

FOOD INSECURITY

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, every year we celebrate Easter and Passover, in part, with food. Yet for millions of Americans, putting food on their tables this holiday season is no different than any other day. It is a struggle at best, and a failure at worst. It is a failure of this institution and our government as a whole that we still tolerate incredibly low wages so that people are forced to choose between rent and food, clothes and food, utilities and food. We can do better.

We need the White House to step up and own this issue. They can start with a White House conference on food and nutrition.

Mr. Speaker, even though millions struggle with hunger, there are good souls out there who are trying to help. I want to highlight one Good Samaritan who paid for the groceries of a young woman named Andrea who was just trying to feed her kids. When Andrea exhausted her SNAP benefits at the grocery store, an unnamed woman in line gave her \$17.38 so that she didn't have to return any of the groceries.

This House could learn from this example to help our neighbors rather than penalize them simply for being poor. I include for the RECORD Andrea's letter to this unnamed woman in line at the grocery store.

DEAR WOMAN BEHIND ME IN LINE AT THE GROCERY STORE: You don't know me. You have no clue what my life has been like since October 1, 2013. You have no clue that my family has gone through the wringer. You have no clue that we have faced unbelievable hardship. You have no clue we have been humiliated, humbled, destitute.

You have no clue I have cried more days than not; that I fight against bitterness taking control of my heart. You have no clue that my husband's pride was shattered. You have no clue my kids have had the worries of an adult on their shoulders. You have no clue their innocence was snatched from them for no good reason. You know none of this.

What you do know is I tried to buy my kids some food and that the EBT machine was down so I couldn't buy that food. I didn't have any cash or my debit card with me. I only had my SNAP card. All you heard was me saying "No, don't hold it for me. My kids are hungry now and I have no other way of paying for this." You didn't judge me. You didn't snarl "Maybe you should have less kids." You didn't say "Well, get a job and learn to support yourself." You didn't look away in embarrassment or shame for me. You didn't make any assumptions at all.

What you did was you paid that \$17.38 grocery bill for us. You gave my kids bananas, yogurt, apple juice, cheese sticks, and a peach ice tea for me; a rare treat and splurge. You let me hug you and promise through my tears that I will pay this forward. I will pay someone's grocery bill for them. That \$17.38 may not have been a lot for you, but it was priceless to us. In the car my kids couldn't stop gushing about you; our "angel in disguise." They prayed for you. They prayed you would be blessed. You restored some of our lost faith. One simple and small action changed our lives. You probably

have forgotten about us by now, but we haven't forgotten about you. You will forever be a part of us even though we don't even know your name.

You have no clue how grateful and embarrassed I am that we pay for all our food with SNAP. We eat well thanks to the government. I love that. I love that the government makes sure my kids are cared for. It is one less worry for us. I also struggle with pride and embarrassment. I defiantly tell people we are on SNAP. Daring them to judge us.

Only those closest to us know why we are on SNAP. They know my husband is a hard worker who was laid off after 17 years in a management position with his former company. They know we were moved from our home to a new state only to be left homeless since the house we had came with the job he lost. Only those closest to us know my husband works part time while looking tirelessly for more; that he has submitted more applications than he has received interviews for. Too many jobs are only offering part time work anymore. It is not easy for a 40-something year old to find a job that will support his family of five kids.

You know none of this but you didn't let that stop you from being compassionate and generous to someone you have never met.

To the woman behind me at the grocery store, you have no idea how much we appreciate you. You have no idea the impact you had on my kids. You have no idea how incredibly thankful I am for you. Your action may have been small, but to us it was monumental. Thank you.

Thank you for not judging us. Thank you for giving my kids a snack when they were quite hungry. Thank you. Just thank you.

Forever,
Andrea, the woman in front of you at the grocery store with the cart full of kids who are no longer hungry

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO NATIONAL COMMISSION ON HUNGER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 743(b)(3) of Public Law 113-76, and the order of the House of January 3, 2013, of the following individuals on the part of the House to the National Commission on Hunger:

Mr. Jeremy Everett, Waco, Texas
Dr. Susan Finn, Columbus, Ohio
Mr. Robert Doar, Brooklyn, New York

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STATEHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, while I am waiting for my posters to arrive at the rostrum, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. I thank the gentle lady so much for yielding.

