

gulag of prisons in the Caribbean to totalitarian state of the Castro brothers, a few days ago six heroes managed to get a statement out of one of the prisons, and I'd like to read it at this time.

"We continue to suffer cruel treatment, inhuman, degrading treatment, and even torture in the Communist regime's prisons. We ask all who support Cuba's freedom to, between March 12 and March 31, unite in short periods of fasting and study of the Bible, demanding the liberation of all political prisoners and liberty and democracy in Cuba. Please engage in short fasts and prayer sessions in your homes, churches, or other public gathering places, and speak out in articles and conferences to reflect upon and help implement, through peaceful, just, and patriotic means, the long-sought objectives of the Cuban people."

And this statement is from Oscar Elias Biscet, Julio Cesar Galvez, Ricardo Gonzalez, Normando Hernandez, Regis Iglesias, and Angel Moya. They are in the Combinado del Este prison of Cuba. This was sent March 3rd.

The Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies was formed this last Friday, Madam Speaker, under the leadership of Lithuania, that is chairing the Community of Democracies, and especially a magnificent diplomat, Ambassador Pavilionis.

Lithuania led the Community of Democracies to form a parliamentary assembly, the Parliamentary Forum, and the first meeting was held in Vilnius, Lithuania, on Friday. And the first resolution by motion of the new president of the Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies, President Zingeris, the first resolution of that Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies, I'd like to read. It's titled Calling for Support of Cuba's Pro-Democracy Movement. In the convening meeting, the Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies, Vilnius, Lithuania, March 12, 2010:

"Whereas the pro-democracy movement in Cuba has grown at a rapid pace over the last 3 years, and specifically expressions of the movement are evident today in the explosion of bloggers, independent journalists and musicians, artists, writers, and others who are using their talents to denounce the atrocities of the dictatorship, all while putting forth new ideas for the transition to democracy;

"Whereas there are still extraordinary obstacles to overcome such as the continued repression by the totalitarian dictatorship, extremely limited access to the Internet and 'texting' capabilities, and a lack of a coherent message of solidarity from the international community;

"Whereas the dictatorship is fearful of the growth of the pro-democracy movement;

"Whereas the message of the movement is coherent and clear in demanding freedom for all Cuban political prisoners, beginning with those are

gravely ill inside the prisons, freedom of expression, and fair multiparty elections with international supervision;

"Whereas this common position of the Cuban pro-democracy movement requires recognition, dissemination, and solidarity on the part of the international community;

"Whereas now more than ever the Cuban pro-democracy movement requires that the democratic community take concrete steps to demonstrate its solidarity;

"Now, therefore it is resolved by the Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies that it condemns the brutality of the Cuban regime against Cuban political prisoners;

expresses its full support for the Cuban pro-democracy movement;

honors Cuban pro-democracy fighters such as the martyr Orlando Zapata Tamayo and express its admiration for the efforts of other heroes such as Guillermo Farinas;

calls for the immediate release of all Cuban political prisoners and free multiparty elections in Cuba; and

calls on the democratic community to take concrete steps in demonstrating their solidarity with the Cuban pro-democracy movement by providing humanitarian and technological assistance to the pro-democracy movement, urging foreign diplomatic posts in Havana to strengthen contacts with pro-democracy activists on the island, encouraging foreign dignitaries to visit Cuba for the sole purpose of meeting with pro-democracy activists, and looking for opportunities to reiterate and support the common position of the Cuban pro-democracy movement in the international community."

This action by the Parliamentary Forum of the Community of Democracies deserves commendation. Those heroes in the gulag who are suffering today are the leaders of Cuba tomorrow, and they deserve our support.

THE RULE OF LAW

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 as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, for the past, about—I don't know—12 to 18 months, I've been coming on the floor of the House and talking about various aspects of the rule of law. The rule of law is the underpinning upon which our society is built. We've talked about this over and over. We've talked about it in terms of ethical issues that pertain to people in this House. We've talked about it in terms of criminal actions. We've talked about it in terms of what's going on with our military.

You heard some speakers here tonight raise some issues concerning how we fight wars, rules of engagement. All of these are rules we set for ourselves in some form or fashion.

Well, I've also been on this floor talking about the fact that political correctness, in my humble opinion, is becoming so rampant in our society that we forget the "why" of what we are doing because we're so afraid of offending someone.

I am from central Texas. My district includes the largest military facility, as far as soldiers are concerned, on the face of the globe, Fort Hood, Texas. I think everybody, those of us from central Texas, we know Fort Hood, and when we hear Fort Hood we have a lot of great thoughts about the great soldiers out there, we have great thoughts about the great commanders that serve at Fort Hood, about the awesome accomplishments of the soldiers that have passed through Fort Hood for generations, fighting our Nation's battles on every shore you can imagine and all over this country, dating back to the Civil War.

Fort Hood doesn't date back to the Civil War, but Fort Hood is named after a Civil War soldier. We are proud of Fort Hood.

But, unfortunately, because of something that happened this year, Fort Hood will also be identified always in the minds of American citizens as a place where a terrorist stabbed people in the back by walking down the line of soldiers and shooting soldiers just standing in line, either checking in from going to war or checking out, getting ready to go to war. They were not armed. They were not doing anything more than what's required of them by the Army to process into or out of the facility.

And yet, a man who's now—we call him the accused, but over 200 people witnessed Mr. Hasan go on a shooting rampage, killing soldiers who were doing nothing more than standing in line, or processing another soldier. These were not people that were at war or were armed to defend themselves. Had they been armed to defend themselves, Mr. Hasan wouldn't have gotten over more than maybe one shot before he would have died, because these were professional soldiers who knew exactly how to take care of business.

