

Sligh packed up their camper and headed out on Interstate 5 on the way to their favorite campsite in northwest Washington State. While crossing a bridge over the Skagit River that they'd safely crossed many times before, a large truck ahead of them clipped the bridge's frame above. Without warning, and without time to react, the pavement under Dan's pickup fell out from underneath them. Next, Dan said, "It was just a white flash and cold water."

Like thousands of my constituents, I myself have driven over that bridge many times. But now, today, no cars are crossing it. Recovery workers have been hard at work pulling pieces of that bridge, along with Dan's pickup, from the flowing waters of the Skagit River and quickly building a replacement span.

The fact that no one died in this collapse is a blessing, but not all have been so lucky. My colleagues will remember in 2007 when a bridge spanning the Mississippi River in Minneapolis crashed during rush hour, killing 13 people and injuring another 145.

Today I want to ask my colleagues a simple question: Shouldn't Americans be able to drive across a highway bridge with the reasonable expectation that it will not crumble away from underneath them?

On Thursday, the Senate Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee will hold a hearing on the Skagit River bridge collapse. I spoke this morning to the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board about its investigation. I'm eager to read their report on the incident. But we already know that our aging infrastructure should be enough to make this Congress act.

Sixty-seven thousand bridges in our country are rated structurally deficient—67,000 bridges. When those bridges fall, it isn't just the unlucky few on those bridges who suffer. Whole economies that rely on safe and efficient transportation suffer.

The I-5 bridge over the Skagit River doesn't just connect Burlington and Mount Vernon; it connects the entire west coast and carries millions of dollars worth of trade between Canada and the U.S. Today, that trade is in stop-and-go traffic on local roads.

But here's the good news: we know how to build safe bridges. There are thousands of civil engineers devoting their lives to building good structures that don't fall down. But we need to pay for them. We need to maintain our bridges until they are old, and then we need to replace them. We can't keep waiting until they crumble into the water below.

President Obama wants to fix it first by spending \$40 billion on highways, bridges, transit systems, and airports that are most in need of repair. That's a good start, and Congress should approve that funding. But if we're really going to do something about our long-term transportation needs, this body, this Congress, needs to get to work on

a long-term transportation bill that doesn't just patch our aging roads, but invests in an infrastructure that meets the needs of America's 21st century economy. We can't have a big league economy with little league infrastructure.

Over Memorial Day, more than 31 million Americans hit the roads. I ask my colleagues: Were you among them? How many bridges did you drive over? How many were structurally deficient? If you think your constituents should be able to drive over a bridge without wondering whether it will crumble beneath them, then this Congress must act on a long-term transportation bill. It's time to put our money where our safety is.

□ 1210

THE SILENCE OF MUSLIM LEADERS IS DEAFENING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMPEO. Mr. Speaker, it's been just under 2 months since the attacks in Boston, and in those intervening weeks, the silence of Muslim leaders has been deafening. And that is sad, but perhaps most importantly, it's dangerous.

There have now been at least a dozen attacks by Muslim terrorists on U.S. soil since Ramzi Yousef's parked rental van exploded in the basement of the World Trade Center on February 26 of 1993. Some have caused death and injury, such as the 9/11 attacks in 2001 and Nidal Hasan's mass shooting at Fort Hood, Texas.

Other attacks, such as Faisal Shahzad's fizzled Times Square bombing, or the unsuccessful underwear bombing of a flight, were thwarted or aborted.

But yet, fatal or not, all of these attacks were successful in scaring Americans, successful in reducing our freedom in the most freedom-loving Nation on Earth, successful in slowing our economy, and successful in demonstrating that an open society can potentially be vulnerable.

They were, in former Attorney General Mike Mukasey's words, "crimes that are nonetheless meant to send a terrorist message."

When the most devastating terrorist attacks on America in the last 20 years come overwhelmingly from people of a single faith, and are performed in the name of that faith, a special obligation falls on those that are the leaders of that faith. Instead of responding, silence has made these Islamic leaders across America potentially complicit in these acts and, more importantly still, in those that may well follow.

If a religion claims to be one of peace, Mr. Speaker, its leaders must reject violence that is perpetrated in its name. Some clerics today suggest that modern jihad is nonviolent, and is only about making oneself a better Muslim.

Perhaps that's true for moderate Muslims. But extremists seek to revive the era when most Islamic clerics understood jihad to be holy war.

