

Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Insllee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch

NOT VOTING—26

Berkley
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Chandler
Costa
Cubin
Ferguson

□ 2233

Messrs. MELANCON, HINOJOSA and HINCHEY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."
Mr. BILBRAY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."
So the motion to adjourn was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 142, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 1050]

YEAS—269

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Billirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boya (KS)
Bralley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carmahan
Carney
Castle
Castor
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cucnich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Green, Al

Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—142

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David E.
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCreery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrbacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Walberg
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—22

Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Buyer
Carson
Chandler
Cubin
Ferguson
Fossella
Gordon
Jindal
LaHood
McNulty
Oberstar
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Tancredo
Westmoreland
Wilson (OH)
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 2250

Mr. WHITFIELD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
So the conference report was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

### 13 IS THE NUMBER BEFORE US

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, unlucky or not, 13 is the number before us. That's how many predominantly Sunni nations in the Middle East have declared in the past year that they want nuclear power. We know that Iran is building a nuclear capacity which it claims will be used solely for power generation. Iran is predominantly a Shiite nation. While both are Muslim, Sunni and Shiite are different. At the grass-roots level, everyday people intermarry and get along just fine, until the governments in power decide they want religious ideology to govern everyone.

Sunni-Shiite dominance was behind the Iran-Iraq war two decades ago when Don Rumsfeld went to Iraq to pledge U.S. support to Saddam Hussein. Today the Iraq war has inflamed Sunni-Shiite passions and U.S. forces are in the middle of it, fighting and dying in a fight that we shouldn't be in. There's been a lot in the news about Iran's nuclear program, including threats by the Vice President that Iran will never be permitted to acquire nuclear capacity. In other words, the administration's international diplomacy with Iran begins with an order from the U.S. military to lock and load. A military strike directly ordered by the administration, or indirectly sanctioned by the administration, is considered a foregone conclusion by many in the Middle East.

Given this, let's renew the bidding, because 13 other nations in the Middle East are not being threatened by the administration. In fact, quite the opposite is true. A recent article in the Christian Science Monitor lays out the fact. I submit it for the RECORD.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 1, 2007]

MIDDLE EAST RACING TO NUCLEAR POWER—SHIITE IRAN'S AMBITIONS HAVE SPURRED 13 SUNNI STATES TO DECLARE ATOMIC ENERGY AIMS THIS YEAR

(By Dan Murphy)

CAIRO.—This week Egypt became the 13th Middle Eastern country in the past year to say it wants nuclear power, intensifying an atomic race spurred largely by Iran's nuclear agenda, which many in the region and the West claim is cover for a weapons program.

Experts say the nuclear ambitions of majority Sunni Muslim states such as Libya,

Jordan, Yemen, and Saudi Arabia are reactions to Shiite Iran's high-profile nuclear bid, seen as linked with Tehran's campaign for greater influence and prestige throughout the Middle East.

"To have 13 states in the region say they're interested in nuclear power over the course of a year certainly catches the eye," says Mark Fitzpatrick, a former senior nonproliferation official in the U.S. State Department who is now a fellow at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. "The Iranian angle is the reason."

But economics are also behind this new push to explore nuclear power, at least for some of the aspirants. Egypt's oil reserves are dwindling, Jordan has no natural resources to speak of at all, and power from oil and gas has grown much more expensive for everyone. Though the day has not arrived, it's conceivable that nuclear power will be a cheaper option than traditional plants.

But analysts say the driver is Iran, which appears to be moving ahead with its nuclear program despite sanctions and threats of possible military action by the U.S. The Gulf Cooperation Council, a group of Saudi Arabia and the five Arab states that border the Persian Gulf, reversed a longstanding opposition to nuclear power last year.

As the closest U.S. allies in the region and sitting on vast oil wealth, these states had said they saw no need for nuclear energy. But Fitzpatrick, as well as other analysts, say these countries now see their own declarations of nuclear intent as a way to contain Iran's influence. At least, experts say, it signals to the U.S. how alarmed they are by a nuclear Iran.

"The rules have changed on the nuclear subject throughout the whole region," Jordan's King Abdullah, another U.S. ally, told Israel's Haaretz newspaper early this year. "Where I think Jordan was saying, 'We'd like to have a nuclear-free zone in the area,' . . . [now] everybody's going for nuclear programs."

