

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

(Mr. CARTER 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 Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF 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 Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR 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 Florida (Mr. POSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE DANGER OF IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. You know, Mr. Speaker, it is sad that the chains of bondage are often too light to be felt until they are too strong to be broken. History has shown humanity to be susceptible to malignant dangers that approach inaudibly and nestle among us until the day of sudden calamity comes and finds us empty-handed, broken-hearted, and without excuse. The ominous intersection of jihadist terrorism and nuclear proliferation has been inextricably and relentlessly rolling toward America and the free world for decades. Mr. Speaker, this menace is now nearly upon us, and it represents the gravest short-term threat to the peace and security of the human family in the world today.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, due to the jihadist ideology of its leaders, represents a particularly significant danger to America and her allies. It was 31 years ago that the Iranian Revolution occurred, and that nation's relentless march to jihad was born. Shortly thereafter, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a few other Islamic revolutionaries led

a student revolt that shocked and defied the world when they kidnapped and held 53 American hostages for 444 days. Then during the Iraq-Iran war, Mr. Speaker, the Iranian regime again shocked the entire world with its brazen barbarity when reports surfaced that Iran was clearing the way for its tanks by using a force they referred to as the Basij. This was a phalanx formation of child soldiers and old men that they would recruit from the streets with promises of glorious rewards for their self-sacrifice. This was signified by plastic keys that were given to the children to wear around their necks in order for them to unlock the gates of heaven as they marched to their own bloody deaths.

Between 1980 and 1988, Mr. Speaker, Iran's radical leaders sacrificed an estimated 100,000 innocent Iranian children in this gruesome process. Row upon row would be marched into battle, falling under the rapid fire of the enemy's machine guns and clearing minefields with their own bodies to make way for Iranian tanks. This, Mr. Speaker, is the ideology that gives rise to Iran's now-President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Those radicalized, brainwashed, Basij forces have now come of age and are among Mr. Ahmadinejad's strongest supporters. And today the President of the Islamic Republic of Iran has now led his Nation to become the world's largest sponsor of terrorism.

President Ahmadinejad was speaking to the whole world when he said, "And you for your part, if you would like to have good relations with the Iranian nation in the future, recognize the Iranian nation's greatness and bow down before the greatness of the Iranian nation and surrender. If you don't accept to do this, the Iranian nation will later force you to surrender and bow down."

How can we possibly trust such a man to have his finger on a button that could launch nuclear missiles aimed at our families? And how would we negotiate with a nuclear Iran when their jihadist ideology considers Armageddon a good thing and believes that it is God's will for them to annihilate America and Israel? Despite claiming to desire peace, Ahmadinejad has consistently undermined every advancement toward peace in the Middle East by supporting terrorist groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Shiite insurgents, and militias in Iraq responsible for killing and maiming U.S. and coalition forces and countless innocent citizens.

What possesses us, Mr. Speaker, to believe that they would not do the very same with nuclear weapons? Mr. Speaker, Iran has recently begun to enrich uranium to beyond 20 percent, which is four times the amount necessary for peaceful domestic energy production. It also means that they are 70 percent of the way to weapons-grade uranium capable of fueling nuclear warheads. Iran's leaders still claim that they're just enriching uranium for solely peaceful intentions, Mr. Speak-

er. But the IAEA put it this way: "We are being asked to believe that Iran is building uranium enrichment capacity to make fuel for reactors that do not exist."

Over the last several years, Iran has shifted its stories with each well-documented discovery about its enrichment efforts by the IAEA. First it claimed it had no centrifuge program whatsoever. Then it claimed it had only done a limited amount of centrifuge testing. And now we know, in fact, that Iran possesses not a few but thousands of centrifuges. Mr. Speaker, if the Iranian enrichment program is only for producing nuclear power plants for fuel, why have they continuously deceived the world and hidden it for three decades?

With its languishing economy and literally centuries worth of natural gas reserves, Iran's claim that it seeks nuclear capability solely for peaceful purpose is ridiculous beyond my ability to express, Mr. Speaker. Iran has disregarded three previous rounds of security council sanctions and has repeatedly misled the IAEA.

□ 2200

They have built underground enrichment facilities at that Natanz and the newly discovered underground facility at Qom, and they've continued to test the long-range ballistic missiles that could be used to deliver a nuclear payload.