But they were not armed. And, in fact, they were in a safe place. That's the sad thing. They were in a safe place, a place where they should have been safe or where they thought they were safe, and where maybe never again they will think that they are safe because of what happened that day.

□ 2015

Now, this was not some terrorist that sneaked into our country. This was a man that had joined the United States Army and, through the goodness of the American citizen and the American taxpayer, received a medical degree with a psychiatric specialty; and all of this was paid for by the United States Army. He did his medical school, his residency, his post-residency training and his residency for psychiatry all

while working for the U.S. Army and all paid for by the United States Government. He was an American citizen.

And yet homemade jihadism, we're now calling it, and some of that has been in the news this week, caused this man to go out and murder 13 people and one unborn child and wound or injure 43 additional people. There's one soldier right now—I won't mention his name but if he's watching he'll know who I'm talking about—he's sitting in a hospital in South Austin, he was shot multiple times, he's had a plate put in his head and it was rejected and he's going to have another plate put in his head. When I talked to his father, his father said: Two deployments. We prayed and worried our son all the way through two deployments. He came out with not a scratch. He's at home where he should be safe and this animal killed him; almost killed him. He's surviving through his heart being big and being tough and having a family and an Army that supports him.

This young man had been so successful in his last deployment that they were sending him to Officer Candidate School. He was not even stationed at Fort Hood. He was just transitioning through there to Officer Candidate School when he was shot. He still hopes to be an officer in the United States Army, and we are very hopeful that he will be, but he's a seriously wounded soldier. But he's going to make it and hopefully he'll get back in the Army that he loves.

And this is this domestic terrorist who decided he would take it upon himself to start a fight, right there at Fort Hood. Not a real fight, a one-sided fight, where he was the only guy with a gun. He had two of them. And he got to selectively shoot who he wanted to shoot, and he shot men and women in uniform. I don't know about you, but I think this was just another theater of war, a war that we've been fighting in Iraq and a war that we've been fighting in Afghanistan, against these terrorists who indiscriminately think that they have the right to kill in the name of whatever cause they call it. Some would say they are religious fanatics. Others would say they are jihadists and they have some kind of fanatical following. Whatever it may be. This is who we've been at war with now for 10 or 12 years.

And as we were told when it all started, it's going to be a long fight, maybe the longest in the history of the Republic. And it's approaching that now. I think these kids, these young men and women, were killed on the battlefield of Fort Hood, and that's why I've introduced a piece of legislation to have them get the kind of benefits of people who get killed in combat or wounded in combat get, and that is that if there are medals to be awarded, they should get a medal; if they are wounded, they should get a Purple Heart.

I've already heard a story of a sergeant who was there with several of his troops. The sergeant was shot four

times and as the man lowered the pistol to fire the fifth time, one of his enlisted men, thinking he couldn't take anymore, jumped in between the shooter and the sergeant to protect his sergeant and took the three other rounds that were fired. Had that taken place on the battlefield, I'm sure that would be something that would be heroism in the line of fire, and I think that young man should be awarded something like the Bronze Star, the Silver Star, something like that. I don't know. I'm not saying what medal, but he ought to get a medal for it. And if there are families from this combat experience who either lost a loved one or were injured from this battle at Fort Hood, I think they ought to get the extended combat benefits that we give to our soldiers when we send them into harm's way on a battlefield. And I think the American people, if they heard about that, would think, sure they ought to get that; that this was just another battle.

Because, remember, the testimony will be when this trial comes out, because I've talked to a lot of these soldiers that were there, that he was shooting soldiers. If he hit any civilians, it's just because he missed. But he was walking down the line shooting soldiers. He was declaring war on the American soldier.

I wanted to talk tonight about Fort Hood and what's going on there, the fact that we've got a report out that doesn't even mention radical jihadists or mention even the name of the shooter, and I'm afraid it was done because somebody was afraid they were going to step on somebody's toes. I've had some tell me they did it because they wanted to protect the prosecution of this man. Being a judge who tried cases in his courtroom for 20 years, including, I believe, five or six capital murder cases, I can assure you that if you can't prove a case with 200 eyewitnesses, you've got a serious problem with your lawyers. So I don't hesitate to say what I think about this thing because I think it was wrong for them not to report accurately who the person was and what he did.

I am joined by a good friend of mine who is a former Federal prosecutor, MIKE MCCAUL. He's my friend, my colleague from Texas, my neighbor, right down the road. I'm glad he's come to join us, and I will yield to my friend from Texas whatever time he wishes to consume.

Mr. MCCAUL. I thank the gentleman from Texas and your hosting this leadership hour and your great leadership on this issue. You and I see this the same way. You were a judge. I was a Federal prosecutor. We respect the rule of law, but we respect the truth. We call it like it is. We call it like we see it. That's what Texans do. And the way I see it is this matter has been swept under the rug; we're not calling it what it is.

You and I, I think, were some of the first two Members of Congress to stand up and say, you know what, that was

an act of terrorism that occurred the other day at Fort Hood. That was an act of a terrorist. Not some criminal defendant. This was an act of terrorism. You stood up, in representing Fort Hood in your usual way, and said that's what it was and I stood up and said the same. And it took months before the Secretary of Homeland Security came before our committee and finally acknowledged what we had said all along and that this was truly an act of terrorism.

I want to congratulate you for your bill, which essentially acknowledges it for what it was, and that was an act of war on U.S. soil, combat, recognizing the victims and their families, giving them the combat pay that they deserve. You and I were at the ceremony, the memorial service, one of the most dramatic memorial services I think I've ever attended. I know the gentleman feels the same way.

