

allowed this important issue, one that will affect our children and grandchildren, to become a partisan wedge issue.

This country did not become great by ignoring problems or wishing them away. We did not become great by mocking scientists and those who would rely on cold, hard facts or, in this case, long, hot, endless summers. And we did not become great by ceding leadership in new technologies and new markets to our competitors, like China.

The time to address climate change is now.

IN DEFENSE OF LEGAL IMMIGRATION

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, America is a Nation of immigrants. We're all either immigrants ourselves or were the sons and daughters of immigrants. America's motto is "E pluribus unum"—"From many, one." From many nations we've created one great Nation, the American Nation.

There's only one way to accomplish this remarkable feat, and that's through the process of assimilation. Unlike other nations, our immigration laws were not written to keep people out. They were written to assure that those who come here demonstrate a sincere desire to become Americans, to acquire a common language, a common culture, and a common appreciation of American constitutional principles and American legal traditions.

Illegal immigration undermines that process of legal immigration that makes our Nation of immigrants possible. If we allow illegal immigration, then legal immigration becomes pointless, the process of assimilation that our immigration laws assure breaks down, and the bonds of allegiance that hold a country like ours together begin to dissolve.

As a recent article by John Fonte of the National Review points out, earlier immigration bills included a provision calling for "patriotic integration of prospective citizens into the American way of life by providing civics, history, and English . . . with a special emphasis on attachment to the principles of the Constitution of the United States, the heroes of American history, and the meaning of the Oath of Allegiance."

But the director of immigration policy for La Raza objected to this language, writing that "while it doesn't overtly mention assimilation, it's very strong on the patriotism and traditional American values language in a way which is potentially dangerous to our communities."

Well, that language is pointedly missing from the Senate measure, suggesting a purpose fundamentally different from past immigration laws. It

raises the question of why groups supporting this bill find the mention of assimilation objectionable and consider patriotism and traditional American values not only disagreeable but, in their word, "dangerous."

Now, to those who say that we need a path to citizenship, I must point out we already have such a path that is followed by millions of legal immigrants who have obeyed all of our laws, who have respected our Nation's sovereignty, who've done everything our country's asked of them to do, including waiting patiently in line, and are now watching millions of illegal immigrants try and cut in line in front of them.

The 1986 Immigration Reform Act promised a balanced approach that combined legalization of the 3 million illegal immigrants then in the country with promises of employer sanctions and tougher border security. As we all know, legalization occurred instantly, but the promises of enforcement were first ignored and, later, actively resisted by the Presidents who followed.

The current administration, for all its rhetoric, has unlawfully suspended enforcement of our existing immigration laws and actively obstructed States from assisting in their enforcement. If this administration will not enforce our existing law, why should anyone believe its promises to enforce even stricter laws in the future?

Now, a common tactic of those on the left is to blur the distinction between legal and illegal immigration and to paint those in opposition to amnesty as "anti-immigrant." This is simply dishonest.

Legal immigration is the very essence of our country. It sets us apart from every other nation in the world, the fact that citizenship is open to all who evince a sincere desire to understand, adopt, and revere those uniquely American principles enshrined in our Declaration of Independence and animated by our American Constitution.

They do so by the thousands, every day, by obeying our immigration laws, renouncing foreign loyalties, and embracing American principles. By doing so, as Lincoln said, they become the "blood of the blood and the flesh of the flesh of the men who wrote that Declaration."

Illegal immigration destroys all of that, and any measure that encourages more of it, by granting special privileges to those who defy our immigration laws, is a direct affront to every legal immigrant who has become an American, and it is a direct challenge to the process of immigration that built our Nation.

To those illegal immigrants who seek citizenship out of a sincere desire to become Americans, I ask only that they respect our laws, and I invite them to begin the process of legal immigration that's already available to them and that's been followed by the millions who've come before them.

RURAL HUNGER IN AMERICA

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, nearly every week that this House has been in session this year, I've come to the floor to talk about the need to end hunger now. Fourteen speeches later, I still hear from some of my colleagues who doubt that hunger is a problem in the 21st century here in this country, the richest, most prosperous Nation in the world.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that anyone who doubts that we have a hunger problem in America has a chance to read the article by Eli Saslow in Sunday's Washington Post, titled, "Driving Away Hunger," subtitled, "In Rural Tennessee, a New Way to Help Hungry Children, A Bus Turned Bread Truck."

Mr. Speaker, this is a heartwrenching story of hunger, where children of all ages have trouble getting enough food in the summer months in rural Tennessee. It breaks your heart.

The article may focus on a small area in rural Tennessee, but it really tells the story about the 50 million hungry Americans in this country, and more specifically, the 17 million kids who are hungry in this country.

And the blame shouldn't be cast on these poor Americans who are doing their best to make ends meet. Consider the Laghrene family portrayed in this article. Jennifer, a mother of five, works full-time as a cook at a nursing home. Yet her kids don't have enough to eat because Jennifer only makes \$8 an hour.

SNAP helps during the school year when kids get to eat two meals a day at school. Combined, these five kids, ranging from 14 years old to 9 months old, ate a total of 40 free meals and snacks at school every week, but there's very little help during the summer months when school is out of session.

While the \$593 food stamp allotment lasted throughout the month during the school year, Jennifer only had \$73 in food stamps left, with 17 days to go in the month that she was interviewed for this article in The Washington Post.

And if that weren't enough to convince people about this ugly side of hunger, consider this heartbreaking paragraph from the article.

