

Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)

Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (WI)
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers

Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Davis (IL)

Diaz-Balart
Fudge
Giffords
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)

Miller, George
Myrick
Nadler
Paul
Rahall

□ 1436

Ms. HAYWORTH changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 268, noes 150, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 912]

AYES—268

Adams
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Amash
Amodi
Austria
Baca
Bachus
Barletta
Barrow
Bartlett
Barton (TX)
Bass (NH)
Benishke
Berg
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Brooks

Broun (GA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Buerkle
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Canseco
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Cassidy
Chabot
Chaffetz
Chandler
Coffman (CO)
Cole
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cravaack
Crawford
Crenshaw
Critz
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais

Dold
Donnelly (IN)
Dreier
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers
Emerson
Farenthold
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Flake
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garamendi
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy

Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grimm
Guinta
Guthrie
Hall
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Heck
Hensarling
Herger
Herrera Beutler
Hochul
Holden
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Kelly
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kissell
Kline
Labrador
Lamborn
Lance
Landry
Lankford
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Long
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
Lungren, Daniel E.

Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCotter
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
Meehan
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Paulsen
Pearce
Pence
Peterson
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe (TX)
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Quayle
Reed
Rehberg
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rigell
Rivera
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross (AR)
Ross (FL)
Royce
Runyan
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Loretta
Scalise
Schilling
Schmidt
Schock
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott (SC)
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Southerland
Stearns
Stivers
Stutzman
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Turner (NY)
Turner (OH)
Upton
Walberg
Walden
Walsh (IL)
Walz (MN)
Webster
West
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Wolf
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—150

Ackerman
Andrews
Baldwin
Bass (CA)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Carnahan
Carney
Carson (IN)
Chu
Cicilline
Clarke (MI)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly (VA)
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutch
Dicks
Dingell

Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hastings (FL)
Heinrich
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson Lee
(TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kildee
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)

Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lujan
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Moore
Moran
Murphy (CT)
Napolitano
Neal
Oliver
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor (AZ)
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree (ME)
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reyes

Richardson
Richmond
Rothman (NJ)
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Tonko
Towns

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Woolsey
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bachmann
Campbell
Castor (FL)
Coble
Davis (IL)

Diaz-Balart
Fudge
Giffords
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)

Miller, George
Myrick
Nadler
Paul
Rahall

□ 1444

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas and Mr. HOYER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 470. An act to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER
AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3538

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3538.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PRAY FOR VICTIMS OF VIRGINIA
TECH SHOOTING

(Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia. I ask everyone here and across the Nation to pray for those individuals at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia, who are currently dealing with the shootings that took place there today and the two people who, regrettably, have passed away.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the majority leader to inquire about the schedule for the week to come, let me say I join with the gentleman from Virginia, and I know certainly Mr. CANTOR, who also represents Virginia, but the entire country as

well. We don't know the facts yet. We don't know exactly what's happened. But the information I have is that two people may well have lost their lives at this point in time. We certainly want to send our deepest sympathies to Virginia Tech and to the families that are affected by this incident and hope sincerely that there is no further loss of life.

On that issue, let me yield to the majority leader, who I know will want to say something as well.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the Democratic whip, for yielding.

I too want to join the gentleman in expressing our sorrow and extending our thoughts and prayers to those in the Hokie Nation in Blacksburg who, unfortunately, have endured more pain today, reminiscent of the pain that so many have felt in that fine university in the past. Hopefully, things can look up. I know that there are reports that law enforcement was involved. We also want to extend our thanks to law enforcement in that community as well as everywhere else in this country—certainly in this Capitol—for what individuals of the Capitol Police and other police forces across the country do for us every single day.

Again, we express our sorrow to those who are mourning the loss of life and extend our thoughts to President Steger at Virginia Tech and to that community.

I do thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

At this point, the House is scheduled to be in session for the remainder of the week, with a weekend session possible. Per our usual weekly schedule, I would expect morning hour on most days to begin at 10 a.m. and legislative business to start by noon. However, because this will likely be our last week in session prior to the end of the year, the daily convening times may fluctuate to accommodate our year-end business.

