

“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

to unilaterally stop climate change. That's right, he's going to part the oceans and change the temperature to his liking. How's he going to do this? Well, he's declaring war on fossil fuels—again.

This week it's coal. Mr. Speaker, coal counts for 37 percent of our Nation's electricity. How does the President plan to make up for that 37 percent? Well, the ruler doesn't really say. I guess that 37 percent will just have to do without heat come winter. In his radical climate change manifesto, to a room packed full of his environmental lobby, the President issued an edict to the EPA to regulate coal out of existence.

Both Congress and the American people have overwhelmingly rejected this policy in the past. Never mind the will of the people, never mind Congress has said "no" to these ideas. The President is pandering to the environmental groups, and he wants it his way. So he's just going to issue another one of those—what I believe is unconstitutional—executive orders.

Mr. Speaker, there are consequences for such rash actions by the President. The White House war on coal will raise the cost of energy for American families, cripple the economy, and destroy hundreds of thousands of jobs of people who work in the energy industry. The war on coal is really a war on the American people.

Mr. Speaker, maybe the President is not aware that the coal plant over here on South Capitol Street heats part of the Capitol. Is this his way to silence Congress? Who knows. But this is just another day from the administration whose energy policy is "nothing from below." Nothing from below the ground, nothing from below the sea. No oil, no coal, no gas, and no jobs. That's the result of this policy. That's why I've introduced the Ensuring Affordable Energy Act. My bill will put an end to this back-door attempt by this administration to go around Congress and circumvent the will of the people. This bill would prohibit any EPA funds from being used to implement the regulation of greenhouse gases. This has passed in the House, but it has yet to become law.

Now let's talk about natural gas. Down the street from the White House is another marble bureaucratic palace they call the Department of Energy. Sitting on their oak desks are dusty folders holding applications to export liquefied natural gas. In 2010, the oil and gas industry contributed almost \$500 billion to our economy. And over the last 7 years, the amount of recoverable natural gas in our country has skyrocketed. For the first time in our Nation's history, we have more natural gas than we can use here in the United States, even if we tried. America can sell that gas on the global market for billions of dollars, creating thousands of jobs in the process; but we're not doing it, for one simple bureaucratic red-tape reason—the Department of Energy.

In typical Washington-style fashion, we've seen delay, delay, delay by the Department of Energy to approve these permits. Over the last 70 years, this bureaucratic hurdle was hardly noticed as the U.S. was an importer of natural gas, but not so anymore. Technology has changed all of this. There are some 18 export applications sitting over there on those desks in those dusty folders for the DOE to approve. The Department's response: no response. In the last 3 years, the DOE has granted only two applications. Meanwhile, countries that want to buy American natural gas are going to our worldwide competitors, like China and Russia. Isn't that lovely.

Understand this, Mr. Speaker, there is already an agency, FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, that is in the pipeline to approve applications such as this. So we have duplication with the DOE and FERC. So what we have to do is remove the DOE from the process, remove this duplication.

Mr. Speaker, we have enough oil, natural gas, and coal in America to make the Middle East turmoil, Middle East politics, and Middle East energy irrelevant if we would just use our own God-given natural resources. Washington bureaucrats sit at their large oak desks sipping on those lattes every day, and they are regulating American energy out of business. It's time to take the padlock off the marble palaces of the EPA and the DOE and remove the bureaucrats from the energy business. Let's use the resources the good Lord has given us to take care of America.

And that's just the way it is.

STRUGGLE FOR EQUALITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the struggle for equality, for justice, for freedom, for democracy is an awesome force. No force, no historical circumstance has done more to shape our Nation, but that struggle has always been confronted by an endless series of attempts to block, minimize, sidetrack, undo, and weaken our democracy. Through all these struggles, those most oppressed have repeatedly taken the lead to reinforce our democracy and solidify our Nation.

We fought a bloody, wrenching Civil War to end a Nation that was suffocating "half slave and half free." Three million men fought in that war, and 620,000 died. Although African Americans made up 1 percent of the population of the North, they made up 10 percent of the Union Army.

In the aftermath, Congress sought to enshrine in the Constitution, forever, basic democratic rights: in the 14th Amendment, the power to enforce the Bill of Rights, due process, and equal rights; and in the 15th Amendment,

voting rights regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. But a violent, terrorist backlash led by the Ku Klux Klan prevented the implementation of our Constitution for a hundred years until a new civil rights struggle, based on nonviolence, but no less powerful, forced our Nation, the courts, and this Congress to recognize those promised constitutional rights.

Among the forms of recognition were the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1965. They transformed the political landscape of America.

□ 1050

But the truth is that, beginning as far back as the Nixon administration, efforts sought to chip away at those rights. Yesterday's Supreme Court decision undermining the enforcement of voting rights is the latest attempt to roll back history.

Shall we go forward or shall we go backwards?

The rapidly changing demographics of our Nation is calling new forces into the struggle for civil and voting rights every day, and our response to yesterday's Supreme Court decision presents a challenge for every Member of this Congress. And we have to ask ourselves: Which side are you on?

For me, the path is clear. We need a Federal right to vote enshrined in our Constitution, one clearly, unambiguously, boldly, proudly asserting that we will not tolerate any infringement on our rights as citizens to express the will of the people.

Those who seek to dilute voting rights, to place barriers on every citizen's right to participate in this government, will find themselves on the wrong side of history and, in the end, will be no more able to stop the movement for equality, for justice, for freedom, for democracy than they're able to stop the sun from rising in the morning or setting in the evening or to stop people who've decided that they love each other from expressing it.

OFFSHORE ENERGY AND JOBS ACT

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I want to just express my appreciation to our colleague, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and my respect for him and the eloquent tribute that he paid his father. Indeed, his father was a member of the Greatest Generation, and we thank him, his father, for his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk about my number one priority in serving the Second District of Virginia and this incredible country that we have the privilege to live in, and that's jobs. That's the number one focus for our office.

I rise in strong support of House Resolution 2231, Offshore Energy and Jobs Act, that will come before this House either today or tomorrow. That bill includes language that I authored and introduced, and it creates a clear path,