You are allowing me to correct a grave mistake I made earlier today. I had the great pleasure of carrying the RSC budget to the floor today. We

weren't able to succeed in passing our balanced budget, but we did succeed in passing the Budget Committee balanced budget. I think that is a great success for this House, but those successes don't happen by themselves. They happen because we are surrounded by staffers in this institution who do an amazing amount of work day in and day out.

In my case, it is Will Dunham, who is the staff director at the Republican Study Committee; the very able budget staffer there, Matthew Dickerson; and my own budget associate, Nick Myrs. Without their help, it would have been impossible to put that budget together, and I am so grateful for their commitment to this institution and to the very difficult work that we do.

With that, I thank my friend very much for yielding.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, all this week I have come to the House floor for a very special purpose. I have offered only some of the reasons that the residents who live in the Nation's capital should have the same basic rights as other Americans. All other Americans have achieved these rights through statehood. We have tried to break down the elements of statehood into separate bills, but we have not been able to get those elements recognized by the Congress of the United States either.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am making use of an important day coming up next week when Congress will be out of session. April 16 is commemorated in the District of Columbia because it is the day 152 years ago when Abraham Lincoln freed those slaves who happened to live in the Nation's capital 9 months before the national Emancipation Proclamation. This week, I have used this upcoming occasion to offer a series of remarks not only, of course, because of this historic occasion in our city but because of the meaning this occasion has to the residents of the Nation's Capital here and now, right this moment, not 152 years ago.

Unlike 1862 when African Americans who happened to live in the Nation's Capital were deprived of freedom, in 2014, every American citizen of every background, of every race, of every color, of every religion, of every ethnic origin, of every sex is equally deprived of equal rights with other Americans.

Other Americans, to have obtain full rights, need only be taxpaying citizens who serve in the Nation's wars. The people I represent have served in the Nation's wars since our very first war, the war that created the United States of America. And from the moment the Congress imposed Federal income taxes on the people of the United States, the people I represent have paid those taxes to support their government without a voting Member in this Congress, this House of Representatives, and with no voting Members in the Senate of the United States.

I do have the vote in committee, but when matters affecting my district, in

particular, or matters affecting the United States in which my jurisdiction, like other Americans, is implicated, like whether to go to war in Iraq and Afghanistan, where our residents have served, I have no vote on this floor. Mind you, on this floor, Congress votes on the budget raised, the local budget raised in my city, not one penny of which has been contributed by this Congress.

□ 1230

Yet nothing is more important to Americans than the ability to pass your own local laws, to raise your own local money and say how it is to be spent without interference from the national government.

No others who pay taxes, Federal income taxes—obviously, we pay local taxes—but no others who pay Federal income taxes and who have served in our armed forces are denied their basic rights in our country. This, of course, is an embarrassment to the country itself, but today it is far more serious. It is a violation of international law and a treaty that we have signed.

Last month, the U.N. Human Rights Committee issued its report for 2014. Its report called our country to account on the denial of congressional voting rights in the National Legislature for the residents of the District of Columbia. In other words, the United States Government is in violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That is the treaty that our country signed in 1992. The U.N. report recommended: “Provide full voting rights for the residents of Washington, D.C.”

I would venture to say that you will not find an American citizen who does not agree that, before the Congress can impose any burden on you, you ought to have the right to raise your hand “yea” or “nay.”

Moreover, this is not the first time that the United Nations has called our country to account. Earlier, in 2006, the Human Rights Committee wrote:

“The committee having taken note of the responses provided by the delegation”—

That means the United States delegation to the U.N.—

heard their responses and said: “. . . remains concerned that the residents of the District of Columbia do not enjoy full representation in Congress, a restriction that does not seem to be compatible with article XXV of the covenant.”

And then it cited articles II, XXV, and XXVI.

Article II, and I won't quote from the entire article, says:

“Adopt such laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in the present covenant.”

