

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**Ranking Member Crawford  
C3 Subcommittee Hearing  
November 3, 2021**

---

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Republican Members of this Committee have consistently raised concerns about the Intelligence Community playing a role in collecting intelligence and conducting surveillance of U.S. persons without a foreign nexus.

Executive Order 12333, which every IC element points to as the guiding principle for their authority, clearly states that the role of the IC is to provide information on “foreign security threats” and the “intentions of foreign powers, organizations, and persons, and their agents.”

The lane for HPSCI is looking at foreign collection and any nexus between overseas individuals and groups with those in the United States that are plotting violence. But we are not doing that today.

This hearing has no classified portion – no opportunity to hear from the witnesses on IC collection of any foreign nexus to domestic violent extremists.

Today’s hearing is not the first event the House Intelligence Committee has held this year on domestic terrorism. I hope the intention of the Majority is not to communicate that there is an interest in expanding the role of U.S intelligence entities, their resources and authorities, to look inward at U.S. citizens. These carefully authorized capabilities were never intended for domestic use and we need to have a very clear boundary. The use of National Intelligence Program funds and authorities should be targeting foreign threats not on surveilling Americans.

Government action to counter domestic extremism is an area fraught with potential overreach that impacts civil liberties. Over the past few weeks, we have seen the danger of the Federal government taking action for political purposes.

The Attorney General’s memo directing the FBI to hold 94 meetings across the U.S. to look at allegations of threats toward school officials without having any data or request from state and

**UNCLASSIFIED**

local law enforcement, points to significant government overreach motivated by politics and intended to intimidate American parents.

I understand that the Attorney General memo references violence and threats of violence. However, General Garland has testified several times in the intervening weeks that the driving force for his memo was a letter from the National School Board Association, which refers to complaining parents as possible domestic parents and the need to use Patriot Act surveillance tools to monitor these threats. The fact that the Attorney General allowed these complaints to drive government action demonstrates the critical need for vigilance about the role of the Intelligence Community in the domestic arena.

Let me be clear. There is a need for a strong law enforcement role in countering, investigating, and prosecuting domestic terrorism. Anyone who threatens or commits acts of violence must face legal consequences. However, there must be a clear boundary between the appropriate role for law enforcement and the surveillance tools of the Intelligence Community.

Moving forward, I hope this Committee will get back to focusing on true foreign threats. This Subcommittee alone has critical focus areas that need attention – counterterrorism collection shortfalls after the Afghanistan withdrawal, counterintelligence threats from multiple foreign actors across all sectors of U.S. society, and the development of bioweapons and other WMDs – just to name a few. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with you on these critical issues central to the Committee’s jurisdiction.

I yield back my time.