

28th. That's just a little after the deadline that taxes are due, and we've already spent it all. In other words, by April 28, that's next week, we're going to have spent all the money that comes in in taxes in the year 2009. And that's what these different charts are showing in very different ways.

But, you know, you've got the tax day, when you have to have your income taxes in, April 15. And now we've got Debt Day, which is April 28. My goodness.

Ms. FOXX. It's April 26.

Mr. AKIN. 26 is it? Yeah.

Yielding to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. Well, I'm very sad to say that, to learn that Debt Day, the day we don't have any money that we raise from taxes, is my daughter's birthday. I wish her a happy birthday. But, quite frankly it's coming up this weekend. And you know, it's mind boggling that taxes are paid on the 15th, and basically we'll have spent all the money that we've gotten from tax revenues by the 26th. That's spending some money, folks. That's doing it better than anybody's ever done it.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, and I note that you are not so different in age than I am, and I'm just asking the same question I asked earlier this evening about our parents' generation. They've been called by some people the greatest generation. And they were called the greatest generation, because, among other things they had this intrinsic compass that said, we're going to leave our Nation better than it was when we were here. And they went to Europe, and they went to the China Seas and they did their bit and they left us a freer country. And they may not have gone through college themselves, but they saved their money so we could go through college, so that we could have a little bit better lifestyle.

Some of those people now are like my own parents. They're just still alive, but they still have that attitude of making this a better country.

And it breaks my heart to say, when I take a look at these numbers, that instead of leaving it a better country, we're leaving debt as an inheritance for our children. And that's tragic.

I thank everyone for joining us this evening; look forward to next Wednesday night.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1145, NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI (during the Special Order of Mr. AKIN), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-82) on the resolution (H. Res. 352) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1145) to implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative, and for other purposes, which was referred to

the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the 5-minute special order of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is vacated.

There was no objection.

□ 1900

RIGHT-WING EXTREMISM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you for recognizing me for this hour. I'm very pleased to be here.

I'm here to talk about a subject that, I think, is very interesting, and I don't think the American people have really gotten their hands on this subject yet, but it's also extremely concerning. It really concerns me a great deal.

I happen to serve on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security. We have spent an awful lot of time and an awful lot of effort trying to make sure that we keep our country safe from clearly identified terrorists who, if you have any question of do they mean us harm, then just look back at the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, and then ask yourself: Do they mean us harm?

We have been diligently trying to defend our borders, diligently trying to stop terrorism and trying to catch it before it gets here and trying to deal with these people who have identified themselves and who have told everyone publicly they're here to hurt us. Now we have a new administration, and we have a new memo that has come out from Ms. Napolitano over at the Department of Homeland Security. It would just shock you to know that she is warning not of al Qaeda, not of the Taliban, not of Osama bin Laden. She is warning people about right-wing radical domestic terrorism.

Now, this would be almost humorous, but those of us who have a little age on us, like I do, can think back to the Clinton administration and can remember how many times when anybody ever criticized the Clinton administration you would hear the First Lady then and now Secretary of State say, "Well, it's all a plot by those right-wing extremists, those right-wing extremist organizations." President Bill Clinton would say, "Well, they don't agree with my party and with what we're saying here, but it's really the people you're hearing from who are right-wing extremists." They label talk show hosts as right-wing extremists. All this fear was generated about right-wing extremists. Now we're not

even 6 months into the Obama administration, and the people who are supposed to be protecting our homeland are warning us against right-wing extremists.

This is the intelligence briefing right here. Now, I'm not trying to be mean about all of this. I'm just trying to tell you what they tell me is a right-wing extremist. I just took the things that they tell people who fall into that category, and then I put those classifications in with a poll that we did to identify the nature of my congressional district. Believe it or not, based upon accurate polling data that has been done in my district, 81 percent of the registered voters in my congressional district would qualify as right-wing extremists under Ms. Napolitano's memo—81 percent. They're probably going to come up with a category to cover the other 19 percent. I'm not being facetious about this. I happen to have Fort Hood, Texas in my district. Fort Hood, Texas is the largest military base on the face of the Earth. It has two field divisions of the corps headquarters.

One of the things they tell us in this report is very sad in light of what our Army has been going through, which is to watch out for returning, disgruntled military veterans coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan in that they have the potential to be right-wing terrorists. These young men and women, some of whom have done four and five deployments overseas, some of those deployments for as much as 15 months, have served our Nation as heroes, as the next great generation, and our government is labeling them: At the time they finish their service, we should consider them potential right-wing extremists and terrorists. They are defining them as people the government had better keep an eye on. Veterans who have served in other wars are in here. They classify them as right-wing extremists.

Are you opposed to abortion? It says right here at the bottom of this page: "It may include groups and individuals that are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration."

It's just shocking. It basically says, if you disagree with the Obama administration, you could be a right-wing terrorist. Now, I hate to say that. It talks about people who believe in the right to keep and bear arms: right-wing terrorists. It talks about people who disagree with the stimulus package: right-wing terrorists. It talks about people who disagree with the economic path of recovery that this Nation is taking: potential right-wing terrorists. This is what this report says. I'm sure it's available. It's unclassified. It's for official use. We got it off the Internet. There's more, a lot more.