I just wanted to hold up a picture of that tragic day, where we had 13 pairs of combat boots, 13 rifles with 13 helmets honoring the dead and, of course, one unborn child; 43 injured, two of those injured standing next to me in this photograph. I asked them the question, because they are the best evidence, what happened that day? They were shot by him. What did he say to you? And these two said: Congressman, he said "Allahu Akbar." He screamed "Allahu Akbar" as he gunned down my colleagues in cold blood, as he wounded 43 soldiers on the base, the largest military installation in the country.

And who is this man? I met with General Cone at the ceremony and I said, Would you have liked to have known that a major on your base was making communications with the top al Qaeda operative?

Sure I would have.

What happened that day? The Joint Terrorism Task Force who I used to work with when I was a prosecutor had that evidence; a Department of Defense representative on the JTTF had that evidence; but for a variety of reasons—and I've questioned witnesses on this—did not want to share that with the commander of Fort Hood; for a variety of reasons. But for God's sake at least let the commanding officer know that he's got a major—this is not some ordinary event—a major on his base talking to an al Qaeda operative in Yemen, a man who it has come to our attention in a big way recently with the Christmas bomber, the same radical cleric who talked to the Christmas bomber.

But who is Mr. Hasan? And thank God he's a terrorist that is going to face a military tribunal. Well, he was born of Jordanian immigrants. Each of these, as the case unfolded, if you will, raised a flag as to who is this man. We talk a lot about connecting the dots, but these were dots that popped up that were failed to be acted upon. Why weren't these dots acted upon?

A man who said his allegiance was to the Koran, not the Constitution.

A man who described the war on terrorism as a war against Islam, according to a doctor who was in a graduate program with him.

A man who argued that Muslims are being targeted by U.S. anti-terror campaigns. A former classmate said of Mr. Hasan, he was very vocal about the war; very up-front about being a Muslim first and an American second.

And if that's politically incorrect for me to say that, all I'm saying here in this Chamber is the truth. You take it for what it is.

He was also concerned that Muslims in the military were being persecuted. On his business cards—this is all the evidence of this man—his business card said Soldier of Allah. We know that the morning of the shooting he wore traditional Pakistani garb at the 7-Eleven that morning. He was known to wear that off-duty. Certainly there are religious protections in this country for that.

But all these flags put together shows us an individual who was presenting a threat to the soldiers. We know al Qaeda has targeted military installations. We know they targeted Fort Dix. The question that General Cone asked me was, We just don't know how many more Hasans are out there. How many more Hasans are out there who are a direct threat to our military installations? The cleric in Yemen basically said that Hasan trusted him and praised him as a hero after the shooting. "God is great," that's what he screamed when he shot those men in cold blood. I can't think of anything more sickening to my heart as a God-fearing man, a Christian, or anybody who believes in God, to believe in a God where you could say, "God is great" as you're killing somebody. That's a perverted, twisted religion. That is what we are dealing with.

I have asked the Homeland Security Committee through letters. I am ranking on the Homeland Security Intelligence Subcommittee. I asked Chairwoman JANE HARMAN to hold hearings on this. We asked BENNIE THOMPSON, the majority chairman of the Homeland Security Committee, to hold hearings on this matter, because the American people are entitled to know what happened that day. And yet we got a report, a report that really didn't say a whole lot, a report that was so politically correct, it didn't even mention radical Islam. Well, in my view, that's what this war is all about that we're in right now, is a war against the extremists, against a radical, perverted teaching of Islam that says it's okay to kill in the name of Allah. The day we recognize that in this country, I think is the day we're going to be a lot safer.

I have a lot more to say, but I know the gentleman probably has some comments, but I do want to thank you for being one of the first ones to step out of the box and say this was an act of terrorism. I'm glad that NAPOLITANO has come around to that same conclusion. And I want to thank you also for

your steadfast support for our troops. You represent a base that has more soldiers than any in the world, and I know how proud you are of them and how well you represent them, and I want to personally thank you for that.

□ 2030

Mr. CARTER. I thank my friend, Mr. MCCAUL, for those kind words. And let's look at this exhibit we have got here. Congressman MCCAUL, you have touched on a lot of these things. But you know, it was said by Mr. Nidal Hasan that he felt that he was being persecuted by people. And I have an old Gulf War colonel who said, You know, the Army must have changed a whole lot since I left the Army, because I never did know any enlisted men that would persecute a major in the United States Army. It makes to sense what he says, that enlisted men were persecuting a major. It makes no sense.

But the first question you need to ask yourself is how does a man who has shown the signs of radical Islamic behavior on multiple occasions, who has acted erratically for months before the attack and, I would argue and the evidence will show, actually for years before the attack—in fact, one of our Members of this House has talked to a doctor who went through medical school with him and said he was doing this in medical school, which is long before this period of time. And he promoted radical Islamic views at Walter Reed Hospital. He exchanged emails with this al-Aulaqi character, this radical imam character. How does a guy do those things and get promoted to major? He didn't start out in the Army as a major. He got promoted to major. He got moved down the line.

Well, I am going to tell you. And this is only my opinion, but it is based upon some experience I have had in my life. I tried a case one time back in the eighties that involved a nurse. And in our case she was accused of killing a baby while giving it its injections for typhoid-tetanus at a doctor's office and intentionally killing that baby. And there was an awful lot of evidence that while working in an intensive care neonatal unit in San Antonio, a lot of other babies died very mysteriously on her watch. And unless I am mistaken, she got life imprisonment and she is still there.

