

I turn back to my colleague from New Jersey, Congressman DONALD PAYNE.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you, Ms. KELLY. We appreciate your comments.

In closing, I would like to thank you for cohosting the Special Order on criminal justice reform, accountability, and diversity. It is through these Special Orders that we are able to speak directly to our constituents about the valuable work the Congressional Black Caucus does to reduce injustice and promote equality for all African American communities.

Our criminal justice and police systems are in a state of crisis. Too often, under these systems, Black lives are treated as though they don't matter. We saw this last month, when Baltimore's Freddie Gray died in police custody from a brutal spine injury. Such tragedies erode trust between our communities and the police.

This problem is compounded by a wide range of factors, from disturbing gaps in incarceration rates to racial disparities in sentencing. We need a system that holds criminals accountable and protects law enforcement while, at the same time, ensuring the safety and equal treatment of all communities.

This includes implementing police body cameras in order to promote transparency and accountability while deterring wrongdoing.

□ 2000

At the same time, we need to make sure that law enforcement officers don't resort to discriminatory policing practices.

It is undeniable that racial profiling remains an ongoing crisis in our Nation. There is a clear and growing need to ensure a robust and comprehensive Federal commitment to ending racial profiling by law enforcement agencies. The End Racial Profiling Act, which I proudly support, would do just that. It was constructed after a law in New Jersey, authored by my uncle, Assemblyman William Payne. It was the first racial profiling law passed in the United States, a law of which I am very proud. I took that idea and brought it Federal.

Of course, real accountability means that we will, at times, need independent investigations of police-related deaths. We are glad to see, finally, Attorney General Lynch launch an investigation into the Baltimore Police Department, with the stated goal of assisting police departments across the country in developing their practices. In less than 1 month on the job, Attorney General Lynch is already making a difference, and we thank her for that.

As we reflect on the dire need for the reform of our criminal justice system, we need to advance the cause of equality in all contexts. This means expanding diversity in the workforce, in health, and in all aspects of life—from the mailroom to the boardroom, from

the manufacturing industry to the technology sector. Many of these challenges we face today are great, but as a caucus, we remain committed to solving them.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus, in support of today's Special Order Hour: "The Urgency of Now: Addressing Reform, Accountability, Equality and Diversity." As the conscience of the Congress since 1971, these issues are of paramount importance to the Congressional Black Caucus in the 114th Congress.

There is a crisis in America—one that centers on criminal justice reform and law enforcement accountability. Just over a month ago, Freddie Gray lost his life at the hands of the police in a city plagued by a weak economy, high levels of crime, and a lack of good-paying jobs. While Baltimore is a city with a unique set of issues, its problems are common to many of America's inner cities. The pressure to address, not only the police accountability and criminal justice issues, but the context in which those issues arise, grows exponentially with each new tragedy.

As we watch American cities battered, bruised and burned during demonstrative outcries against injustice, I am reminded of the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. "We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history, there "is" such a thing as being too late. This is no time for apathy or complacency. This is a time for vigorous and positive action." These words are just as true today as they were when Dr. King delivered them at the 1963 March on Washington.

Far too often, unarmed African American men die at the hands at police officers with little or no accountability. This reinforces the painful narrative that black life is not valued in this country. It is sad, yet very telling, that Americans celebrated when state officials announced that criminal charges were being brought against the Baltimore police involved in Freddie Gray's death. For too long, African-American communities nationwide felt as if no one could hear its cry. But the cries are not just the result of pain caused by police brutality. They are the result of a nation divided: one that grants access to quality healthcare to some, while denying it for others; one that provides economic security for a privileged few, while denying opportunities to the poor and the middle class; one that seeks justice for the unwarranted taking of a human life; while ignoring the rising death toll of American youth at the hands of police officers.

