

that they viewed as hindering their progress, and they agreed to the following back in the early 1980s:

First, that religion should not be separated from politics; secondly, that the only way to achieve true independence, true independence, was to return to Islamic roots; third, there should be no reliance on superpowers or other outsiders, and the region should get rid of them; and, fourth, they recommended that the Shi'a should be more active in getting rid of foreign powers.

Dr. Marvin Zonis, at that time the director of the Middle East Institute at the University of Chicago, had a stunning comment about the Psychological Roots of Shiite Muslim Terrorism in a Washington seminar, in which he stated this message from Iran: No matter how bizarre or trivial it may sound on first, second, fourth or 39th hearing, is, in my opinion, the single most impressive political ideology which has been proposed in the 20th century since the Bolshevik Revolution. If we accepted Bolshevism as a remnant of the 19th century, then, he argues, that we have had only one good one in the 20th century, and I would put the word good in quotes, and it is this one: Islamic fundamentalism. This powerful message will be with us for a very long time, no matter what happens to Ayatollah Khomeini.

As I end this evening, I would just commend this book "Sacred Rage," and say I will continue with briefings on this as the days proceed, and I submit herewith, Mr. Speaker, the newspaper article I referred to above:

[From the Toledo (OH) Blade, Nov. 26, 2001]

SHEDDING THE VEIL OF BIN LADEN

(By Thomas L. Friedman)

DUBAI, United Arab Emirates.—Over coffee the other day here in the gulf, an Arab friend—a sweet, thoughtful, liberal person—confided to me something that was deeply troubling him: "My 11-year old son thinks bin Laden is a good man."

For Americans, Osama bin Laden is a mass murderer. But for many young Arabs, bin Laden even in defeat, is still Robin Hood. What attracts them to him is not his vision of the ideal Muslim society, which few would want to live in. No, what attracts them to him is his sheer defiance of everything young Arabs and Muslims detest—their hypocritical rulers, Israel, U.S. dominance, and their own economic backwardness. He is still the finger in the eye of the world that so many frustrated, powerless people out here would love to poke.

The reason it is important to eliminate bin Laden—besides justice—is the same reason it was critical to eliminate the Taliban: As long as we're chasing him around, there will never be an honest debate among Muslims and Arabs about the future of their societies.

Think of all the nonsense written in the press—particularly the European and Arab media—about the concern for "civilian casualties," in Afghanistan. It turns out many of those Afghan "civilians" were praying for another dose of B-52s to liberate them from the Taliban, casualties or not. Now that the Taliban are gone, Afghans can freely fight out, among themselves, the war of ideas for what sort of society they want.

My hope is that once bin Laden is eliminated, Arabs and Muslims will want to do the same. That is, instead of expressing rage

with their repressive, corrupt rulers, or with U.S. policy, by rooting for bin Laden, they will start to raise their own voices. It's only when the Arab-Muslim world sheds the veil of bin Laden, as Afghans shed the Taliban, and faces the fact that Sept. 11 was primarily about anger and problems with their societies, not ours, will we eradicate not just the hardware of terrorism, but its software.

"We in the West can't have that debate for them, but we can help create the conditions for it to happen," remarked the Middle East analyst Stephen P. Cohen. "America's role is to show the way to incremental change—something that is not, presto, instant democracy or fantasies that enlightened despotism will serve our interest. We can't just go on looking at the Arab world as a giant gas station, indifferent to what happens inside. Because the gas is now leaking and all around people are throwing matches."

Every day I see signs that this war of ideas is possible: It's the Arab journalist who says to me angrily of the Arab world today, "We can't even make an aspirin for our own headache," or it's Ahmad al-Baghdadi, the Kuwaiti professor, who just published a remarkable essay in Kuwait's Al Anbaa and Egypt's Akhbar Al Youm titled "Sharon Is a Terrorist—and You?"

[Ariel] Sharon was a terrorist from the very first moment of the . . . Zionist entity," wrote Baghdad. But what about Arab-Muslim rulers? "Persecuting intellectuals in the courtrooms [of Arab countries], trials [of intellectuals] for heresy . . . all exist only in the Islamic world. Is this not terrorism? . . . Iraq alone is a never-ending story of terrorism of the state against its own citizens and neighbors. Isn't this terrorism? . . . The Palestinian Arabs were the first to invent airplane hijacking and the scaring of passengers. Isn't this terrorism?"

"Arab Muslims have no rivals in this; they are the masters of terrorism toward their citizens, and sometimes their terrorism also reaches the innocent people of the world, with the support of some of the clerics . . .