I can assure Members, however, that we do not expect votes on Tuesday, December 13, prior to 1 p.m. That is as far as Tuesday, December 13 is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, our legislative business next week will include a number of suspensions, a complete list of which will be announced by the close of business tomorrow. In addition, we expect to consider a conference report on the remaining appropriations bills for FY12 as well as a conference report for the National Defense Authorization Act. I want to thank both Chairman HAL ROGERS and Chairman BUCK MCKEON for their incredibly hard work throughout the year.

Finally, we anticipate a vote on a year-end package of expiring laws that will include extensions of the payroll tax holiday, unemployment benefits, and the physician reimbursement issue.

If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute to highlight a bipartisan event that took place here in the Capitol this week.

□ 1450

Yesterday the Democratic whip and I hosted the first-ever Facebook Hackathon, allowing private sector programmers and software developers to get together with us to work on ways to utilize social media in making Congress more accessible to the public. I'm happy to report that over 200 developers from all over the country participated in this bipartisan event and shared their ideas.

I thank the gentleman for joining me and for his help in facilitating this noteworthy cause, and I look forward to working with him to continue to make Congress a more transparent and accessible institution for the people who have sent us here.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his leadership on the Hackathon event that occurred yesterday.

He and I both had the opportunity to address a large number of—over 250, I think—individuals who were there who will, in fact, bring their expertise, their technical knowledge to bear on what the gentleman referenced as making our institution more accessible and transparent to our citizens. We all believe, I think, that doing that will make the products that we produce better and make citizens better able to make judgments on the work that we do.

So I want to thank the gentleman and his staff for their leadership on this effort. We were glad to join in that.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that the unemployment insurance, the payroll tax issue, which will continue to give the middle class tax cuts to those who need it most, the unemployment, which will keep millions of people from losing their unemployment, as well as the physician adjustment are scheduled next week. It's my understanding that that bill has not been filed yet.

Can the gentleman tell me when he believes that bill will be filed?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman by saying that we are still in discussion about that bill and in drafting; and we do intend to abide by our necessary 3-day notice period so that all sides and all Members, as well as the public, can enjoy their right to know what will be in that legislation. But the gentleman is correct, we do expect that bill on the floor next week.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that comment.

I have had discussions with the gentleman, and with Mr. MCCARTHY in particular—and also briefly with the Speaker—that we are certainly prepared to participate in discussions leading towards a successful passage of those three pieces of legislation, par-

ticularly the unemployment insurance and the payroll tax extension, which we believe are critical before we end this year. So we're pleased to see that legislation moving forward. But I will tell my friend that I would be pleased to participate in discussions with him so that we can assure that that bill will in fact pass and, hopefully, pass in a bipartisan fashion.

I want to tell the gentleman that I'm a little bit concerned, and I want to ask him whether this principle will be followed. I think I used this quote last week, but it bears repeating. Speaker BOEHNER said:

We will end the practice of packaging unpopular bills with must-pass legislation to circumvent the will of the American people. Instead, we will advance major legislation one issue at a time.

That was in the Republican Pledge as well, and the Speaker has reiterated that at the beginning of this session.

Now, I am concerned because Republican Study Committee Chairman JIM JORDAN of Ohio is quoted in The Washington Post as saying the following:

"The fact the President doesn't like it"—the "it" referring to the Keystone pipeline provision, which we understand is under discussion. I'm glad to hear those discussions have not concluded. But he again quoted, "The fact that the President doesn't like it makes me like it even more . . . said of the GOP leadership proposal as he left Thursday morning's closed-door meeting."

I will say to my friend that we are at the end of the session. We are hopeful, as I have said—and as we have demonstrated on the two CRs and the debt extension and on the minibus appropriation bill that we passed—that we are prepared to respond in a bipartisan fashion to assist in passing must-pass legislation and would hope very much that we don't put controversial items in that. The President has clearly announced that he will veto a bill that has the Keystone pipeline.

I will say, as my friend clearly knows, there is bipartisan concern—as a matter of fact, the Governor of Nebraska, a Republican, and the Republican legislature, which although nominally nonpartisan, as the gentleman knows, is two-thirds Republican, one-third Democrat, have all voted to delay this project because of their concern about the aquifer and the impact that the Keystone pipeline, as currently platted, will have in reference to the aquifer, so that there is a bipartisan concern.

As the gentleman knows, as a result of Nebraska's passing legislation which said they wanted to do a study on the aquifer and alternative siting of the Keystone pipeline course, that that study would take them 5 to 6 to 7 months, as a result, the President indicated they would give time to the Nebraska Governor and the Nebraska Legislature—again, Republican or-gans—to look at that, has given them

additional time and said he won't act until the beginning of 2013.