That covenant is a treaty, a treaty we signed in 1992, to which we are, by human rights and international law, bound.

Article XXV says that that right includes: “the right to take part in the conduct of public affairs directly or through freely chosen representatives.”

In our country, we do not have direct democracy. We govern through freely chosen representatives who get to vote on this floor. The residents of the District of Columbia get to choose me, but I do not get to vote even on matters affecting their local concerns.

Article XXV also says: “to have access on general terms of equality to public service in this country.”

The residents have access to public service. I serve as a Member of Congress, but they do not have that right in terms of “equality” because I cannot vote once I become the Member chosen to exercise that service.

Moreover, notably, when my party was in power, using House rules, the District was given the right to vote on behalf of the residents of the District of Columbia on matters in the so-called Committee of the Whole. Imagine, after getting a right that is not the full right to vote on most matters in this Chamber, but when my Republican colleagues came to power, they took even that right, the right to vote in the Committee of the Whole, from the people of the District of Columbia. Is that, my friends, “equality,” or is it discrimination against the residents of the Nation's capital?

The report refers also to article XXVI. That is worth quoting:

“All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination through the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground . . .”

Then they name some such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth—and here is the one that applies to District of Columbia residents—or other status.

What is the other status of the residents of the District of Columbia? Their status is that they reside in their Nation's capital, the only Nation in the world that denies the residents of their capital the same rights that other residents in their country enjoy.

Nor is there any question that there are more than enough American citizens here to be granted statehood or at least equality.

Two States of the Union that have two Senators and one Representative have fewer residents than the District of Columbia. Here is one, the lowest population in the country, Wyoming. Next is Vermont. And finally, with considerably more residents, almost 650,000, the District of Columbia.

We are soon going to overtake a number of other States. The District is growing, so much that there has been an attempt to raise the so-called Height Act, which limits how high buildings can be, because of the need to expand housing and office space. That attempt was turned back because residents were more concerned with the low-scale residential quality and attractiveness of their city.

We are talking, Mr. Speaker, about 650,000 people, about the size of an av-

erage congressional district. Look to this chart about how rapidly the District is growing, on an average, more than 2 percent a year for more than 10 years now. In the last couple of years, it has grown by almost 2½ percent. Just compare that with growth in the United States itself. The United States population grew not by 1 percent or 2 percent, but by 0.7 percent in the last couple of years.

We live in one of the most rapidly growing regions in the country. This is called the national capital region. Maryland and Virginia are the closest States. And yet the District, is growing more than 2 percent compared to Virginia, which grew only 0.9 percent, and Maryland, which grew only 0.7 percent.

Mr. Speaker, during my remarks this week on the floor, this week, selected the two most basic obligations of Americans who have won statehood to test whether the District is being denied its rights. I began with taxes because I think people fret most about paying taxes—and almost all of us have to pay taxes—not because taxes are more important.

Who thinks taxes are more important, of course, is the Republican majority. They are obsessed with taxes. So you would think that they would want to do something about people who pay taxes but don't have representation. Taxes is about the only issue that the Republican majority cares about. But by “taxes,” they mean cutting taxes. Yet they raise taxes by imposing taxes without representation on the people of the District of Columbia. They are happy to take more than \$3 billion annually out of the pockets of D.C. citizens with no vote on whether those taxes should be raised or lowered.

But, the most surprising fact about taxes in our country is who, which individuals, pay the most. Well, if I were to ask our citizens, to guess, they probably wouldn't say District of Columbia residents. Let me clarify. Of the residents of the 50 States, the residents of the District of Columbia pay more Federal taxes per person than the residents of any of the 50 States.

This chart shows how it goes from the highest to the lowest. The highest in the United States at almost \$12,000 per person in Federal taxes annually, resident by resident, live in the District of Columbia. The lowest per capita, per person, live in the State of Mississippi.

□ 1245

So imagine the rage—nobody wants to pay taxes—imagine the rage when you pay more taxes than anybody else and still don't have the vote on the House floor.

Now, I haven't put all of the States on this poster because they could not be seen, but you see it goes from \$12,000—or almost \$12,000—down to as little as \$4,000.