We cannot view the situations in Baltimore and Ferguson as limited incidents; instead, we have to look at the toxic environments that birthed these situations of unrest. If we do not comprehensively address the systemic issues that plague cities like Baltimore, relations between the people and its government will only grow worse. It is time that we honor the sacred truth of this nation—that all men are created equal, and demand equal justice. As we strive to become a more perfected union, it is imperative that the commitments of the American system be applied to African-Americans, just as it is to every other American. Madam Speaker, the urgency of addressing these issues has reached its pinnacle. Congress

must act. We must act swiftly, and we must act now.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1806, AMERICA COMPETES REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2250, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2353, HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION FUNDING ACT OF 2015

Mr. SESSIONS (during the Special Order of Mr. PAYNE) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-120) on the resolution (H. Res. 271) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1806) to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2250) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2353) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE PRESIDENT'S 2016 BUDGET REQUEST AND ENERGY POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to talk this evening about the 2016 President's budget request and energy policy in this Nation.

Madam Speaker, there are a number of energy programs in this Nation whereby public lands resources are leased and energy is produced on public lands and in the offshore waters of this Nation.

As you can see here, this is a table that explains some of the different programs that are out there today.

Onshore, on Federal lands, when you produce Federal resources—or energy resources—like oil, gas, coal, and other resources, you can see that 50 percent of the funds from that energy production on Federal lands goes to the Federal Government and that 50 percent goes to the States under the Mineral Leasing Act. There are no constraints whatsoever in regard to how those

States can spend those funds. So 50 percent of the money from energy production on Federal lands goes directly to the States.

Right here, of the 50 percent that goes to the Federal Government, 40 percent of that 50 percent—or 80 percent of the Federal funds—actually goes into what is called the reclamation fund to be used on water projects in the 17 Western States. In effect, 90 percent of the funds that are produced from energy production on Federal lands goes back and is invested, in many cases, in those same States where production occurs. There is one anomaly, and that is the State of Alaska, where 90 percent of the money goes back to the State with no strings attached whatsoever.

You can see here on geothermal energy that 25 percent goes to the Federal Government, and 50 percent goes to the State. Even the counties share in 25 percent of the revenue. For offshore alternative energy, such as wind and wave energy and things along those lines, 27 percent of the revenues are shared with the adjacent States.

I am going to come back to this one on oil and gas offshore, but I will just make note that there is an extraordinary disparity in regard to how these different resources are treated.

I made reference to the Mineral Leasing Act. Again, except for in the case of Alaska, when you produce energy on Federal lands, 50 percent of the money goes directly to those States. Of the offshore dollars, up to \$900 million each year goes into what is called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which all 50 States benefit from, for national parks, for urban parks, for playgrounds, and for wildlife refuges that the States manage.

You have \$150 million that goes into the Historic Preservation Fund to ensure the preservation of historic buildings. You have 27 percent in the 3-mile zone offshore of the 6 States that produce energy, and they get 27 percent under section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act. Under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, you also have 12.5 percent of the revenues given to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and then remaining funds go to the General Treasury.

Let me just recap this disparity here.

If you are producing energy on Federal lands onshore, 50 percent of the money goes directly to the State with no strings attached; 40 percent of the money goes into the reclamation fund; and only 10 percent goes into the U.S. Treasury. If you are producing energy in the offshore, effectively, all of that money goes to the Federal Government.

I will show you another poster here that demonstrates some of the dollars that have been given to States that produce offshore energy.

You can see here, in the case of Alaska—and this accounting mechanism came off of the Department of the Interior's Web site and from the Office of

Natural Resources Revenue, and this pertains to different types of sales year data, so it will vary to some degree each year—that between 2009 and 2014, 97 percent of the funds that were generated from energy production on Federal revenues was returned to the State of Alaska. They received \$158 million out of \$163.6 million in revenue generated on Federal lands.

In the case of California, 52 percent of the money went to the State of California. It was over half a billion dollars during that time period. To give you an idea on some of these amazing figures, you can go to the State of Colorado, where they produced nearly \$2 billion in energy production on Federal lands, and they received over \$900 million with no strings attached.

