This Congress can avoid taking us to yet another fiscal cliff and avoid sequestration by working together in the balanced way that the American people have asked us to.

RESOLVING ISSUES AND WORKING TOGETHER

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say to our colleagues that it is very gratifying that in just a few minutes we are going to begin to address the first issue that will come before us as a lame-duck Congress, and it's an issue that is going to be addressed in a bipartisan way. I'm very happy to see my friend from Worcester here, who has joined with me in doing a ''Dear Colleague'' in support of passage of permanent normal trade relations for Russia and Moldova. Our commitment to economic growth and human rights is one which has led us to this point, Mr. Speaker.

And I think that the idea with the mandate from the election was for us to resolve issues and work together, and we are going to have a chance to do that. And so as I get ready to call up the rule in just a moment, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my colleagues that this is a great day for us to take on the very, very serious challenges. And I believe that the success we are going to have, with the bipartisanship that is going to be demonstrated on this issue, should lay the groundwork for the work of the rest of this Congress and I hope very much for the next Congress as well.

SUPPORTING WIND PRODUCTION TAX CREDIT

(Ms. LEE of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, let me thank Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. TONKO, as well as all of the members of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Coalition, for being such strong advocates for a responsible and sustainable energy future.

Today I rise to speak in favor of the wind production tax credit and urge my colleagues to support its extension. Wind power and other sources of renewable energy are a vital and central part of a sustainable energy future, and they can be harvested right here in America.

In my own district, for example, I am very proud to say that there are currently six companies operating wind power plants. These power plants not only generate energy but also jobs and manufacturing right here at home.

I urge this Congress to support the extension here because it will put people to work in good paying jobs, help rebuild our manufacturing base, and help us achieve energy independence.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 808 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 808

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House 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. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 112-33 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate, with 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means and 30 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. On any legislative day during the period from November 19, 2012, through November 23, 2012—(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; (b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment; and (c) bills and resolutions introduced during the period addressed by this section shall be numbered, listed in the Congressional Record, and when printed shall bear the date of introduction, but may be referred by the Speaker at a later time.

SEC. 3. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 2 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say how great it is to see you in the Chair, and I wish you well.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my very good friend from Worcester, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me say, as I just mentioned in my 1-minute, it is very gratifying that, as we look at this election, we have many people who have used the term ''mandate'' to describe what it is they have gotten. The President says he has a mandate to increase taxes. Some Republicans say we have a mandate to not increase taxes. Lots of people throw this word ''mandate'' around.

I believe that the mandate is for us to focus on job creation and economic growth. And while we still embrace the Madisonian vision of the clash of ideas—it's a very, very important notion put forward by the author of the U.S. Constitution—at the end of the day, it's important for us to do something. And I think that the mandate from the election is that the American people want us to do everything that we can to create jobs, get the economy growing, and deal with many of the societal challenges that we face.

Mr. Speaker, that's why I say it is very gratifying that the first item out of the chute after the election is something we will be able to do in a bipartisan way. Not that it hasn't been controversial, and I will admit, Mr. Speaker, that there is controversy that surrounds this issue, and I'm going to talk about it, but I will say that it is great that we'll be able to do something, with Republicans and Democrats in the House, Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, and the President of the United States on the same page in support of Russia's accession to the WTO and, most particularly, the opportunity for the United States of America, our workers, to have access to 142 million consumers in that country.

So, Mr. Speaker, on August 22, Russia became a member of the World Trade Organization. Again, a huge economy. In fact, the last large economy to actually become a member of the WTO, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing because Vladimir Putin is not a good guy. It's a good thing because we are going to, not only with accession of the WTO but also with the multifarious provisions that are included in this measure, call on the United States Trade Representative, call on the State Department, and call on other entities to focus on things like intellectual property violations, negotiations, sanitary and phytosanitary agreements, the information technology agreement, and the government procurement agreement.

□ 1230

There are a wide range of provisions in here that will force Russia to live with a structure that it does not have today and will not have until we take this very important action.

Now one of the reasons that I have been such a strong proponent of this issue has to do with a name, and it's not the name we're going to be talking about in a minute. The name is Mikhail Khodorkovsky.

Mikhail Khodorkovsky is a businessman who was jailed and at this moment is incarcerated in the midst of a 7-year additional extension of his sentence for so-called ''tax evasion.''

Now I mention those two words in explaining why I'm here because I met

Mr. Khodorkovsky, who was the head of Yukos Oil and was widely respected. I'm sure he was a great businessman. But he was widely respected and was a great philanthropist in Russia. He was a critic of Vladimir Putin's. And as we all know, and as I said, he is incarcerated today for one thing and one thing only: being a critic of Vladimir Putin's. That's really why he's in prison.

Well, the reason I am standing here and am such a strong proponent of the action that we're about to take is that after I had met with Mr. Khodorkovsky in Moscow, he sat in my office right upstairs here in the Rules Committee. And in that meeting that I had with him, Mr. Khodorkovsky—a great philanthropist, one of the wealthiest people in Russia—said to me, I'm concerned about my safety and well-being. I think that there might be action taken against me.

Mr. Speaker, I am embarrassed to say that my reaction was to laugh at him. I said, There's no way that a man of your stature, doing the kinds of good things that you've been doing in Russia, will face anything other than broad-based support.