I ask the gentleman, does he believe that provision—I understand what Mr. JORDAN says. It may be a nice political gesture, but I would hope that that would not be the kind of provision that would be included in the legislation, whether it's individual bills or a comprehensive bill, including those three items that hopefully we can pass in a bipartisan fashion.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I understand the point he is trying to make.

Mr. HOYER. If I may, I thought I did make the point.

Mr. CANTOR. Well, you may have made the point.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say is that I disagree with the gentleman, that if the provisions dealing with the Keystone pipeline are in the measure that makes it to the floor that we shouldn't join together and do what was done in the past, and that is demonstrate a strong bipartisan vote in support of that project. Because, as the gentleman knows, organized labor in this country is very supportive of that bill, of that provision. It means immediate jobs. The President continues to say he is for creating jobs, doing all we can to get America back to work. This is a provision that allows for that.

We also have seen, Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman's concerns about Nebraska and the issues raised by its Governor as well as its State legislature, I believe and am told that there have been many discussions in which an alternative route has been determined, and there is agreement on that to allow for the proceeding of the construction of the pipeline.

Again, knowing that there is strong bipartisan support for the project, knowing that labor is in support of it, knowing that it puts people back to work immediately, it would seem to me that this is a consistent provision to go along with making sure that we deal with the unemployment situation in this country through an extension of the UI provisions—with, hopefully, some reforms—as well as the extension of the payroll tax holiday.

As the gentleman knows, our side is concerned. We don't want taxes to go up on anybody, especially in an economy like this. But again, I hope the gentleman can consider joining us in terms of helping promote an environment for job creation.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

I will say this, though, it seems inconsistent, when the President of the United States yesterday said he would veto such a provision, that we would include it in legislation that is must pass.

By the way, the unemployment insurance, economists tell us, will provide for 100 times as many jobs; so, therefore, we're for that. Some 500,000

jobs may be affected by extending the unemployment insurance.

In addition to that, I tell my friend, the President has offered a jobs bill. I know that you're concerned about jobs. The pipeline bill, in and of itself, is about 5,000 to 6,000 jobs over the lifetime of the pipeline. The jobs bill, economists tell us, is 1 million jobs, or 200 times as many jobs. Notwithstanding that, very frankly, that has been languishing since September and not brought to this floor.

So it seems to me that, if we are really interested—and I think you are—in extending unemployment insurance and providing for a continued tax cut for middle-income Americans and for providing for the payment of doctors who are serving Medicare patients, that we not include in that bill an item that apparently is popular on your side just because the President doesn't like it, according to Mr. JORDAN.

□ 1500

I think that's not the way we ought to be operating. The last 7 days of the session, or 5 days, 6 days, 7, assuming we went through Sunday, we shouldn't be doing that, I suggest respectfully to my friend, the majority leader, because it will simply put us back into the situation the American public doesn't want us in, and that's confronting one another, playing chicken with one another, bringing us to the precipice of defeat and lack of success.

The public doesn't want us there. We shouldn't want us there. And I would urge the gentleman not to include items, as I have urged you with respect to the appropriation bills that also must be passed. That's not in this list, but you did mention it, of course, in the announcement, Mr. ROGERS and Mr. DICKS have been working hard, and others have been working hard to get our appropriations bills done.

We have urged that we not put controversial items in that, and we showed our good faith on that representation when we passed the minibus, and 165 Democrats joined 135 Republicans to pass that legislation.

So, again, I would urge the gentleman to, if he feels strongly about that, and I know that he feels—he said labor is for that bill. Labor is for that bill. I think I'm for that bill, I want the gentleman to know. So this does not come from my particular opposition to this bill.

I am concerned about the alignment and the aquifer. I think that's a legitimate concern. But I think that that oil is going to be drilled no matter what we do. It seems to me that it's better for us to have it than for others to have it and have that availability.

But having said that, gratuitously putting it into a bill that the President has already said I don't agree with that is simply playing chicken on legislation that's very important.

If the gentleman wants to comment on that, I would be glad to yield to him.

Mr. CANTOR. I'd just say to the gentleman I've already responded to the notion of issues arising in Nebraska that I am told have been resolved, so the issue that he is concerned about has apparently been resolved.