The first 10 States, the top 10 States, end with California. Some of them, you might recognize if you had to guess

them. The second is Connecticut. The third is New Jersey. The 10th is California at about \$8,000 per person. Compare that to our almost \$12,000 per person. Understand that this doesn't have to do with the size of the State's population. It has to do with the amount of taxes per person, and regardless of population size, District residents pay more.

I indicated that Vermont and Wyoming were States we exceeded in population. Wyoming residents pay something close to \$8,000 per person compared to our \$12,000—or almost \$12,000; and Vermont, also a State with fewer residents than in the District of Columbia, pays about half, something over \$6,000, compared to our almost \$12,000 per person in taxes. Or just randomly pick out your State. Bear in mind, we are comparing them with D.C.'s almost \$12,000 per person in Federal taxes that are paying to support the Government of the United States.

Nebraska is half of that, about \$6,400. Take two others that are close to one another in the amounts they pay, each about \$6,000—Arizona and Indiana—compared to D.C.'s \$12,000.

There is Idaho. To support the Federal Government, Idaho, which pays \$5,440. D.C. pays something over twice what they pay.

When you get to those which pay the least—let's take the bottom two States, Louisiana at \$4,500 and Mississippi at \$4,200—you will see D.C. getting to paying three times what these States pay—States which have Representatives and two Senators.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, of all the obligations, perhaps the most poignant is service in the Armed Forces. For the people I represent, there has been service in the Armed Forces ever since there has been a United States of America and even before, when we were fighting in a Revolution to create the United States of America, but that service has often been disproportionate to the number of residents.

Looking to the major wars of the 20th century, you get an idea of what I mean. In World War I, 635 casualties, but that was more than three States. In World War II, now, we are getting to more in casualties than four States.

By the time we got to the Korean war, the District had more casualties than in eight States. So we have gone from three to four, to Korea with eight and, finally, to Vietnam with more casualties than in 10 States.

The District even sometimes has had to fight to get equal respect for D.C. members of our Armed Forces.

A mother wrote me when she recently went to the graduation of her son from boot camp at Naval Station Great Lakes. The family was there, glowing with honor and pride, for a son who had passed up going to college in order to serve in the United States Navy, so passionate was this kid about service.

When each graduate stepped forward, the flag of the State was raised. When

Seaman Jonathan Rucker stepped forward, no State flag was raised.

That, my friends, was the last straw. I was immediately in touch with the White House and with the Armed Services Committees, particularly after veterans in the District of Columbia came forward with more particularly heartbreaking stories.

For example, among the most serious were some veterans who spoke of no D.C. flag being displayed at "welcome home" ceremonies, even though the flags of other States were raised. I don't think anybody meant any disrespect to our residents serving in the Armed Forces.

I just believe that, when you pay taxes without representation—when you don't have anybody in the Senate who can take care of you and when you have only a nonvoting Representative in the House, who votes in committee, but not on this floor, it is easy to be disregarded in many ways.

I am very grateful to Senator LEVIN and the Senate Armed Services Committee and to this House and its Armed Services Committee for rectifying this serious slight to our residents, the residents who have given the most to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I read an honor roll, picking out just a few of the very distinguished Washingtonians who have served in the Armed Forces because some of them stand out in the history of our country.

This was a city which had racial segregation imposed on it by the Congress of the United States until the 1960s, even though, until that time, the majority of the population of the District of Columbia was not African American, but was White; yet even during that period—that period of segregation when African Americans were entering the armed services from every part of the country, the first African American Army general was born in this city, the first African American Air Force general born in this city, the first African American Naval Academy graduate born in this city, the first African American Air Force Academy graduate born in this city, and this roster continues to this very day.

The first Deputy Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard is serving as I speak, Vice Admiral Manson Brown, who was born in this city; and the first African American female aviator of the D.C. National Guard, First Lt. Demetria Elosie—60, is a Washingtonian.

Mr. Speaker, we know that statehood is the only way Americans have gotten full and equal rights. That, of course, is why we seek statehood, but don't think we haven't tried to get our rights in every single way we could. We also have tried piece by piece.