Mr. Speaker, I was wrong. The human rights violations which have taken place against Mikhail Khodorkovsky and a wide range of other people are one of the other reasons that we are here, pushing very, very strongly for permanent normal trade relations to force Russia to do something that they might not want to do, and that is to live with a rules-based trading system.

The other name that leads us here, of course, is Sergei Magnitsky, a young lawyer who was simply raising questions, a so-called whistleblower, a whistleblower who was beaten to death 3 years ago tomorrow. Tomorrow marks the third anniversary of Sergei Magnitsky's death. And it is outrageous, Mr. Speaker, that this kind of action in this 21st century still exists in a country that claims to be a democracy. It is horrendous, and it is unacceptable. And that's why I believe coupling the permanent normal trade relations for Russia and Moldova along with the Magnitsky language—and I want to congratulate our Senate colleagues BEN CARDIN and JON KYL, and I know my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has been involved in pushing this. I strongly support the effort that we have had that will ensure that those who are responsible for Sergei Magnitsky's tragic, brutal beating, which led to his death 3 years ago tomorrow, will be followed and be brought to justice.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a great bipartisan effort. It's one that I think will inure to the benefit of the people of Russia and the people of the United States. And I would like to say that, remember, we're not giving up a thing. We're not lowering a single tariff. There is not a single sacrifice that's being made here in the United States of America. What we're doing is we're breaking down the barriers there.

Last year, we exported $11 billion to Russia. The projection is that by 2017, our exports will be $22 billion, twice what we have today. And there are a number who anticipate that they will go actually beyond that.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this is a win-win all the way around. It's a win for the cause of human rights. It's a win for the cause of those of us—Democrats and Republicans alike—who want to create good American jobs so that we can have access to 142 million consumers. And it's a win for the people of Russia, who deserve better than they have gotten and, through the U.S. access to that market, will have an opportunity to see their standard of life and quality of life improve, because I believe passionately in the interdependence of economic and political liberalization.

This accession to the WTO will enhance economic liberalization, and it will create an opportunity. I hope and pray for the kind of political reform that is desperately needed.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the honorable chairman of the Rules Committee, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I want to thank him for his eloquent statement, and I want to thank him for bringing this to the floor. As he mentioned, he and I both coauthored a Dear Colleague and supported the underlying legislation. And it was a pleasure to work with him on this important bill.

And I know that there will be other opportunities to say this before he departs. But I want to thank him for his service to this House of Representatives, which I know he loves very deeply. And I want to thank him for his service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6156 joins together two pieces of legislation that deal with trade and human rights in the Russian Federation. The distinguished chairman has provided a clear description of the provisions in this bill that grant permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR, to the nations of Moldova and the Russian Federation. It is fairly straightforward.

Simply put, after 18 years of negotiations, Russia joined the World Trade Organization in August. That membership will require Russia—for the first time—to play by the same rules of trade as the United States and virtually every other nation in the world.

But under WTO rules, the United States cannot take advantage of Russia's WTO membership unless and until Congress grants Russia permanent normal trade relations, replacing the 1974 special bilateral agreement with Russia known as the Jackson-Vanik amendment.

The United States is not required to change any U.S. law as a result of Russia's WTO membership other than this change to the 1974 trade law. This is in contrast to bilateral free trade agreements where the United States is required to provide duty-free treatment.

If that were all there was to H.R. 6156, it would pass or fail along familiar lines of trade-related legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6156 will become known as a landmark piece of trade legislation not because it grants PNTR for Russia and Moldova but because it includes title IV, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012.

Let me share with my colleagues just a little bit about the life and death of Sergei Magnitsky, in whose honor this section of the bill is named.

After exposing the largest tax fraud in Russian history, tax lawyer Sergei Magnitsky was wrongly arrested and tortured in a Russian prison. Six months later, he became seriously ill. He was denied medical attention despite 20 formal requests. On the night of November 16, 2009—3 years ago tomorrow—his condition became critical. Instead of being treated in a hospital, he was taken to an isolation cell, chained to a bed, and beaten by eight prison guards for 1 hour and 18 minutes, which resulted in his death.

Sergei Magnitsky was 37 years old. He left behind a wife and two children. Those responsible for his abuse and murder have yet to be punished. And sadly, he is not alone. His story is emblematic of corruption, human rights abuses, and impunity in Russia.

Since the death of Sergei Magnitsky, the human rights situation inside the Russian Federation has continued to deteriorate.

Russia's parliamentary elections last December were marked by mass protests over alleged electoral fraud. Since Vladimir Putin was reelected president in May of 2012, his government has taken a harsh and confrontational approach to ongoing protests, cracking down on the Russian people's growing discontent with corruption and creeping authoritarianism. Russian authorities have used excessive force to break up peaceful demonstrations and detained and raided the homes of opposition leaders.

Russian civil society has also been a target of increasing repression. Beginning in June and with astonishing speed, the Russian Duma passed a series of draconian laws that restrict freedom of expression, freedom of association, and freedom of assembly. Many observers fear that these laws will be used as a political weapon to stifle criticism of the government. They make it harder for Russian civil society to operate effectively and create a climate of fear and self-censorship. Civil society's sense of isolation is only compounded by the Russian Government's recent decision to expel organizations like USAID from the country.