But what is interesting is the system she was working in, when they started seeing unusual behavior, rather than doing something about it for fear of offending someone, they just recommended her for another job. And this pediatrician who was operating in Kerrville had asked whether this nurse would be a good nurse to go to work for them. And she got glowing reports from people who were looking at records and saying something is wrong when this lady is on duty.

You ask why would people do that? Well, because people have gotten to where we are so afraid of stepping on somebody's toes or offending someone

because of their class, sexual classification, whatever it may be, that we don't just speak the truth. Something smells here. Something's bad. This doesn't make sense. We need to ask questions about this. We can't have a society like this. We have to be able, when we see something that looks wrong, to say that is wrong.

That is why I have got a bill that I introduced and will be working on it even further, the Military Whistleblower Protection Act. We have whistleblower protection which is very effective in the United States in many categories. And one of the things that happens in the military is your progress report; how you are doing in your job in the military is very important to whether you are going to be promoted to the next rank. And if you don't get promoted in the military, your days in the military are numbered. So you need to be promoted.

Many people fear to speak out in something like this for fear that someone might think they are exhibiting some sort of prejudice or prejudicial behavior which would go on their record and maybe prevent them from being advanced in the military even though everything else says they should be advanced. So they fear speaking out for fear of retribution. And they have made movies about whistleblowers. People know that in our society today the guy that steps up and says something and gets fired because he said it has a protection under the law called the whistleblower act. So I have asked us to look at granting to the Members of Congress the right to create a whistleblower act and doing it to protect our soldiers.

So we have got a whistleblower act that basically says that servicemembers can report unusual, bizarre behavior by other members, whether they be equal rank or other rank, without fear of retribution, and especially as it relates to radical Islamic threats, as we saw in this case.

Mr. MCCAUL mentioned one of the things that we need somebody in the Department of Defense to say is that this involved a radical Islamic terrorist event. I have had my differences with Ms. Napolitano, but I will give her credit: when she was asked both in Mr. MCCAUL's committee and in the Appropriations Subcommittee of Homeland Security, she made the statement that this was a violent Islamic terrorist act that took place at Fort Hood. She had the courage to call it what it is.

It is time for the Defense Department to call it what it is, to recognize these were men and women put in harm's way because they were serving in the United States Army in the presence of an enemy combatant with a gun. And that is why they should get the kind of benefits, including medals that should be awarded for heroism, if they deserve them and they earned them. So I commend Secretary Napolitano for being a person who speaks the truth.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. CARTER. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. McCAUL. It was refreshing to see that. And I don't always agree with her either, but she had the courage to call it like it is, like you and I called it for quite some time. The sad thing is there are 13 dead, one unborn, and 43 wounded because people didn't have the guts to stand up and call it what it was. You know, the day that happened it seemed to me there was a systematic process of trying to—like you said, I was a prosecutor too. If you can't win this case, you know, you need to get out of the business. The sweeping under the rug and not wanting to hold hearings on this issue and not willing to brief us.

We finally got a briefing on this just a couple of weeks ago for the first time. And you saw the impact this administration was trying to have on this whole thing that no, this wasn't—you know, we can't really call it what it is because we don't want to offend anybody. Well, that is the same type of attitude that led to this monster killing 13 people to begin with.

It was when all these red flags popped up and these dots, if you will, when they popped up, no one had the guts to act on it. And they want to sweep it under the rug, and they swept his promotion. They promoted him, even though all this was out there, swept it under the rug. And now even after the tragic events that happened that day, there is an attempt, in my view, to try to sweep all this under the rug and trying to move forward.

You know, this is one example of many things that have happened this past year. I always said that they like to attack a President in the first year of office, al Qaeda. They did it with Bill Clinton, '93 World Trade Center. They did it with George W. Bush with 9/11. And I predicted that this was going to happen under this President's watch this year. And not only did this happen, but we had the same radical cleric tied to the Christmas bomber. Fortunately, Mr. Hasan will face a military tribunal. The Christmas bomber, on the other hand, will not.

We had several events over the last year of threats to the United States and multiple attempted terrorist attacks on the United States of America. And I think it is high time we recognize it and see it for what it is to better protect the American people and our military bases that we know are being targeted right now. The idea that the Joint Terrorism Task Force and, again, these are friends of mine, that they had this information and they didn't—I understand compromising investigations. But you could at least let the general at the base know that he has an individual, a major, in his outfit talking to a top al Qaeda recruiter, and you may just want to put him under observation. You don't have to question him, you don't have to dig into his files, you don't have to put him on alert that we are looking at him; but you may want to kind of just monitor

his actions because there is some radical stuff going on, and potentially he could be a threat.

This man did not believe in the mission. The irony of Mr. Hasan is he was the man trained and paid for by the taxpayer in the United States Army to counsel people coming back from the theater of war, and he didn't believe in the mission. I can only imagine what kind of counseling he was giving to these troops coming back from the war theaters that you and I have been to in Iraq and Afghanistan and what he was telling them when he himself didn't believe in the mission they were sent to do. That is the absurd irony of Mr. Hasan.

And, again, as General Cone asked, how many more Hasans are out there? I think we have a duty in the Congress. I think the Department of Defense has a duty. I hope the Webster report will uncover more of this. But we have a duty to better protect our soldiers not only abroad, but right here in the United States. And that is the great, awful tragic event of what happened was that it happened on American soil and it happened in their home. That is just not supposed to occur in this country.