Mr. Speaker, decades of Middle Eastern oil money have propounded this more extreme, violent interpretation in mosques around the world. Less than 2 months after the 9/11 atrocities, an Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood preacher, who is probably the most influential Sunni cleric today, declared suicide bombing to be legitimate. He said, "these are heroic commando and martyrdom attacks and should not be called suicide."

So what is it that these Islamic leaders must say?

First, that there is never any justification for terrorism. No political goal legitimizes terrorism. Terrorism is never excusable as resistance. Imams must state unequivocally that terrorists' actions, killing and maiming, sully Islam.

They must also publicly and repeatedly denounce radical clerics who seek to justify terrorism. There is a battle of interpretation within Islam. It's not enough to deny responsibility by saying one's own interpretation doesn't support terrorism. Moderate imams must strive to ensure that no Muslim finds solace for terrorism in the Koran. They must cite the Koran as evidence that the murder of innocents is not permitted by good, believing Muslims, and must immediately refute all claims to the contrary.

Finally, Muslim leaders must say that there is no room for militant Islamism in the religion of peace. These statements must be made publicly, frequently and in the mosques, yes, in the mosques and in the madrassas, where many learn their Islamic religion.

You know, we have to call evil by its name in order to stamp it out. Downplaying atrocities and rampages ensures more of them. Every Muslim leader must unequivocally proclaim that terror committed in the name of Islam violates the core tenets of the Prophet Mohammed, and they must do so repeatedly, period.

My own faith has occasionally been hijacked in the name of violence and cruelty, including in Kansas, my home State, by Fred Phelps and his Westboro Baptist Church. In response, hundreds of Protestant ministers preach that Mr. Phelps' actions violate the most fundamental Christian traditions, and they have denounced him and his church's evil acts.

Pope John Paul II similarly apologized, in 2000, for the Catholic Church's failure to do more to speak out against the evils of Nazism, and to protect Jews from the Holocaust.

Just as these religious leaders have called up those who have killed and acted brutally in the name of their faith, so too must Muslim religious leaders refute terrorist theology.

We're now 2 decades into Islamic radicals attacking Americans on U.S.

soil. I know that not every Muslim supports these actions. Dr. Zuhdi Jasser of the American Islamic Forum for Democracy has spoken out in a clear and consistent way. So has Zainab al-Suwaij of the American Islamic Congress.

But the silence in the face of extremism coming from the best-funded Islamic advocacy organizations and many mosques across America is absolutely deafening. It casts doubt upon the commitment to peace by adherents of the Muslim faith. This is utterly unacceptable, it is dangerous, it must end.

CHANGE THE NAME OF THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE'S WASHINGTON FOOTBALL FRANCHISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to decry the disparaging name of the National Football League's Washington, D.C., franchise, the Redskins, which I will refer to as the "R-word." For decades, Native American leaders and organizations have advocated for an end to the use of the "R-word" as the Washington franchise's "brand" because it is derogatory, it is demeaning, and patently offensive.

Recently, 10 of our colleagues explained the violent history and disparaging nature of the "R-word" in a letter to Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the NFL. In what can only be deemed as an insensitive and ignorant response, Mr. Goodell justifies the Washington franchise's name by claiming that neither the intent nor the use of the name was ever meant to denigrate American Indians. Then, in a dismissive manner, Mr. Goodell further declares that the "R-word" has a positive meaning and represents many positive attributes.

Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Minnesota, a co-chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM, who states that Mr. Goodell's letter "is another attempt to justify a racial slur on behalf of Mr. Dan Snyder," owner of the Washington franchise, "and other NFL owners who appear to be only concerned with earning ever-larger profits, even if it means exploiting a racist stereotype of Native Americans. For the head of a multibillion-dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that 'Redskin' actually stands for strength, courage, pride and respect is a statement of absurdity," and a total lack of appreciation of the culture of the Native American community.

I also join, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma, the cochair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, my dear friend and colleague, a member of the Chickasaw

Nation of Oklahoma, Congressman TOM COLE, when he says:

This is the 21st century. This is the capital of political correctness on the planet. It is very, very, very offensive. This isn't like warriors or chiefs. It's not a term of respect, and it's needlessly offensive to a large part of our population. They just don't happen to live around Washington, D.C.

