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 colleagues 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 that to others, 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 and minority leadership, unveiling the hood.

We have now been able to break through that with what is surely a symbol of statehood.

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.

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 Bolger 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.

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—
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I don’t recall anyone saying anything of that magnitude of our current Attorney General. 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 has always been a liar or a brat.
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President treated as have been the current ones.

Senator Hillary Clinton, former Secretary of State, said:

There has never been an administration, I don’t believe, in our history more intent on consoling and abusing power to further their own agenda.

She also said:

I have been absolutely amazed, even shocked, at the combination of arrogance and incompetence that marks this particular administration.

We are just helping those who have short memories or maybe were busy helping terrorists or others get pardons and didn’t notice these kind of statements being made.

Former Senator and former Vice President Al Gore said:

While President Bush likes to project an image of strength and courage, the real truth is that, in the presence of his large financial contributors, he is a moral coward.

Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI said:

Bush is an incompetent leader. In fact, he is not a leader. He is a person who has no judgment, no experience, and no knowledge of the subjects that he has to decide upon.

Quotes go on and on, pages of quotes.

But Democratic Senator from Washington, PATTY MURRAY, said, “He’s”—talking about Osama Bin Laden—“been out of these countries for decades; building schools, building roads, building infrastructure, building daycare facilities, building health care facilities, and these people are extremely grateful. We haven’t done that.”

Former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI said, “I believe that the President’s leadership and the actions taken in Iraq”—talking about President Bush—“demonstrate an incompetence in terms of knowledge, judgment, and experience in making the decisions that would have been necessary to truly accomplish the mission without the deaths to our troops and the cost to our taxpayers.”

She also made this statement, former Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, talking about President Bush: “I believe that the President’s leadership and the actions taken in Iraq demonstrate an incompetence in terms of knowledge, judgment, experience in making the decisions that would have been necessary to truly accomplish the mission without the deaths to our troops and the cost to our taxpayers,” basically the same thing again.

But, there are some of us that could care less about someone’s party or someone’s race or someone’s gender; someone’s age. We don’t care. We care about whether you are helping or hurting our country if you are in a position to do one or the other.

I would also direct my friends who would later do research and get the truth before they go accusing, ignorantly, someone who has the gall to question refusal to turn over documents that were provided by the Justice Department to terrorists, convicted terrorists.

People who financed terrorism, which made them a part of the terrorist act, convicted of over 100 counts, they were given, their lawyers were given thousands of pages of documents and hundreds of pages of documents. Lawyers were given 9,600 or so transcripts or summaries of transcripts.

And Members of Congress are told, as I was in a letter this year in response to my request to get these documents that the Justice Department provided to terrorists, I get a response, basically, saying, hey, here is a Web site, you can look up some exhibits that were admitted in evidence. And here is a public access Web site.

I have been asking for 3 years, just give us the documents Justice gave to the terrorists. If somebody wants to try to make something of that, that is their problem. But the Constitution provides that Congress has oversight; we know what to fund and what not to fund. That is part of article I, section 8 of the Constitution.

So, to be denied documents for 3 years, as I have been, with little coy, useless answers, then allegations of ulterior motivations, when I want to protect America—and I travel around the world, and I hear moderate Muslim leaders, friends in other countries say, why are you not helping us against radical Islam anymore? You are helping the bad guys.

I want to find out what the documentation was and is that the Justice Department has. And they know how to reduce it to disk and provide it to others. I am told they have done that to others in the Justice Department, so do that for Congress.

At one point I was told, well, there are classification issues. You gave them to terrorists, your Department did, so it shouldn’t be a classification problem to give them to Members of Congress.

So for those who wonder about the treatment of an Attorney General coming for an oversight hearing, we have already seen that the Justice Department repeatedly refused to provide the documentation of what happened in Fast and Furious.

And if someone wants to talk about unprecedented treatment, let’s look at the Justice Department’s actions. We know that haven’t been covered up by this administration, that haven’t been kept secret by this administration.

Thank God, one of the gun store owners who was being pressured by the Justice Department to sell to the people he knew he should not sell to, he recorded some of the conversations. If he had not, you can’t help but believe they would have turned on him bigger than they did, because once they found out he had tapes of the conversations, they knew he didn’t completely blame him, because he was saying, in essence, I shouldn’t be selling to these people. But he was coerced into selling.

People were coerced into selling weapons to people that should not have had them, morally or legally, because the Justice Department wanted to get them to drug cartels in Mexico, where they did, and we know, we have heard from at least a couple of us, the Mexicans, each one of them a life worth saving, those lives were taken by guns that this Justice Department forced into the hands of criminals, people that should not have had them. So we would like to know more information about how this all came about.

And it is not good enough to say, hey, the Bush Justice Department had a scheme where they had devices, they had guns that they were going to track, just like in drug sales, where you have a controlled sale so you can try to arrest the bad guys and, because of a problem, they got away from them.

