

Our Founding Fathers thought that those specific five tenets were crucial to the citizens of America—so critical that they needed to be guaranteed first and foremost.

The conscience protection debate that started a few weeks ago with the administration's announcement of a new rule regarding contraception, sterilization, and insurance policies is a perfect example of the importance of these rights.

The government cannot, and should not, be forcing any employer, whether they are Catholic charities and schools or an individual businessman, to violate the tenets of their faith.

As this debate continues, it highlights the great need to have a standard that explicitly protects employers from attempts to erode our First Amendment rights.

We need to fight for the standard in H.R. 1179, the Respect for Rights of Conscience Act of 2011, introduced by my good friend from Nebraska, Mr. FORTENBERRY.

It simply protects employers from being forced to violate their religious or moral beliefs by an overreaching mandate from the administration. It takes nothing away from the public, nor does it prohibit women from getting services that are already provided, as some have alleged.

H.R. 1179 is a responsible and reasonable response to clarify what can and cannot be mandated through the healthcare law regarding conscience protections.

We cannot allow the federal government to start going down the slippery slope of eroding our constitutionally protected rights—we took an oath to uphold the Constitution.

As a mother and grandmother, I will do everything in my power to ensure that the rights we enjoy today continue to be guaranteed for my daughter, grandchildren, and generations to come.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3630, MIDDLE CLASS TAX RELIEF AND JOB CREATION ACT OF 2012

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (during the Special Order of Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 112-400) on the resolution (H. Res. 554) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 3630) to provide incentives for the creation of jobs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time.

The Progressive Congressional Caucus is that caucus in Congress that comes together to talk about the most important values that our country is founded on—ideas like fairness, inclusion, prosperity for all, protecting our

world and the environment that we live in. The Progressive Caucus can be found talking about civil and human rights, standing for an economy that is fair and inclusive and has shared benefits and responsibilities for everybody. The Progressive Caucus is that caucus in Congress that will stand up for peace and diplomacy and also will make the case for the human rights of all people.

We bring you the progressive message to illustrate what's at stake in America today. I'm very pleased that I'm joined by my good friend from the great State of Illinois, JAN SCHAKOWSKY. We're going to bring the progressive message tonight and just talk a little bit about the values that we share.

You know, I want to set up a question I have for you, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, because we have been dealing with this transportation bill over the last several days, and we will be up until the week of February 27.

One of the things about it that I found most galling is that one of the ways that the Republican majority intends to pay for the transportation bill is by charging Federal employees a fee, and really a tax, on their retirement and then using the money that they're going to gain to pay for their transportation bill.

□ 1930

When I think about people who are Federal employees, I'm thinking of people who take care of our veterans—the nurses at the VA. I'm thinking of people who make sure our roads and our parks are safe. I'm thinking about Federal employees who make sure our water and our air is clean. So I just want to ask you:

Do you think it's fair to sort of go after Federal employees, working people, to try to pay for this transportation budget we've been talking about over these last few days?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank you for that question and for leading this hour in this important discussion.

No. In fact, our colleagues in the majority want to pay for the legislation in the transportation bill, but what they want to continue to do is to refuse to touch a single hair on the heads of millionaires and billionaires, and they stand firm in their defense of the big oil companies and the corporations that ship their jobs overseas. Instead of asking the wealthiest Americans to contribute a little bit more, they want to ask Federal workers. Instead of going to the 1 percent, they want to ask people who are solidly in the 99 percent to pay the price.

Federal employees are hardworking, middle class Americans, who work for the Federal Government all across this country, not just in Washington. In fact, only about 30 percent of Federal employees are in Washington. Of course, some of them work in our offices, and they work in this House of Representatives. We all represent Federal workers.

So who are they? You mentioned a few. Yet there are also those benefit specialists who help our seniors get their Social Security and Medicare benefits, and they're the law enforcement professionals who defend our borders and our ports and our skies and us when we're here in the Capitol.

