

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, what a great day for America—a victory for the American people.

You know, last November the American people loudly demanded the repeal of ObamaCare, and today the House delivered.

Earlier today, I outlined why the American people were so opposed to this legislation. So tonight I thought I would remind my colleagues on the left as to why they rejected ObamaCare.

It was the employee mandate and the mandates on individuals that tax, penalize, and punish Americans who choose not to opt in to a government-approved health care system.

Maybe it was the \$569 billion in new taxes or the \$2.6 trillion cost or the \$700 billion in deficit spending over the first 10 years this law is fully implemented, and who knows what after that.

More importantly, it violated our Constitution and our personal liberties.

So earlier today I asked my friends and folks back in the district who follow us on Facebook, the Georgians I work for and I represent, to respond to us as to how the legislation has already impacted them today. So we got a few of those responses; and, Mr. Speaker, I thought I would share some of those.

From north Georgia, Elisabeth in Rossville said her health insurance premiums have already almost doubled.

Jimmy in north Georgia said his health care premium is certainly more expensive.

Brian said his health insurance just went up by at least 8 percent, and the cost of his mother's Medicare part D coverage has doubled.

BJ in Calhoun, a health insurance agent, said premiums have risen, and companies he represents are reducing or eliminating commissions.

Then there is Jeremy in Ringgold. He was going to expand his business this year, but he was forced to put those plans on hold because of the costly and burdensome 1099 tax filing requirements that were required under ObamaCare.

It is because of these Americans that we not only repealed ObamaCare today but that tomorrow we will also vote on a House resolution directing the committees of jurisdiction to begin working on legislation through a transparent process—open to the American people—that will embody free market principles that, under many circumstances, will foster economic growth and private sector job creation; lower health care premiums through increased competition and choice; ensure patients have the opportunity to keep their health care plans if they like them; reform the medical liability system to reduce unnecessary and wasteful health care spending; remove barriers that prohibit health care plans from being purchased across State lines; provide the States greater flexibility to administer the Medicaid programs.

More importantly, it will be policy that empowers Americans with options

instead of mandates coming from the Federal Government. Above all, our reforms will not infringe upon individual liberties.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank those tonight who on Facebook responded to us in helping us start that round two of the ObamaCare debate.

Today, we voted to repeal. Tomorrow, we begin the work to replace with free market solutions.

□ 1840

DISTORTING THE DREAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Earlier this week, Mr. Speaker, we recognized the 82nd birthday of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., perhaps the greatest moral and spiritual leader in our Nation's history. Each of us in our way reflected on Dr. King's teaching, and his message had more relevance than ever in light of the tragic shootings in Tucson.

It's a sign of progress that a man whose ideas were considered revolutionary during his life has achieved mainstream iconic status in death. But as we all share his legacy, there is a very real danger that some people will, in a self-serving way, distort King's vision to justify the very policies he gave his life opposing. In fact, Department of Defense General Counsel Jeh Johnson has a bizarre, unsettling interpretation of Dr. King's dream.

In a speech last week, Mr. Johnson suggested that this great agitator for peace would have endorsed the war in Afghanistan. And I quote him, he said, "If Dr. King were alive today, he would recognize that our Nation's military should not and cannot lay down its arms and leave the American people vulnerable to terrorist attack."

Mr. Speaker, this strikes me as a presumptuous and manipulative distortion of everything Dr. King represented. He was fierce; he was resolute in his opposition to the Vietnam War. It was a courageous, controversial stand that cost him friends and allies.

He believed nothing as strongly as the idea that nonviolence was the only route to social change. He left little ambiguity about his feelings on war: "The chain reaction of evil wars producing more wars must be broken," Dr. King once said, "or we shall be plunged into the dark abyss of annihilation." I don't know how you get much clearer than that, Mr. Speaker.

Violence, he preached, "is a descending spiral, begetting the very things it seeks to destroy. Through violence you may murder the hater, but you do not murder the hate. In fact, violence merely increases hate. Returning violence for violence multiplies violence."

