

period. There will be parades and fireworks and picnics for all of us, but for too many of our neighbors there will be no such festivities. They will be too busy working two or three jobs just to make ends meet.

They will be worrying about their children, who, during these summer months, are too often forced to go without enough nutritious food to eat because school is out of session, because in our country, Mr. Speaker, in the richest, most powerful Nation in the history of the world, the reality is that 50 million of our fellow Americans struggle with hunger.

I am also sure that, during the 4th of July activities, many Members will be getting quite an earful from the farmers in their districts. Those farmers are now facing confusion and uncertainty as they prepare for yet another season without a long-term reauthorization of the farm bill. They will wonder why this House of Representatives can't seem to get its act together.

I hope that my colleagues will tell them the truth, which is that the reason the farm bill failed in the House last week is that it would have thrown 2 million people off the SNAP program. It would have caused over 200,000 children to lose access to the free school breakfast and lunch program. It would have made hunger worse in America. It would have forced struggling Americans to jump through all sorts of hoops, like drug testing, while not requiring the same of wealthy farmers who receive Federal subsidies. It would have not only allowed but actually encouraged States to find ways to kick people off the SNAP program. In short, it would have continued the Republican majority's assault on hard-working, struggling poor people; and for many of us on our side of the aisle, that price was simply too high.

As columnist E.J. Dionne wrote after the defeat of the bill:

This is, above all, a story about morality. There is something profoundly wrong when a legislative majority is so eager to risk leaving so many Americans hungry. That's what the bill would have done and why defeating it was a moral imperative.

Mr. Speaker, I want a farm bill. Our farmers deserve a farm bill. I am honored to represent hundreds of small farmers, and I am honored to serve on the Agriculture Committee. I know that Chairman LUCAS and Ranking Member PETERSON worked incredibly hard to thread a very small needle. If the Republican leadership really wants a farm bill, it should do away with these draconian SNAP cuts and bring a bill to the floor that acknowledges the struggles faced by millions of our neighbors.

□ 1030

My fear, however, is they will do just the opposite, that they will go even further, make even deeper cuts to food and nutrition programs, make even more Americans hungry in a vain attempt to convince some of their more

right-wing members to support this bill. Indeed, we see that dynamic at work with the agriculture appropriations bill before us this week, a bill that makes drastic cuts to the Women, Infants and Children program.

I would like to once again urge the White House to take an active leadership role on this. Last week, the administration issued a veto threat against the farm bill because of the devastating SNAP cuts that it contained, and I welcomed that threat. It was a positive sign. It was a positive sign that the White House understands that throwing 2 million people off of SNAP would be devastating not just to those individuals, but to our economy, as well.

But the administration, quite frankly, needs to do more. They need to convene a White House conference on food and nutrition so that we can get everyone in a room, including our farmers, to address the issue of hunger in America. Let's solve this problem. This is a solvable problem, but it needs attention and we need to have a plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reflect over the next week about where we should go from here. Do we want to live up to the bipartisan tradition of giants like Bob Dole and George McGovern, who came together and helped create this anti-hunger safety net that we have in this country? Their leadership almost ended hunger in this country in the 1970s. Unfortunately, we have strayed so far away from what they've done that we now find ourselves with 50 million hungry people.

Do we want to unite to provide a circle of protection around our most vulnerable neighbors? I hope so, Mr. Speaker. I hope that this House of Representatives understands that one of our obligations is to make sure that the needy and the poor and the most vulnerable are not forgotten, that we don't sit back and allow them to fall through the cracks.

We can do this. We can end hunger now. All we need is the political will.

FREEDOM IN THE BALANCE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, three major developments have occurred within the last 6 weeks that are each disturbing by themselves, but extremely alarming when viewed together.

The first was the revelation that for more than 2 years, one of the most powerful and feared agencies of the Federal Government was used to harass and intimidate individual Americans into silence because of their political beliefs. Evidence has already established that hundreds of conservative groups were subjected to invasive interrogations when they sought to participate in the political process. This

pattern of conduct was not limited to applications under section 501(c) but included audits of established conservative groups and individuals, as well. This conduct reached the highest levels of the IRS. A similar pattern of abuse has been documented in several other agencies, including the Department of Labor and the Environmental Protection Agency. These facts are undisputed, and their implications are utterly toxic to a free society.