Mr. ELLISON. FBI agents who are protecting us from everything from terrorism to drugs to guns, are these people Federal employees?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Those are called Federal employees, as are the Capitol Police; and they're computer and network specialists who spend their days making sure that we're safe from cyberattacks. They're medical and scientific researchers who are looking for cures for devastating diseases. They're the nurses and doctors who take care of our wounded warriors. They're the men and women who make sure the food supply is safe and that our water is clean enough for our children to drink. They're the hardworking support staff. I just left my office, and I was having my trash and recycling taken away.

Those are all Federal employees. There are 423,000 Federal employees who earn less than \$50,000 a year; and 48 percent of them are women, but 60 percent of the employees earning less than \$50,000 a year are women. They are the people who have seen their pay frozen for 2 years while health care and other costs are going up.

Mr. ELLISON. If I may just ask the gentlelady a question.

Do you mean to tell me and the American people and the Speaker tonight that not only is this transportation bill proposing to cut into and to basically tax Federal employees' retirement benefits, but they've already had a freeze on top of this?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. For 2 years. That's about \$30 billion a year in cuts. So they've already given up, really, about \$60 billion from a normal increase in wages just to pay for the cost of things going up. Everybody knows that the cost of food and gasoline and those kinds of things are going up, and still we aren't asking millionaires—or they aren't. The Republicans who propose these cuts, these additional contributions from Federal employees, are not asking millionaires and billionaires to contribute their fair share.

Mr. ELLISON. I will say to the gentlelady that I have brought a document here with me today. I had a great meeting with some Federal employees the other day, and they said, Explain it to me, GOP.

One person, Paul here, says: I earn less than \$45,000 a year. Explain it to me, GOP, how cutting my pay creates jobs. This person, Paul, represents the Tobyhanna Army Depot workers. They do something really important.

Then there is another Federal employee: Twelve percent of my salary I earn caring for veterans goes to my retirement. Explain it to me, GOP, how cutting my retirement puts people to

work. That's what Teresa has to say, and she represents nurses at the Minnesota VA hospital.

Then here is Eric Young, and he represents correction officers in Miami, and he says: I pay more than \$9,000 a year for my family health insurance. Explain it to me, GOP, how cutting my take-home pay lowers unemployment.

These are the faces of Federal employees. Sometimes when we talk about, oh, just cut the Federal employees, they're nameless, faceless. Who are these people? But as you pointed out, they are the people who really improve the quality of our lives every single day—people who protect us here in the Capitol but also who protect our veterans, who work in our Federal prisons, and who are Army Depot workers. This is the face of Federal workers, and I just think it's fair to say that they deserve to have somebody speak up for them as they have put their lives on the line to protect all of us.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me also say this.

Some argue that, oh, well, it's such a cushy job to work for the Federal Government and that Federal employees actually make more money than in the private sector. Let me explain that.

As for the people who work in the lower-wage jobs for the Federal Government, women actually make more working for government than they do in the private sector because, in the private sector, they make about 70 cents on the dollar, and thank goodness the Federal Government has more equity in what it pays. The same is true for minorities, who earn much less than white men do in the private sector; but when you work for the Federal Government, you have certain protections and certain equity that we've all supported, so they make more money.

When you get to the higher-wage jobs, working for the National Institutes of Health or more, for the higher-skilled jobs, in fact, those workers who work for the Federal Government could make more in the private sector, but they have made a decision to help our government, to help our country by working in the public sector.

So when they say some Federal workers earn more, I say God bless them because we don't discriminate like many in the private sector do, and we wish that the private sector would not discriminate in pay against women and minorities. It's not as if they should go out there and earn less money.

Mr. ELLISON. What I hear them say is, oh, well, the Federal workers earn more money than the people who pay their salaries in the form of taxes. They say this divisively and in a very smug way. And I think to myself, aren't we a country that should value public service, people working in the public interest for the public good? Does bread cost less for them? Is gasoline cheaper for them? No, it's not. Thank heavens that the Federal Government can pay people fairly and that

we don't have these vast disparities in pay between men and women for Federal workers.