Mr. Speaker, we've seen exactly this in our misguided struggle to defeat terrorism through warfare. Killing one Taliban or al Qaeda insurgent

emboldens the movement and simply creates more terrorists. Dr. King added that "a nation that continues to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching a spiritual death." These are the words we ought to reflect on as we continue a debate about Federal budget priorities.

Far from supporting the war in Afghanistan, I believe Dr. King would be much more likely to embrace the principles of the SMART security platform that I've spoken of from this podium many, many times. It calls for cooperation, not conquest; dialogue, not destruction; engagement, not invasion. It pursues the goal of global peace and security by focusing on our common humanity. It is an agenda that respects human rights, that seeks to empower and lift up the poor people of the world instead of dropping bombs on their villages and on their communities.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnson of the Pentagon couldn't be more wrong about the lessons of Martin Luther King's life. I have every confidence that, were he alive today, Dr. King would join me in a loud and unmistakable call to bring our troops home.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, last month, The Economist exhorted Western leaders to more openly and consistently criticize Russia for its sham democracy, its brutal treatment of human rights activists and political dissidents, and its utter disregard for the rule of law. It was a challenge that should be taken seriously.

Our approach to Russia has been characterized paradoxically by a failure to be both sufficiently pragmatic and sufficiently idealistic at the same time. Russia is a key international player with whom we must engage. That's undeniable. It is a permanent member of the Security Council. It is a key actor in any international effort to contain Iran's nuclear ambitions. It exerts great influence in regions such as central Asia, with implications for our struggle against violent extremists in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

Keeping our engagement with Russia as constructive and effective as possible is essential to pursuing our vital national security interests. But, Mr. Speaker, this reality cannot preclude our commitment to promote democracy around the globe and condemn those who brutally suppress it. We

must stand up for human rights and the rule of law, even when—especially when—they are undermined by major international players. We cannot remain silent when journalists and activists are killed or savagely beaten with impunity, while political prisoners face years of jail time.

The new guilty verdict imposed on Mikhail Khodorkovsky late last year makes it appear that the only crime that's actually punishable in the Russian Federation is opposition to Putin. Days after the verdict was handed down, opposition leader and former Prime Minister Boris Nemtsov was arrested for participating in a peaceful rally. He had committed the grave offense of expressing support for the protection of constitutional rights and condemning the sham Khodorkovsky verdict.

Hostility to the rule of law extends beyond Russia's own borders, as we saw in the August 2008 invasion of our democratic ally Georgia. It was reprehensible. Georgia's sovereignty and territorial integrity remain under threat today.

In our relationship with Moscow, we must learn to balance the twin imperatives of effective engagement and criticism of gross miscarriages of justice. This will only become more essential in the context of the coming debate on Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization. Russia has moved closer than ever to acceding to the WTO. We are likely to face this prospect in the coming year and the resulting vote on whether to extend Permanent Normal Trade Relations.

We will need to have a full and robust debate on this issue. We will need to ensure that PNTR is not granted until we have confirmed that Russia has fulfilled the basic obligations that WTO membership demands. If those obligations are met, my view is the WTO accession would be a very positive step forward. Bringing Russia into a rules-based trading system would bind Moscow to the rule of law. It would create consequences and enforcement mechanisms for failure to live by its commitments.

WTO membership is by no means a panacea, particularly for symptoms as deeply flawed as Russia's, but it would be a significant step in the right direction. Not only would it impose the rule of law in Russia's trading relationships, it would demonstrate that even Moscow recognizes the value of international rules of fairness. This should serve as a reminder that their presumed indifference to our criticism is no excuse for failing to voice that criticism.

We need to engage with Russia, but Russia also needs to engage with us. We cannot shy away from taking a public stand against increasingly brutal repression at the hands of those with whom we have important negotiations. Neither can we lose sight of the fact that supporting the rule of law is not just about promoting American ideals.

