(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

buy nuclear fuel from abroad? ''If you are interested in having the capability of building a nuclear weapon, the best way to start is by building up your nuclear power infrastructure,'' he says. ''The same people that help you design and build nuclear reactors have many of the skill sets you will need if you are going to build a nuclear weapon.''

Fitzpatrick agrees that if Egypt promises not to develop a nuclear fuel cycle and would agree to more intrusive inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency, there would be little reason for concern, though he doubts those commitments will be made. ''Egypt won't take those steps because it says its hands can't be bound anymore while Israel's hands are unbound. They already resent the nuclear asymmetry with Israel, and a nuclear armed Iran on top of that adds too much for them.''

The conclusion is clear: a nuclear Iran is not acceptable, but a nuclear Israel, a nuclear Egypt, a nuclear India, a nuclear Pakistan, a nuclear Yemen, a nuclear Saudi Arabia and nuclear all the others, well, that's a different story.

There was a time when world leaders hoped for a nuclear-free zone in the Middle East. Instead, while we try to shoot our way to peace in Iraq, other world leaders are watching the creation of a nuclear excess zone in the Middle East. We threaten Iran, while we encourage the others.

The President has used two terms to implement a nuclear double standard. Today's U.S. friends can have nuclear power because they really only intend to use it for power generation. But today's U.S. foes must be stopped from acquiring nuclear power because they might use it in a bad way.

Today's friend is the President's standard for supporting the proliferation of nuclear capacity in the world.

Timing is everything. Not many years ago, Iran was our friend. Under the Shah of Iran, maybe they should have started their nuclear work sooner because that would have met the President's definition for a nation deserving of nuclear power.

But let's not forget Rumsfeld's meeting with Saddam. He may not have been our friend that day, but we sure acted like it.

Today Pakistan is in political crisis. And we know they have nuclear weapons, not just nuclear power. What will the President do about it? His State Department spokesman said the other day the administration doesn't have a problem with nations developing peaceful nuclear energy. That's diplomatic-speak for today's U.S. friends get to develop nuclear energy, while today's U.S. foes get threatened with bunker-buster bombs. The administration has been drumbeating for months against Iran, but how much have we heard about the other 13 nations who intend to develop nuclear capacity?

A double standard is no standard at all. And history shows that in the Middle East, today's friend can be tomorrow's foe. What kind of policy is that?

The President has destroyed the philosophy, the practicality, and the prudence of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Instead he has embarked on a new policy that will guarantee, that will guarantee, that we live in a much more dangerous world.

So much for security from this administration.

□ 2300

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

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

PAKISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, all eyes are watching the nation of Pakistan. And I rise today to acknowledge that the people of Pakistan are friends of the United States.

Over the last decade or so, they have been moving toward democracy, a growing middle class, a desire for education for the boys and girls of Pakistan, and a real commitment to fighting the Taliban and terrorists in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. President Musharraf has shown leadership and commitment on these issues.

But today we see a raging Pakistan, a collapse of democracy, the calling of emergency rule, and the complete lacking of sensitivity to the needs of the Pakistan people. So today I am calling on President Musharraf to lift the emergency rule, to restore constitutional order, and to put Pakistan back on track. There is a definitive need for free and honest elections, and he should make an announcement that the elections should be called as of November 15 and that they should be held on January 16, 2008.

Why return Pakistan back to a period when democracy did not reign? It is a Muslim country. It is a democratic country. And it has flourished under the concept of democracy.

Dissidents should be allowed to dissent. Political prisoners and the lawyers of Pakistan should be released. There should be an independent judiciary. And the United States should show its leadership by immediately dispatching a diplomatic team from the Defense Department and State Department in order to negotiate directly with President Musharraf. Pakistan has a great future if it will maintain civility and democracy and freedom of speech and association.

It is important for President Musharraf to allow the judiciary to a decide his fate, to possibly seek another opportunity for election. But the most important part is that we, as an ally of Pakistan, must not abandon the people of Pakistan. It does have nuclear capacity. We must ensure that that nuclear capacity falls not in the wrong hands but is used only for civilian purposes and to provide the necessary energy resources. We can only do that if democracy is restored and if America insists that its friend Pakistan and the people of Pakistan fight and are protected in their fight to preserve democracy and the constitution.

We hope over the next couple of days that we will begin that kind of approach and as well that the present funding that Pakistan receives, it should be made very clear that even though those moneys may not presently be in jeopardy that those moneys will be subject to the scrutiny of determining whether human rights, constitutional rights, and democracy and order are restored to Pakistan. This is the only way to save Pakistan for its people and to allow its people to flourish in democracy and to grow as a prosperous middle class and for the children of Pakistan to see a bright future.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana 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 gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

(Mr. FLAKE 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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