Basically, the protections that the people have in working for the Federal Government don't always prevail in the private sector, and that accounts for some of the disparity. Then, of course, as you just pointed out, people at the higher income levels, they could do just as well and be paid much more handsomely if they were to work elsewhere.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. It's estimated, actually, that those individuals could probably make as much as 26 percent more working in the private sector, but they want to contribute to the common good and work for all of us. Then, in order to pay for our transportation bill or any other bill, we ask the Federal workers to contribute more.

□ 1940

Take a look around. I say to my colleagues, look around us. Everywhere we go in this Capitol, in our office building, we are looking at Federal employees that, without, this place simply would not run. We are dependent on them and we rely on them for a good reason—because we can count on them. They contribute often as much as anyone here to making our country the great country that it is, and working in the Capitol of the United States of America with enormous pride, I might add.

Mr. ELLISON. I ask the gentlelady, when did it happen that working in the public interest became, in the minds of some people, something less than honorable work to do?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I think there has been a real demonization of all public sector workers lately, and that is why I'm so glad tonight we're able to put a face on these individuals and say who are they, what kind of work are they really doing.

But beyond that, to say, really, this is where we want to get the sacrifice? We're not going to ask one thing more of the oil companies or the gas companies or the businesses that are making record profits and taking those jobs overseas and outsourcing them and getting a tax break for them? We're not asking the millionaires and the billionaires in this country who have actually benefited from the work of public employees, of Federal employees to get what they need in order to get ahead, we're not asking them to pay any more? No, we're going to take it out of the hides of middle class workers, if they are lucky. Some of them are down at the lower end. We're going to take it from the middle class workers, the middle class families, and ask them to make the sacrifice and pay more for their pensions.

Mr. ELLISON. If the gentlelady will yield.

I actually see this as another wedge. We talk about the wedges. We talk about some folks often are associated with the right-wing conservative phi-

losophy who make arguments that would divide people who were born here versus immigrants, gays versus straights, all these kind of wedges, the "Willie Horton" thing, all this kind of wedge stuff. This is a new wedge, Federal workers versus private sector workers. It seems like they're trying to engender a certain amount of resentment among private sector workers for public sector workers. When are we going to talk about the people at the very tip-top who have been compensated beyond imagination in the oil and gas sector, in the drug sector, in the health care sector, those in private equity, all these folks who have been making so much money on Wall Street? When do we ask them to do more?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Actually, we did, didn't we, in the people's budget that the Progressive Caucus introduced? That budget balances the budget, cuts the deficit, cuts the debt, but doesn't try to take it out of the hide of middle class people in the same way that we see from our colleagues across the aisle.

I know included in that budget is my Fairness in Taxation Act that says that people starting at a million dollars ought to pay a higher tax bracket, ratcheting up to people who make a billion dollars a year. There may be somebody at home saying, oh, nobody makes a billion dollars a year. Yes, they do. Mr. Paulson made \$5 billion in 2010. He probably paid at a rate that may have been lower than his secretary or secretaries.

Mr. ELLISON. I am glad that you raised this point about the people's budget, because that really is the point of the Progressive message, to talk to the Speaker and the American people about there being an alternative in our Congress. Not everybody is carried away with this philosophy that Federal workers need to pay more and get less.

Actually, there are a body of folks in the Democratic Caucus, and particularly the Progressive Caucus, who really want to see a more shared way of paying for the needs of our country.

We recently had a hearing in which we talked about jobs, and we had a group called the Patriotic Millionaires who was there. And this is the interesting thing about your particular tax proposal. A lot of people who are making a lot of money agree that they should pay more. I find this to be very interesting, because patriotic Americans do come from various income strata. I think it's commendable for people at the top end, the people who might pay a higher rate under your bill, who say, Yeah, tax us more because we believe there should be a good public school system; we believe the water should be clean; we believe that Federal workers should be fairly compensated; we have enough. What drives us is not the acquisition of more, but the idea of creating good products and services for Americans, which we charge for, of course, but at the end of

the day, everybody has to do their fair share.

I thank you for offering the Buffett Rule before there was a Buffett Rule. Before we were talking about a Buffett Rule, you were out in front of the pack.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. One of the themes that the President has underscored over and over again is that everybody should get a fair shot and everybody pay their fair share and everybody play by the same rules.