Though the U.S. has been vociferous in its opposition to Iran's nuclear bid, particularly since the country says it's determined to establish its own nuclear fuel cycle, which would dramatically increase its ability to build a nuclear bomb, it has generally been tolerant of the nuclear ambitions of its friends in the region.

"Those states that want to pursue peaceful nuclear energy . . . [are] not a problem for us," State Department spokesman Sean McCormack said in response to Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak's announcement on Monday.

Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center in Washington and a former Defense Department official focused on containing the spread of nuclear weapons, says he finds that hands-off approach of the Bush administration alarming.

"I think we're trying to put out a fire of proliferation with a bucket of kerosene," he says. He said he recently spoke with a senior administration official on the matter, who argued that it was better for the U.S. to cooperate with Egypt and other countries since, in the official's view, nuclear power in these countries is "inevitable" and it's better to be in a position to influence their choices and monitor the process.

Egypt has had an on-again, off-again nuclear program since the 1950s. In the 1960s, Egypt threatened to develop a bomb largely out of anger over Israel's nuclear pursuit. Under Mr. Mubarak, who has ruled since 1981, the country has been consistent in saying it does not want nuclear weapons, and Egypt has been at the forefront of diplomatic efforts to declare the region a nuclear-weapons-free zone—a strategy it uses to target Israel's nuclear weapons.

Today, the country has a 22-megawatt research reactor north of Cairo that was built by an Argentine company and completed in 1997. A drive to develop a power plant in the 1980s stalled after the Chernobyl nuclear disaster in Russia.

In a nationally televised speech Monday, Mubarak said nuclear power is an "integral part of Egypt's national security" while also promising that the country would not seek the bomb. Other Egyptian officials say the country is planning on having a working reactor within a decade, though analysts say that's an optimistic time line.

Egypt's nuclear plans have been reinvigorated in recent years, with Mubarak's son, Gamal, widely seen in Egypt as his father's favored successor, calling for the building of a reactor. Mubarak discussed nuclear power cooperation on state visits to Russia and China last year.

"They feel politically threatened by Iran's nuclear program, they've pointed out rightly that Israel [hasn't been] a member of [nonproliferation] treaties for many years," says Jon Wolfsthal, a nonproliferation expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington. "Of course there is economic logic: If they can sell whatever oil they have for \$93 a barrel instead of using it, that's attractive . . . but it shouldn't be assumed that it's all benign."

For Egypt, the allure of nuclear power is apparent. Its oil consumption is growing and electricity demand is growing at about 7 percent a year.

"Egypt can absolutely make a legitimate case for nuclear energy," says Mr. Fitzpatrick. "Its reserves are dwindling, it needs the oil and gas for export, and it needs to diversify its energy resources."

Even major oil producers such as Saudi Arabia are, along with Iran, arguing that they need nuclear power. They say it's better to sell their oil than to burn it at home.

But some analysts argue that nuclear power remains an economic loser. Mr. Sokolski says that when state subsidies to nuclear power are removed, nuclear plants are not economically viable. "If it was, private banks would be financing nuclear plants without loan guarantees. They can't do it and make money yet."

Of course whenever the topic of nuclear power comes up, particularly in the Middle East, concerns about the possible spread of nuclear weapons are not far behind. Experts who follow the nuclear weapons question say assurances of only pursuing peaceful objectives, as have been given by all the countries pursuing nuclear power, Iran included, shouldn't be taken at face value.

"Although Egypt does not feel directly threatened by Iran, it does feel its own power and influence in the region threatened by a resurgent nuclear armed Iran," says Fitzpatrick.

"There are a lot of countries in the region who have expressed interest in nuclear power, and I think there are good reasons to be concerned about this interest and the timing of this interest," says Mr. Wolfsthal. "Nuclear power has had economic arguments in its favor for a decade, but the fact is these programs are only coming to a head in light of the Iranian program."

Wolfsthal says the key issues in the coming years will be whether Egypt contracts a turn-key plant from a foreign company—which would minimize the amount of skill and technology transferred to Egyptian engineers—or if it will pursue nuclear partnerships that broaden its knowledge and skills bases.

Will they pursue their own nuclear fuel cycle, which, he says, would make little economic sense and would be a clear "red flag" of intent to develop a weapon, or will they