There are pending bills before the House and the Senate now. Some contain important elements of statehood—for example budget autonomy—that would allow our budget to go into effect, a local budget after all, once it is passed by the local legislature, the D.C. Council.

Because this Congress insists that we bring our local budget to this national body, which does not fund the District, our city was almost shut down this past year when the Congress shut down the Federal Government for 16 days.

That was a subject of great anguish in the District of Columbia because we were no part of that fight. We have got a balanced budget, and indeed a surplus, but because we had to bring our budget here and because Congress had not passed a single appropriation, we got shut down, too—or almost.

The mayor kept the city open, and as we were running out of contingent funds, the Republican majority relented and allowed the Federal Government to open, and therefore, the District did not have to close down.

I am pleased that the administration, President Obama, has put into his budget language that would grant the District control over its own budget, allowing the local budget to go into effect as soon as the D.C. City Council passes the local budget. He put that same provision in his budget last year, and the Senate appropriators passed it.

I thought then that D.C. budget autonomy would become law with the budget deal, but when the budget deal came out, it left out the section that would have given the residents of the District of Columbia control over the money they, themselves, and nobody else raises.

I am pleased to say that there are Members of this House on both sides of the aisle who recognize that elementary fairness lies in budget autonomy. I thank Majority Leader ERIC CANTOR for his support for budget autonomy. He is the second in leadership, a Republican leader of this House.

I thank Chairman DARRELL ISSA, who is the chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over matters affecting the District of Columbia, in that he has pressed for budget autonomy even as he pressed to keep the District open when the city was almost shut down.

□ 1300

The District also does not have complete control over its local laws. What D.C. has is a costly requirement that delays local bills for months before they can become effective, because they have to come to the Congress, although the Congress never uses this procedure called a "layover procedure" to overturn city laws but finds other means to do so, yet continues to impose the layover requirement of bringing every local law here to the Congress before it becomes effective.

I appreciate that Senator MARK BEGICH, who chairs the subcommittee, and Chairman TOM CARPER, who chairs the full committee with jurisdiction over matters affecting the District of Columbia in the Senate, have introduced bills that would give the District budget and legislative autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, when I came to the House in the early nineties, I was able to get almost two-thirds of the Democrats to vote for statehood for the District of Columbia. It was not enough

but it does show you that there were Members then and I believe people now who recognize the unfairness of the unequal status of D.C. residents I have discussed today and earlier this week.

It became more difficult to make progress as the years went by, because most of my service in the Congress has been in the minority. Yet we are making progress.

We were able to get the first statue representing the District of Columbia in the Capitol last year. The reason that is important is that a statue, like those of the states, was denied us because we are not yet a State. We have now been able to break through that with what is surely a symbol of statehood.

And at the ceremony with majority and minority leadership, unveiling the Douglass statue, Majority Leader REID used the occasion, with great enthusiasm, to indicate that he was cosponsoring the D.C. statehood bill.

The reason that is important, Mr. Speaker, is that the Majority Leader, like the Speaker of this House, cosponsors very few bills. It says something about the importance of correcting unfairness to the District of Columbia that Majority Leader REID not only has become a cosponsor of our D.C. statehood bill, one of 17 Senators, but that he did so with great enthusiasm and in a prominent public announcement.

I am pleased that virtually the entire Democratic Senate leadership has sponsored our statehood bill.

Mr. Speaker, Congress continues to deny the American citizens who live in its Nation's Capital their most basic rights. Today we have discussed how that is a violation of every American principle, and that it is even a violation of international law.

Congress has failed to give D.C. residents even some of the rights associated with statehood, rights that they could give today or tomorrow even if they were not prepared to grant us statehood, the right to control our own local funds, funds we raise, funds we then turn over, at a cost of \$12,000 per person, to support the government of the United States.

Congress tyrannically overturns locally passed laws and keeps our local laws from going into existence until they have had an opportunity to look at them, except they don't. They just leave this costly, delay-ridden requirement in place.