□ 1240

In addition, journalists and human rights activists continue to face grave

dangers in pursuing their work. Just last month, Tanya Lokshina with the Moscow office of Human Rights Watch received a series of threats to herself and her unborn child, most likely in connection to her efforts to expose impunity for human rights abuses. Her experience is not unique. While Russian authorities have tried to silence critics, NGOs, and independent media, the world is still awaiting justice for many violent attacks on dissidents and journalists.

I would like to note for my colleagues that today at 2 p.m. the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission will be holding a hearing on human rights in the Russian Federation, and Ms. Lokshina will be one of the witnesses.

In this context, the story of Sergei Magnitsky remains especially important. At a time when the human rights situation in the country is going from bad to worse, it is all the more important to hold Russian human rights violators accountable.

Mr. Speaker, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, which is title IV of H.R. 6156 as reported by the Rules Committee, places an asset freeze and visa ban on those individuals responsible for Sergei Magnitsky's torture and death, as well as on Russian officials engaged in corruption and gross violations of human rights. This is beyond just Sergei Magnitsky. These measures provide a degree of accountability and reinforce the administration's toolkit to respond to crimes by individual government officials.

Passage of the Magnitsky act sends a clear message to the Russian people that we support their fundamental human rights. Importantly, it also sends a strong message to those Russian officials who support the rule of law and who reject corruption and human rights abuses. It lets them know that their efforts and their achievements are valued by the United States and the international community. Only individuals within the Russian Government who abuse their office and engage in corruption and human rights crimes will find their assets and visas under scrutiny and subject to U.S. sanction.

So let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. I would not be supporting PNTR for the Russian Federation if it did not include title IV, the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me just close by again thanking not only the gentleman from California, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, but I want to thank the Republican leadership, the Speaker of the House; the Democratic leadership, the minority leader and our minority whip; as well as the chairwoman of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for working together to come up with an agreement here that I think deserves bipartisan support.

So I urge all my colleagues to support the Magnitsky act by voting for the underlying legislation, H.R. 6156, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, let me again express my appreciation to my good friend from Worcester, and it's been a great honor and privilege to work in a bipartisan way with him on this, as I've been privileged to work with many Democrats in this House on many different bipartisan issues over the years.

And I'm getting ready to leave this place, Mr. Speaker. I'll be in January, as you will, moving on to another life. For me, it's after nearly three-and-a-half decades, and we've got lots of work ahead in the next 4 weeks. To have this trade issue as one there is something that is very gratifying for me.

As I mention that I'm leaving, for his first speech since being named chairman of the Rules Committee for the next Congress, I'm very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the very thoughtful, dedicated, and hard-working gentleman from Dallas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that there are lots of hard workers in this House, and we all learned as kids there is a differentiation between a workhorse and a show horse. And I've got to tell you something, Mr. Speaker—and you know this very well—there is no Democrat or Republican in the United States House of Representatives who works any harder than PETE SESSIONS, and I'm very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that he is going to be succeeding me as chairman of the House Rules Committee.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, to my dear and distinguished friend, the gentleman, the young chairman of the Rules Committee, DAVID DREIER, thank you very much.

It is DAVID's leadership, not just in the Rules Committee but, I believe, to all of us here in the House of Representatives, that DAVID has led us to be a more open, thoughtful body; a person who used his time and position, power of the Rules Committee in the committee that's upstairs, to speak with all the Members of this body about their ideas that they represent and to make this a more open body. This institution is better because of DAVID DREIER. And I am very aware of what lies ahead for me, but, DAVID, you have done a great job, and thank you. Thank you very much.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today really to support what Chairman DREIER and the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, have been speaking for, and that is a rule and the underlying legislation.

There are over 23 million Americans right now looking for work that are either over- or underemployed in our country, Mr. Speaker. So today is a jobs bill, another jobs bill that is important, and permanent normalized trade relations with Russia and Moldova will provide that much-needed boost, just a little bit. But a boost to the direction of adding jobs and making sure that the jobs we have here in this country to provide goods and services to another country are on an equal basis is important.

This PNTR vote will mean that we're expected to double exports to Russia in just 5 years and to help create and strengthen jobs in this country while providing Russia with a great product at the right price, whether it's in manufacturing, agriculture, or the service industry. I believe this is an important bill for us to move on a bipartisan basis.

Russia is the ninth largest economy and has a population of about 142 million people. It has a large and growing middle class. And Russia holds outstanding potential for the United States, not just in the business interests, but also for goods and services to make the lives of the Russian people even better.

My home State of Texas is the top exporter to Russia among U.S. States, and Texas imports to Russia are growing faster than its exports for the rest of the world. Specifically, Texas exported $1.6 billion worth of goods to Russia in 2011. We, in Texas, value this relationship, the jobs, the exporting, and the ability to have better products and services in Russia, with the Russian people making those decisions to buy these products and services. This legislation today will only help us build on that success, growing not just more jobs, but, really, the American economy.

So I will say this on behalf of all of us. This is an important bill. We needed to work together. We need leadership of this body, all the Members, as well as the Senate and the President to make this happen.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding.