That is a different thing entirely, of intentionally letting guns get away to criminals who killed hundreds of Mexicans, and at least one American, Brian Terry, and perhaps more.

It would be nice if we could get to the bottom of that. When there are big problems in our government, we need to know what they are so we can defund them, or at least bring about accountability, just as my Democratic friends in the Senate repeatedly said, except not so kindly about the Bush administration and John Ashcroft and Alberto Gonzales.

And there were some things I agreed with Senator SCHUMER on in the Gonzales Justice hearings. It was outrageous that they allowed so many National Security Letters to go out without proper basis. I was outraged about that.

In fact, if someone decides to check the RECORD, they can see the way I went after the Bush FBI Director, because I believed then and still believe he did some serious damage to the FBI during the Bush administration.

The only difference is, I never heard him run out and give a speech whining about how he was mistreated as he came before me for questioning. He didn’t do that. And he actually tried to take actions to correct the problems that I got all over him about.

Another difference is, he was a Republican President’s FBI Director. But I didn’t care what his party was. I didn’t care who he was. I thought he was hurting the FBI, and I sounded off. And I was shocked when I had more friends on the Democratic side of the aisle join me in going after the Republican-appointed FBI Director.

And of course, once he held over and became the FBI Director for this administration, the other side of the aisle got even more kind in its questioning. But one of us—I certainly stayed consistent.

But there are many problems in this Justice Department, as is very clear. There is an article from 2011, August 26, by Christian Adams, a guy that should know. He was in the Justice Department and had a case ready for
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judgment against the New Black Panthers who were intimidating voters at a voting place, until the Holder political appointee stepped in and stopped it.

Yes, there was one judgment. It was basically, they can go intimidate others at other polling places, and there were no legal actions that were really pursued to provide any teeth.

But Christian Adams has an article entitled “The Politicized Hiring of Eric Holder’s Compliance Section.” He says every since the administration, the Justice Department has a history thick with left-wing activism.

And then he goes through and talks about it in a very long article, very well-documented.

My friend across the building, Ted Cruz, Senator Cruz, invoked Watergate in blasting DOJ’s probe of the IRS scandal. This was March 20, this year, an article from The Blaze by Fred Lucas.

Senator Cruz said the investigator is a partisan Democrat who has donated over $6,000 to President Obama and Democratic causes. Just as nobody would trust John Mitchell to investigate Richard Nixon, nobody should trust a partisan Obama donor to investigate political targeting of President Obama’s enemies.

But he makes a good point. John Mitchell deserved the criticism he got, but no Attorney General since John Mitchell has the truthful history in their files on file and says no. No Attorney General has ever been treated worse than I have.

You just have to go back to Alberto Gonzales. Again, I think he deserved some of the criticism he got, especially on the National Security Letter issue, and I am right there thinking it was a disaster, and it shouldn’t have been allowed to happen, and that people needed to be held accountable, which is why I called the White House after it came to light that a report had been on the Attorney General’s desk before he testified before the Senate that there were no known abuses of the National Security Letters.

I told the White House, this is indefensible. This isn’t right. We can’t defend this.

And I wish colleagues across the aisle, when they found similar abuses, problems, fault, would let party politics or other divisive issues stand in their way. And I am right there thinking it was a disaster, and it shouldn’t have been allowed to happen, and that people needed to be held accountable, which is why I called the White House after it came to light that a report had been on the Attorney General’s desk before he testified before the Senate that there were no known abuses of the National Security Letters.

There are transcriptions of Senators going after Attorney General Gonzales, Attorney General Ashcroft, or even going back to John Mitchell. This Attorney General, compared to them, doesn’t have a lot to complain about.

And one thing is interesting. You know, when I was a freshman, the Bush administration was in power. We had a lot of trouble getting documents from the Bush administration. The difference between that one and this one: they would eventually get us the documents.

The difference here is they have been there 5 years and they still will not produce documents that should be of critical concern to every American.

Some would say, look, there is no other issue than and concern for America when, in May of 2013, as this article points out from Breitbart:

On Wednesday, Attorney General Eric Holder testified in front of the House Judiciary Committee on the recent scandal plaguing the Obama administration. Unfortunately, the committee and America did not learn very much because Holder appears to be singularly devoted to what happens in Washington, D.C.

The AP claims the Department of Justice violated their constitutional rights when they obtained 2 months of phone records of reporters. When asked about the scandal, Holder claimed ignorance and that he was not part of the decisionmaking process.

He did defend the effort to subvert the press, saying the DOJ wanted to find who leaked information to the AP about a CIA operation in Yemen to stop an airliner bombing plot around the anniversary of Osama bin Laden’s death.

On Tuesday, Holder recused himself from the investigation into the AP scandal and the committee held the hearing that had the leaked information. He could not give the exact date he recused himself, and he never put it in writing. It took quite awhile for the committee to find out it was Deputy Attorney General James Cole who signed the subpoena for the AP phone records.

There are all kinds of reasons to be concerned about what is going on. There are plenty of stories out there.

