



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2013

No. 149

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, October 28, 2013, at 2 p.m.

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 23, 2013

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. STEWART).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 23, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CHRIS STEWART to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEIRUT BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am on the floor today in remembrance of the

bombing of the United States Marine Corps barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, 30 years ago.

On October 23, 1983, at approximately 6:20 in the morning, a truck packed with explosives broke security and detonated outside of the barracks, killing 241 Americans and wounding 128 more.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate that, on the 30th anniversary of this act of terrorism, we recognize the sacrifice of the individuals who lost life and limb, and join with the families and friends of the victims in mourning their loss.

Furthermore, I believe that we should learn from the example of America's leader at the time of the bombing, President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan appreciated the sacrifice made by our servicemembers and was deeply pained by the loss of life.

While many other Presidents would have continued sacrificing young men and women for the sake of the mission in Lebanon, President Reagan acknowledged his mistake. I would like to take a moment to read a statement he made regarding the bombing:

Perhaps we didn't appreciate fully enough the depth of the hatred and the complexity of the problems that made the Middle East such a jungle. Perhaps the idea of a suicide car bomber committing mass murder to gain instant entry to Paradise was so foreign to our own values and consciousness that it did not create in us the concern for the marines' safety that it should have.

In the weeks immediately after the bombing, I believed the last thing we should do was to turn tail and leave. Yet the irrationality of Middle East politics forced us to rethink our policy. If there would be some

rethinking of policy before our men die, we would be a lot better off. If that policy had changed toward more of a neutral position and neutrality, those 241 marines would be alive today.

I have read these quotes from President Reagan to honor the sacrifice of the 241 marines and their families. They did not die in vain, but gave their lives to bring peace to a troubled area.

The leaders of our country must learn from tragedies like Beirut that our men and women in uniform are very precious. Our foreign policy must be formed with a better understanding of the commitment and purpose in a mission before we risk the life of one single American.

I believe sincerely that this was the point President Reagan was making as he remarked with remorse on the bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon, on October 23 of 1983.

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege to represent Camp Lejeune Marine Base and other bases in eastern North Carolina, and I have visited the Beirut memorial many times to look at the names, certainly people I never knew and probably would not have known.

But the point is that our foreign policy continues today in Afghanistan. We have had six Americans killed in the last week. In the bill that passed recently to raise the debt ceiling, there was \$30 billion for Karzai, who is a crook.

I do not understand this Congress, why we continue to sacrifice our young men and women, and why we continue to send money that we do not have to a foreign dictator and we cut programs

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6679

for children and seniors who want to have a meal.

With that, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I honor the 241 who died by saying I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform. And Dear God, I ask You to continue to bless America.

LET'S WORK TOGETHER

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

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I don't think it is news to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle that you don't win every battle around here. The place is tough, and occasionally you get knocked down. The measure of a man or woman in Congress, or anyplace for that matter, is what do you after.

We all witnessed a political showdown over the past several weeks, and now it is time to put it behind us. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to step up and show the country what you are made of, and let us actually legislate on behalf of the American people.

I have heard a lot of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say things like, We don't trust that President; we can't work with this President.

So, Mr. Speaker, does this apply to everything?

Will there be no legislation until there is a different President in 2017?

Well, that doesn't sound very realistic.

On my side of the aisle, they are already saying, oh, those Republicans, they are hard-liners; they will not compromise on anything. And when someone does reach across the aisle to say, hey, let's work on an issue together, what do we get?

Hey, why are you helping them?

I have heard it. When I stood with DAVID VALADAO in California, or PAUL RYAN in Chicago to say immigration reform is an objective we can reach in a bipartisan manner, I heard from the Democrats: stop working with them, we're trying to defeat them. We want to take the House back.

Look, I get it. There are millions of dollars to be raised by partisan bickering. Your side raised a ton of money off the past battle, and my side has too.

The fact is that if two of us get into a shouting match, it is news; and if it gets bad, it will be shown on every channel. But if two of us reach an agreement on something, it's not news.