And, Mr. Speaker, as I was sitting here listening to the very thoughtful remarks of my successor as chairman of the House Rules Committee, it reminded me of what really got him onto the Rules Committee and got him engaged with me, and interesting enough, Mr. Speaker, it was this issue. It was the issue of breaking down barriers to allow for the free flow of goods and services and capital.

When he first came to this body, Mr. Speaker, we were in the midst of our battle on China's accession to the World Trade Organization and establishing PNTR at that juncture, which has been a great thing; not that it's been problem free—I acknowledge that—but it's been a great thing to be able to take the steps that we have. And it was PETE SESSIONS, Mr. Speaker, who came to me and said, I want to help you with this. I actually gave him an assignment, and it was to talk to a half dozen Members about how important this was.

Mr. Speaker, in less than an hour he came back to me, having done the job right then, and that's why I describe

him as the person—as I say, there are a lot of hardworking people here, there are a lot of hardworking people on both sides of the aisle, but no one has been more diligent and worked harder than my friend PETE SESSIONS, and I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman.

And reclaiming my time, this is the kind of energy and leadership that DAVID DREIER expects from Members as he gives them not just tasks but opportunities, and the young chairman gave me that opportunity, and I took full advantage of that. As I recall, we were 10 out of 10. All of them voted for it. So I didn't just make up ''all of them.''

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill we're doing today. This is worthy of our time, and I'm delighted that we're joined by our friends.

□ 1250

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume first of all to thank the gentleman from Texas for his statement, but also to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate him on his new appointment. I look forward to working with him. So congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again point out that trade bills oftentimes are very controversial. There's often a resistance to attach any additional language, whether it be human rights language or labor rights language, to trade bills. But in this case, again, working in a bipartisan way, I think the attachment of the Sergei Magnitsky bill to this trade bill is probably the most significant piece of human rights legislation attached to any trade bill since I've been here in Congress.

This is a big deal. This sends a message to human rights violators in Russia, those who are guilty of corruption, that there's a consequence. And even if that consequence is not bringing you to justice within Russia, the United States—and we will be joined, hopefully, by our allies—will make sure that there are visa bans that are put in place and that assets are frozen, that there is a consequence. Again, our hope is that this language will prop up those in Russia who want to push for reform, who believe in accountability and believe in tackling issues like impunity.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who is the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee, who was incredibly helpful to me in making sure that these two pieces of legislation were brought together and I think in a way that makes it possible for me to be able to support this bill.

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. First, if I might, let me congratulate Mr. DREIER on your service of many years. You believe in this institution.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. When you said ''many years,'' you are my junior colleague by one term.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LEVIN. You believe in this institution, and I think that's been reflected.

So let me just say a few words—we'll debate it, perhaps, longer tomorrow—why this trade bill should be passed. I think we need to take each trade bill on its own merits. When you look at the need to move here today to grant PNTR, I think the answer is we clearly should.

First of all, Russia is now in the WTO, and it has gone in with certain requirements; for example, no export subsidies are allowed. That's a change, and that's beneficial to those of us who want to trade with them so they don't rig the deck against us and for them. And there are major reductions in tariffs.

Also, now that they're in the WTO, there is a dispute settlement system. So when they violate the requirements, there's a dispute settlement system that can be enforced. If we don't grant PNTR, we can't access that dispute settlement system.

Also, it's so important that there be strong enforcement. A number of my colleagues put forth some legislation that proposed that we beef up the enforcement provisions within this bill, and that's been done. Our staff on the Democratic side worked assiduously with the Senate, and the essence of those provisions are now in this bill. So that's another reason to vote for it, because strong enforcement is critical to good trade legislation.

Also, I would urge everybody to look at what are the exports from this country and the imports from Russia. When you look at those, it's a good reason for us to vote for this legislation, because the top three exports from the U.S. are machinery, motor vehicles, and aircraft—made in America by American workers. And so, in a sense, this is a ''Make It in America'' piece of legislation.

The dominant import from Russia is in petro, in oil, and in that sense, they're not directly competing with our workers. So we have, in terms of what flows, an advantage being a full partner.

But let me say one other thing, because I think those of you who have followed this know I don't believe that trade legislation is only about flow of goods. It also has to be embedded in a structure to make sure that there are benefits for our companies and for our workers and that there is a structure to try to make sure there's a rule of law, because if there isn't a rule of law in another country, it is not beneficial for their citizens or for our companies.

So here I want us to pay attention to the Magnitsky legislation, because no one should think that it's easy to do business in any country where there isn't a rule of law. It isn't easy to do business—and we should hesitate to simply blindly do business—with a country which really imposes restrictions on the rights of their citizens. That's what Mr. MCGOVERN has done and what Mr. CARDIN and others have done. And there has been bipartisan cooperation on this point, strong bipartisan cooperation, to place in this bill the Magnitsky legislation that sends a clear signal to the Russian Government and to everybody in Russia that we care about the rights of the citizens there, and as we do business, we care about the rights of others. That's the strength of this legislation, in addition to opening their markets for goods made in America

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. LEVIN. So I really urge that everybody look at this legislation on its own merits. Whatever the feelings are about other trade agreements, we need to take each of them on their own, the pluses and the minuses. In this case, I think—especially now that Russia is in the WTO—it works so much to our advantage in terms of the economy here, in terms of jobs here, in terms of our businesses and our workers. And also, I think we can vote for this legislation, if I might say so, with good conscience.