I have friends here who have joined me on this shocking thing that's going on in this country. I'm going to start with my good friend, VIRGINIA FOXX, who was with us here in the last hour, and I'm very pleased to have her again.

I'll yield to her what time she may need to consume.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for his willingness to take this hour and to bring attention to this report.

I had a chance to skim over this report today for the first time. I, frankly, was appalled when I read it. I didn't think I would live to see the time when Representatives of this government would be characterizing the good people of this country, who love this country and who have served this country so well, as extremists and terrorists. We can't even get the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security to use the word "terrorism" anymore for real terrorists. What she wants to do, though, is to characterize very, very patriotic Americans as terrorists, and I am simply appalled by it.

As somebody pointed out today to me, when the President was campaigning, he promised to transform this country, but you know, I don't think people really understood what that meant. He never said he was going to improve the country. He said he was going to transform it. I think that these folks are on their way to doing that, and I don't think people are going to like, primarily, the way they transform it.

You've done a great job, Congressman CARTER, of highlighting this really, really scary definition of "right-wing extremism." I want to highlight a couple of parts of that definition. I want to talk about rejecting Federal authority in favor of State or local authority or rejecting government authority entirely.

I guess that what these people in the Department of Homeland Security mean is that the 10th amendment of the Constitution, which I consider an integral part of our system of federalism, is part of the danger that they see in this country, and I'm going to read the 10th amendment just so we're all clear on it.

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

I tell people when I speak to them, particularly to school groups, that the three most important words outside the Bible, in my opinion, are the words "we the people." That begins the preamble to the Constitution.

These folks see the American people as right-wing extremists in their concern for terrorists. So, as for those of us who are members of the Constitution Caucus, who for the last 4 years have come here on a fairly regular basis and who have talked about the 10th amendment in order to bring attention to the overreaching of the Federal Government, we're those right-wing extremists. So many patriots who have served in this House and in the Senate before us who felt very strongly about the 10th amendment and who did everything that they could to hold

down the reach of the Federal Government are considered right-wing extremists.

I just cannot understand how we have put in power in this country the kind of people who have so little regard for our Constitution.

You and I and all of us in this body, who come here every day to vote, are sworn to uphold the Constitution. Many of my "no" votes are based on the 10th amendment, rejecting Federal authority in favor of State or local authority. When I say that on this floor, then these people consider me a right-wing extremist. I don't consider myself a right-wing extremist. I consider myself a person who believes in this 10th amendment, which, by the way, we understand from history that the Constitution probably could not have been ratified had that amendment not been in this because the Founders understood so well what a dangerous country this would become if we gave too much power to the Federal Government.

I also fail to see how someone who holds fast to the Constitution and to the Bill of Rights should be lumped into a category with homegrown terrorists and violent racist groups. This is an affront and an insult to the millions of law-abiding and taxpaying citizens who long for a return to limited Federal Government and to a restoration of limited Federal power.

The question that must be answered in light of this document is: Since when does being a small government conservative make one a right-wing extremist?

The claims in this report that limited government activists pose a threat are completely unsubstantiated and paint law-abiding citizens with the broad brushstrokes of extremism.

I have to say that, I think, most of us who consider ourselves conservatives see this as a real slap in the face because we consider ourselves patriots for this country. I think also offensive—and I want to highlight another part of the definition of "right-wing extremists"—are those groups and individuals who are dedicated to a single issue, such as opposition to abortion or immigration.

You know, I'm not opposed to immigration. All of us come from people who immigrated to this country, but I am very much opposed to abortion, and that does not make me a right-wing extremist. That makes me, I believe, a person who celebrates life, and I believe that it is completely wrong to say that those of us who cherish life and who oppose abortion on demand pose a security risk to the United States. Such an assertion not only insults the moral beliefs of countless Americans but threatens their very right to freedom of expression. I've been on this floor many times in the past few months saying that I believe we're going down a slippery slope in this country in terms of how our right to freedom of expression may be impinged upon.

I think, again, this report—which, by the way, I'm going to post a link to it on my Web site because I want every American to have the right to read this and to make some judgment for themselves.

Opposition to abortion is a profoundly moral issue to those of us who oppose abortion. The willful taking of innocent human life is not a matter of right-wing extremism. It's a matter of conscience and of deep personal conviction. When we belittle our conscience and our deep personal convictions, we've come to, I think, a very, very bad place in our country. There is also not a shred of evidence anywhere to back up the claim made here that pro-life Americans who hold deeply rooted beliefs in the immorality of abortion are a threat to our Homeland Security. There is not a shred of evidence.

When people read this, they're going to see all kinds of assertions made in here that I do not believe they can back up. I think that, again, those assertions undermine our ability to have freedom of speech and are a real threat in the opposite way to our country.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas for taking on this Special Order tonight and for highlighting this report. I do hope that millions and millions of Americans are going to read this report. I believe they will judge for themselves that this is a bad definition for "right-wing extremism."

I yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

□ 1915

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentlelady for her excellent comments on what we're dealing with here.

You know, I think these—every kid that ever graduated from high school and took, whether they call it civics now or whether they call it government, and just had a brief study of the Constitution, knows that every single provision of the United States Constitution is equal and that these amendments have a purpose. They define what is our governing body. Remember, every person elected in this Congress and every person who serves in the Federal Government and every person who serves in the State government takes an oath to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution, all parts of the Constitution.