"[Ours] is a nation whose ignorance makes the nations of the world laugh! The Islamic world and the Arab world are the only [places] in which intellectuals—whose only crime was to write—rot in prison. The Arab and Muslims claim that their religion is a religion of tolerance, but they show no tolerance for those who oppose their opinions.

" . . . Now the time has come to pay the price . . . and the account is long—longer than all the beards of the Taliban gang together. The West's message to the Arab and Muslim world is clear: mend your ways or else" (translation by MEMRI).

We must fight the ground war to get bin Laden and his hardware. But Arab and Muslims must fight the war of ideas to uproot his software. The sooner we help them get on to that war, the better.

Ask the folks in Kabul.

GENERAL CONCERN ABOUT OUR BORDERS, LAND, AIR, AND WATER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk a little bit tonight about our north and south borders. We have general concerns in the United States about our borders, our land, air, and water, for any number of reasons; and our challenge is how to keep our trade flowing and our traffic flowing while still meeting our security concerns.

Drug issues are a big concern in this country, illegal immigration, and other products that are either illegal to come in, like Cuban cigars, or of particular importance in regional areas such as cheese or other products. And of course the big concern that all Americans have right now is terrorism. It is of particular importance on the northern and southern borders of the United States, where trade with Mexico and Canada have become vital to the economic systems of our nations.

My Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform is conducting a series of hearings over the next few months in both the north and south borders. Our first hearings were held at the Highgate Springs, in Vermont, on the Montreal-Boston interstate corridor, and in Champlain, New York, on the Montreal-New York City corridor. In 2 weeks, we will be having a hearing in Blaine, Washington on the Vancouver-Seattle corridor.

In addition to these hearings, we have also been systematically meeting with the Coast Guard on Lake Champlain and will be in Puget Sound with the Border Patrol, with INS, with Customs and DEA. We also visit some of the lower traffic ports of entry in each of these areas. Some of these in the past have only been manned part-time with one person. There are many areas along our borders, both north and south, where you can just walk across. These are clear challenges as we try to control not only illegal drugs and immigration and products but also terrorists from entering our Nation.

With these hearings, because of the importance of working with our neighbors, we have invited participants from the parliaments as well as business representatives from Canada and plan to do the same with Mexico. As a result of our first hearings, in which Parliamentarian Denis Paradis from Quebec participated, he asked me to come to Ottawa to discuss with the numerous committees and other parliamentarians, as they enter into the final stages of their debate on anti-terrorism legislation and immigration bills what we have passed here in this House.

I returned from Ottawa a few hours ago, after spending a day and a half with our Canadian friends and our U.S. Embassy, and I would like to discuss a few of the important points tonight, and probably get a little bit into these again tomorrow.

Twenty-five percent of all trade from the United States is with Canada. To put this in perspective, the trade crossing the Ambassador Bridge between Windsor and Detroit, not all the trade that comes through Detroit, the tunnels and the other bridges, just the Ambassador Bridge alone, the trade over the Ambassador Bridge in Detroit is greater than all U.S.-Japanese trade. All the trade with U.S. and Japan does not equal what goes across one bridge in Detroit.

As Canadian Parliamentarian Susan Whalen of the Windsor Riding has pointed out to me multiple times, it is not just trade and tourism, which are big, for example, our Speaker's State of Florida, if the Canadians do not come down to Florida, it is not clear what would happen to the tourism business. Many United States Congressmen and women represent more Canadians at this time than the Canadians themselves in their parliament do. We have a big tourism exchange. Many people retire and go back and forth with their relatives.

But we also have workers across the border in Canada and in Mexico. In Windsor, there are 1,100 nurses who daily cross to meet the needs of the Detroit hospitals and the Detroit area hospitals. What are the people in these hospitals going to do if we wall off the borders or, as is currently happening, it takes 4 hours on many days? They are not able to get to the hospitals. The hospitals do not know how to staff. They are running into these problems on borders.

Clearly, we have to figure out some different methods of how we are going to do this long term because maybe a 2-hour is tolerable, but 4 hours is pushing the extreme. We have a 30 to 50 percent reduced traffic right now. What is going to happen if the traffic comes back? How are we going to meet the economic, the tourism, the trade and the workforce movement pressures?

Now, there are real reasons why traffic has slowed down. It is not just to spite either one of us on either side. There are real concerns. In the narcotics issue alone, we have seen a rise in illegal narcotics coming across from Canada, not just Mexico. BC Bud and Quebec Gold both are very potent forms of marijuana like we have never seen before in the United States. BC Bud is very near the levels in THC of cocaine. They have brought it into Indiana. Indiana has now become an exporter of marijuana to California and around the country. They bring it in, and they plant it in our soybeans and corn.