Mr. MCGOVERN, you have led. It's a tribute to your devotion to the human rights of people as we advance trade not only in this legislation, but in other legislation. I think it's also a recognition of our ability to work together.

So I urge passage, and tomorrow we speak together to urge passage of the legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN, for his very thoughtful comments and to say I was very pleased to join with Mr. MCGOVERN—as Mr. MCGOVERN has mentioned and as I did earlier—a joint Dear Colleague to focus on the benefits of this legislation as we tackle this important challenge of human rights.

I happen to believe very fervently that economic liberalization is a key part of ensuring the ability of human rights to be recognized. That's why I think this legislation is very, very complementary in addressing not just job creation, economic growth, and improving quality of life for people, but I believe both aspects—the Magnitsky aspect and the permanent normal trade relations—together work to enhance the human rights situation that is as devastating as it is.

Mr. Speaker, I know I have talked about a number of other Members, but I'd like to say that for nearly a decade and a half I've been very privileged to work on a wide range of issues, but one of the most important has been the issue of trade liberalization with my friend from Hinsdale, Illinois. She is

going to be leaving this institution, as you, Mr. Speaker, are and as I will as well. But I've got to say that this institution is a better place. The issue of ensuring economic opportunity here in the United States and around the world is brighter for the work that has been done by JUDY BIGGERT. I'm happy to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT), Mr. Speaker.

□ 1300

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for your kind words, but also for what you have done for this country as far as trade and how you have really worked so hard to make sure that all of the Members of Congress realize the impact that trade has for our economy and for our place in the world. Either bilateral agreements, multilateral commitments, you were always there to make to sure that we moved forward on that, and I really thank you.

I do rise in support today of this rule and H.R. 6156, to grant permanent normal trade relations to Russia. This important legislation is a small step toward a big reward. Without it, the United States exporters and service providers will continue to lose business to our foreign competitors that already have trade relationships with Russia. And once we lose those markets, our competitors will only become stronger and better-positioned to surpass the U.S. in a critical marketplace of the 21st-century global economy.

According to the National Association of Manufacturers, Russia imported over $500 billion in goods last year; and of that total, only 5 percent came from U.S. exports.

This bill will lift outdated policies that restrict American access to Russian markets. As a result, studies show that U.S. producers can expect to achieve double-digit increases over the next decade in exports of heavy machinery, agricultural machinery, chemicals and services. This is particularly critical for my home State of Illinois, where we have fallen behind Japan and Korea in these export categories.

Most importantly, granting Russia permanent normal trade relations gives the U.S. a level playing field on which we can compete from a position of strength in terms of intellectual property and agricultural exports, and it will provide a reliable forum for trade dispute resolution.

I would urge my colleagues to vote for the rule and the bill, to grow American exports and create good jobs here in the United States by supporting this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. I want to thank the gentleman for his great work on this legislation; and also my colleague, who will be leaving us, the chairman of the Rules Committee, who's done some great work over his many years.

I rise in support of this legislation. I think it is important to see, as this continuum moves, our relationship with Russia change and now moving into a circumstance of additional trade and enhanced trade.

I'm one that's very focused on improving manufacturing here in the United States, and this is going to open up tremendous opportunities for our manufacturers. So I want to commend those who've worked together on this and the Obama administration for their continuing efforts to open up trade opportunities so that we can make it here and sell it everywhere, which I think should be our focus.

In addition to that, I think it shows how, over time, old wounds can be healed and new relationships can be built.

I spoke earlier today with the consulate general for the State of Israel in Philadelphia, offering my support and concern for the unfortunate circumstances that are taking place in the Middle East now, in which hundreds of bombs or rockets have been shot at Israel, some of its largest cities as the targets. This is a matter for obviously much higher levels in our government. There have been communications and the assurance that Israel has the right to defend itself.

But I think that we can see in this Russia trade agreement that if we can get to the point where there can be relationships that are built on self-interest and economic development, that we can put the weapons aside and move toward a circumstance in which people are focused on economic activity.

So we see in this crisis a circumstance that we hope will resolve itself. Obviously, we stand with our ally, but we also hope for a day in which peace will reign, and economic opportunities, I agree with DAVID DREIER, really is the way in which eventually we can create a circumstance in which people will not have the necessity to resort to violence.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time, and I thank the House. And I hope that we will favorably pass this bill.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FATTAH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DREIER. I just wanted to express to my very dear friend from Philadelphia, express my appreciation, Mr. Speaker, for his very kind words and to say that the recognition that economic liberalization is one of the greatest keys to our goal of enhancing human rights, the standard of living, and the quality of life for our fellow human beings is a very, very important point; and I just want to underscore that point that was made.

Yes, the Magnitsky legislation is important, but I'm going to talk in just a moment about what some leaders in Russia have had to say specifically about PNTR and its impact on human rights.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, with that I'm very happy to yield 3 minutes to my very good friend from Huntington Beach, my fellow Californian, Mr. ROHRABACHER. And pending that, let me say that he and I have been great friends since he was a speech writer for Ronald Reagan. We've worked closely on a wide range of things. And I just told him, Mr. Speaker, since I'm leaving Congress, he's taught me one thing and one thing only and that is how to make margaritas.