Oh, gee, how about the speech that my friend across the aisle, Keith Ellison of Minnesota, gave where, as reported here from the Minneapolis Star Tribune, Mr. Ellison said, talking about comparing September 11:

It’s almost like the Reichstag fire, kind of reminds me of that. After the Reichstag was burned, they blamed the communists for it, and it put the leader of that country—Hitler—into power, where he could basically have authority to do whatever he wanted.

The fact is that I am not saying September 11 was a U.S. plan or anything like that because, you know, the police put them in the nutball box or dismiss you.

But he went on, basically comparing September 11 to Hitler’s Reichstag fire, which was set and then blamed on the communists.

From CNN, a report on this, Keith Oppenheimer had stated:

Well, first of all, Wolf, some of the themes that Keith Ellison is talking about are themes that he has been sounding off for a while.

And then Oppenheimer said:

The Minneapolis Star Tribune, quoting Ellison at the forum, is saying this about the Vice President: “It is beneath his dignity in order for him to say anything negative about the citizens of the United States. That is the very definition of totalitarianism, authoritarianism, and dictatorship.”

In response to this, questions for Ellison as to whether Ellison supports a new investigation of the causes of September 11, Ellison made a comparison to the Reichstag fire in Berlin that Adolf Hitler used to get power.

And then he quoted my friend across the aisle, with what I just mentioned.

So anyway, there are all kinds of accusations. I thought both George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush should have done more to defend themselves against the outlandish claims; but one thing George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush never did—no matter what race, creed, color, national religion, gender, age, whenever anybody attacked them—never really responded to it and, in fact, would often try to point out, actually, they have the right to their opinion.

Nowadays, it is a different matter. If someone is concerned that your department or their department provides discovery documents to convicted terrorists that they are refusing to provide to Congress, that is not an issue of anything other than just not doing what the law requires in the way of oversight.

There is so much going on in this country that needs our attention, and one of them is the Department of Justice. Is it the Department of Justice? Is it the Department of ‘just us’?

There is an article in the Star Tribune by Candice Lanier, June 26, 2013, where she entitles the article, “Sixteen Scandals: The Legacy of Eric Holder,” and then she goes through and cites 16 reasons we should be very concerned about the Justice Department. One of them quotes Discover the Networks.

She says:

Holder also took a leadership role with the Student Afro-American Society, which at one point demanded that the school’s abandoned ROTC office be renamed the “Malcolm X Lounge”—“in honor of a man who recognized the importance of territory as a basis for nationhood. In 1970, Holder was a participant in a 5-day occupation of that office. And, according to some accounts, the occupiers were armed. In addition, Holder and SAAS also occupied the office of Henry Coleman, Dean of Freshmen, until their demands were met.

It would appear the SAAS was an advocate of the Black Panthers who were charged with plotting to blow up a police station department, a train station, train tracks, and the New York Botanical Gardens.

It references the discriminatory hiring practices in the Department of Justice. This article points out:

In June 2008, Holder admitted to the American Constitution Society, an organization started as a liberal counterpart to the Federalist Society, that the Justice Department was ‘going to be looking for people who share our values.’

Then it references Fort Hood and the fact that:

Following the Fort Hood attack on November 5, 2009, not one of the postattack reports issued by the Department of Justice mentioned Nidal Hasan’s Islamist ideology.

It talks further about that, and then it talks about the AP surveillance case, the way it went after the Associated Press and cowed them.

Number four, the Department of Justice secretly targets Fox News reporter James Rosen.

There were issues of credibility in comparing our Attorney General’s testimony, saying he didn’t know of any one ever being prosecuted, in essence,
and then his signing off on the pursuit of James Rosen.

Five is the Marc Rich pardon and that Eric Holder played an important role in what was arguably the most infamous of President Clinton's 176 pardons. Holder, as Deputy Attorney General, was the gatekeeper for presidential pardons and the standards for granting pardons were former Weather Underground members Susan Rosenberg and Linda Evans.

Number six was the Weather Underground pardon.

Holder, as Deputy Attorney General, was the gatekeeper for presidential pardons and the standards for granting pardons were former Weather Underground members Susan Rosenberg and Linda Evans.

Number seven—and I am not reading off all the information about these—but seven was:

Fred came in behind me and set the gatekeeper for presidential pardons. At an American Constitution Society gathering in 2004, Holder made the following comments—these are all quotes:

"Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 35, 113th Congress, I move that the House do now adjourn."}

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5368. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Peanut Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Amendment to Primary Peanut-Producing States and Adjustment of Membership [Document Number: AMS-FY-13-0042] received April 7, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 601(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5367. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the authorized insignia of the brigadier general, of the lieutenant general and of the colonel to the Committee on Armed Services.

5368. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Stanley T. Kresse, United States Air Force, and his advancement on the retired list in the grade of general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5369. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Weapons Counsel, transmitting certification of amounts requested for the national Nuclear Security Administration in the President's Budget for FY 2015, to the Committee on Armed Services.