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.

RISING 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 nonsolution.

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

word ''redskins'' by one of the NFL's richest franchises. It is absolute absurdity.

Mr. Goodell's response is indicative of the Washington football franchise's own racist and bigoted beginnings. The team's founder, George Preston Marshall, is identified by historians as the driving force behind the effort to prevent African Americans from playing in the NFL. And once African Americans were allowed to play in 1946, Marshall was the last club owner to field an African American player—a move he reluctantly made some 14 years later in 1962. It should be noted that Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall and U.S. Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy presented Marshall with an ultimatum—unless Marshall signed an African American player, the government would revoke his franchise's 30-year lease on the use of the D.C. Stadium.

Congressman TOM COLE, the Representative from Oklahoma, Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, and a member of the Chickasaw Nation, states: ''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, DC.''

Congresswoman BETTY MCCOLLUM, the Representative from Minnesota and Co-Chair of the Congressional Native American Caucus, 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 multi-billion dollar sports league to embrace the twisted logic that '[r]edskin' actually 'stands for strength, courage, pride, and respect' is a statement of absurdity.''

Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, the Representative from the District of Columbia, 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.''

Recently, in an interview with USA Today Newspaper, Mr. Snyder defiantly stated, ''We'll never change the name. It's that simple. NEVER—you can use caps.'' Mr. Snyder's statement is totally inconsistent with the NFL's diversity policy.

Let me be clear on this—I love and respect Mr. Snyder's people. They gave to mankind the Torah, the Bible, the Koran—the prophets like Adam, Methuselah, Enoch, Moses, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob—and yes, and even our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

But I also want to remind Mr. Snyder that six million of his people were gassed, tortured, murdered, and even skinned by the Nazis to make lamp shades and other forms of horrifying experimentations. Time will not allow me to elaborate further. But let me be clear—I would be among the first to defend Mr. Snyder and his people against racial intolerance. All I ask is for Mr. Snyder to do the same for our Native Americans.

Despite the Native American community's best efforts before administrative agencies and the courts, the term ''redskins'' remains a federally registered trademark. It has been well over twenty years and this matter is still before the courts. This injustice is the result of negligence and a cavalier attitude demonstrated by a federal agency charged with the responsibility of not allowing racist or derogatory terms to be registered as trademarks. Since the Federal Government made the mistake in registering the disparaging trademark, it is now up to Congress to correct it.

REAL JUSTICE AND MILITARY JUSTICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Today, I'd like to highlight two very important topics: real justice and military justice. As a recent case of sexual abuse illustrates, they are far from one in the same.

Last fall, Lieutenant Colonel James Wilkerson was convicted of sexual assault by a military jury. The assault took place in Wilkerson's own home, as his wife and child slept upstairs. The all-male jury—four colonels and one lieutenant colonel—was unanimous in their ruling: guilty. Wilkerson was sentenced to 1 year in prison, a less than honorable discharge, and a loss of benefits. Three months later, General Craig Franklin, a three-star general who had originally called for the court-martial, overturned the punishment. General Franklin has no legal training. Wilkerson was free and clear and reinstated on Active Duty.

Now, that's quite a reversal, you'd say. There must have been some ironclad, watertight, slam-dunk evidence for a general to negate a jury of five officers, right? Some silver-bullet testimony? Sorry, no. In this case, the reasoning for the general's stunning intervention was ''character.'' The general simply felt that Wilkerson was a ''doting father and husband.'' You know, a family man.

Okay, you say. Maybe the general considered solid evidence that calls the entire night into question. Sorry, no. It turns out General Franklin relied on evidence that was ruled inadmissible in court. Evidence like letters of support from Wilkerson's wingmen, who had his back. On the other hand, he ignored the results of a polygraph test that Wilkerson had failed.

Wait a minute, you say. Maybe this one terrible act was an isolated incident, horrible as it was. Sorry, no. Earlier this month, the Air Force acknowledged that Wilkerson had previously fathered a child through an extramarital affair. Adultery is a crime in the military, but only inside a 5-year statute of limitation. This crime from 8 years ago is no longer punishable. And it was kept quiet by the Air Force. Why? Because they say the Privacy Act prevented the disclosure of those actions without Wilkerson's permission. Can you believe that?

Those are the facts of the case. Currently, Wilkerson is slated to receive full military benefits, including a pension and health care, for life. And this is what military justice currently looks like. If the Uniform Code of Military Justice allows for such negligence and obstruction, then the Code is more than just outdated and ineffective; it's broken. It's damaging the military itself.

It's also obvious to any legal expert that General Franklin was out of his depth and overmatched in this situation. Is he a lawyer? No, he's not a lawyer. But you keep these proceedings in the chain of command and you get bias. You get a travesty. You get no justice at all.

Today, I'm demanding real justice. The Air Force needs to redeem itself. I call on the Air Force to convene an involuntary discharge board. For Wilkerson's gross misconduct, the Secretary of the Air Force should also do a grade determination and assess whether Wilkerson should be demoted to his rank at the time of his first offense. I've sent a letter to the Secretary demanding these actions. Twenty-five of my colleagues in the House have joined me and signed the letter.

We've heard repeatedly how bad this problem is. There are 26,000 cases of sexual assault a year. A tiny fraction of those are reported. It's rare that a case like the Wilkerson one ever gets to this stage. And when it does, look what happens. Zero tolerance evaporates and becomes zero accountability. Victims suffer all over again. The military continues to look inept, incompetent, arrogant, and unjust to everyone but to themselves.

In the meantime, we are left to describe this ongoing problem in any number of ways: a plague, a cancer, or simply a national embarrassment. Should we even consider this type of justice—this sham of military justice—worthy of our country and our values? I say ''no.'' I believe the American people would say a resounding ''no'' as well.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 38 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.