So with that, I'm happy to yield to my friend, Mr. ROHRABACHER.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I rise in support of the rule and of this legislation, and note that the classified nature of that margarita formula should never be disclosed to an enemy of the United States, of course; but we will be glad to transmit that information to colleagues on the other side of the aisle in a spirit of bipartisanship.

I do rise in support of this rule and H.R. 6156, the legislation to grant permanent normal trade relations status to Russia.

During the 1980s, as it was just mentioned, I worked for Ronald Reagan in the White House and was part of a team dedicating ourselves to bringing down the Soviet dictatorship. I might add that Dave Dreier was an ex officio member of that team.

Today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union. That's the most important message. Over 20 years of reform have created an imperfect country, yes, but also a new Russia with a relative free press and churches that were once closed by the Communists which are now filled with those who would gather to worship God.

Many here in the United States have not appreciated the dramatic change and continue to view Russia as if it were the Soviet Union 30 years ago.

Well, what we do today is long overdue. Our protracted refusal to grant Russia permanent normal trade relation status has been counterproductive and hypocritical. Counterproductive for years because it's been an unnecessary barrier to better bilateral relations between our two countries. Hypocritical because over a decade ago we had rushed to give most favored nation status to Communist China, which still continues to be the world's worst human rights abuser.

All the arguments made to refuse it to Russia have always applied one hundredfold to Communist China. However, I have not heard the critics of this bill calling for an end to our trade status with Communist China, which I might add, human rights in China is worse today than when we granted most favored nation status to them.

If we want to have a real debate about trade, the place to start is with Communist China and not be looking at a democratic Russia. PNTR for

China has cost millions and millions of jobs over the decade. Our trade relations with Russia will benefit both of us, both the people of the United States, as well as the Russian people.

So how then can we justify such a pro-Communist China policy, which has had no political reform, and not giving it to Russia, which has had dramatic political reform?

Two decades ago, while I was working in the White House, I was arguably one of the Soviet Union's worse enemies. But my boss, Ronald Reagan, never wanted the people of Russia and the people of the United States to be enemies. He envisioned, once the Communist Party had been discarded, that our two peoples would one day be friends and trading partners and, yes, even allies.

Russian society has moved far from the Cold War. It is past time that we do the same. We need to reach out to them, stand together against an alarming rise of power in Communist China and against radical Islamic terror, which targets Russians as well as Americans.

Thus, I encourage my colleagues to join me in voting and pass this legislation.

□ 1310

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I thank my colleague from Massachusetts. I also want to praise my colleague from California. This is one of the last rules Mr. DREIER will be managing here on the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. I'd like to ask my friend if he has looked at the schedule that we have for the next 4 weeks. I think it's light years away until I deal with the last rule here if you look at our legislative schedule. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. When it comes to the fiscal cliff, I actually hope you're right. I hope you will be so busy that you will have no time to think of anything else. But I do want to congratulate you on this rule and on your tenure here in the House. You will be missed.

The Jackson-Vanik amendment, Mr. Speaker, was a product of the Cold War when the Communist threat was ever-present and when Communist countries had little or no emigration rights. As our friend from California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, just said, we need to recognize that today's Russia, while hardly a perfect place when it comes to human rights and political expression, is not the Soviet Union. We need a positive framework—economic, political, social—to move forward.

This PNTR, normalizing trade relations, allows us to wrangle with Russia when we think they're wrong in trade disputes at the World Trade Organization. Absent this normalization, we don't have that leverage. Furthermore, the committee needs to be really commended, as does my colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for creating a statutory framework for addressing one of the most egregious human rights violations in modern Russian history. It involves Sergei Magnitsky.

Now, this framework could ultimately be a model, frankly, as we move forward in other parts of the world as well, but it certainly marries a positive trade relationship possibility with vigilant and vigorous human rights enforcement and vigilance. So I commend the committee for marrying the two, for allowing us positively to go forward in our relationship—troubles and all—with modern-day Russia. I urge the passage of the underlying legislation, H.R. 6156.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this juncture, I have no further requests for time. If the gentleman would like to close, I will then offer some closing remarks.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert two articles into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—one of The New York Times, entitled, ''Russia plans to retry dead lawyer in tax case,'' and the other from The Washington Post, entitled, ''The Kremlin's blacklist.''

Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, the Magnitsky Act has been a bipartisan and bicameral effort. The final Magnitsky language in title IV of H.R. 6156 is the result of genuine collaboration and compromise. I want to again thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER. I would like to thank Speaker BOEHNER, Majority Leader CANTOR, Majority Whip MCCARTHY, Democratic Leader PELOSI, Democratic Whip HOYER, House Foreign Affairs Committee chairwoman ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, and our ranking member, Mr. BERMAN of California, as well as Mr. LEVIN, who has been so very helpful on the Ways and Means Committee, for all of their support in drafting the bill under consideration by the House this week. It has been a pleasure to work with all of these individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Magnitsky provisions are strong, flexible enough to be well implemented and will allow us to have a cooperative relationship with Russia on trade and other issues while holding human rights violators accountable, including those responsible for the brutal treatment and death of Sergei Magnitsky. As I stated earlier, I would not be supporting PNTR for the Russian Federation if this bill did not include a Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act.