Madam Speaker, there are two extraordinary ones. The State of New Mexico generated \$5.5 billion in revenue between 2009 and 2014 from the production of energy on Federal lands. That State received \$2.75 billion back, or approximately 50 percent. In the case of Wyoming, they produced \$11.7 billion in revenue between 2009 and 2014 from energy production on Federal lands, and they received \$5.8 billion—over \$1 billion a year—with no strings attached whatsoever.

I want to be clear that I think that is great. I think that is how Federal policy should work. I think the revenues should be returned and shared with the States that host such energy production, but here is the incredible, absolutely indefensible comparison of what happens with offshore energy revenues.

This shows you that, in 2009, less than 1 percent of revenues were returned to the States that produced offshore energy. Those are the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, and Alaska. Those States in 2009 generated over \$5 billion in revenue for the U.S. Treasury. Those 6 States—and in some cases shared with counties and parishes—received only \$30 million of that, or 0.56 percent. In 2010, they received 0.06 percent. In 2012, they produced \$6.5 billion in revenue for the Federal Government from energy production offshore of the coasts of those States, and those 6 States in 2012, on \$6.5 billion in revenue, shared only \$837,000. Unbelievable—less than \$100,000 per State.

If you take overall the comparison between 2009 and 2014, approximately \$41 billion in revenue was produced from offshore energy production, and less than \$50 million of that, or 0.12 percent, was shared. In the case of onshore energy, States, in some cases, are getting 90 percent of the revenues. In the case of offshore energy, the 6 States that produce all of this offshore energy are receiving 0.12 percent, not the 90 percent and not the 50 percent. They are receiving 0.12 percent.

Madam Speaker, you have to ask: What roles do these six States play in our overall energy production?

It is pretty amazing. With just 2 percent of the offshore Outer Continental

Shelf actually leased, the oil production offshore accounts for 18 percent of all of the oil production in the United States. With just 2 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf offshore leased for energy production, that production is approximately 5 percent of the Nation's natural gas production. For example, in 2014, it generated incredible numbers—\$7.3 billion. This is one of the largest recurring nontaxed revenue streams that goes into the U.S. Treasury each year.

To add insult to injury, I guess it would be five of the six States that produce offshore energy only have 3 miles of State waters, which means they only get 100 percent of revenues from State water energy production, which would be between zero and 3 miles offshore of their coasts.

In the cases of Florida, which doesn't produce energy, and the State of Texas, they actually have three times that—or 9 miles—of State waters. So you have disparity, and that onshore production gets 50 to 90 percent of the revenues. In the case of offshore production, the States only get 0.12 percent of the revenues to date, and you have the fact that the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, and Alaska only have 3 miles of State waters. In the cases of Texas and Florida, they have 3 marine leagues, or, roughly, 9 miles, of State waters. The disparity is unbelievable.

This House has taken many efforts dating back decades ago, with some of the more recent ones in the mid-nineties, to try to rectify—to try to address—this disparity. Dating back to the mid-nineties, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, known as CARA, brought together such diverse interests as those of Congressman DON YOUNG of Alaska and Congressman George Miller of California, who are two Members who, I am quite certain, agreed upon nothing except for this. It was really amazing to see this House pass legislation bringing together everyone from the oil and gas community to the environmental community in order to ensure that these resources were reinvested back into coastal States that produced energy and back into ensuring that we conserve and protect our outdoors and opportunities for future generations. Unfortunately, that legislation, despite passing the House with a strong margin, didn't pass in the Senate.

Rolling forward to the early 2000s, in 2001, as I recall and I believe again in 2003, additional efforts included in the Energy Policy Act, during a conference report, passed the House of Representatives, once again, with a strong margin to share offshore energy revenues with the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, California, Alaska, and those States that produced offshore energy. Unfortunately, those efforts died in the United States Senate.

Then you roll forward to 2006. In 2006, the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act—in December of that year—was

enacted. What that did is that largely replicated an offer that President Truman made to the States decades ago whereby President Truman offered those States that produced offshore energy 37½ percent of all of the revenues generated from energy production in Federal waters. Those States, apparently, turned down that offer from President Truman and asked for a higher share. Despite that being offered decades and decades ago, it was not until 2006 when Congress finally acted and enacted again what is known as the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which would share 37½ percent of revenues from new energy production. I want to be clear on that distinction—new energy production—which is energy production that occurs prospectively after December of 2006.