The 10th amendment, the part that says all those things that are not specifically given to the Federal Government or aren't specifically excluded from the State government, those powers belong to the States.

Now, to say that because a person believes that they ought to support what is written in the Constitution in the 10th amendment, that makes them a right-wing radical, then does somebody who thinks they ought to be able to—that we should support the right of free speech in the First Amendment, does that make you a right-wing radical? Does supporting any amendment or

any provision of the Constitution make you a right-wing radical?

I had one of my friends today say to me, 'They are radicalizing the war. If you are a right-wing radical because you're opposed to abortion and you're passionate on that issue, then does that make you a left-wing radical if you favor abortion and are passionate on that issue? If you are a right-wing radical if you believe that our Constitution clearly says that our citizenry has the right to keep and bear arms, do you become a left-wing radical when you believe that the government should regulate and take away the right to keep and bear arms?'

I mean, at what point does disagreement on issues make you a radical?

I see the gentledady from Minnesota, Mrs. BACHMANN, has risen to speak on this issue, and I will yield her such time as she may wish to consume.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank you, Judge CARTER, for holding this important forum this evening.

I think, just as Mrs. FOXX said of North Carolina, we absolutely can hardly believe that we're in this day and time when our own United States Government and our own Secretary of Homeland Security is illustrating a very different definition of words.

I think a lot of us were shocked when about a month ago the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano, came out and said that she would no longer call terrorists, what we know as terrorists, what the average American knows as terrorists—Osama bin Laden, people who actually committed and planned terrorist attacks on American soil and have, in fact, committed those attacks on American soil—she said for purposes, and I quote—she was in an interview with a German paper, and she was asked about the word "terrorism" and she said that she never—the questioner said, "You never mentioned the word 'terrorism.' Does Islamic terrorism suddenly no longer pose a threat to your country?" And the Secretary said, "Of course it does. I presume there is always a threat from terrorism. In my speech although, I did not use the word 'terrorism.' I referred to man-caused disasters." And I think it's important for the record to note she said that with a straight face. She decided not to use the word "terrorism" but "man-caused disaster." "That is, perhaps," the Secretary said, "only a nuance, but it demonstrates that we want to move away from the politics of fear toward a policy of being prepared for all risks that can occur."

Now, that's pretty interesting because the Secretary of Homeland Security was very careful to nuance her words. She didn't want to upset other countries, she didn't want to upset the terrorists by calling them "terrorists." So our Secretary of Homeland Security was very, very careful that she would no longer use the word "terrorism" and that she would very carefully nuance her words.

Well, while she was making that statement, we could only presume a re-

port was being issued, and the report that was being issued by Secretary Janet Napolitano's Department and it's called—we have it here. It's available to Americans now, and we will all be linking to it on our Web sites, I am sure—Right-Wing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment.

Now, this is interesting. Here we have the specter of our own Homeland Security Secretary who is very reluctant to call actual terrorists "terrorists," so we're all told now we have to wipe that dictionary definition clean. We have to call them manmade disasters, and we have to call acts of war "overseas contingencies." So we're now being told to alter and change our definition of words. While on the same hand she, under her authority, is issuing a right-wing extremism guide. This is an assessment. This was just released. I was really curious about this. It was released the day before all of the TEA parties occurred here in the United States talking about right-wing extremism.

What is very interesting is there was no reluctance to have any nuancing of any words in this report. I didn't see any, and I am sure that the judge from Texas, Judge CARTER, I don't see you saw any extremist, any willingness to have nuance of these words. As a matter of fact, as I was going through this document—and I invite every American to please go through this document—I am reading the words, "domestic right-wing terrorists." She is presuming that those who are on the right wing who hold conservative views apparently are not only terrorists, they are domestic terrorists here in this country.

And she goes on in item after item in this document, right-wing extremists, right-wing extremists, domestic terrorists, right-wing extremists. This sounds pretty serious. It must be that Osama bin Laden's guys got through the border. They are here. That must be the domestic terrorists she is talking about. Or maybe she is talking about those violent Mexican gangs. Maybe they got over the border. Maybe those are the domestic right-wing terrorists. Or perhaps the Secretary of Homeland Security is talking about those detainees down in Gitmo that are going to be released from Gitmo and put here on American soil. Maybe that's who the Secretary of Homeland Security is talking about.

But I don't think so. And the reason I think Mrs. FOXX doesn't think so and why Mr. CARTER doesn't think so, why Mr. BRADY doesn't think so, why Mr. BURGESS doesn't think so is because of the words that the Homeland Security Secretary states in this article.

Now, it's unclassified, but it is for official use only. I don't think the Department of Homeland Security had any idea that the American people were going to have access to this document because it says quite simply this,

that who they are concerned about are returning military veterans.

Now can you believe this? Every one of us, I think, are horrified when we hear this. Probably some of the most patriotic people that we know of are returning military veterans. They laid their lives down for you and for me and for this great country. No one has more love for this country than a returning military veteran. And here we have our own Department of Homeland Security calling these people potential domestic extremists, terrorists? This is unbelievable. I don't think any of us can believe it.