I agree with what has been said about the importance of increased trade in terms of promoting more positive reforms in countries like Russia, but there is always a problem when you have a country that doesn't abide by the rule of law, where impunity rules the day. In cases like that, I think it is important to have a tool like the Magnitsky legislation to make it clear to those in Russia—not just those involved with the Sergei Magnitsky tragedy, but with other terrible human rights crimes, those who are involved in corruption—to make it clear to them that there is a consequence and that, even if within their own countries they are not brought to justice, the world will know who they are and take appropriate action. There will be visa bans, and we will go after their assets. To me, this is a very, very powerful tool that complements the benefits of PNTR for Russia.

I would say to my colleagues that this does represent a genuine compromise—the Sergei Magnitsky Act, which I am the author of in the House and Senator CARDIN is the author of in the Senate. In the House, we originally wanted this to be global in its approach, but in the spirit of compromise, it has been narrowed down to Russia. I think, if this proves to be a good tool and if it is implemented properly, hopefully, we can broaden it, because I do think that it is important for the United States to make it clear to the world that, if we stand for anything, we stand out loud and foursquare for human rights.

With regard to the rule, I just want to say that I'm a little bit disappointed that this rule on a bipartisan bill includes lockdown provisions that restrict the rights of the minority in this body. I would have preferred that this rule have only included procedures for the bipartisan PNTR-Magnitsky bill, but in the spirit of bipartisanship, I'm not going to dwell on that. I'm just going to point it out for the record.

In conclusion, let me just make this one observation. This is an example of bipartisanship, of people coming together and of our supporting an important piece of legislation. I hope that some of this rubs off on some of the bills that we're going to be considering in the days and weeks to come, but this really is how this House of Representatives should be run.

Again, my compliments to the leadership of the Republican Party and to the leadership of my own party. It was not just gratuitous. I meant it. This was a process by which those of us who care about the issue of human rights felt that we were included. As a result, I think we've come up with a bill that deserves support. I think it will make a positive difference in the lives of a lot of people in Russia. In terms of trade, I think it will result in a situation where there is a more level playing field, where we have an agreement that just doesn't benefit the few at the expense of the many; we may have an agreement here that will help benefit the many.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 7, 2012]

RUSSIA PLANS TO RETRY DEAD LAWYER IN TAX CASE

(By Andrew E. Kramer)

MOSCOW.—The police in Russia plan to resubmit for trial a tax evasion case in which the primary defendant died in detention more than two years ago, his former employer said Tuesday.

The trial of the defendant, Sergei L. Magnitsky, would be the first posthumous prosecution in Russian legal history, according to a statement by the former employer, Hermitage Capital.

The death of Mr. Magnitsky, a lawyer, in November 2009 drew international criticism over Russia's human rights record, especially after accusations arose that he had been denied proper medical care. The State Department has barred officials linked to Mr. Magnitsky's prosecutions from entering the United States. Parliaments in nine European countries are considering similar bans.

Police officials reopened the case against Mr. Magnitsky last summer, saying it would provide a chance for relatives and supporters to clear his name.

Relatives, though, said they had not asked for that, and executives at Hermitage said the motive was something else entirely: to vindicate the officials Mr. Magnitsky had accused of corruption.

Hermitage Capital's executive director, William F. Browder, who lives in London, will be a co-defendant in the case; he will be tried in absentia, a procedure used only intermittently in the post-Soviet period but restored under a Russian law that took effect in 2006.

The statement from Hermitage said that even in the Soviet period, no defendant had been tried after death. But a Russian Supreme Court ruling last summer allowed the police to conduct posthumous investigations.

Calls to the press service of the Investigative Committee of the Interior Ministry, which is handling the case, were not answered on Tuesday.

Mr. Browder maintains that the posthumous case against Mr. Magnitsky, who died in pretrial detention when he was 37, is intended to intimidate his family and discourage them from pressing for the prosecution of the police and tax officials who they say orchestrated his imprisonment. A conviction of Mr. Magnitsky might also appear to vindicate the officials he had accused of wrongdoing.

The Hermitage statement said a police investigator had offered to drop the case in a letter to Mr. Magnitsky's mother last week, but only if relatives stated that they had no "desire to protect the honor and dignity of the deceased."

Mr. Browder said in the statement, "If the Russian Interior Ministry thinks that running a show trial against me and Sergei will stop our campaign for justice, they are dead wrong."

Mr. Magnitsky was detained in 2008 on suspicion of helping Hermitage Capital evade $17.4 million in taxes. That accusation came after Mr. Magnitsky testified against Interior Ministry officials, saying they had used Hermitage companies to embezzle $230 million from the Russian Treasury by filing false corporate tax returns.

Mr. Magnitsky's supporters say they believe that the prosecution was retaliatory, and that investigators assigned to his case, including individuals he had accused, denied him medical care before his death.