□ 2015

It is not 37½ percent of all energy production. It is not 37½ percent of these numbers you see here, of the overall energy production, the billions of dollars. It is merely a fraction of that. So it is not anything close to parity with what happens for onshore revenues, but it is a start; and it is establishing parity in onshore and offshore policy, and it is a movement in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, in the State of Louisiana, we actually passed a constitutional amendment with an amazing margin that dedicated every penny of those revenues from the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, GOMESA, here, dedicated every penny of it to hurricane protection and coastal restoration, to making our coastal communities and our coastal ecosystem more resilient, ensuring that we don't see a repeat of what we all witnessed from Hurricane Katrina, where in our home State of Louisiana we had over 1,200 of our brothers and sisters, of our neighbors, of our friends, of our coworkers lose their lives—over 1,200.

Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005 caused or resulted in gasoline price spikes nationwide to the tune of 75 cents a gallon—nationwide average. And again in 2008 we saw price spikes \$1.40 a gallon on average in the 50 States—\$1.40—constituting the largest price spike in gasoline since the Arab oil embargo.

Mr. Speaker, you may be wondering the reason I am here tonight. The reason I am here tonight is to talk about the President's budget request. This year, when the President submitted his budget request, he submitted a request where he proposes to withdraw the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, to withdraw the pittance—or in 2014, the \$8.6 million—that was split among the four Gulf States that produce offshore energy, trying to prevent that from ever happening again.

In the President's budget request he says: This proposal generates \$5.6 billion in savings over 10 years through legislative reform proposals, including oil and gas management reforms to en-

courage diligent development of Federal energy resources while improving the return to taxpayers from relative reforms.

Well, let's talk about that for a minute. He says that it is going to generate savings. He says that its management reforms on oil and gas production are going to encourage diligent development. Mr. Speaker, by withdrawing revenue sharing and potentially discouraging offshore energy production, that is not encouraging diligent development. It results in us having to import more energy from other nations.

I remind you, nations like Venezuela, nations like Nigeria and many countries in Africa and the Middle East that don't share America's values, we are sending hundreds of billions of dollars to those countries. In 2011, over one-half of this Nation's trade deficit was attributable to importing energy from other nations. That effectively is sending jobs. It is sending hundreds of billions of dollars to those other countries that in many cases are taking those same dollars and using them against the United States' interests around the globe. It doesn't encourage diligent development of Federal energy resources, as the President's budget request suggests.

They also say that it improves the return to taxpayers. I am struggling with how this improves the return to taxpayers whenever study after study is crystal clear that proactive investment in things like coastal restoration, hurricane protection, hazard mitigation investments, according to the CBO it returns \$3 for every \$1 invested; according to a FEMA study, it returns \$4 in cost savings for every \$1 invested; and many, many others have estimated that the cost savings are multiple times that.

Now, what is incredible to me, when we had the Secretary of the Interior, who I asked for a meeting, I believe it was, on February 4, and here we are on May 18 and we still have not been able to get that meeting, including offering to meet with the Deputy Secretary or anyone else who can speak intelligently on this issue. I will take the receptionist, if you are watching. We have asked for that meeting.

In their budget request, it specifically says this cut has been identified as a lower priority program activity for purpose of the GPRA Modernization Act. Now, that is the Government Performance Results Act. So I said: Well, wow, they did an evaluation. So let's go ahead and ask the Secretary, Madam Secretary, could you explain to me how you did an evaluation and what the outcome of that was?

Well, her first response was: What is GPRA?

Well, this is in her budget request, and she asked me what GPRA was, despite the fact that it said they did an analysis and it determined that it was a low-priority program. After I explained it, they were unable to answer the question.