And I think we're at the point now where we need to have a hearing, we need to have our Director of Homeland Security in front of the Members of Congress, call her to account, ask her why on multiple occasions in this document she calls people who believe in the sanctity of life, who believe in owning firearms, who believe in serving their country in the military and coming back who are very concerned about the policies that this Nation is embarking on, spending too much money, taxing too much, it's all listed right here. These are the domestic right-wing extremists. That is so frightening that we need to have the Secretary of Homeland Security before the Members of Congress and ask her, does she really believe this? Is this really her opinion?

But if it is, I think it would be imperative and incumbent upon us to ask for her resignation. It is not too soon to do that. Because to consider whole blocks of the American electorate somehow a threat to American security—because I didn't notice any nuance in this document. There was no being careful. There was no saying, you know, we need to recognize and understand that there might be a difference of opinion, that there might be diversity of public opinion on these issues. There is no nuancing about that in this document. It is like a hammer coming down on interest group after interest group that apparently the Obama administration perceives as a threat.

Mr. CARTER. If I could reclaim my time to point out to the gentledady what we've got in this definition that I have got on this board right here. And it says, "right-wing extremism," I like this right here where it says "those that are mainly anti-government, rejecting Federal authority in favor of State and local authority."

Then, if I understood what the TEA parties were all about, the TEA parties were all about all of these millions of people that came out to express their right to free speech and to demonstrate and to step up and petition their government and say, "You know what? We don't like what the Federal Government is doing. We don't like the way you're taxing. We don't like the way you're spending." Guess what? The Obama administration just classified them as right-wing extremists, terrorists.

Now, if the gentledady needs to conclude her remarks and then—or maybe

I will let Mr. BRADY take over and then we will come back to you.

KEVIN BRADY, my good friend from Texas. I will yield you as much time as you need.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Congressman CARTER, thank you for your leadership on this issue.

Look at the board that you're standing next to. They are basically saying—our government is saying that right-wing extremists in the United States fall into two groups: those who hate others, hate-oriented groups, and those who are anti-government. So those who hate people and those who just don't think we ought to have a big government—according to our Department of Homeland Security—there is no difference. None. What kind of country are we becoming?

I, like you, was in front and participated in two of our TEA parties in Montgomery County. Hundreds of people attended downtown Conroe, thousands in the Woodlands at Creekside Park waiting hours to get to the park. Average people. Americans. The type that built this country.

I took a good look at this crowd and didn't see an extremist in the bunch. And don't you know I was looking for it after reading all about Secretary Napolitano's memo who paints them as the new national security threat in our country.

But let me tell you what I did see. I saw Americans who are fed up with the government spending their money hand-over-fist, Americans who live within their means and pay taxes to a government that, starting this Saturday, will run out of money for the entire year. We just paid our taxes on the 15th. The government is already out of money, living on a credit card. They are asking why. What is extremist about that?

I saw Americans who want secure borders, Americans who welcome immigrants who are seeking a better life. They are just asking that they come in through the front door of legal immigration rather than the back door of illegal immigration, just like generations of Americans before them.

I saw veterans, veterans from World War II, Korea, Vietnam, veterans home from Iraq and Afghanistan. They didn't look extreme or maladjusted or dangerous. They looked concerned for a country they put their lives on the line for. As Mrs. BACHMANN said, they put their lives on the line. And now this country is at a crossroads, and these veterans who are willing to fight for it overseas, they are also willing to fight for their country here at home by speaking out. And my brother, who I am so proud of, a master sergeant in the Army, served in Iraq, has been deployed overseas as well, he's not extremist. He's my hero.

□ 1930

And I would say that goes for every family that has someone who served in our wars; they are not the threat to

America, man, they are the solution for America.

I think Americans are waking up all across this country—we saw this this past week—they want to know if Congress, they want to know if Washington hears them. And it seems to me that not only do they not believe they are extreme, they believe the Constitution gives them the right to disagree, respectfully and forcefully, with their government, that the Constitution actually allows them to question these decisions, to question reports like you, Congressman CARTER, have brought to light, rightfully so. They want and are speaking out for lower taxes. They are speaking out for families. They are speaking out for the unborn. They want all the rights afforded them in the Constitution under the Bill of Rights, including the right to keep and bear arms, and they simply ask that it be protected.

In case anyone hasn't noticed, there are a lot of people in America who think that solutions to our country come from individuals, families, neighborhoods, local communities, even States. And they don't get anointed from Washington and then passed on to—Washington doesn't know best. And just because people believe in those rights, they shouldn't be labeled as extremists.

The Secretary's comments were offensive. She apologized to veterans, sort of.

Mr. CARTER. Not really.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Not much, not much at all. And she absolutely ignored everyone else. And it seems to me that she should recant this report forcibly. She should apologize to everyone who was offended. As you said, 80 percent of Americans are now a national security threat. She should apologize to them. She should commit to the American people that she will not confuse the patriots within our country who want to build it up with extremists outside who want to tear it down. There is a huge difference. And if our government doesn't know, I really am frightened. Some pundit said, you know, maybe the snake is out of the box. Maybe this really is the attitude of our government about those who simply disagree with it. If it is, then the TEA parties will only continue to grow to be more valuable, to be critical to where we go.