It needs to be taken seriously. It shouldn't be swept under the rug. And I think we should continue to do this and continue to ask the majority to hold hearings on this. And you know, as Secretary Napolitano admitted, it was a violent Islamic terrorist attack. I think the Department of Defense needs to come forward with that as well, and I think we have an obligation to the American people not to sweep this under the rug, to prevent future actions from occurring. Our oversight responsibilities under the Constitution I take very seriously, and we have a duty here in the Congress to hold those hearings and get to the bottom of this case so we can stop it in the future.

I went down to Guantanamo after the President decided to close it down, and I saw Khalid Sheikh Mohammed. And it was during prayer hour. And he was laying on his rug, bowing to Mecca. And it was one of the most chilling things I have ever seen in my life. A man responsible for killing 3,000 Americans, and the idea that we are going to bring him into the United States. And look, I am a Federal prosecutor. The Southern District of New York is one of the best U.S. Attorney's offices in the country. But are we going to treat these people as criminal defendants or enemy combatants? Are we going to say that this is a war or a criminal prosecution?

It seems to me that we are slipping back into the Clinton years, where we really looked at these as really just illegal criminal prosecution, not an act of warfare perpetrated against the United States of America. It seems to me, particularly with the top 16 al Qaeda operatives, many of whom were responsible for 9/11, that was an act of warfare, and it should be treated as such.

□ 2045

Mr. CARTER. This exhibit right here has a picture actually of the Pentagon right after it was hit. We have this displayed here because in talking about the receiving of medals by our soldiers at Fort Hood and getting the kind of benefits that you get from being in combat, we awarded the people killed and injured by the plane that flew into the Pentagon with exactly those benefits. And I am told by members of the Armed Services Committee that it was done without an act of Congress; although, I will ask for this Congress to act.

I have also written a letter to Secretary Gates asking him for the same administrative remedy for these casualties of the war on terror on American soil. We gave it to them. It was a horrendous act. That picture, and other pictures from that time, should be cemented in our memory forever. Whether you kill 3,000 or whether you kill 14 and injure 43, these are still American people who lost their lives at the hands of terrorists in the middle of the war on terror, a war on radical Islamic jihadism. It's time for us to step up to the plate for these people and do this for them.

Mr. McCAUL. If the gentleman would yield, I was proud to be a cosponsor of your bill. I hope we see it pass in short order.

I agree with you. That was an attack on American soil by the terrorists. According to the Secretary of Homeland Security, so was Fort Hood, and American soldiers were killed. So how can we differentiate between the Pentagon and Fort Hood? Both are symbols of military might and power in the United States. I think it is fitting to the families. I would hope the majority would see it the same way, that this was an act of terror perpetrated on American soldiers and on a symbol of military might and power, and give them the just compensation that they gave the victims of 9/11 and the Pentagon.

I can think of no reason why that legislation should be blocked by the majority.

Mr. CARTER. Let me state that many Members of both sides of the aisle have joined in cosponsoring this bill. I think when we get through some of this other business that is taking forever around here we might get down to something like this. I agree with you. This was supposed to be an oversight Congress, and I think in many ways, there is a valid attempt to try to be an oversight Congress.

Nothing is more important for oversight than an issue like this, and that is, just what happened and how it happened. And you say, Well, okay, people were killed. It has got bigger ramifications than that. That is what is so hard to understand. This was a man wearing the same uniform of the people he shot.

I want to share a story, and I have shared it before on the floor of the House. The day after all this took

place, I was at Fort Hood. I was out at Darnall Hospital where there were wounded out there who had been transported both there and all over our district. Our community, from all the way down into Williamson County, Bell County, and Coryell County, the whole surrounding area just united behind the medical community, behind this terrible act and gave the very best medical care available anywhere for these people.

I was talking to a nurse, and she said when she was deployed to Afghanistan, she worked in a hospital with Australians. And she got an email from an Australian nurse the morning I visited Fort Hood, which was the day after the shooting, and in that email the lady said, you know, Soldiers in the Australian army are starting to question and asking this question of mental health professionals in our army already today: If the Americans can't trust the people in their uniform, can we trust the people in our uniform?

Now, remember, if you're in the military and you're a soldier, we like to say we depend on each other in this place. But when they say they depend on each other, they mean they put their life in the hands of the man behind them and the man on either side of them and the man in front of them, and they in turn have those people's lives in their hands. The military functions by knowing that each can do their job and trusting the other one to do it.

And so there is something that strikes in the psyche of a soldier when a fellow soldier publicly executes 13 people and ultimately results in the death of an unborn child, 14 deaths, wearing the same uniform as the people who were shot, and so it strikes to the soul of a soldier. We are doing our very best and I would say doing a good job of overcoming that. These are awfully, awfully talented young men and women in the army, but it's still there. It's still creating distrust, driving a wedge in our military, and, arguably, it's as effective a strike as you can have if you cause folks to distrust. So this has big scope. In truth of fact, what will we think if somebody we trusted to have our backs started shooting people in this place? We would wonder who we could trust.

Mr. McCAUL. I agree. I think this is, in some ways, worse than 9/11 because, there, the enemy was foreign, radical Islamic terrorists. In this case, these soldiers are saluting their colleagues who lost their lives, who were killed by a major in the U.S. Army who was wearing the very same military uniform that they are. And the idea that he could betray his soldiers like this, and not only betray, but kill them, that's what I think makes it so very, very hard to accept.

Aulaqi, the Yemeni cleric, said that Hasan trusted him. The radical cleric said that Hasan trusted him. Unfortunately, the Army trusted Mr. Hasan and promoted him through the ranks.