Desperation had become their permanent state, defining each of their lives in different ways. For Courtney, it meant that she had stayed rail thin, with hand-me-down jeans that fell low on her hips. For Taylor, 14, it meant stockpiling calories whenever food was available, ingesting enough processed sugar and salt to bring on a doctor's lecture about obesity and the early onset of diabetes, the most common risks of a food stamp diet. For Anthony, 9, it meant moving out of the trailer and usually living at his grandparents' farm. For Hannah, 7, it meant her report card had been sent home with a handwritten note of the teacher's concerns, one of

which read, "Easily distracted by other people eating." For Sarah, the 9-month-old baby, it meant sometimes being fed Mountain Dew out of the can after she finished her formula, a dose of caffeine that kept her up at night.

Mr. Speaker, this is all taking place in rural Tennessee. That's right, Mr. Speaker. Hunger doesn't just exist in urban areas. According to USDA statistics, rural areas are poorer than urban areas. And according to the latest USDA data, households in rural areas were more likely to be food insecure. While 14.9 percent of all households were food insecure in 2011, 15.4 percent of households in rural areas were food insecure.

And let's look at the SNAP statistics. While 16 percent of all Americans live in nonmetropolitan areas, 21 percent of SNAP beneficiaries live there. Ten percent of the rural population relies on SNAP, compared to 7 percent of the urban population. Children under 18 make up 25 percent of the rural population, but they are 40 percent of the rural population using SNAP.

These statistics show empirically that hunger is a problem in rural America. Sunday's article paints a terrible and disturbing picture about hunger in rural America. And together, they show why we must commit ourselves to end hunger now.

That's why it is so disturbing to me that so many of my Republican friends seem hell-bent on cutting huge amounts from the SNAP program, literally throwing millions of Americans off the program. It shows a stunning ignorance of current reality, and it shows a callousness that, quite frankly, is beneath this institution.

During the recent debate on the farm bill, I had heard a number of my colleagues from the other side of the aisle demean the poor in this country and diminish their struggle. I heard rhetoric from some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle characterizing these Americans who are struggling in poverty in inappropriate and demeaning ways. It was offensive, some of the rhetoric that was spouted here on this floor.

I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans alike, to reject any assault on the SNAP program.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to end hunger now, but we must take it. We need some leadership. We need leadership in this House, but we also need leadership from the White House in order to get this done. We need the White House to host a conference on food and nutrition. We need the President to bring the best and brightest minds from any and every corner of this Nation together, lock them in a room, and direct them to come up with a plan. It is not hard.

We need the political will to end hunger now. This issue needs to be more of a priority.

RIISING STUDENT LOAN INTEREST RATES

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon, Senate Majority Leader HARRY REID stated, "If we do nothing, student loan rates go to 6.8 percent," as reported by Politico.

In case the Leader forgot, interest rates doubled to 6.8 percent last week. The House acted to prevent it. The Senate did not.

Today, The Washington Post Editorial Board writes:

The Senate is set to consider on Wednesday the Keep Student Loans Affordable Act in what could be the Chamber's only reaction to the recent doubling of a low student loan interest rate . . . lawmakers should reject this pathetic nonresolution.

The editorial continues:

With the President and the House in near alignment on the student loan issue, the Senate has no excuse to fail. Mr. Obama should press Democrats hard and work with Republicans to strike a deal, not to vote for dead-end policy.

Unfortunately, rather than solve problems, the Senate is wasting the American people's time and moving forward with another dead-end policy, what today's Post refers to as another "campaign gimmick."

The people deserve better. Our students deserve better in this country.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has no excuse.

IT'S TIME TO 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, it's time that the National Football League and the NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell face the reality that the continued use of the word "redskin" is unacceptable. It is a racist, derogatory term and patently offensive to Native Americans.

The Native American community has spent millions of dollars over the past two decades trying earnestly to fight the racism that is perpetuated by this slur.

□ 1030

The fact that the NFL and Commissioner Goodell continue to deny this is a shameful testament of the mistreatment of Native Americans for so many years. It is quite obvious that once the American public understands why the word "redskins" is so offensive, they'll know that the word should never be used again.

The origin of the term "redskins" is commonly attributed to the historical practice of trading Native American

Indian scalps 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 "10 Guineas for every Indian Mi'kmaq 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. By vote of the General Court of the Province, 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 years was 50 pounds, and his scalp was worth 40 pounds. The bounty for a female Penobscot Indian of any age and for the males under the age of 12 was 25 pounds, while their scalps were worth 20 pounds. These scalps, Mr. Speaker, were called "redskins."

The question is quite simple. Suppose that that redskin scalp that was bought for payment was the scalp of your mother, the scalp of your wife, the scalp of your daughter, the scalp of your father, the scalp of your husband, or of your son. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, Native Americans are human beings, not animals.

The current chairman and chief of the Penobscot Nation, Chief Kirk Francis, recently declared in a joint statement that "redskins" is "not just a racial slur or 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."

Recently, myself and nine Members of Congress explained the violent history and disparaging nature of the term "redskins" in a letter to Mr. Dan Snyder, owner of the Washington football franchise. Similar letters were sent to Mr. Frederick Smith, president and CEO of FedEx, a key sponsor of the franchise, and Mr. Roger Goodell, commissioner of the National Football League. As of today, Mr. Snyder has not yet responded. Mr. Smith ignored our letter as well, opting instead to have a staff member cite contractual obligations as FedEx's reason for its silence on the subject.

Mr. Goodell, however, in a dismissive manner, declared that the team's name "is a unifying force that stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect." Give me a break, Mr. Speaker. In other words, the National Football League is telling everyone—Native Americans included—that they cannot be offended because the NFL means no offense. Essentially, Mr. Goodell attempts to wash away the stain from a history of persecution against Native American people by spreading twisted and false information concerning the use of the