I appreciate Congresswoman BACHMANN, Congressman BURGESS—you, especially, Congressman CARTER—for bringing this issue to us tonight so the American public can see that we are as outraged and angry at this report as they are, and we intend to hold those accountable who drafted and support it.

With that, I would yield back.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and my good friend, very much for his comments. As you were saying that, you know, I had to think, if you are first classifying people who disagree with you as terrorists, or dan-

gerous, then the next step is dealing with those people. The next step may be, we'll read headlines like this, "Venezuelan Government arrests Chavez opponent." "Equatorial Guinea: Arrest and torture of political opponents." "Zimbabwe arrests opposition leaders." "Britain tells Pakistan Government don't arrest political opponents." "Obama administration issues warning over right-wing extremists." What is the next headline going to say? I am not trying to be a scare factor, but when you start classifying ordinary Americans who disagree with you as an extremist, we have to be concerned.

I am not going to change my position on State's rights and the right of our States under our Constitution. I am not going to change my position on abortion. I am not going to change my position on the right to keep and bear arms. And if I have to go to prison for it, I am going to do it because that is what our Founding Fathers would have done. And that is where we have got to be.

I yield back to Mrs. BACHMANN.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I also thank Mr. BRADY for his remarkable words as well.

I think, in answer to where do we go from here? We need look no further than the statements that were made by then candidate Obama during the election when he said this—this is a statement of President Obama during last year's election campaign that got remarkably little attention in the media, but he suggested the creation of a Federal police force comparable to the size of the military. And he made that statement, I believe, in Colorado Springs, Colorado. And so the question that we need to ask is, why would you need such an organization? There is no constituency calling for a Federal police force, there is no one out there doing it. But yet, Barack Obama made the suggestion himself that we needed to create and fund a domestic army that would be a Federal police force. Why would we need a Federal police force the size of the U.S. military? For what purpose? Would it be for this purpose?

It is intriguing to me, we have a report now that says—as Mr. BRADY said and as Judge CARTER said—80 percent of the American people would be classified as "right-wing extremists" under this report. Couple that with a statement made by President Obama during the campaign that we need to have a Federal police force the size of the military. Add it up. No wonder people right now who are gun owners, who cherish their second amendment rights, are purchasing weapons and are purchasing ammunition. They see the handwriting on the wall. They know the Obama administration is looking at weapon bans and is looking at pulling back on gun ownership and registration of firearms, and they are rightly concerned about that. So what? They are purchasing firearms lawfully. They are purchasing

ammunition lawfully. And yet this document would categorize these law-abiding citizens, which our Founders—as Judge CARTER correctly stated, are exercising their second amendment right to own and bear arms. They are doing that, and now our government is calling them right-wing extremists?

We need to be on this floor tonight. We need to be outraged. And furthermore, we need answers, as Mr. BRADY said, from the Secretary of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano. What did she really mean? Does she agree with this report? Does she recant this report? If not, she should resign.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I am going to yield just briefly to Mr. BRADY.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Congressman CARTER, again, I appreciate your leadership on this issue, but it begs the question of the discussion tonight; in America, we don't tolerate racial profiling, so why are we tolerating values profiling? Why are we allowing this government to profile people based on those who believe in smaller, limited government, who believe in pro-family issues, who believe in their constitutional right, the second amendment, or who just believe they ought to be able to disagree with their government? Why is our government profiling those with values at a time when we ought to be encouraging all Americans to raise their values, to speak out, to be engaged? It seems to me we have got the gun pointed at ourselves when we really ought to be, again, protecting this country against the real terrorists who threaten our way of life, not those inside who are trying to preserve it.

I just want to thank you and our other speakers tonight for their very insightful remarks on this issue.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time for a moment, the other thing that is very offensive to me—and I think it should be very offensive to every American—is that this report, when you read it—and we haven't even touched it, but I am going to tell you I am going to touch it right now—almost every paragraph begins, “Due to the election of an African American President.” They are lumping everyone who disagrees politically with them, they are lumping them all into a racist category. And that is offensive to me. That should be offensive to every single free American that breathes a breath on this soil because disagreeing with your government does not make you a racist against electing an African American. With all that we have done and this great victory of an African American President that everybody recognizes as a turning point in the history of America, and then to say, but anyone that disagrees with anything he says or anything he does or anything anybody under his auspices does is a racist and a domestic terrorist?

I agree with the gentelady from Minnesota; it is time to talk seriously about who is in charge of the new

Obama department that we have got that is supposed to be protecting our Nation, Homeland Security.

I have my very good friend and colleague, one of my classmates, and a very intelligent gentleman, Mr. BURGESS from Texas, who has been my buddy since we got here, and I am glad to yield the time he needs.

Mr. BURGESS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, home on the 2-week recess that we just had, you are so busy—recess is a misnomer, you are so busy going from one place to another that oftentimes you don't even have an opportunity to keep up with the current events of the day. And I did what I was doing so often as I drive through my rather long and narrow district, I was listening to talk radio, a subversive station there in the Dallas/Fort Worth market, and they started talking about this report that had just come out from the Secretary. Well, I was so upset about what I was hearing on the radio that I got on my phone and I called the staff up here in the Washington office and I said, we need to get a letter to the Department of Homeland Security, to the Secretary right away. So I am going to read to you a few excerpts from the letter that I wrote last week to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security. And Judge, it actually goes back to something that you were saying.