When we talk about where should the money come from for important things like transportation—of course there are many flaws in that bill. They take mass transportation, mass transit, out of the funding stream. Transportation, I think, has always before been a bipartisan issue, and, of course, we want to be able to pay for that. It creates a lot of jobs. Everybody uses the roads. They use the transit system. They benefit. Everybody needs to pay their fair share, what they are able to pay to contribute to the common good.

The President has talked about having each other's back as kind of a basic philosophy, that we're all in this together, not we're all in this alone. That's one of the early ideas in America.

Picture, now, the covered wagons and the rugged individualism of those people crossing. They were together in a row, each one a rugged individual, but all of them were making sure that they helped to take care of each other so that they could get across safely.

I think that's the vision, that we're a combination of individual freedoms, strong individualism, but we also understand that we all do better when we all do better.

Mr. ELLISON. As my hero Paul Wellstone famously said, "We all do better when we all do better."

But those people you're talking about, those rugged individuals crossing the prairie, when they had to put a barn up, they didn't do it alone, did they? They'd have a barn raising, which was a community event. This idea that we do what we do—what we do, we should do best together, we do those things together. Whatever we can do individually, we certainly have the freedom to do that.

I am concerned about shifting political winds, which sort of ignore the idea that we are in this together, that the road in the transportation system is part of our commonwealth, something that is a benefit to us all, and so we all should pay for it, which is why I was particularly concerned about this transportation bill, H.R. 7. For the first time in about 50 years, the House is going to consider a partisan transportation package. Republicans are breaking the historical tradition of bipartisan action to rebuild infrastructure, create jobs, and strengthen our economy.

This proposal, H.R. 7, would cut about 550,000 American jobs, cuts highway investments in 45 States and D.C.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Everyone needs to hear that again. Would cut?

Mr. ELLISON. Cut.

The GOP proposal cuts 550,000 American jobs, cuts highway investments in 45 States, bankrupts the highway trust fund with a \$78 billion shortfall. As you said, it takes transit funding and puts it in the regular appropriations process, not in the stream of funding.

□ 1950

It gets rid of biking paths; it gets rid of walking paths. The reviews are in, and they all agree: the GOP bill is bad for jobs.

A good friend of mine who happens to be a Republican but works for the Obama administration, Ray LaHood, said, "This is the most partisan transportation bill that I have ever seen." And he's seen a lot of them. He's your home boy from Illinois, right?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That he is.

Mr. ELLISON. Continuing to quote Mr. LaHood:

And it also is the most anti-safety bill I have ever seen. It hollows out our No. 1 priority, which is safety, and frankly, it hollows out the guts of the transportation efforts that we've been about for the last three years. It's the worst transportation bill I've ever seen in 35 years of public service.

Now, that's saying a lot.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That is saying a lot. As I said before, and as Ray LaHood was alluding to, as many differences that may have existed across the aisle, recognizing the importance of transportation for commerce, for business, for everyday Americans getting to work, for linking our country together, for transporting our goods, Democrats and Republicans have always been able to sit down and together craft a piece of legislation on transportation. And to come up with an equitable way to fund it. Everyone has been able to agree.

This time, not only the way the bill is funded—talking about putting the burden on public employees to help fund it, but the elements of the bill itself. The fact, as you read, it is going to actually cost jobs. The transportation bill has always been the place where we have created jobs in our country. I think it's really shameful. I don't see that this piece of legislation is going to pass, but those who proposed it, I think, have made a serious miscalculation in every way.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, you know, it's beyond my ability to comprehend that any American, any American, would do anything other than try to make sure that everybody had enough. We had enough jobs for everybody who wanted to work, and those jobs were well-paying. But I tell you, there has been polling out there on what Americans think. This is not what I think; this is what Americans have said. Half of Americans believe that Republicans are sabotaging our recovery to win an election; 55 percent believe that, and 44 percent believe other than that.