I would say to the gentleman there are 47 Members on his side of the aisle, including five ranking members of committees, that have supported the measure allowing for the construction proceeding on the Keystone pipeline.

There's no gratuitous move here. It's an attempt to try and bring the two sides together on the most important issue, which is creating jobs. This is a provision that I believe has been demonstrated has support on both sides of the aisle.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I would hope the gentleman could refrain from trying to say and impute motives here. We're trying to work in a fashion—open, transparent, together so that we don't come to any kind of end that doesn't produce a result for the people. That's it.

Again, I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. I was quoting, not imputing. Mr. JORDAN's comments seem to be pretty clear.

Before we conclude, the STOCK Act, TIM WALZ had a bill that was ready for markup in the committee. We understand that was pulled.

As you know, that bill has 220 cosponsors and is a bipartisan sponsorship. It simply says that Members should not use insider information to trade with, information the general public may not have about legislation that may or may not be reported or passed to the floor. And I understand that was pulled. I think that was unfortunate.

Can the gentleman tell me what the status of that piece of legislation is?

Mr. CANTOR. Sure. Absolutely.

First of all, the issue of insider trading is something that we abhor as well, do not tolerate, and believe that all Members of Congress should fall under the same laws that apply to anyone, and want to make sure that is the case, if it is not.

And transparency is the key because the public needs to know what their Members are doing. We intend to take this issue, make sure that concerns that have been raised by Members on both sides of the aisle are being vetted. This is an issue of extreme import for the confidence of the public towards this institution. We intend to do so in a deliberate manner.

There were issues raised again by Members on both sides of the aisle about this bill not being brought up in a vetted way. There are many other chairmen who have jurisdiction in this matter who need to be involved in this with a full vetting, and we intend to do that. And I do hope the gentleman will work with us in doing so.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

As he knows, Congressman WALZ has been working hard on this, and I know that he will be very inclined to work with you and with the committees of jurisdiction; and I will certainly be able to work with you as well on this issue because, as I say, Congressman WALZ has worked very hard on this.

I think all of us agree, as you just indicated, that no Member of Congress ought to be using insider information to trade in the stock market to disadvantage, obviously, others who are trading in the stock market. So I thank the gentleman for his comments, look forward to working with him and, again, in closing, hope that we can reach bipartisan agreement on so many major pieces of legislation that we need to pass prior to leaving this.

I will tell the gentleman I hope his side agrees, my side will not want to adjourn, nor will it support adjournment, until such time as we act on the unemployment insurance and the middle class tax cuts.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, December 12, 2011, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? There was no objection.

EXTEND THE MIDDLE CLASS TAX CUT

(Ms. BERKLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Nevada's middle class families. Because of the economic downturn, thousands of Nevadans are struggling to find a job, pay their rent, and put food on their families' tables. They cannot afford a tax increase.

However, Washington gridlock is threatening just that, a massive tax increase on middle class families. Why? Because some Washington Republicans refuse to roll back special tax breaks for Wall Street millionaires in order to pay for a middle class tax cut for 1.2 million Nevadans. That's just not right.

So my message today is this: no holiday vacation for Congress without extending the middle class tax cut. We cannot go home while Nevada families are hurting and desperate for this extension of their payroll tax cuts.

However, that's going to require Washington Republicans to stop protecting Wall Street millionaires and start putting Nevada's families first. The only fair way to achieve this is to roll back special tax breaks for Wall

Street millionaires, not slash Medicare benefits, not layoff thousands of people.

It's time to stop putting Wall Street first and before Main Street. Washington ought not go on vacation until we take care of this problem.

CHINA ORGAN HARVESTING

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, an article in last Monday's Weekly Standard reveals the systematic execution and harvesting of organs in China's prisons.

The article provides firsthand accounts of the targeted elimination of religious prisoners, prisoners of conscience, and political opponents of the regime. Minorities, including Falun Gong, Uyghurs, House Christians, and Tibetans have been executed, followed by organ transplant surgeries—some being performed while the victims are still alive, numbering in the tens of thousands.

Furthermore, foreign companies are already making investments to benefit off of the thriving organ transplant market. Pharmaceutical companies like Roche and Isotechnika Pharma have been involved in clinical drug testing of transplant patients. A British firm, TFP Ryder Healthcare, is proposing a medical facility that would include an organ transplant center.