Quebec Gold is being shipped down to New York City and is right now more higher priced because of its potency than cocaine on the streets of New York. Ecstasy is coming in predominantly from Holland and Rotterdam into Canada and down, precursors for methamphetamine labs and meth labs.

Clearly, we have to work on the narcotics issues, but both nations have other concerns as well, and the terrorism, and I will get more into how both our parliament and their parliament are trying to address these concerns and balance the needs of both commerce and terrorism.

□ 2000

O.C. SMITH, SINGER KNOWN FOR "LITTLE GREEN APPLES" DIES NOVEMBER 24, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JEFF MILLER of Florida). Under a pre-

vious order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I come to memorialize someone who was not only a constituent but a minister and a friend. The Reverend O.C. Smith was a jazz singer, a pop singer and minister.

O.C. Smith, a one-time jazz singer in the Count Basie band, found popular success in the late 1960s with songs like "That's Life" and the Grammy-Award-winning "Little Green Apples." When we walked into the sanctuary of his church on Sunday, there were big baskets of little green apples that were given out as a souvenir of his life; and little green apples grow into ripe red apples, such a symbol of who he was.

Smith officiated at a Thanksgiving service Thursday. I do not know whether he foresaw his immediate demise, but he had all of his children come from around the country. He had asked the Reverend Barbara King to preach for him on Sunday, and she was on her way from San Diego to Los Angeles when she heard about his death.

In early 1961, Smith auditioned successfully for the Count Basie band. He was the one who replaced the legendary Joe Williams.

After the Count Basie band, Smith worked the club and concert circuit across the country, toured the Far East for several months, and settled in Los Angeles afterwards. Columbia Records soon signed him on and expanded his repertoire. Many Members probably remember the successful "That's Life" which Frank Sinatra turned into a golden record years later. He obtained his first commercial breakthrough with "Son of Hickory Holler's Tramp" which became a big hit in Britain.

Then came his version of Bobby Russell's "Little Green Apples," winner of the Grammy Award in 1968. A year later Smith had another big R&B single, "Daddy's Little Man" in 1969 which hit number 9.

I guess there was a calling or an avocation. In 1980, Smith's life began to take a new direction after friends invited him to attend a Science of the Mind service, and later on he became the Reverend O.C. Smith. He felt the presence and he was called to come and administer to many celebrities, many professionals and just regular people.

The O.C. Smith I knew was kind, loving and always full of joy. He always had an uplifting word for you whenever you saw him, on the streets, in the theater performing, or in his church. I am very proud to say I was the only politician that he would allow to come up to the podium and speak and that he would endorse. The last time I saw him was in his church, but as we attended his church on Sunday, he was seen in spirit throughout that sanctuary.

We have lost not only a minister but a person who could make one believe in the Supreme Being being inside of you. We lost a performer. We lost a great and spiritual man which we shall re-

member forever, and particularly when we hear his version of God's "Little Green Apples." May he rest in peace and always be with us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act and Sec. 221(c) of H. Con. Res. 83, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2002, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD revisions to the allocations for the House Committee on Appropriations.

As provided by Sec. 218 of H. Con. Res. 83, I am increasing the allocations to accommodate House action on the President's revised request for defense spending. As reported to the House, H.R. 3338, the bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2002, includes \$17,347,000,000 in new budget authority and \$14,932,000,000 in outlays in response to the Administration's requested increase. I am increasing the allocation by those amounts.

As you know, the Committee on the Budget has reported separate legislation (H.R. 3084) that would, among other things, increase the appropriate aggregate established pursuant to H. Con. Res. 83 to reflect the President's revised defense request. It is my intention that this bill be passed freestanding or incorporated into one of the appropriations conference reports. In either event, it will be necessary to modify the language in H.R. 3084 to avoid duplication of the defense adjustment.

In addition, Division B of H.R. 3338 provides for the use of emergency-designated funds previously authorized in P.L. 107-38, Emergency Supplemental Appropriations in Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States. Under the provisions of both the Budget Act and the budget resolution, I must adjust the 302(a) allocations and budgetary aggregate upon the reporting of a bill containing emergency appropriations. The emergency-designated spending provided in Division B of H.R. 3338 totals \$20,001,000,000 in new budget authority and \$9,347,000,000 in outlays.

Next, the conference report on H.R. 2620, the bill making appropriations for Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies for fiscal year 2002, included an emergency-designated appropriation providing \$1,500,000,000 in new budget authority to the Federal Emergency Management Agency. No outlays are expected to flow from that budget authority in fiscal year 2002. The allocations had previously been adjusted by \$1,300,000,000 in new budget authority