Because of political correctness, he was never called out for his behavior, which we know was a problem. We know the flags were raised. I'm not making this stuff up. He had business cards that said "soldier of Allah," the jihadist line he used when he killed them in cold blood, talking about the war on terrorism is a war against Islam. It just makes you wonder how could we have promoted someone in the United States Army and the United States military with these types of flags going up? He said his allegiance was to the Koran and not the Constitution.

Judge, you are absolutely right. The morale, which is so important in a time of war that we are in, is critical here. And if we can't act upon cases like this in the United States Army in the United States out of fear that we won't be politically correct and we may hurt someone's feelings, where have we gone in this country? We can't call it out like it is and say it for what it is, that this man did not love his country, that he had more loyalty to radical Islam, and that is precisely why he killed those 13 soldiers that day.

Mr. CARTER. I will make another argument besides that, and then I'm going to let my good friend Mr. KING from Iowa talk a little bit.

I would also argue that the way this thing has been treated, I would say with kid gloves, makes the next homegrown terrorist, of which we have seen, what, two or three in the last 2 weeks up here, Jihad Jane and I think there is another one now, Jihad Jenny or somebody, these women who are American citizens who are now promoting jihadist terrorism, and the underwear bomber on Christmas Day. So these people, I think, by looking at the soft kid gloves activity of a murderer on a military base, I think it encourages them to get involved in this stuff. If they have got a screw loose, which most of these people do, I think it just encourages them.

Mr. McCAUL. I point to the same radical cleric who praised Mr. Hasan's actions and called him a hero is the same radical cleric who is behind the Christmas bomber. This is no coincidence here. It is connecting back to a radical al Qaeda operative out of Yemen. Why in the world General Cone didn't know about this, a major on his base, is really beyond me. And that's what we have got to fix looking forward with the JTTFs and with the Department of Defense.

We have talked to them about the Christmas bomber. But how many Christmas bombers are out there? How many more people is the radical cleric Aulaqi influencing? Jihad Jane and others, they all go to these Web sites. And not only do we have to deal with the al Qaeda operatives overseas, but this kind of act inspires them, and the fact that we could have let this happen inspires them. And then how many more radical homegrown terrorists are potentially out there in the United States?

We know that the radical cleric has now said just one man, one incident. They are decentralizing. They are saying one man can carry out, take a gun, take an explosive device. That is in a very radical departure from how al Qaeda had worked in the past, and it is coming from the same individual who is tied to Mr. Hasan and the Christmas bomber, and we better wake up to that.

Mr. CARTER. Let me say as a comment that I have huge respect for General Cone and the outstanding job he did with the situation that happened at Fort Hood. And this is the same man who was preparing to deploy three corps to Afghanistan to start the very serious business of pulling American soldiers out of that combat zone. With that on his plate, this fellow in his lap, I think he did an outstanding job of handling it. And by the way, he still, on time, deployed the third corps to Iraq, and he is right now, today, over there doing our bidding and our job of pulling down, making elections work, and pulling down the forces for the taking out of 50,000-plus soldiers in August. He is a great American and an outstanding soldier.

I want to yield to Mr. KING from Iowa however much time he wants to take to talk about these issues of radical Islamic jihadism and not letting political correctness silence our mouths.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the Judge from Texas for yielding and my friend from Texas for being here to lead on this Special Order tonight, and you especially felt it more than anyone else outside of Texas, the pain of the 14 that were murdered by Major Hasan. And the question arises that we need to face, and it is something we talked around a little bit here, and I don't believe we talked about it directly, and that is the issue of profiling. What is it about people that makes us think we should be a little more suspicious of them than somebody else?

I grew up in a law enforcement family, and a couple of things never occurred to the law enforcement extended family that I grew up in. One of them was to ignore the law or the rule of law, and another one would be to ignore the very evidence in front of your eyes. The good thing about police work and investigation is you see things that are out of order, you notice those, turn your focus on that and wonder why it is out of order. And the instincts and the training, which is profiling to one fashion or another, causes the law enforcement resources to be used in a far more effective fashion, and time after time, crimes are solved because there have been police officers that understood the anomalies in the people.

I'm opposed to using law enforcement to go out and target people because of race, religion, or ethnicity. But when it's before your very eyes, and when you see people going in and out of the airports and who has been blowing up our planes and who has been hijacking us, that is young Muslim men. And so

I would suggest that, instead of spread-eagle searching the 80-year-old Norwegian grandmother with blues eyes and white hair, we ought to turn our focus in a higher percentage on the people that fit the profile of the kind that are likely to bomb us.

Now, it's unfortunate that there are a lot of innocent people that would fit that profile, but it's far more unfortunate if we waste our resources searching people that have no history and then their profile doesn't fit anyone that would be bombing an airline. And that is just simple common sense, and it is good police work. But we are so politically correct in this country, we wallow in self-guilt in America. We go back and look at ourselves and figure out, somebody once pointed the finger and said, Well, you're bigoted and racist, so, therefore, we have to bend over backwards to demonstrate we will do all kinds of foolish expenditures of our taxpayer dollars to avoid anybody being able to point statistically to the focus of resources where the resources should be focused.

And I don't suggest, Madam Speaker, that we ought to simply profile and put all of our efforts into one particular profile; I just suggest that we score them according to a weight system and turn our focus on those in proportion to the degree of the score. That makes sense. And I would assume that that would have been the thing we would have done after September 11, but in reality, no. We are a nation with self-guilt.