Within the letter, the report states that “the economic downturn and the election of the first African American President present unique drivers for right-wing radicalization and recruitment.” The report goes on to connect associations with right-leaning ideology with the Oklahoma City bombing, the murder of law enforcement officials, bank robbery, attacks on infrastructure, racism, and bigotry in general. This report claims that, “high unemployment leads to alienation, increasing an individual's susceptibility to extremist ideas.”

This report appears to claim that high unemployment amongst Caucasians, Christians, second amendment supporters and Armed Forces veterans has a causal relationship with radicalism and violence against the State. I call into question this underlying assumption and baseless claim. The implication that veterans returning home from serving our country are at risk of becoming domestic terrorists or assassins is sensational at best, but dishonorable and disrespectful of their service.

Profiling based on race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or life experiences is always wrong. I believe the Department of Homeland Security owes an apology to the Americans that are offended by this report, especially to the men and women of our Armed Forces. Furthermore, the Department should rescind this report so that those local, State and Federal law enforcement officials who received it are not compelled to profile individuals as terrorists simply

because they associate themselves with conservative organizations. I ask that you enact these recommendations on behalf of the constituents of the 26th District of Texas.

And just briefly, I want to read some lines from a stack of mail that I got from my constituents back home. Some of them are pretty outspoken. A resident from Flower Mound, Texas put it pretty simply; “Fire Napolitano immediately. The United States is not a police state.” Another resident wrote, “The only acceptable response is to fire Secretary Napolitano immediately. No apology should be accepted. Even her resignation should not be allowed. All Americans should demand that the Secretary be fired without delay.”

Another resident from Mound, “Dear Congressman Burgess: Americans are repulsed by the leaked DHS Anti-Terrorism Security Assessment Summary that clearly targets mainstream Americans as dangerous extremists.”

A resident from Keller, Texas, “The report issued yesterday by the Department of Homeland Security was reprehensible and insulting to tens and millions of Americans. The statement issued today by Secretary Napolitano standing behind the report is absolutely inexcusable. Secretary Napolitano should resign.”

A resident from Hurst, quoting from the body of the letter, “I ask you to speak out against this kind of rhetoric, Congressman, and to call for the immediate resignation of the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Janet Napolitano.”

Another resident writing from Hurst said, “In fact, I am considering calling the Department of Homeland Security and giving them my name and address so they can keep an eye on me and my radical ideas, like a smaller Federal Government, more control back to the States. Maybe we should start a list for them.”

A resident from Corinth, Texas stated, quite simply, “Fire Janet Napolitano immediately. I viewed her so-called apology on Fox and Friends in the morning on Thursday; that was no apology as she stands by the report.”

Another one writing in said, “I have spent over 20 years of my life serving my country as an officer in the United States Navy fighting to protect the Constitution and America from the very likes of this. I joined during the Cold War, and I know firsthand how Communists act and what they do to political dissenters. Now to have this said of me and my family, my children, my friends, my neighbors, my church, and everyone else I know by my own government makes me”—I'll use a colloquial term here, I'll just say “sick to my stomach.”

□ 1945

I demand Janet Napolitano's immediate firing. She has demonstrated she is unfit for service in any capacity in the U.S. governments. Another resident of Flower Mound. “This is disgusting. Of all the departments and

agencies in our government which should be apolitical, Homeland Security is one of the most, if not the most critical, to remain apolitical. They are tasked with defending all Americans. I implore you to call for a congressional investigation immediately. I urge you to call immediately for the resignation of Secretary Napolitano. If she is so concerned with advancing a political agenda, let her go work for ACORN, whoever they are."

A resident from Pilot Point, "Warmest regards from Pilot Point. We are former U.S. Army officers. One of us is a West Point graduate. We are both veterans of Desert Storm. Both of our fathers and my grandfather are veterans. My father was a career Army officer and my uncle a Navy fighter pilot. My little brother, a U.S. Army officer, has served tours in Afghanistan and just returned from a tour in Iraq last month.

"Forgive my tedious intro, but in the spirit of full disclosure, I thought you should know that we are biased. We bleed red, white and blue. I cannot find the words to share with you, how repugnant we find the justification of discriminatory governmental directives and a complete lack of rational government demonstrated by the DHS Secretary.

"Someone can be given knowledge, but unless they truly accept and internalize the error of their actions they cannot be taught good judgment. She must be held accountable with a full investigation. Short of that, please demand her resignation.

"There is no apology that will change the discriminatory character that she demonstrates and apparently supports. Please make an outspoken stand on principle. I feel we cannot change her character."

Well, to the two Army officers from Pilot Point, consider it done.

Resident from Lantana, "Why have Republicans not been screaming for Janet Napolitano's firing? My employees would be fired in this situation."

It goes on to say "I love you, and I went to the Denton TEA party."

A resident from North Richland Hills, "Returning veterans are being subjected to unjust scrutiny by the DHS Secretary."

A resident from Denton, "Her pronouncements are an insult to every American and probably 95 percent of hardworking citizens. To hear such word from a high-ranking Federal employee, language that denigrates those who defend our country and every patriotic American makes me one that Napolitano, I suppose, would consider a threat even though I have always thought that nothing in my personal life and belief system would so delegate me."

