

We urge our colleagues to adopt our motto—"politics stops at water"—and support this effort. This magnitude will take a team working together, united in the goal of saving lives and improving communities around the world. Please join us in this critical legislation, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act (H.R. 2901).

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.'S MARCH ON WASHINGTON

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, from time to time in our Nation's history, people of faith have stepped forward to call this Nation to something greater. This is steeped in our culture, our tradition, and our founding documents. It goes back to the cross at Cape Henry and to the landing at Plymouth Rock. You see it in our Declaration of Independence and again in the movement to abolish slavery.

Then, in the 1950s and 1960s, it was people of faith who birthed the new civil rights movement. No figure cast a wider shadow on that movement than the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King. This month, we mark the 50th anniversary of one of the most iconic speeches in American history—Dr. King's address at the Lincoln Memorial. It is a great honor for me to stand here today to recollect the words of Dr. King, a man who stands among the heroes of our Nation.

Dr. King was a pastor. He received a divinity degree from Crozer Theological Seminary in Pennsylvania. His call to the ministry led him to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, Alabama, where, in the church's basement, he helped to plan the Montgomery bus boycott of 1955. That Dr. King's actions were motivated by his faith in a just God is evident when you read his words.

From the marble steps of the Lincoln Memorial, he used the words of the prophet Isaiah to articulate his dream of an end to injustice and oppression:

That one day every valley shall be exalted, every hill and mountain shall be made low; the rough places will be made plain, and the crooked places will be made straight; and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together.

Martin Luther King, Jr., looked not for a revolution but for an affirmation of the country's founding principles when he declared:

That we have come to our Nation's Capital to cash a check. When the architects of our Republic wrote the magnificent words of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, they were signing a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir. This note was a promise that all men would be guaranteed the inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

It was not the first time that Dr. King had alluded to the promise of our founding documents. Just 4 months be-

fore the March on Washington, in writing from a Birmingham jail, he wrote that African Americans had waited for more than 340 years for their constitutional and God-given rights.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail could not be clearer in its articulation of the moral status of law and the role that religion plays in a just society:

Now [King wrote] what is the difference between a "just" and an "unjust" law? How does one determine whether a law is just or unjust? A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law of God. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law.

Yes, Dr. King appealed to the Nation's religious roots to encourage social change, and from a Birmingham jail, he encouraged individuals to confront unjust laws:

[T]here is nothing new [King wrote] about this kind of civil disobedience. It was evidenced sublimely in the refusal of Shadrach, Meshach and Abednego to obey the laws of Nebuchadnezzar, on the ground that a higher moral law was at stake. It was practiced superbly by the early Christians, who were willing to face hungry lions . . . rather than submit to certain unjust laws of the Roman Empire. . . . In our own Nation, the Boston Tea Party represented a massive act of civil disobedience.

We should never forget [King continued] that everything Adolf Hitler did in Germany was "legal" and everything the Hungarian freedom fighters did in Hungary was "illegal." It was "illegal" to aid and comfort a Jew in Hitler's Germany. Even so, I am sure [King proclaimed] that, had I lived in Germany at the time, I would have aided and comforted my Jewish brothers. If today I lived [King continued] in a Communist country, where certain principles dear to the Christian faith are suppressed, I would openly advocate disobeying that country's anti-religious laws.

King's letter from a Birmingham jail and his "I Have a Dream" speech should be required reading for every American high school student and for every Member of Congress.

With the 50th anniversary of Dr. King's speech upon us, it is good to remember his words. It is good to appreciate all that faith in God and the moral law have done to advance the cause of freedom in our country. It is good to reflect on whether policies enacted by government in our time are a step back from, or show a rising intolerance of, the religious freedom that has been instrumental in defining our country and defending our rights.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, AN UMBRELLA ON A RAINY DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman who preceded me for that very powerful message; and it reminds us generally of, really, the elements of our presence here in this House. When we represent the people of this country, it is important that we are lawmakers and that we have the compassion that was evidenced by the movement that Dr. King led and by the

movement that he was leading at the time of the tragedy of his death and that was, of course, the Poor People's March in 1968.

I rise today to discuss that capacity and to say that I know that our friends, Republicans and Democrats, can come together around important service elements that this Nation engages in. The Federal Government is an umbrella on a rainy day. It is the engine of the economy. It is the answer to issues such as transportation and housing. It really provides housing to working families. It boosts the middle class and poor families, and it gives jobs to builders and contractors. So that is why, I think, it was quite appropriate for this, unfortunately, poorly driven and constructed Transportation, Housing and Urban Development appropriations bill to go to its timely death.

How can you with any compassion cut so much money that you cut even the amount of money under the present budget, and you cut 9 percent below the level now mandated by the across-the-board spending cuts by sequestration?

You went below that. This bill was \$44.1 billion—shameful—cutting public housing, cutting housing vouchers, cutting opportunities for the homeless, and particularly for our young people. As the cochair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, every day, I note that children in America suffer for a variety of reasons. The Senate, of course, had a bill, which they are pushing through, that was at the \$54 billion level—still very far short of the great needs of this community.

So I rise today to say that it landed with a thud, and I think, more importantly, my colleague from Texas—again, from Houston—spoke on the floor of the House about some untimely language on page 52—I remember it—that cut into the light rail system of Houston. It would impact my district. It would stop students at the University of Houston and at Texas Southern University from being able to have access to rail by cutting down on their travel costs because there was a provision in the bill that did not fund just a sector of that light rail.

□ 1015

My colleagues, how can you build light rail when you cut it in the middle, almost like the western movies, where the train rushes up and finds a big hole over the mountains where something has happened and it can't go any further?

It was a bill that was destined to die and should have died because it lacked compassion. I stand here opposing any language that does not fund or find an alternative route in any community's light rail new starts on which that community chooses to move forward. In Houston, we should not be attacked, if you will, for that kind of singular targeting. Our light rail should proceed.

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