I asked if they would provide us their calculation here to show how it is a lower priority program and how it may compare with other onshore programs. Of course, here we are months later, and you will be shocked to learn that we still have not received that information that simply doesn't exist.

Politics, Mr. Speaker, at its best. Unbelievable.

You can't justify it from a policy perspective; you can't justify it from a financial perspective; you can't justify it from a resiliency perspective; you can't justify it from an environmental perspective. Absolutely incredible.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a quote here from the Environmental Defense Fund, from the National Wildlife Federation, and from the National Audubon Society, where they note, let's see: "This proposed budget undercuts the administration's previous commitments to restore critical economic infrastructure and ecosystems in the Mississippi River Delta, where we are losing 16 square miles of critical wetlands every year—a preventable coastal erosion crisis."

"We urge Congress to fund the President's commitments to coastal restoration and conservation by maintaining GOMESA funding that is vital to the Gulf Coast and by identifying additional funding for . . . other priorities."

That is a quote from the environmental community. This is the administration, I guess, attempting to win accolades from the environmental community, who turned around and criticized him for that.

Now, the irony goes even further in that in 2013, Secretary Jewell actually sends out a press release saying how great these dollars that are being shared are. It talks about how these revenues were distributed to State, local, and Federal tribes to support critical reclamation, conservation, and other projects. So here they are taking credit for it, saying how great it is, and then they come back and make an about-face that they can't explain, justify, can't even meet on, and haven't even been able to provide any documentation as to how they came to their decision.

In December of 2014, once again a press release from the Department of the Interior giving all sorts of accolades to themselves for sharing these revenues and all the great investments that they will result in, yet in the fiscal year 2016 budget request we have seen them attempt to withdraw those dollars.

Now, what is interesting in the press release, the administration said that this should be done because these resources, these public resources, these energy resources offshore, should be shared by all Americans. Well, okay, let's talk about that.

As we noted here, for onshore production, 50 percent of the money goes to the Federal Government, but of that, 80 percent of this actually is returned

back to the States; 50 percent goes directly to the States with no strings attached. So the Federal Government only gets 10 percent. The Federal Government only gets 10 percent, yet they didn't cut this program.

So I am struggling with how they have determined that these resources should be shared with all Americans, yet they are only doing it for this one program and leaving this other program entirely intact. Once again, the disparity cannot be defended.

Let's go ahead and take their idea that resources should be shared with all Americans, and let's apply it to other Federal resources. What about a national park? What about a national wildlife refuge? What about some BLM land somewhere?

These facilities that charge entrance fees, they take all those dollars, and they give it right back to that park. The State of Louisiana doesn't get any of it. It goes back to the park. We don't get any disparate benefit from that. The State that hosts the national park and hosts the national wildlife refuge, it benefits from that in the form of tourism and economic activity and a place for their citizens to recreate. Explain to me that disparity. Once again, it simply can't be done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make note of the problem in coastal Louisiana and why it is so critical that these dollars be invested, that the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act be continued. In coastal Louisiana, prior to the Federal Government building levees on the Mississippi River, the Atchafalaya River, and our coastal region of the State, the State of Louisiana was growing to the tune of three-quarters of a square mile per year, on average. Our State was accreting; it was growing in land.

When the Corps of Engineers came in and built levees on our river system, we immediately went from growing, or accreting, to losing land. In some decades, we have lost an average of 16 square miles per year. In other decades, we have lost closer to 26 or 28 square miles per year. In 2005, we lost nearly 200 square miles of our coast per year. To add it all up, the total figure, we have lost 1,900 square miles of our State since the 1930s. To put it in comparison, if the State of Rhode Island lost 1,900 square miles, the State of Rhode Island wouldn't exist anymore. If the State of Delaware lost 1,900 square miles, it would consist only of its inland waters. Nineteen hundred square miles is an extraordinary amount of land. Then to watch this administration come out and say: You know what? We are going to propose this new waters of the U.S. definition, because waters of the United States are so important and wetlands are so important to us, we have got to protect them. Yet the Federal Government is causing the greatest wetlands loss in the United States—prospective, ongoing, and historic—the Federal Government, the same agency, the Corps of

Engineers, that actually is supposed to be enforcing wetlands laws.