The second development was news that the Justice Department had surreptitiously seized the telephone records of some 20 reporters covering Congress for the Associated Press in an obvious attempt to discourage whistleblowers from talking to the press. Fox News reporter James Rosen and his family were stalked by authorities as he tried to get to the bottom of the Benghazi scandal. To obtain the search warrant allowing this, the Attorney General of the United States filed an absolutely spurious claim with the Federal court charging that Rosen had conspired to violate the Espionage Act. That's the same act under which Julius and Ethel Rosenberg was executed in 1953. The message to reporters asking inconvenient questions of this administration could not possibly have been more powerful or terrifying, and this week the head of AP reported that their news sources have indeed dried up in response to these naked acts of intimidation.

The third development is news that the Federal Government has swept up the phone and Internet records of millions of Americans in the name of state security just months after the official in charge categorically denied the existence of this program in sworn testimony to Congress.

The practice of the government searching your personal records without having first established reason to believe that you have committed a crime is expressly forbidden by the Fourth Amendment, adopted in direct response to British officials indiscriminately searching homes and records for evidence of contraband, yet this government has done precisely that on a scale unimaginable in colonial times, in this case searching for evidence of terrorism.

If I know the Web sites that you've visited and what phone numbers you've called, I know a great deal about your political and religious beliefs, your personal relationships, your sexual interests, your mental and physical health and your family finances. And with that information in the hands of officials who already have demonstrated a clear intention and ability to use their power to intimidate political adversaries into silence or to discourage reporters from asking embarrassing questions, our society could very quickly cross a very bright line between freedom and authoritarianism.

As if to underscore the point, the administration spokesman recently told a national television audience that

"the law is irrelevant." He called these matters "a distraction." What does that say about a society that once prided itself on being a Nation of laws and not of men?

All around this Capitol, we are surrounded by the trappings of the Roman Republic. They serve as an inspiration, but they should also serve as a warning. The Roman Republic didn't end because Caesar crossed the Rubicon with his legion. It was because that illegal act was not effectively resisted and led to another usurpation and then another and then another over a period of years. It was the accumulation of many such infringements that brought the inexorable decline of freedom and set the stage for Rome's age of tyrants. That's what Jefferson meant when he said the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

My great fear, as we adjourn tomorrow to celebrate the 237th anniversary of American freedom, is that sometime between the barbecues and the fireworks we shrug off these profound developments and go about as if nothing has happened. The summer of 2013 has brought us to a crossroads, and I rise today to urge the House to give these events its full and undivided attention.

"REDSKIN" OFFENSIVE TO NATIVE AMERICANS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, just yesterday on the cover page of The Washington Post newspaper, there was an article written by journalists Jon Cohen and Rick Maese that, according to a recent poll taken among the sports fans of the Washington, D.C. area:

A large majority of area sports fans say the Washington Redskins should not change the team name, even though most supporters of the nickname feel the word "redskin" is an inappropriate term for Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, not only is the term "redskin" inappropriate, but it is just plain offensive and derogatory towards Native Americans. And I want to share with my colleagues in Congress, and especially the American people, how the word "redskin" came about and its history.

In 1749, it was a standard procedure among settlers who lived in what is now known as Maine and Nova Scotia to kill and scalp as many of the Indians as members of the Micmac Tribe. The same policy was also implemented in 1755 by settlers who lived in what is now known as the State of Massachusetts—that their object was to kill and scalp members of the Penobscot Indian Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the policy was you get paid for killing and/or scalping Native American Indians. And if you kill an Indian boy, you get paid 50 pounds. If you get a scalp of an Indian, you also get paid 40 pounds. For any female, Mr. Speaker, under 12 years old that you

killed or scalped, you also get paid 25 pounds. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these scalps were also called "redskins." Mr. Speaker, this is why this word is so offensive to Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, there's a saying in Indian country: "Walk in a man's moccasins for 2 weeks before you pass judgment on that person."