[From the Washington Post, July 26, 2012]

THE KREMLIN'S BLACKLIST

(By Vladimir V. Kara-Murza)

On July 12, as I stopped at the gate of the Russian Embassy compound in northwest Washington, the on-duty officer had some unexpected news. "I cannot let you in," he said through an intercom. "You are forbidden to enter the embassy." Being a Russian citizen and a credentialed Russian journalist, and having been to my country's embassy on numerous occasions, I was naturally curious. Yevgeny Khorishko, the embassy's press secretary, whom I called for an explanation, was brief: The directive to "strike" my name from the list of credentialed Russian journalists came from Ambassador Sergei Kislyak. No reason was given. In an interview later with Slon.ru, a Moscow news Web site, the press secretary explained that the decision reflected the fact that I am "no longer a journalist."

The explanation would seem passable, except for one detail: The ambassador's directive came before it was publicly announced that I had been dismissed as Washington bureau chief of RTVi, as Russian Television International is known, effective Sept. 1. How Kislyak could have known this in advance remains a mystery.

Around the same time, two trustworthy sources in Moscow informed me that my name has been placed on a "blacklist," making me unemployable not only by RTVi but also by other, even privately owned, Russian media outlets. This was quickly verified, as one editor after another indicated that cooperation at this stage is impossible. From his own sources, opposition leader and former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov found out the name of the Kremlin official who has supposedly blacklisted me: Alexei Gromov, President Vladimir Putin's first deputy chief of staff. As for the reason for the Berufsverbot, my interlocutors were unequivocal: It was my advocacy for the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act, currently being considered by the U.S. Congress.

This bill, a rare example of congressional bipartisanship, proposes to introduce a targeted visa ban and asset freeze for Russian officials "responsible for the detention, abuse, or death of Sergei Magnitsky"—an anticorruption lawyer tortured to death in a Moscow prison in 2009—as well as for any "extrajudicial killings, torture, or other gross violations of internationally recognized human rights" (among them, "the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections"). The Magnitsky Act would bring a much-needed measure of accountability to corrupt Russian officials and human rights violators who prefer to rule in the manner of Zimbabwe or Belarus but opt for such destinations as the United States or Britain when it comes to storing and spending their ill-gotten gains.

Along with many other representatives of Russia's civil society, political opposition and independent media, I have been a vocal supporter of the legislation, urging its passage in public speeches and in private meetings with Washington policymakers. In authoritarian systems that maintain their power by stifling free initiative and free speech, the line between journalism and civic activism is not—and cannot be—as rigid as it is in democratic societies. Colleagues have long warned that my support for the bill would, sooner or later, catch the Kremlin's attention. The timing is not surprising, as the bill is nearing passage.

My case is just one in a series of "retaliatory" measures Putin's regime has taken against Russian supporters of the Magnitsky legislation. Other examples include the recent early-morning raids on the homes of opposition leaders and a series of new repressive laws directed against Russia's already-besieged civil society, including the 150-fold increase in fines for "violations" at public rallies and the requirement that Russian nongovernmental organizations that receive funding from abroad be tagged as "foreign agents." That the targets of retaliation are Russian is hardly surprising: A "reciprocal" visa ban for U.S. sponsors of the Magnitsky Act would have drawn only laughter. Officials in Moscow had long promised that the response to the bill would be "asymmetrical."

The Kremlin's blackmail must not be allowed to succeed. The hysterical reaction from Putin's regime shows beyond doubt that the legislation hits precisely where it hurts. The prospect of losing access to the West and its financial systems (initiatives similar to the U.S. bill are already being considered in European Union parliaments and in Canada) may well be, for now, the only serious disincentive to corruption and human rights violations by Russian officials. Symbolically, the adoption of the Magnitsky Act has been tied to the repeal of the antiquated Jackson-Vanik Amendment, thus replacing trade sanctions against a nation with personal sanctions against specific criminals. Perhaps the most pro-Russian piece of legislation ever put before the U.S. Congress, the Magnitsky Act offers Washington an opportunity to speak with a unified voice and with unquestioned moral clarity. I hope that it will be signed into law before the end of the year.

Mr. DREIER. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let me offer some closing remarks and say that, as I reminisce, having spent virtually my entire adult life as a Member of this body, privileged to stand in this well for nearly three-and-a-half decades—making arguments, engaging in debate—as I said, I'm very gratified that we were able to work on one of the many final issues, which is the first issue of the lame duck session, in a bipartisan way as my friend from Worcester just said. I was privileged to work with him and to have him as a cosigner of this Dear Colleague letter that we sent out in support of this legislation.

I am reminded, in having listened to remarks from both sides of the aisle—my California colleague (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and others—that on the 6th of November 1979, Ronald Reagan announced his candidacy for President of the United States. He offered lots of eloquence and lots of brilliance, but he said something that at the time was seen as absolute heresy, not only here in the United States but around the world and within this hemisphere.

On the 6th of November 1979, Reagan envisaged this notion of eliminating tariff barriers among all of the Americas so that we could have the free flow of goods and services and capital and ideas, and yes, people as well. That's aspirational. That's a notion that he put forward. A few years later in the Congress, I was privileged to be elected the day Ronald Reagan was elected President. I joined with my colleagues Mr. Colby and Mr. Lewis, and introduced legislation calling for the elimination of tariff barriers among Canada, the United States, and Mexico, which led to the North American Free Trade Agreement.

□ 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,