You know, bipartisanship is something that is much lauded here, but it is infrequently applauded and rarely rewarded.

But here is the thing. The only way we actually get anything done is to put aside the shouting matches and work together. I want immigration reform to pass; and even though I think almost every single Democrat agrees with me,

it is still not enough because there are only 201 of us.

We don't run the Rules Committee or set the agenda. The Republicans are the majority in the House, so I know I have to work with the other side.

On your side, you say you don't like what the Senate passed. Let's not just respond with nothing. Let's craft a House response and put our own proposal on the table.

Those on the other side of the aisle say they don't trust the President and can't work with him. Well, okay. Fine. Then work with your colleagues on this side of the aisle.

You know, there are 435 of us. We need 218 votes to pass a bill, and the President doesn't get a vote.

The truth is that even during the shutdown, many on your side of the aisle have been drafting proposals that many of us on this side of the aisle are willing to work with you on. The question is whether the work on a bipartisan basis will be allowed to flourish.

I want to spend the rest of this Congress working with whoever wants to join, in either party, to get immigration reform done.

Your side needs a little time to recover from the last fight? I get that. But with 1,100 deportations every day, we can't wait forever. The kids who are losing their moms are not going to wait for you or for me. The husbands and the fathers who die in the desert because their wives and kids live here don't have any more time to give.

But you probably ask, LUIS, after the battle over health care and budget, how can two parties ever work together?

But, you know, that is exactly what I thought in 1996: How can we work together?

I was here 17 years ago. In 1996, it was Speaker Gingrich who shut down the government. But after that, let's remember what happened. We passed a series of major bipartisan bills on difficult policy issues.

Welfare reform was crafted, in part, by a very conservative House, and signed by a very liberal President Clinton. He had vetoed the bill twice before but, after the shutdown, reached an agreement with the Republican majority.

The Kennedy-Kassenbaum bill was historic, bipartisan legislation on health care, and we passed it after the shutdown. We can do the same if politicians in both parties are committed to accomplishments over campaign talking points. We can pass immigration reform this year.

We all know that immigration reform is immensely popular with voters in both parties who want a political solution to fixing our broken immigration system. Diverse constituencies back immigration reform, like labor unions and business owners and evangelical leaders and Catholic bishops and leaders across the political spectrum.

Don't think of it as working with President Obama if it makes it easier

for you. Think of it as doing your job. Think of it as working on behalf of the American people, not for an Obama solution, not for a Tea Party solution, but for an American solution.

POLITICAL DOUBLE STANDARD AT WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, if you missed this past Sunday morning TV talking heads shows, you missed the political double standard at work. Time and again, the hosts of the aforesaid programs referred to the recent "Republican government shutdown."

Wait a minute. Republican government shutdown?

There were two advocacy groups to this affair: one, President Obama and the Democratic administration and, two, the Republicans.

So it appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that a more accurate description would be the Republicans, President Obama and the Democrat administration and the government shutdown.

The Republicans, in spite of the President's adamant refusal to negotiate, requested a 1-year delay for the controversial health care proposal. The President rejected that proposal but, considering the reviews surrounding his health care proposal, which are, at best, dismal, it was an offer the President should have embraced.

All of us, in and out of the political arena, should dismiss the application of the double standard that oftentimes is used in this town, and we should encourage objectivity to prevail over subjectivity; and, in so doing, our country will become the beneficiary of good government, of fair government. Good government finally will be promoted in the end, and we will all benefit therefrom.

THE NATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today the House begins consideration of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act, which includes in the title the word "reform" but would represent a huge step backwards.

This legislation would have significant impact on the way the Army Corps of Engineers conducts projects that are critical to the Nation's environmental and economic health. I have long worked to help the Corps be a better partner which, in times past, has proved troublesome.

It was my pleasure to work with the head of the Corps previously, General Robert Flowers, and his staff to change the way the Corps does business. Otherwise, we can waste a lot of money and