

I rise today to again reinforce this question of homelessness by showing this picture, which sates, "Houston seeks better ways to serve homeless youth," and to be able to indicate that in trying to count homeless youth, they were only able to count a tenth, 378. When Houston's leadership went out on streets to try and count them, there were over 4,000. Our school districts say there are 19,000. Yet, we have a home called Little Audrey that the very public dollars that are supposed to be in the HUD funding could fund. We have a directive housing community development near Ratcliff that has a million dollars that could fund this particular facility. Mind you, in a city as large as Houston, there are only four for homeless youth.

I visited Little Audrey. These are the kind of young people who are there:

A young man who lived in a crack house not because he was on crack, but because he had no place else to live. He's found his way to Little Audrey; or the twins whose father died in Hurricane Katrina, were brought here by their mother to Houston, and then the mother died and they were homeless; or a young woman who was abused; or a young man who came and was put out of his house, from Dallas.

Little Audrey is a refuge that would be as helpful to the children that I met with and sat down with as this young man is being helped by Covenant House. Covenant House cannot do it alone. So it is important that communities who receive the public dollars, who, given the opportunity such as the public facilities dollars that the Housing and Community Development office has in the city of Houston, utilize it so we do not have this kind of shame in our community.

I look forward to working with the city Housing and Community Development and the Secretary of Housing to stop youth homelessness in America and to helping these young people. I know we can do it together.

THE TRUTH ABOUT YOSEMITE

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Yosemite Valley is a national treasure that was set aside in 1864 with the promise that it would be preserved for the express purpose of "public use, resort, and recreation." Ever since, Americans have enjoyed a host of recreational opportunities and amenities as they come to experience the splendor of the valley.

Now the National Park Service, at the urging of leftist environmental groups, is proposing eliminating many of these amenities, including bicycle and raft rentals, horseback riding rentals, gift shops, snack facilities, swimming pools, and iconic facilities, including the ice skating rink at Curry Village, the art center, and the historic

stone bridges that date back to the 1920s.

For generations, these facilities have enhanced the enjoyment of the park for millions of visitors, adding a rich variety of recreational activities amidst the breathtaking backdrop of Yosemite. But today the very nature and purpose of Yosemite is being changed from its original promise of public resort, use, and recreation to an exclusionary agenda that can best be described as "look, but don't touch."

As public outrage has mounted, these leftist groups have found willing mouthpieces in the editorial boards of the left-leaning San Francisco Chronicle and Sacramento Bee. It is obvious their editorial writers have either not read the report or are deliberately misrepresenting it to their readers. They say the plan is designed to relieve overcrowding in the park. In fact, this plan compounds the overcrowding.

In 1997, flooding wiped out almost half the campsites in Yosemite Valley. Congress appropriated \$17 million to replace these campsites. The money was spent; the campsites were never replaced. That's what's causing the overcrowding—half the campsites for the same number of visitors.

This plan would lock in a 30 percent reduction in campsites and a 50 percent reduction in lodging compared to the pre-flood area. Three swimming pools in the valley give visitors a safe place with lifeguards for their children to cool off in the summer. The park service wants to close two of them. That means packed overcrowding at the remaining pool, pushing families seeking water recreation into the perilous Merced River.

They assure us they're not eliminating all the shops at Yosemite, but only reducing the number of them. Understand the practical impact on tourists. It means they're going to have to walk much greater distances to access these services and then endure long lines once they get there.

Another of the falsehoods is that the plan doesn't ban services like bike rentals, but just moves them to better locations. The government's own report puts the lie to this claim. It specifically speaks to "eliminating" and "removing" these services. It goes on to specifically state: "Over time, visitors would become accustomed to the absence of these facilities and would no longer expect them as a part of their experience in Yosemite." Their intent could not possibly be any clearer.

We are assured that although bicycle rentals will be—and I'm using the government's word—"eliminated" from the valley in the interest of environmental protection, visitors will still be free to bring their own bikes. That invites the obvious question: What exactly is the environmental difference between a rented bicycle and a privately owned bicycle?