Now, when you hear that this transportation bill is going to cut over half a million jobs, it's difficult to go to

Americans and explain that's not what they are doing. Now again, I'm not going to look into the inner recesses of anyone's heart. I don't know what people's motives are. But I do know any bill, when we have unemployment north of 8 percent, which is going to cut jobs, and has been a historic place where we have created jobs, I think Americans have reason to be suspicious, and I hope our Republican majority would come and clarify what they're actually doing because, like I just pointed out, half of Americans believe that the Republicans are sabotaging our recovery to win an election.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Well, let me give you an example.

We have seen the unemployment rate now drop to 8.3 percent, and that's not good, but it's better. We've seen it drop, and we have seen 23 months now of private sector job growth every month, which is a great thing, a great record.

Yes, let everybody look at that chart. The orange-brown part is during the Bush administration when the economic crisis first hit. And then the blue is during the Obama administration, where you see a pretty steady decrease in unemployment, and then you see now we are above the line for many months and creating jobs, and that increase in jobs.

But if the Republicans had not gone after public sector jobs, if there had not been the cut in public sector jobs at the Federal level as well as at the State level, because a lot of Federal dollars were lost to the States, causing the layoffs of many teachers and firefighters and policemen, public sector workers have been laid off, we would have an unemployment rate of about 7.5 percent if those cuts hadn't happened in the public sector. So, you know, who's really for getting our economy going, putting people back to work, letting them be taxpayers rather than having to receive unemployment benefits, you know, which we better extend because people need them, but they'd rather have a job.

Mr. ELLISON. Absolutely. The gentlelady should note, I had this one chart up, and I would like to let folks know, because what the question was—Washington Post-ABC asked the following statement: President Obama is making a good-faith effort to deal with the country's economic problems, but the Republicans in Congress are playing politics by blocking his proposals and programs.

Or: President Obama has not provided leadership on the economy, and he's just blaming the Republicans in Congress as an excuse for not doing his job.

Fifty percent of the people responded to statement A, the first one. And that is: President Obama is making a good-faith effort to deal with the country's economic problems, but Republicans in Congress are playing politics by blocking his proposals and programs.

Now, I hope that Republicans are reading these, because they're not

looking good. The best thing for them to do is to stop making proposals like this transportation bill, H.R. 7, which literally cuts jobs, because the American people are watching this. And quite frankly, I want us all to succeed. I don't think that it's good for the American population to think that one party that is elected to promote the public interest is doing something other than that in order to win an election.

Again, this board here clearly shows that when President Bush was in, this was kind of red. It's kind of bleeding, and then the blue is going up, up, up, and now above the line, and we have been adding 23 consecutive months of private sector job growth, but that public sector job loss, as you pointed out, is literally a drag on the economy, and it's hurting us. We need people to get to work.

I just want to ask the gentlelady a question. Again, I mean, does a public sector paycheck offer less at the local grocery store when the person goes to buy some groceries with that public sector paycheck?

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. No. It's a job and a paycheck, and you take it to the grocery store. And it resonates throughout the economy. But I'll tell you, it's a pinch. When that wage and that check is frozen for 2 years, people feel that. Prices at the grocery store still go up, and so that very same paycheck doesn't quite buy as much. You know, there may be some lifestyle changes, maybe not such big things but some little things that add to the quality of life that actually our Federal employees have had to do without because of the freeze. And then, they're asked now, in order to even pay for a transportation bill, to lose money out of their pension fund, to have to pay more of their pension, which is their retirement fund.

Mr. ELLISON. I just want to point you, you and I were just talking about this chart which shows that under the Bush administration, the unemployment rate going up, us losing jobs, and then the steady march back the other way.

This chart shows that GOP proposals would eliminate up to 7.4 million jobs by 2016. So if you look at the proposals that the GOP has been making while they have been in the majority, the transportation bill, H.R. 7, is just one example of job killing. They like to call stuff "job killing." That's their little Frank Luntz talking point. But they have in actuality proposed job-killing legislation. Starting with H.R. 1, The Economist, The Center for American Progress, showed that it would cut a million jobs. Repealing health care reform would cut about 2 million. GOP budget cuts, that's the Ryan budget, cuts to the Federal workforce, their so-called JOBS Act, all the way down the line.