Congress continues to command our taxes to support the national government at a higher per capita rate than the rate paid by any other Americans while denying D.C. residents voting representation when Congress passes laws concerning those taxes or concerning any other matter affecting our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in the name of those who have died in the Nation's wars; in the name of the living veterans of our wars who are among the 650,000 residents of the District of Columbia today; in the name of D.C. resi-

dents who pay \$12,000 per person, the highest per capita federal taxes in the country, to support the United States of America; in the name of millions ever since 1801, when the District of Columbia became the Capital, who have died in our wars without seeing the benefits of voting representation in the House and Senate and without the full and equal rights of other Americans who died alongside them, I ask this House to grant the residents of their Nation's Capital statehood. And if you fall short of statehood, at the very least, our residents are entitled to equal representation and to equal recognition, to equality under law with every other American citizen.

WAR ON BRATS

(Mr. PETRI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern that protectionism could one day lead to a "war on brats."

Bratwursts are delicious. They are enjoyed around the world. In Wisconsin, we take our brats seriously. But nowhere more so than in the Sixth District, which includes the Bratwurst Capital of the World, Sheboygan, Wisconsin.

In 1970, the city of Sheboygan battled Bucyrus, Ohio, for the title and won. The battle was ended on August 14, 1970, when Judge John Bolgert issued an official decision bestowing the title upon Sheboygan and barring all other claimants from using it.

Unfortunately, this title could soon be under attack. There is growing concern that the European Union could consider more geographic name restrictions on products including "kielbasa" and Wisconsin's own "bratwurst."

This is, frankly, getting ridiculous. If anything, we should be trademarking the name "bratwurst," not them.

I am currently circulating a letter urging the U.S. trade representatives to reject any attempt to include these provisions in further trade negotiations. I strongly urge my colleagues to consider signing this letter.

WAR ON CONSERVATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is amazing some of the efforts made to rewrite history and cast things in a light that doesn't exist. So as some people in the administration step up the continued trashing of conservatives in America—we have already seen the assault on conservative groups by the IRS, that does need a special prosecutor, clearly—the assault on people with whom some in the administration disagree,

they can't answer questions, and so they make personal attacks.

Then our Attorney General makes a speech yesterday in which, because he was busy helping, perhaps, terrorists or Marc Rich or things like that he didn't notice, because I am sure he wouldn't be untruthful or tell a lie, but he doesn't even know how bad it gets in Washington if you are a conservative, if you are George W. Bush, if you are John Ashcroft, if you are Alberto Gonzales.

It got pretty brutal here, a lot worse than anything our current Attorney General has seen, and that is even without having to go back and recall the treatment that John Mitchell got. I would say, deservedly so, John Mitchell got the treatment he got. But for any Attorney General to be so ignorant of what has happened in very recent years of the maltreatment and malignment and basically slander of Republicans and a Republican President and Republican Attorneys General is a bit breathtaking.

There is a Web site that is Boycott Liberalism. It has a lot of quotes from people. Senator HARRY REID said:

President Bush is a liar.

I don't recall anyone saying that at our hearings with our current Attorney General.

The Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, NANCY PELOSI, said:

Bush is an incompetent leader. In fact, he's not a leader.

I don't recall anyone saying anything of that magnitude of our current Attorney General or President, not in any of our hearings.

Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State and U.S. Senator, said:

We have a culture of corruption. We have cronyism. We have incompetence.

This actually raises a question about pots and kettles calling each other names.

Other quotes. John Edwards, a former U.S. Senator and Democratic Vice Presidential nominee:

I would say if you live in the United States of America and you vote for George Bush, you've lost your mind.

Senator AL FRANKEN said:

I think the President highjacked 9/11 and used it to go to war with Iraq in a way that was very divisive.

The late Ted Kennedy, as Senator, said:

No President in American history has done more damage to our country and our security than George W. Bush.

Amazingly, I am not aware of any U.S. President in one party reaching out more to a Senator in the other party than did George W. Bush with Senator Ted Kennedy, and these are the kind of comments he got in response.

Senator Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State, said:

I predict to you that this administration will go down in history as one of the worst that has ever governed our country.

We are just talking about there has never been an Attorney General or