We're assured in the smarmy words of the Sacramento Bee that the plan merely contemplates relocating raft

rentals so they meet visitors at the river. In truth, the plan specifically states that it will "allow only private boating in this river segment," and even then will limit total permits to only 100 per day.

Mr. Speaker, every lover of Yosemite needs to read this report. It proposes breaking the compact between the American people and their government that promised public use, resort, and recreation for all time when the park was established.

My district includes the Yosemite National Park. I represent the gateway communities that depend on park tourism to support their economies. The affected counties and communities are unanimous in their vigorous opposition to this plan; and in a recent phone survey, the people of these communities, who are jealous guardians of Yosemite, expressed opposition to it in numbers well exceeding 80 percent.

Many things need to be done to improve gate access and traffic flow through the park, but destroying the amenities that provide enjoyment for millions of Yosemite visitors each year is not among them.

CLIMATE RESEARCH

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

Ms. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, climate change is not a science debate; it never was. As we know, science is never universally agreed upon. It's a constant reexamining of what is deemed the squats quo. Nonetheless, the science surrounding climate change is near universal and it is incontrovertible. Over several decades of study, an overwhelming majority of scientists, including many at NOAA and NASA Goddard, in fact, in my district, as well as researchers worldwide, have concluded that climate change is real, is caused by man, and will have a significant impact on our Earth, it's process, the safety of our public, and our economy. These findings simply must quell the ideological differences and guide our policy decisions with regard to our environment in all due haste.

As a member of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I remain astounded that so much climate denial exists within these Chambers. This doubt is translated into slashing funding for climate research and Earth science research, both short-term and long-term. It's resulted in preventing agencies with the expertise to maintain and develop Earth-observing systems and conduct the analysis necessary to understand our Earth—all slashed.

Just 2 weeks ago, our House Science Committee reported out legislation that would cut NASA's Earth science budget by a third, something like over \$600 million. NASA is a major contributor to our U.S. Global Change Research Program, and such a cut would

not only devastate Earth science research, but hamper our ability to understand what is truly a matter of national significance, indeed, global significance.

Unfortunately, my home State of Maryland will suffer disproportionately if this Chamber refuses to act. Maryland has the fourth longest tidal coastline and is the third most vulnerable to sea level rise, one of the major consequences of climate change. Islands and low-lying communities throughout our State will be impacted by rising seas and severe weather events like Hurricane Sandy. Just last week, The Washington Post reported that Maryland's coastal waters could rise 6 feet by the end of this century. This increase could cause flooding in major cities like Baltimore and Annapolis. Areas on the lower half of the Delmarva Peninsula could be especially impacted. While our State has been proactive about preparing for these kind of environmental changes, thermal expansion of our oceans and waterways will pose significant problems for the State, indeed, for our Nation.

But this is not one State's concern; it's a 50-State concern and a global concern.

Goddard Spaceflight Center, which is located just outside my congressional district, is home to a number of climate scientists who are genuinely concerned about observed and predicted trends for the future. This historical trend of warming and sea level ice, in particular, are not fiction or hyperbole. The are, in fact, facts that are indisputable and in many ways terrifying.

I want to bring to your attention image 1 here. In Maryland, the warming trend over 100 years has increased from 2 degrees Fahrenheit to 6.1 degrees, just since 1960. This is significant and concerning warming in just my State. The U.S. trends are equally staggering, and the global trends are even more overwhelming.

But what concerns me even more is this chart here. This chart depicts polar sea ice, which is important to control and moderate global climate. As sea ice melts in the summer, it absorbs the sunlight and warms our poles. What's happening is that, because, according to the National Snow and Ice Data Center, even a slight warming of the poles will quicken the pace of global warming and likely lead to more severe climate patterns. Since 2000, Arctic ice during the summer has been melting at rates that are scaring scientists. Here, what you see is a sharp decline during the summer ice melting. Last year, half of the sea ice actually melted during the summer.

