□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, the idea behind this diminution—in fact, elimination—of tariff and nontariff barriers is so we can enhance freedom, enhance opportunity, and improve the quality of life and the standard of living for people not only here in the United States, but around the world, as well. We understand that even in repressive societies, that if we can proceed with economic liberalization, political liberalization will follow.

I have to counter the statement that was made by my California colleague, Mr. ROHRABACHER, about China. I am not going to stand here on the day that Xi Jinping has become the new leader of China and claim that things are perfect in China, but I will argue that permanent normal trade relations and China's accession to the World Trade Organization has been beneficial. Why? Because if one looks at the great leap forward in China, there were tens of millions of people who were killed. During the cultural revolution, well over a million people were starved to death.

So you look at the great leap forward, you look at the cultural revolution in China, and you look today at the horrendous human rights violations that exist in China, and my goal is still to see us move towards political pluralism, the development of democratic institutions, a greater sense of the rule of law. But there are a few thousand political prisoners in China. It's horrible. It's not acceptable. But, Mr. Speaker, I argue that that is progress.

It was 10 years ago that I was very privileged to work with President Clinton in seeing China's accession to the World Trade Organization and permanent normal trade relations established. We were able to do that right here in a bipartisan way, and things are better than they were. They're not great; they're not acceptable; but, Mr. Speaker, they are better than they were.

I know there are some who—and Mr. ROHRABACHER thoughtfully did point to the fact that Russia is obviously not what it was like under the Soviet Union. I mean, we can all think back to the refuseniks. I remember adopting refuseniks, Jews who were unable to emigrate from Russia. You think about all of the military expenses that were involved throughout the Cold War, stories—I just came back from Georgia and the Ukraine, overseeing their elections, having been throughout Eastern Europe and Central Europe and heard stories about the kind of repression that existed. As bad as Russia is today, it's still a marked improvement over what existed during the Cold War and the time of the Soviet Union.

A lot of us held out a great deal of hope for Russia, more so than we have right now, just a few years ago, and because we've seen backward steps. I've talked about my friend Mikhail Khodorkovsky, who, at this moment, is languishing in a Russian prison for simply criticizing Vladimir Putin. I'm here today in large part because I want Mikhail Khodorkovsky to be freed. I want to see an end to that kind of treatment of individuals.

Similarly, tomorrow marks the third anniversary of the tragic death of Sergei Magnitsky. It was absolutely horrible that this 37-year-old lawyer, a young man with, as my friend pointed out, a wife and small children, was imprisoned for simply being a whistleblower. He was tortured, abused, and left to die 3 years ago tomorrow. Again, in the 21st century, that is intolerable. It can't be accepted. That's why we need to continue to pursue this effort on economic liberalization.

I'm not going to counter what my friend said about the importance of the Magnitsky component to this legislation, but I would like to share the words of some formerly incarcerated Russians, some of whom were incarcerated human rights leaders in Russia who long before we did the Magnitsky language talked about how important this is. Let me just read a bit of this letter that is signed by seven human rights activists. It goes down the line of these Russians who have been opposition leaders in the forefront.

Before we did this, understanding how important PNTR and China's accession to the WTO would be, they said:

> The persistence on the books of the Jackson-Vanik amendment does not help to solve the problems with democracy and human rights in modern Russia at all. Moreover, it brings direct harm. This helps Mr. Putin and his cronies.

He is basically saying that repeal of Jackson-Vanik is something that is going to help undermine Putin and his cronies.

They go on to say:

> Those who defend the argument that Jackson-Vanik's provisions should still apply to Russia in order to punish Putin's antidemocratic regime only darken Russia's political future, hamper its economic development, and frustrate its democratic aspirations.
>
> We, leading figures of the Russian political opposition, strongly stand behind the efforts to remove Russia from the provisions of the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

This is exactly what this measure has done before.

While I'm gratified that we've been able, in a bipartisan way to include Magnitsky, there is recognition that simply repeal of Jackson-Vanik would go a long way towards undermining the political repression that exists in Russia today.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to say on this overall issue of trade, thanks are being spread around. I want to express my appreciation to my very good friends and colleagues, DAVE CAMP, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and KEVIN BRADY, who chairs the Trade Subcommittee. I've worked with them for many years on the important issue of trade liberalization and in our pursuit of ensuring that we can create good American jobs, union and nonunion jobs, by opening up these markets.

I also have to say that I know people like to malign the 87 newly elected Republican Members, this Tea Party class of crazy people. You read that. You hear that in the media on a regular basis. Frankly, I have to say, Mr. Speaker, the leadership that they have shown on this issue and on the issues of Colombia, Panama, and South Korea are very important issues. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I express my appreciation to the fact that 73 of them signed a letter to the President saying that this needed to be brought forward. We want to work in a bipartisan way to make this happen.

I urge support of this rule, and then tomorrow when we have the vote on PNTR, a strong bipartisan support in behalf of the efforts of Messrs. CAMP and LEVIN and BRADY and others.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1705

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DOLD) at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6156, RUSSIA AND MOLDOVA JACKSON-VANIK REPEAL AND SERGEI MAGNITSKY RULE OF LAW ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 808) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6156) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (normal trade relations treatment) to products of the Russian Federation and Moldova and to require reports on the compliance of the Russian Federation with its obligations as a member of the World Trade Organization, and for other purposes,