I also join, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, Representative EL-EANOR HOLMES NORTON, who states that Mr. Snyder "is a man who has shown sensibilities based on his own ethnic identity, yet who refuses to recognize the sensibilities of American Indians."

And I could not agree more, Mr. Speaker, with the gentlelady from the District of Columbia that Mr. Snyder, more than any of the owners of these NFL clubs, needs to show greater sensitivity towards our Native American community. In fact, I commend Mr. Snyder for building the third most expensive football franchise within the NFL, at well over \$1.6 billion, as part of our free and open market system in the field of sports.

But, Mr. Speaker, why are we allowing this to be done on the sweat, the tears, and the suffering of Native American Indians?

Recently, in an interview in the USA Today newspaper, Mr. Snyder defiantly stated, "We'll never change the name. It's that simple. Never. You can use caps."

Such arrogance is wholly inconsistent with the National Football League's fundamental diversity policy, which states:

Diversity is critically important to the NFL. It is a cultural and organizational imperative about dignity, respect, inclusion and opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, it is critically important that the NFL promotes its commitment to diversity and uphold its moral responsibility to disavow the uses of racial slurs. The use of the "R-word" is especially harmful to Native American youth, tending to lower their sense of dignity and self-esteem. It also diminishes feelings of community worth among Native American tribes and dampens the aspirations of their people.

□ 1220

Whether good intentioned or not, the "R-word" is a racial slur akin to the "N-word" among African Americans or the "W-word" among Latin Americans. America would not stand for a team called the "Blackskins" or the "Yellowskins." Such offensive terms or words would no doubt draw widespread disapproval among the National Football League's fan base. And yet coverage by our national media and sponsors of Washington's football franchise profit from a term that is equally disparaging to Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, so that the public may better understand and be more informed, I want to share with my colleagues the history and the real origin of how the word "redskin" came about.

Mr. Speaker, origin of the "R-word" as commonly attributed to the historical practice of trading Native American skins and body parts as bounties and trophies. For example, in 1749, the British bounty on the Mi'kmaq Nation of what is now Maine and Nova Scotia, was a straightforward "ten Guineas for every Indian Micmac taken or killed, to be paid upon producing such Savage taken or his scalp."

Just as devastating was the Phips Proclamation, issued in 1755 by Spencer Phips, Lieutenant Governor and Commander in Chief of the Massachusetts Bay Province, who called for the wholesale extermination of the Penobscot Indian Nation. The Phips Proclamation declared the Penobscot to be "Enemies, Rebels, and Traitors to his Majesty King George the Second," and required those residing in the province to "Embrace all opportunities of pursuing, capturing, killing, and Destroying all and every of the aforesaid Indians."

By vote of the General Court of the Province, white settlers were paid out of the public treasury for killing and scalping the Penobscot people. The bounty for a male Penobscot Indian above the age of 12 was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. Historical accounts show that these scalps were called "redskins."

The current Chairman and Chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared in a joint statement that the "R-word" is "not just a racial slur or a derogatory term," but a painful "reminder of one of the most gruesome acts of . . . ethnic cleansing ever committed against the Penobscot people." The hunting and killing of Penobscot Indians, as stated by Chief Francis, was "a most despicable and disgraceful act of genocide."

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to correct the long-standing usage of the "R-word," I and several Members of this House introduced the bill H.R. 1278, the Non-Disparagement of Native American Persons or Peoples in Trademark Registration Act of 2013. This bill would cancel the federal registrations of trademarks using the word "redskin" in reference to Native Americans. The Trademark Act of 1946—more commonly known as the Lanham Act—requires that the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) not register any trademark that "[c]onsists of or comprises . . . matter which may disparage . . . persons, living or dead . . . or bring them into contempt, or disrepute." 15 U.S.C. § 1502(a).

Native American tribes have a treaty, trust and special relationship with the United States. Because of the duty of care owed to the Native American people by the Federal Government, it is incumbent upon us to ensure that the Lanham Act is strictly enforced in order to safeguard Indian tribes and citizens from racially disparaging federal trademarks.

Accordingly, the Patent and Trademark Office has rejected applications submitted by the Washington franchise for trademarks which proposed to use the "R-word"—three times in 1996 and once in 2002. The PTO denied the applications on grounds that the "R-word" is a racial slur that disparages Native Americans.

In 1992, seven prominent Native American leaders petitioned the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (TTAB) to cancel the federal registrations for six trademarks using the "R-