I want to highlight one more thing. Our most conservative models didn't predict what we've actually observed in terms of decline in sea ice thickness. Our climate model simulations have failed to keep up with actual significant loss. This problem is twofold:

First, additional cuts to climate research and gaps in our satellites—and

there are gaps because we're not funding them—make these observations even less accurate and weaken our modeling;

Second, the poles are actually warming faster than we ever predicted. It's estimated that by 2020, all the sea ice during the summer will be melted.

It's time for us to act. For the sake of the future generations of our economy, our environment, let's restore climate research capacity. Let's act for future generations.

HONORING THE LIVES OF THIRTY-TWO AMERICAN HEROES

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

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in this, the people's House, to pay tribute to, to honor, and to remember the lives of 32 American heroes.

Next Tuesday is August 6, and it is the most sobering anniversary in the district I have the privilege to represent. It was on that day in 2011 that enemy fighters in Afghanistan shot down a Chinook helicopter, killing 5 soldiers, 3 airmen, and 24 Navy SEALs. This tragedy marks the heaviest loss of life for our elite Navy SEAL community.

The warriors we lost that day were loving husbands, devoted fathers, brave sons, selfless patriots. While their families struggle with the loss of their own personal hero, our Nation stands with them, and the good folks in Virginia's Second Congressional District stand with them, as well.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, men and women have sacrificed for this country at a high cost. I have wrestled with this question, and I do not know why providence calls upon some to give so much, including in cases like this, for young men or young women to give the full measure of sacrifice in defense of our freedom. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker: I know the duty we have to the fallen, and that's to honor and to remember them and to care for their families and to meet our obligation today in this place and across this great land and press on for the freedom and liberty that they indeed gave their life for.

So it is with reverence and respect, Mr. Speaker, and sincere appreciation from one American to the families of the fallen that I will now read the names of these Americans whose lives were taken that day in defense of our country.

These are Navy servicemen killed August 6, 2011:

Jonas B. Kelsall
Louis J. Langlais
Thomas A. Ratzlaff
Craig M. Vickers
Brian R. Bill
John W. Faas
Kevin A. Houston
Matthew D. Mason

Stephen M. Mills
Nicholas H. Null
Robert J. Reeves
Heath M. Robinson
Darrik C. Benson
Christopher G. Campbell

Jared W. Day
John Douangdara
Michael J. Strange
Jon T. Tumilson
Aaron C. Vaughn
Jason R. Workman

Jesse D. Pittman
Nicholas P. Spehar

The five soldiers killed that day:

David R. Carter
Bryan J. Nichols
Patrick D. Hamburger
Alexander J. Bennett
Spencer C. Duncan

And the three airmen killed that day:

John W. Brown
Andrew W. Harvell
Daniel L. Zerbe

Mr. Speaker, as these families continue to struggle with their loss, we continue to pray for them, asking that God will give them a special measure of grace and peace on this day and the days ahead.

SUPPORT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on behalf of support for funding for the Community Development Block Grants, commonly known here as CDBG funding.

Public-private partnerships are great investments for our communities. And on the central coast of California, as well as in communities all across our country, Community Development Block Grants have long been a critical source of funding for local initiatives. CDBG funding gives nonprofits opportunities to provide locally tailored services in an efficient and effective manner. These nonprofits are then able to leverage additional private funding, giving taxpayer dollars an extra bang for the buck in spending power. It is a win-win for everyone. The investments that are made stimulate and grow our local economies. They improve the quality of life for our working families.

My constituents see CDBG funding at work each day, even though they may not know what it is. It's there working on their behalf. It's the Santa Maria Meals on Wheels program, which delivers nutritious meals to local seniors each day. For many of these seniors, it's the only real meal they'll have in a day.

It's the Thrifty Shopper and Catholic Charities' Community Services, which support mobile food distribution and case management for our neighbors in need.

It is the youth education enhancement programs which provide quality after-school youth education programs. These programs improve reading and