□ 2100

Another component of this would be Major Hasan. The question that came out was, whatever happened that he got radicalized? We use the term "got radicalized" as if it somehow is not their fault; we allowed an environment or nurtured an environment. Every individual that attacks people and kills them is responsible for their own actions. And if the radicalization does take place, it is by their will and by the will of people like Awlaki.

We are also so politically correct that we won't go in and listen to the radicalization taking place. We won't tape the sermons in the mosque. We simply wait for something bad to happen and, therefore, nobody can point their finger to us and accuse us of being politically incorrect. Of course, they point their finger at me every day as politically incorrect, Madam Speaker.

I think this Nation needs to utilize their resources, utilize them wisely, and do so in a fashion that is clearly for the purposes of enforcing the law and protecting the safety of the American people.

We should look into the psychology of the Army—and I have an Army tie on today, you might notice—that they need to also understand that they have the ability to speak up and keep an eye out for the kind of people that would come and kill us, the people that be-

lieve their path to salvation is in killing Jews, Christians, and capitalists, in that order. And if they can get a twofer, they are happy. They believe that is the eternal bliss for them if they can get that done. I say there is a place for them in the next life, and it is not where they think.

I yield back to the judge from Texas, and thank him for indulging me.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I think the most important thing we ought to do as Americans is be willing to stand up for what is right. And if it means that someone might get their feelings hurt, I don't have a problem with that.

I am not for dragnets. I am not for going out and shaking up communities like used to happen in the olden days, older than me anyway. In fact, there used to be a television show called "Dragnet" and a radio show called "Dragnet." Those are wrong, and we aren't talking about that. But we are talking about using good intelligence. And if we are going to kill our intelligence and not look at things because we are afraid we are going to hurt somebody's feelings, then we are going to get hit again. And if we get hit again, we are going to be standing around still asking the same questions we are asking here tonight: Why? What happened? Why did this happen? Why didn't we know? As my friend Mr. MCCAUL had been saying, we had the information to ask the question. Somebody should have asked it. That is the key.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentleman would yield. We had the information in both the Hasan case and the Christmas bomber. I made all the points about the Hasan case, all the flags that popped up, a failure to act upon those red flags.

Indeed, in the Christmas bomber case you had a State Department cable coming out that warned the father had come in warning that his son was in touch with Islamic extremists in Yemen. Yet, when I asked the Under Secretary of the State Department, Mr. Kennedy, in God's name when he found that out, why didn't he revoke his visa, his response was, You know, a lot of people come into embassies and a lot of people give us tips, and they are not all credible. And I said, Well, this was not some anonymous source coming in, it was his father.

Meanwhile, in the intelligence community there is specific threat information coming in about this individual. The State Department has got the cable, the intelligence community has got the threat information. It is not put together. Both sides could have acted on it. The intelligence community could have asked the State Department, Does this guy have a passport? Does he have a visa? Can we revoke that? And the same with the State Department. Yet, that doesn't happen.

We need to move forward to make sure the Christmas bomber never hap-

pens again, and to make sure, with all the evidence coming in with Mr. Hasan, to make sure that with individuals like this the evidence isn't swept under the rug out of political correctness.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time. Mr. KING made the comment about crazy conservatives, so let's look at some crazy conservatives that made the same statements we are asking.

I wouldn't classify Time magazine as one of the great conservative magazines of the 21st century, but here is an article from Time magazine asking the same question: "The Fort Hood Report: Why No Mention of Islam?"

Here is another, I would say, not very conservative organization, The San Francisco Chronicle, asking the same question: "Political Correctness on Fort Hood at Pentagon"

I think that you cross all boundaries here when you start getting down to the logical things we ought to be doing to fight people trying to kill us. I mean, it doesn't take a genius to say, Daddy says he is crazy, and he may do something crazy. And when you get reports that this guy is out there talking to this guy over in Yemen, these things start to fit together. Maybe you ought to check him when he hits the airport or before he takes off from either Brussels or Amsterdam. Fortunately, he had a misfire and it didn't work. But he could have killed all the people on the airplane, hurt a whole lot of people on the ground in Detroit. Detroit has enough problems right now without having somebody blowing up an airplane over their city, and God bless them.

Mr. MCCAUL. If the gentleman will yield. It was preventable. There is a lot of information coming in, and we have a lot of good men and women working counterterrorism. They have got a tough job. There is a lot of information coming in. But we had these two major focal points that just were never acted upon and never put together in the Christmas bomber case. And Mr. Hasan, my God, how many points of error popping up on him? How many red flags are popping up?

And why weren't they acted upon? I think it goes back to your original point: We didn't want to hurt someone's feelings.

And do you know what? We see this in the Federal Government. They would rather just kind of promote and move on somebody rather than have to deal with the problem. Gee, we have someone who is making these radical statements, but I would rather not deal with the problem. Let's just push them along in the system. Let's transfer him from Walter Reed, where he was a major problem—we know that, poor performance evaluations—to one of the largest military installations in the country, and let's promote him to major in spite of the fact all these points of evidence were out on him. I think that is the real tragedy.

I know my good friend from Texas has probably one of the most difficult

jobs out of any Member in this body, and that is because you have more soldiers in your district than any other, and you are the one who has to comfort them, as we all do, but you, many more times than any other Member, have to comfort the loved ones whose son or daughter has been killed in a time of war. I know you personally have comforted the families of the victims here and Fort Hood, and the biggest tragedy is that it could have been prevented.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CARTER. We are about to run out of time for this evening. Once again, we are talking about the rules we make for ourselves and how we should apply them. I think it is honestly said here that let's don't be so politically correct that we oversee ills that may fall upon our society. That is why we make rules. That is why we have laws and order in our society, so we can protect our citizens, whether they be civilian or in the military.