Well, I have a few more, but in the interest of time, I am going to stop there. Those are some of the most poignant that were submitted to the office.

Certainly this is something that has gotten people's attention and appro-

priately so. I think, Judge, you are doing the correct thing by having this special hour tonight, giving many of us a chance to come down to the floor and talk about this.

I can't say it any better than my constituents have said it, an investigation, to be sure, a replacement of the Secretary, I think, is certainly in order, and I do have to question the sincerity of an administration that would not undertake these measures after the types of very, very painful words that have been included in that report, and how it has affected those that we have depended upon to fight for us and maintain our freedom.

APRIL 16, 2009.

Hon. JANET NAPOLITANO,
Secretary, U.S. Department of Homeland Security,
Federal Office Building, Washington,
DC.

DEAR SECRETARY NAPOLITANO: I am writing to express my concerns regarding a recent Department of Homeland Security (DHS) report entitled, "Rightwing Extremism: Current Economic and Political Climate Fueling Resurgence in Radicalization and Recruitment." This report claims to provide law enforcement officials with the tools to help them deter, prevent, preempt, correspond to terrorist attacks against the United States. I understand the purpose of shared intelligence, however, I am concerned that by broadly characterizing those who support a conservative ideology with terrorism the DHS may have mischaracterized and offended several million Americans and placed them at risk of profiling bylaw enforcement officials.

This report states, "The Economic downturn and the election of the first African American president present unique drivers for rightwing radicalization and recruitment." The report goes on to connect associations with right-leaning ideology with the Oklahoma City bombing, the murder of law enforcement officials, bank robbery, attacks on infrastructure, and racism and bigotry in general.

This report claims that "high unemployment leads to alienation, increasing an individual's susceptibility to extremist ideas." This report appears to claim that high unemployment among Caucasians, Christians, Second Amendment supporters, and Armed Forces Veterans has a causal relationship with radicalism and violence against the state. I call into question this underlying assumption and baseless claim. The implication that veterans returning home from serving our country are at risk of becoming domestic terrorists or assassins is sensational at best and is dishonorable and disrespectful to their service.

Profiling based on race, ethnicity, religious beliefs, or life experiences is always wrong. I believe the Department of Homeland Security owes an apology to the Americans that are offended by this report, especially the men and women of our Armed Forces. Furthermore, the Department should rescind this report so those local, state, and federal law enforcement officials who received it are not compelled to profile individuals as terrorists simply because they associate themselves with conservative organizations.

I urge you to enact these recommendations on behalf of the constituents of the 26th District of Texas.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL C. BURGESS, M.D.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my good friend for his comments. Let me read some-

thing just for a moment from this report, let me read something. As we recall, we have had a lot of discussion on this floor by our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, about some of the things that they are concerned about in manufacturing.

Let me read you another definition of right-wing extremists. "Right-wing extremist views bemoan the decline of the U.S. stature and have recently focused on themes such as U.S. manufacturing capability going to China and India. Russian control of interview resources and the use of these to pressure other countries, and China's investment in the United States real estate and corporations, are part of the subversive strategy."

Wait a minute, we have been arguing on the floor of this House with Democrats bemoaning China taking jobs away from the manufacturing industry. Good Lord, they are domestic terrorists. Good Lord, you know, I am pretty dad gum mad about this, and I agree with my colleagues.

Mr. President, fire that woman. Ms. Napolitano, this is inexcusable to go on television and say, your apology would be, "I am sorry you were offended by this report."

That's no apology. That's saying I am sorry, you have got a chance to read it, and know what our plans were for you in the future.

Mr. President, respectfully, this woman deserves firing. I think it's time we act.

I yield to my friend from Minnesota. Mrs. BACHMANN. Again, I agree with Judge CARTER of I think he is exactly right. I think the question we need to ask now is what's next, political show trials? That's the concern.

When you have disagreement of political opinion, and then you set up the grounds for punishment for disagreement with political opinion, then the government creates what's called political show trials. In other words, kangaroo courts where people are put on trial for their political beliefs.

So what's next? Is it political show trials? Well, shazam, wouldn't you know it, just this week President Obama, together with MoveOn.org, MoveOn.org running television adds by the way, this week calling for political show trials of those in the Bush administration that worked so hard to keep the American people free from terrorist acts, real terrorist acts, like trying to blow Americans up on American soil.

The problem is the Homeland Security Secretary has now redefined real terrorists as foreign victims with Miranda rights and access to American courts with lawyers paid for by the American taxpayer, while at the same time the Homeland Security S has redefined pro-life gun-owning veterans who like smaller government and who believe America should secure our borders against invasion from illegal aliens as domestic right-wing extremists, as you have in the report upon the stand.

Homeland Security, I think we should also note, has the Transportation Security Administration. Any of our constituents that go to the airport, they see people that have TSA on their shirts.

You can't get on a plane in the United States, a commercial aircraft, without going through security. What's going to happen now? Will the Federal Government start IDing returning veterans, start IDing gun owners, start IDing pro-lifers and then pull us out of line for special searches at the airports before we are allowed to get on a plane because we could be considered a domestic right-wing terrorist while we would see Osama bin Laden and his friends skate by because they are not, because maybe they would be involved in a manmade disaster. But those who are pro-life gun owners, returning veterans on the other side, they are the real threat?