□ 1850

One of the most important lessons of the last decade is that democracy strengthening is as firmly grounded in realpolitik as it is steeped in lofty, high-minded ideals. If our moral clarity helps to strengthen democracy advocates in Russia, we will further our strategic goals in the long run. A less corrupt, less autocratic regime in Moscow will result in a better international partner.

As Vladimir Kara-Murza has written in *World Affairs*, defending the rule of law is not just our right but our duty. Last week, Vladimir wrote that statutes of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, to which both the U.S. and Russia are party, make this clear. The statutes state, "issues relating to human rights, fundamental freedoms, democracy, and the rule of law are of international concern."

It is absolutely imperative, Mr. Speaker, that we do absolutely everything that we can to strengthen this relationship but pursue the rule of law.

THE GOLDEN RULE OF TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, before all of the pomp and circumstance of tonight's State dinner honoring Chinese President Hu Jintao, a closed-door meeting took place between President Obama, the Chinese President, and the power brokers from some of the largest global corporations that seem to create more jobs outside this country than inside it: Steve Ballmer of Microsoft; Jeffrey Immelt of General Electric; Jim McNerney of Boeing; David Rubenstein of the Carlyle Group; Ellenn Kullman, the CEO of DuPont. And many greedy Wall Street bankers showed up: John Thornton, the chairman of HSBC Holdings; and Lloyd Blankfein, my gosh, the chief executive officer of Goldman Sachs—where have we heard about them before?—whose imprudent firms are responsible for the economic meltdown that the rest of America is trying to dig out of as we speak tonight.

Too often, these international corporations and megabanks have taken America's ingenuity and hard work that were built with so much effort and shipped them overseas, destroying American jobs and ballooning our half trillion dollar trade deficit.

China remains a communist country, and it is a command-and-control economy described as "Market Leninism"—not free enterprise. Yes, China's people should be able to develop their land and their economy and improve their lives. They surely need it. But their growth should not come at the expense of American jobs and our businesses and our workers.

The moment has arrived to deal with China as the great economic power

that it is and proceed on the basis of reciprocity. If a treaty affects our companies one way, we'll treat them the same way. If they exclude our investments and our imports, we will exclude their investments and their imports. We should give them the exact same deal as they give us. That is the Golden Rule of trade.

While we wish China well, we must defend the interests of jobs in our country, and even more, the highest political ideals to which we aspire. And our highest calling is freedom.

It is not a coincidence that America's trade deficit with Communist China has ballooned since China entered the World Trade Organization in 2001. The trade deficit for 2010 with China and the United States alone stood at \$253 billion—a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Since 2001, jobs in our country in manufacturing decreased by 25 percent. And according to the U.S. Department of Commerce, for every billion dollars of trade deficit we maintain, 5,405 American jobs are lost. This means in 2010 alone, over 1,400,000 more jobs were lost in our country attributable just to our trade deficit with China. This is a major factor in the weakness that our economy is suffering.

China consistently disregards international trade laws. She manipulates her currency, and she does nothing to protect American intellectual property. In fact, of all of the products seized at the U.S. border for infringement of intellectual property rights in 2009, 79 percent were from China.

Communist China's illegal subsidies and no-interest loans to Chinese companies have put American firms at a serious competitive disadvantage. In fact, there's a new 15-year tax holiday for solar companies. And a major firm in Massachusetts just announced it's closing its doors and going to China.

Dumping of products like steel pipes cripple the American steel industry. And earlier today, the White House announced China will purchase 200 Boeing aircraft. Isn't that convenient. A few airplanes. It's great to hear, but positive press releases for one-time purchases will do nothing to erase the \$253 billion deficit that grows with China every year.

Holding China accountable and creating an environment where Communist China's best interest is to follow international trade laws, to protect intellectual property rights, to stop illegal subsidies and no-interest loans to Chinese companies, and to further work to create a level playing field for all is in the hands of the Obama administration, the new majority in this House, and our colleagues in the Senate.

Congress and the administration must stand up most importantly for freedom and the rule of law. For American businesses and our workers and our economy to prosper, we have to hold Communist China accountable to the Golden Rule. And that means reciprocity, not Market Leninism.