□ 1040

Mr. Speaker, my point is what if that scalp belonged to your mother or to your wife or daughter or your brother or sister or to your son or father? Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that our Washington fans and the American public will come to realize why the usage of the word "redskin" has brought nothing but a stark reminder of the horrors of how Native Americans have been treated for centuries.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe in the fairness and decency of the American people. I believe that many of our fellow Americans did not know of the history of the word "redskin," and I sincerely hope many others will come to a better understanding as to why Native Americans feel obviously offended by the use of the word.

I hope Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League, and all the NFL club owners will seriously raise this matter with Mr. Dan Snyder to try to change the name of his Washington football franchise. The NFL has a moral responsibility to take corrective action on this matter. It is the right thing to do.

Under the mandate of the U.S. Constitution, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Congress has both a legal and moral responsibility to look after the needs of our Native American nations. It is for this reason that the bill, H.R. 1278, was introduced to not allow or to cancel the registration of the word Redskins as a trademark name simply because it is a derogatory term and a racial slur against Native Americans.

Mr. Speaker, don't get me wrong. I'm a great supporter and fan of the sport of football. In fact, I played 4 years of football in high school. Many of my relatives played both at the college level and in the NFL: the late Junior Seau of the San Diego Chargers; Troy Polamalu of the Pittsburgh Steelers; Jesse Sapolu of the 49ers, just to name a few. There are many others. My point, Mr. Speaker, is we need to correct this inequity. We need to show a little more respect for members of the Native American community.

[From the Washington Post, June 26, 2013]
WASHINGTON REDSKINS NAME: WASHINGTON POST POLL FINDS MOST D.C. AREA FANS SUPPORT IT

(By Jon Cohen and Rick Maese)

A large majority of area sports fans say the Washington Redskins should not change the team name, even though most supporters of the nickname feel the word "redskin" is an inappropriate term for Native Americans, according to a new Washington Post poll.

The debate over the team's name has intensified in recent months as members of

Congress, activists and media commentators criticized it as offensive to Native Americans and lobbied for change. But most Washingtonians—61 percent—say they like the team's name, and two-thirds say the team should not change it, according to the poll.

Among Redskins fans, about eight in 10 say the team should keep its name. Also, there's some evidence that changing it might undermine support from some of the team's most ardent backers.

"It's been associated with the team for so long, I just don't see any reason to change it now," said retiree Joseph Braceland, 70. "It was not meant to be derogatory."

A quarter of all area adults and slightly more than half of self-described Redskins fans say they "love" the team name, yet both groups overwhelmingly say that in general a new name wouldn't make much difference to them.

Among those who want to keep the Redskins' name, most—56 percent—say they feel the word "redskin" is inappropriate. Only half as many—28 percent—consider the term as an acceptable one to use.

"I think any word that you deal with, it depends on the context," said Stephan Bachenheimer, a District resident who works for the World Bank and supports the Redskins' name. "A lot of people have a hard time separating these issues."

The name has been subject to much criticism and public debate this offseason, with both local and national leaders urging the team to consider a name change, a request the team has fervently resisted.

In the new poll, 28 percent of all Washingtonians say the team should change its name, far above the 11 percent nationally who said so in a recent Associated Press poll.

"I don't believe in being super politically correct—I have a sense of humor—but I think this name came about at a time when there was very different awareness about the plight of the American Indians," said Mary Falvey, 60, who works in communications for the Food and Drug Administration. "I just don't think it's appropriate. There's increased sensitivity about race in this country today—for the good."

While feelings about the team's nickname were similar across most demographics, the percentage advocating a shift in the D.C. area peaks at 39 percent among African Americans with college degrees. (There weren't enough Native Americans among the poll's 1,106 respondents for meaningful comparison; Native Americans make up less than 1 percent of the population in the region, according to Census data.)

According to poll results, education plays a role more broadly: 34 percent of all area college graduates say change the name, compared with 21 percent of those with less formal education.

"Leave the name alone," said Eileen Schilling, 52, who works in construction sales. "It's ridiculous. It's getting completely out of hand. Pretty soon we won't be able to dye our hair because it might offend someone. I'm Irish. Should the Notre Dame Fighting Irish change their name because I don't like it? Hell no. What about the Kansas City Chiefs? The Cleveland Indians? Should the Eagles change their names because it's a national symbol? It's ridiculous."

PRESIDENT PANDERING TO ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the President this week declared he's going