This is an upside down Alice in Wonderland world. I can see why the American people are so upset right now. They are so upset. They look at what's happening. They shake their head. They say, is this America? Is this what we are used to? We are normal God-fearing people who love this country, and now we are the threat while Osama bin Laden and the people who seek to really bring us harm are let off scot free. And we are going to call them manmade disaster, we have got to be nuanced and so careful so we don't hurt their feelings?

Has this Homeland Security Secretary gone absolutely stark raving mad? She needs to come before Congress. She needs to answer a few questions.

I don't think Mr. BURGESS is the only one with constituents that want to know. I think all of us have constituents that want to get some answers to these questions.

Mr. CARTER. You know, I am just reading some more of our report, it just continues to be more and more offensive.

The category where this provision comes from, talking about right-wing extremists being our returning veterans, some examples given, after Operation Desert Shield/Storm 1990-1991, some returning military veterans, including Timothy McVeigh, joined and associated with right-wing extremist groups.

Yes, maybe Timothy McVeigh did, but the veterans that MIKE BURGESS just read about, they didn't. Okay? They served their Nation, and they have left the military service and have been good citizens of his congressional district, and yet they lumped them with Timothy McVeigh.

Another one says, a prominent civil rights organization report, without telling us who they are, "that large numbers of potentially violent neo-Nazi skinheads and other white supremacists are now learning the art of warfare in the United States Armed Forces."

That is so insulting, it's beyond belief, it's beyond belief. It is condemning every bit of our Armed Forces.

So basically they are there. We are not sure who they are. Watch them all. Watch they all. They have got a uniform on. If it says Iraq or Afghanistan or has that American flag, keep an eye on those guys. They might shave their head when they get home and be a skin head. What kind of paranoia is this? It's just beyond belief that there is this kind of thought processes beginning this term of an American President, someone he put in this position.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Less than 100 days, within 90 days.

Mr. CARTER. That's exactly right. This is his responsibility. He chose to be our leader, he needs to lead on this issue.

It is absolutely inexcusable to let a head of a major department, whose purpose is to protect the innocent of this country, to accuse possibly 80 percent of Americans of being right-wing extremists.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Judge CARTER, you are exactly right, because what you are doing is you are calling into question the judgment of President Obama by selecting this Secretary of Homeland Security to come out with a report. Insulting 80 percent of the American people within 90 days of assuming office? You are exactly right.

On page 4 of this report, "It says prominent antigovernment conspiracy theorists have incorporated aspects of an impending economic collapse." Aren't we all worried about that? Economic collapse to intensify fear and paranoia.

But then it goes on to say this. This is for people of faith. This is where people of faith need to perk up their ears because the report actually says this.

It says, End Times prophecies could motivate extremist individuals and groups that stockpile food, ammunition and weapons. These teachings have also been linked with a radicalization of domestic extremist individuals and groups in the past, such as violent Christian identity organizations."

I find this offensive.

Mr. CARTER. I do too.

Mrs. BACHMANN. The percentage of people who believe in this Book of Revelations, End Times prophecy, the Book of Daniel, the Book of Ezekiel, the Book of Isaiah, the people who believe in the teachings of Christ that talk about end-time prophecy? These are people that our government should be watching out for?

This administration needs to be ashamed of this. This is a piece of religious bigotry. That's what this is. This is religious bigotry.

As a matter of fact, we were told we were going to deal with hate crime laws this week. I think this document is an example of hate crimes on the part of the Federal Government labeling its own citizens, practically calling

American citizens criminals to be tracked down by an American government.

And we have to keep in mind the statement that President Obama said on the campaign trail that he believed that a Federal police force should be created, just the same size of the U.S. military, unbelievable, and the media didn't pick up on it. The American people need to know.

Mr. CARTER. What was the exact term that you said that he was calling those that are outside the country, rather than terrorists? Now Ms. Napolitano calls them something nebulous.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes. What she said in her interview exactly, "I did not use the word 'terrorism,' I referred to man-caused disasters. That's perhaps only a nuance, but it demonstrates that we want to move away from the politics of fear," from the politics of fear.

Mr. CARTER. So a person who believes in an interpretation of the Book of Revelations in the Bible is, by her definition, labeled as a terrorist.

But a man who, live on television, on videotape, cuts another man's head off on television in the name of another religion is a what?

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's right, a man-caused disaster.

Mr. CARTER. Man-caused disaster.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's skewed thinking. We had a man who beheaded his wife in upstate New York. Not a word was said about that. The media didn't cover it, I didn't see anything here about religious groups where maybe something like that would happen, it's unbelievable the accusations that are made in this document.

Mr. CARTER. Before we finish here, because we are about to run out of time, I want to say something else. When we are talking about immigration, we are not talking about people who come to this country legally.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's exactly right.

Mr. CARTER. We are not talking about people who came here illegally and meet their obligation to the country, get in line and become good American citizens.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's exactly right.

Mr. CARTER. We are talking about people who break this law in this country. We all, every one of us support immigration, good legal immigration in this country, because that's who we are. Every one of us, unless we are an American, a Native American is an illegal immigrant.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of death in family.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of illness.