India continues its futile efforts to maintain its multinational state by force, in pursuit of Hindu hegemony. It continues to attack and kill Christians, Sikhs, Muslims, Dalits, and other minority groups. It continues to hold tens of thousands of political prisoners, something I find very odd for a democracy. Indian forces have killed more than 250,000 Sikhs, over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland, more than 75,000 Kashmiri Muslims, and many thousands of minorities of all kinds. This repressive policy will not work. Eventually, the force that broke up the Soviet Union and broke up the Austro-Hungarian Empire will break up India. I hope that this happens peacefully. With the war on terrorism ongoing, we do not need another violent trouble spot in the world.

America can encourage this process of nationalism and freedom in South Asia. We should press India for the release of all political prisoners. We should stop our aid and trade with India until they are released and the oppression of minorities ends. We should openly declare our support for self-determination for all peoples and nations in South Asia. By these measures we will help everyone in the subcontinent to live freely, prosperously, in dignity, stability, and peace.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert the Forbes article into the RECORD at this time.

[From Forbes Magazine, Mar. 4, 2002]

INDIA, MEET AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

(By Steve Forbes)

Influential elements in India's government and military are still itching to go to war with Pakistan, even though Pakistan's President Pervez Musharraf has taken considerable political risks by moving against Pakistani-based-and-trained anti-India terrorist groups. Sure, Musharraf made a truculent speech condemning India's "occupation" of Kashmir, but that was rhetorical cover for cracking down on those groups. Washington should send New Delhi some history books for these hotheads; there is no human activity more prone to unintended consequences than warfare. As cooler heads in the Indian government well know, history is riddled with examples of parties that initiated hostilities in the belief that conflict would resolutely resolve outstanding issues.

Pericles of Athens thought he could deal with rival Sparta once and for all when he triggered the Peloponnesian War; instead his city-state was undermined and Greek civilization devastated. Similarly, Hannibal brilliantly attacked Rome; he ended up not only losing the conflict but also setting off a train of events that ultimately led to the total destruction of Carthage. Prussia smashed France in 1870, annexing critical French ter-

ritory for security reasons, but that sowed the seeds for the First World War. At the end of World War I the victorious Allies thought they had dealt decisively with German military power. Israel crushed its Arab foes in 1967, but long-term peace did not follow.

India is not a homogeneous state. Neither was the Austro-Hungarian Empire. It attacked Serbia in the summer of 1914 in the hopes of destroying this irritating state after Serbia had committed a spectacular terrorist act against the Hapsburg monarchy. The empire ended up splintering, and the Hapsburgs lost their throne.

And on it goes.

Getting back to the present, do Indian war hawks believe China will stand idly by as India tried to reduce Pakistan to vassal-state status? Do they think Arab states and Iran won't fund Muslim guerrilla movements in Pakistan, as well as in India itself? Where does New Delhi think its oil comes from (about 70%, mainly from the Middle East)? Does India think the U.S. will stand by impotently if it starts a war that unleashes nuclear weapons?

In his second inaugural address, Abraham Lincoln summed up the unpredictable consequences of war, vis-à-vis America's Civil War: "Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. . . . Each looked for an easier triumph, and a result less fundamental and astounding."

DUTCH TREAT

While cracking down on anti-India terrorist groups operating in Pakistan, Islamabad can take the wind out of Indian war sails by turning over the arrested terrorists who carried out murderous acts in Kashmir and New Delhi. It can turn them over not to India—which would be political suicide domestically—but to The Hague for investigation and trial by an international tribunal. India's moral case would then evaporate.

RECOGNIZING CAPTAIN JAMES B.
STRAIT

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 2002

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an impressive member of my community, Captain James B. Strait. Captain James B. Strait has played an important role in the Monterey Park Police Department and will be retiring after 31 years of service.

Captain Strait joined the Monterey Park Police Department on February 8, 1971 after graduating first in his class from the Riverside County Sheriff's Academy.

Under his leadership, the Monterey Park Police Department made significant changes that improved the Police Department's service to the community. In addition to chairing the Department's Computer Acquisition team and implementing a state of the art digital radio system, he also worked to publish the department's first policy and procedures manual.

In 1985, Captain Strait was awarded the Police Department's Distinguished Service Medal for his help in apprehending a person wielding a hand grenade. During the 1984 Summer Olympic Games, Captain Strait had the honor of being named Monterey Park Police Department's representative for the Security Coordination Center.