So the State of Louisiana said, yes, we are going to take these dollars whenever they finally begin flowing in some degree in 2017 and 2018, we are going to take those dollars and we are going to invest them. We are going to protect them by constitutional amendment. We are going to complement them with billions of dollars and other State-controlled spending, and we are going to invest them in making the coast of Louisiana more resilient, making our communities more resilient, making the economy of this Nation more resilient.

I remind you, in 2005, because of hurricane impacts to the State of Louisiana, prices spiked 75 cents a gallon nationwide, on average. In 2008, when hurricanes hit the Gulf Coast and Louisiana, prices spiked \$1.40 a gallon, on average, nationwide. This is a national issue.

Mr. Speaker, following the 2005 hurricanes, the Federal Government expended over \$100 billion—by some estimates, perhaps close to \$130 billion or \$140 billion—responding to these disasters. If we had taken somewhere in the range of \$8 billion to \$9 billion, we could have prevented the 1,200 lives that were lost that I referenced earlier. We could have prevented the expenditure of well over \$100 billion in taxpayer funds, the majority of that going toward deficit spending.

It doesn't save money to cut the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. To the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it is going to cost our Nation more dollars; and history has proven that, studies by Congressional Budget Office, studies by FEMA, and many others have proven that this is penny-wise and pound-foolish. It will result in additional deaths. It will result in additional flooding. It will result in additional economic disruption in this Nation, and it is the wrong approach.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am going to say it one more time. Onshore energy revenues are shared 90 percent between the Mineral Leasing Act and the Bureau of Reclamation funds, 90 percent; offshore energy revenues, we get well less than 1 percent, well less than 1 percent per year today. And as we try and slowly begin addressing the disparity but nowhere close to what happens for onshore production, when we try to do the right thing and make sure that these funds are constitutionally protected to be invested in making the communities more resilient, making the ecosystem more resilient, and addressing the wrongs of the Federal Government, addressing natural resource flaws of the Federal Government, we now have this administration who is supposed to be the environmental administration coming out and taking these dollars away, which is once again why the Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Audubon Society, and many, many others came out against this.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge, as we continue to move through the appropriations bills and continue to work on energy policy, that we truly seek to do what the President says in regard to an all-of-the-above policy, which includes conventional fuels, to ensure that the States that are producing these energies receive some type of mitigative funds or revenue sharing, to ensure that the State of Alaska, that the East Coast and other States that are bringing offshore production online are treated fairly, and to ensure that these dollars are reinvested back in the resilience of these communities and in the ecosystem.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2030

#### CURRENT NEWS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KATKO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot in the news recently about questions being asked of people running for President. It has been interesting. In taking that issue up, though, it is important to look at some of the current news.

Here is an article on May 17 by Bill Sanderson of the New York Post. It says: "Saudi Arabia to buy nuclear bombs from Pakistan."

It says:

Saudi Arabia will join the nuclear club by buying "off-the-shelf" atomic weapons from Pakistan, U.S. officials told a London newspaper.

Wow. Well, that was something that we weren't expecting back when President Bush went into Iraq when he made that call that some day, Saudi Arabia and others in the Middle East would become so nervous about the chaos created in the Middle East that they would determine: We may need to get nuclear weapons ourselves. In the past, we have always been comforted by the fact that the United States would keep peace in the Middle East. They wouldn't let anything get out of hand. They would keep other Middle Eastern countries, especially radical Islamist countries, from having nukes.

This administration has shown it is not capable of preventing nukes from proliferation in the Middle East, so therefore, our allies our getting quite nervous.

Here is an article from today by a brilliant prosecutor of the original bomber of the World Trade Center in 1993, Andrew McCarthy. It is dated today, May 18. The title of his article in National Review says: "The Iraq Question is the Iran Question—At Least It Should Be."

He goes on to point to the question that is being asked of some Republican Presidential candidates. Obviously, the mainstream media, those that donate