It has been a great evening, and I thank my friends Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. KING for being here to join me in this conversation. I am going to thank the House for allowing me to continue to talk about issues that relate to rules or to the law.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate notifies the House that the Senate shall convene as a Court of Impeachment at 2:00 p.m., on Wednesday, March 17, 2010, for the purpose of receiving the Managers on the part of the House in the matter of the Impeachment proceedings against G. Thomas Porteous, Jr., Judge of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

The message also announced that pursuant to Executive Order 12131, as amended and extended, the Chair reappoints and appoints the following Members to the President's Export Council:

Reappointment:

The Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW).

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Appointment:

The Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) vice the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

MORE GOVERNMENT WON'T WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIMES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I had the great pleasure of holding a town hall meeting in one of the towns in the Fifth District in North Carolina, Statesville, North Carolina.

I didn't count the number of folks there, and I haven't had a chance to

ask my staff exactly how many were there, but I think probably about 175 people were there.

We let these folks put in questions or their names into a box, and we pull their names out randomly and let them speak about the health care bill. This was a health care town hall. And to a person who spoke, and there were probably about a dozen who had a chance to speak for about 2 minutes, and I answered their questions, they all are very upset about what is going on here in Congress. They are upset about many, many things, but they are particularly upset about this government takeover of our health care system, and they just don't understand why the folks in the majority continue to push this issue knowing that the majority of the people in this country are very much opposed to it.

They very much are concerned about what they have heard and read about the way this is going to be pushed through this week. They hate it when bills are put together that aren't germane to each other or that aren't related. They heard about the education bill being put on the health care bill, and they are very concerned about that. They just don't like that.

They said over and over again they know that the government does not do things more efficiently and effectively than the private sector. One businessman talked about how he has been struggling for the last year. He has used up all his savings, all his equity in the last year to keep his business going because the economy is so bad, and he wants to know, where is that stimulus that he thought that we were getting?

So it was a great town hall, because they talked about what was on their mind and got a chance to ask me questions.

When I told them about the plan to do this reconciliation bill, where the folks on the majority side are going to go from passing bills without reading them to passing bills without voting for them, they understood what a threat that is to our entire way of life. They understand that that is a threat to the rule of law, and they are very much concerned about that.

I told them of the President meeting with us at our retreat and saying, You know, I was wrong when I said over and over again that you can keep your health insurance if you like it. But, he said, I made a mistake by saying that, because some cats and dogs got into that Senate bill that we weren't planning to get into that bill. But we are going to take care of that.

But guess what. That is not going to get taken care of. And the President, I understand, made that comment again this week, saying out on the stump, If you like your plan you can keep it—when he told the Republicans at our retreat that that is absolutely not true.

We have a major problem, Mr. Speaker, in this country. We have people trying to establish a takeover of our lives from birth to death. They want the

government to run our lives and to make all of our decisions for us.

I have an article, Mr. Speaker, from The Washington Times, Wednesday, January 20, 2010, that says "More Government Won't Work."

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 20, 2010]

EDITORIAL: MORE GOVERNMENT WON'T WORK

Government is bigger than ever and controls more aspects of American life than at any time in U.S. history. Last year, the federal government ate \$3.52 trillion out of a \$13.2 trillion economy. With the current trajectory of big government under the Democrats, the federal bureaucracy will devour as much as 50 percent of this nation's economic activity by midcentury. To illustrate how wasteful that is, take a look at the empty space above this editorial. That's what government creates—nothing.

A basic problem with a future dominated by ever-expanding government is that bureaucracies are hobbled by waste, fraud and abuse. Government simply does not work well. Freedom works, but the more government that exists, the less freedom we have. Under President Obama and the Democratic Congress, the United States is heading in the wrong direction. The big spenders are on a joy ride, and we're stuck in the back seat on the road to dramatically less freedom.

The main battleground of the war between freedom and government is the marketplace. Markets work for a simple reason: They give people choice. Consumers know what they want, and businesses try to figure out how to produce and deliver the goods and services the best way, considering price, quality and service. Only the best firms survive.

Today is the first anniversary of the start of Mr. Obama's term in the Oval Office. For the past year, Americans have been told that government is smarter than private industry and that more government intervention is needed to fix problems in the market. Central to this agenda is the canard that private for-profit companies have to charge higher prices than nonprofits to recoup enough to earn profits, thus making for-profit firms less competitive. This explanation is wrong-headed because it ignores that profits give an incentive to lower costs and improve quality. The greater the incentive to reduce costs, the less waste there is. That is why, despite all the tax advantages given to nonprofits, the economy is dominated by for-profit firms.

Politicians and bureaucrats in Washington don't know what individual consumers want and certainly shouldn't be the ones to decide what individuals need. If the government decides everything, elections will determine what businesses can produce and what options consumers will have. In a healthy market system, consumers wouldn't have to persuade their neighbors to use the ballot box to determine what type of toys, computers, books, houses or cars they can buy. Those products will be produced as long as the value consumers get is greater than the costs of producing them. The government should stay out of the way of these inherently private everyday decisions.

A common justification for government intervention is based on the notion that individuals and firms don't bear the full costs and benefits of their actions and that taxes and regulations are needed to correct the imbalance. The debate over global warming is an example of this idea. Climate-change activists argue that markets don't take into account damage purportedly caused by carbon dioxide. Yet even if they were right that carbon emissions cause global warming (which is unlikely), there are many stumbling blocks that prevent effective government intervention. First, there is the pure