□ 2000

This red is, if they could have their way, this is the bleed of American jobs

that would happen. Now, this is a projection. But the fact is this transportation bill is a typical example of their idea of how the economy should operate. And it is very disturbing—17.4 million jobs. Of course, this would simply renew a trend that we were on during the Bush administration. So I think it's time for Republicans to stop offering these bad jobs bills and start offering some things that are going to put Americans back to work. They can begin that process by yanking this H.R. 7.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Let me also just say that you mentioned that the Republicans like to point to the President's proposals or Democratic proposals and say, oh, this is another job-killing measure. Well, the facts are the facts. And the facts are that we have seen 23 months of private sector job creation. Literally millions of jobs have been created. And so I haven't heard too much about the job killing lately because it's pretty hard to talk about every time the job numbers come out and those jobs are increasing.

I want to thank you very much for bringing up an example of a piece of legislation that doesn't address our transportation needs, that does result in job loss, and that is paid for by going after middle class Federal workers as the ones who have to sacrifice in order to fund legislation like this. Thank you.

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentlelady. I just want to make a few points before we begin to wrap it up. I just want to point out that economist Mark Zandi, who has advised Senator McCain, said by 2014 real GDP is almost \$200 billion lower, and there are 1.7 million fewer jobs under the Ryan approach than is under the case of the President's. That's just one honest economist's estimate.

The Economic Policy Institute's conservative estimate of the Republican budget is 2 billion to 3 billion jobs lost over 5 years. Again, H.R. 1 would cut a couple of hundred thousand jobs. So, I really think, Mr. Speaker, that the American people need to know what kind of a "jobs program" the Republicans are talking about. They're not talking adding jobs; they're talking about cutting them. And H.R. 7 is but a typical example of the kind of damage these Republican majority Members would do to the American economy.

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

WAKE UP, AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCSHON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are interesting days in which we live. There is supposed to be an old Chinese curse that says: May you live in interesting times; and it's

as if that curse has been placed on us. We certainly live in interesting times.

On 9/11/2001, this country suffered the worst attack in its history on its homeland. It was worse than December 7, 1941. It left thousands dead, it left the Nation reeling from the feeling of vulnerability, and it pushed the Federal Government to respond quickly.

Now, there are a number of things that could be effectuated more effectively in Iraq and Afghanistan. That would be a subject for another time.

I recall after 9/11, Bill Bennett coming to my hometown of Tyler, Texas, and speaking at Tyler Junior College. And there was a huge crowd that turned out. People, in fact, turned out during those few months after 9/11 in record numbers to their churches and to places of worship in record numbers. Because much like the children of Israel after a disaster, they realized they needed to get back closer to our Creator.

The FBI, our intelligence attributes, all of our Justice Department, State Department and all of the Bush administration immediately was pushed into gear to do something to protect us. And in that regard, Bill Bennett speaking there in Tyler said, Some people get offended if they look somewhat like someone who committed the worst attack in American history and they're searched more thoroughly than perhaps someone else.

And Bill said, I just know that if there was a red-headed Irishman that had attacked the United States, he said, I could anticipate having to go through heightened security checks every time I try to fly, every time I try to go anywhere. And he said, If that were to happen, I would understand because, he said, I love this country. I want people to be safe and feel safe, and since someone who looked like me with red hair and my same heritage had committed that act, even though he was and is a law-abiding citizen, he would understand being subjected to more scrutiny.

There was a time in this country when common sense like that did prevail, when no one would have ever dreamed that in going through security at an airport and somebody like me asking, why did I get pulled aside for the extra inspection and the puffery and all the added scrutiny, and being told, you look like you wouldn't get mad. That told me a lot. I stood there and watched for about 20 minutes. There were a couple of African American businessmen, well dressed, they were pulled aside for the heightened scrutiny. They certainly had no resemblance to anybody that had attacked America on 9/11. A little old lady, one of our seniors, full of vim, vigor and spirit, she was pulled aside. Anyway, interesting times.

I think our Justice Department, some of our folks who are supposed to be looking out for our protection have been lulled into a false sense of security, and they have done what some say