Before they follow suit, U.S. companies must understand the unethical climate that exists in China. And our State Department and the U.N. must treat these actions as an abuse of China's international agreements and human rights of their own people.

[From WeeklyStandard.com, Dec. 5, 2011]

THE XINJIANG PROCEDURE

(By Ethan Gutmann)

To figure out what is taking place today in a closed society such as northwest China, sometimes you have to go back a decade, sometimes more.

One clue might be found on a hilltop near southern Guangzhou, on a partly cloudy autumn day in 1991. A small medical team and a young doctor starting a practice in internal medicine had driven up from Sun Yat-sen Medical University in a van modified for surgery. Pulling in on bulldozed earth, they found a small fleet of similar vehicles—clean, white, with smoked glass windows and prominent red crosses on the side. The police had ordered the medical team to stay inside for their safety. Indeed, the view from the side window of lines of ditches—some filled in, others freshly dug—suggested that the hilltop had served as a killing ground for years.

Thirty-six scheduled executions would translate into 72 kidneys and corneas divided among the regional hospitals. Every van contained surgeons who could work fast: 15–30 minutes to extract. Drive back to the hospital. Transplant within six hours. Nothing fancy or experimental; execution would probably ruin the heart.

With the acceleration of Chinese medical expertise over the last decade, organs once considered scraps no longer went to waste. It wasn't public knowledge exactly, but Chi-

nese medical schools taught that many otherwise wicked criminals volunteered their organs as a final penance.

Right after the first shots the van door was thrust open and two men with white surgical coats thrown over their uniforms carried a body in, the head and feet still twitching slightly. The young doctor noted that the wound was on the right side of the chest as he had expected. When body #3 was laid down, he went to work.

Male, 40-ish, Han Chinese. While the other retail organs in the van were slated for the profitable foreigner market, the doctor had seen the paperwork indicating this kidney was tissue-matched for transplant into a 50-year-old Chinese man. Without the transplant, that man would die. With it, the same man would rise miraculously from his hospital bed and go on to have a normal life for 25 years or so. By 2016, given all the anti-tissue-rejection drug advances in China, they could theoretically replace the liver, lungs, or heart—maybe buy that man another 10 to 15 years.

Body #3 had no special characteristics save an angry purple line on the neck. The doctor recognized the forensics. Sometimes the police would twist a wire around a prisoner's throat to prevent him from speaking up in court. The doctor thought it through methodically. Maybe the police didn't want this prisoner to talk because he had been a deranged killer, a thug, or mentally unstable. After all, the Chinese penal system was a daily sausage grinder, executing hardcore criminals on a massive scale. Yes, the young doctor knew the harvesting was wrong. Whatever crime had been committed, it would be nice if the prisoner's body were allowed to rest forever. Yet was his surgical task that different from an obstetrician's? Harvesting was rebirth, harvesting was life, as revolutionary an advance as antibiotics or steroids. Or maybe, he thought, they didn't want this man to talk because he was a political prisoner.

Nineteen years later, in a secure European location, the doctor laid out the puzzle. He asked that I keep his identity a secret. Chinese medical authorities admit that the lion's share of transplant organs originate with executions, but no mainland Chinese doctors, even in exile, will normally speak of performing such surgery. To do so would remind international medical authorities of an issue they would rather avoid—not China's soaring execution rate or the exploitation of criminal organs, but rather the systematic elimination of China's religious and political prisoners. Yet even if this doctor feared consequences to his family and his career, he did not fear embarrassing China, for he was born into an indigenous minority group, the Uighurs.

Every Uighur witness I approached over the course of two years—police, medical, and security personnel scattered across two continents—related compartmentalized fragments of information to me, often through halting translation. They acknowledged the risk to their careers, their families, and, in several cases, their lives. Their testimony reveals not just a procedure evolving to meet the lucrative medical demand for living organs, but the genesis of a wider atrocity.

Behind closed doors, the Uighurs call their vast region in China's northwest corner (bordering on India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, and Mongolia) East Turkestan. The Uighurs are ethnically Turkic, not East Asian. They are Muslims with a smattering of Christians, and their language is more readily understood in Tashkent than in Beijing. By contrast, Beijing's name for the so-called Autonomous Region, Xinjiang, literally translates as "new frontier." When Mao invaded in 1949,