Mr. Speaker, back in 2005, I stood on this floor and called for Iran to be referred to the United Nations Security Council. At that time Iran had fewer than 150 centrifuges. Today the Iranian program now includes over 8,000 centrifuges. And only a total of maybe 3,000, Mr. Speaker, is the commonly accepted figure for a nuclear enrichment program that can be used as a platform for a full scale industrial program capable of churning out enough enriched uranium for dozens of nuclear war heads.

The IAEA reports that Iran has already manufactured enough uranium hexafluoride to ultimately manufacture at least 20 nuclear warheads.

It's also been reported that Iran has experimented with polonium, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, polonium is a radioactive isotope with only one known purpose on this entire Earth, and that is to trigger a nuclear explosion.

Iran has a multiple medium-range ballistic missile program. Based on the success of their medium range Shahab III, Iran is now attempting to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles, the Shahab IV, the Shahab V and the Shahab VI, and the Simorgh two-stage rocket.

The regime only last year successfully launched its first satellite. Mr. Speaker, this is the same technology necessary to integrate a nuclear warhead and an intercontinental ballistic missile.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this brings me to something even more ominous. There

is growing evidence that Iran is pursuing a nuclear high altitude electromagnetic pulse weapon, or an EMP, capability. An EMP attack on America, Mr. Speaker, would consist of a nuclear blast detonated at high altitude which would instantaneously generate an electromagnetic pulse that would be spread out over our homeland at the speed of light with devastating effect. In evidence of this, Iran has practiced launching a mobile ballistic missile from a vessel in the Caspian Sea. It has also tested high altitude explosions using the Shahab III, a test mode consistent with an EMP attack and described the tests as successful. Experts have no other explanation for this type of test than that it was an effort to develop an EMP capability.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would only take one such weapon properly designed and delivered to critically damage our country's electrical grid. According to some experts in such a scenario, an estimated percentage of 70 to 90 percent of the population of the United States would become unsustainable.

Mr. Speaker, it is impossible for me to even wrap my mind around that figure or that scenario. Now, for those who are unfamiliar with the high altitude electromagnetic pulse threat, let me extensively quote for a moment Dr. William Graham, the chairman of the EMP Commission who testified before the House Armed Services Committee on the threat to the United States from an EMP attack. He states: "EMP is one of a small number of threats that can hold our society at risk of catastrophic consequences. The electromagnetic fields produced by EMP weapons deployed with the intent to produce EMP have a high likelihood of damaging electrical power systems, electronics and information systems upon which American society depends. Their effects on critical infrastructures could be sufficient to qualify as catastrophic to the Nation."

A determined adversary can achieve an EMP attack without really having a high level of sophistication. For example, an adversary would not have to have long-range ballistic missiles to conduct an EMP attack against the United States. Such an attack could be launched from a freighter off the U.S. coast using a short- or medium-range missile to loft a nuclear warhead to high altitude.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't know how to put it any clearer. Terrorists sponsored by a rogue state could potentially execute such an attack, and they could do so without even revealing their identity.

Mr. Speaker, an effective EMP attack on America would send this Nation back to the horse and buggy era without the horse and buggy. For terrorists, this is their ultimate goal. An EMP, I am afraid, could be the ultimate asymmetric weapon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are two things in history that have supercharged worldwide recruitment and in-

citement for jihad. First was the taking of our hostages in Iran. And second was the tragedy that occurred on 9/11.

A nuclear attack on Israel or America would activate and accelerate jihad worldwide in ways that we can only begin to imagine. If Iran is allowed to develop nuclear weapons, our entire world reality changes, Mr. Speaker.

First, containing nuclear proliferation becomes almost hopeless. President Obama's idyllic vision of working toward a nuclear-free world would be absolutely dead. Iran is a threshold state, and its nuclear program is already on the brink of catalyzing nuclear proliferation throughout the entire Middle East. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey all have signaled their interest or intent to become a nuclear power if Iran does. Ahmadinejad is in fact quoted as saying, "Iran is ready to transfer nuclear know-how to other Islamic nations due to their need."

A nuclear Iran also means the Arab-Israeli peace process would be dead. Our security assurances to our allies in the region would be drastically weakened, and America might well be forced to extend its nuclear umbrella, Mr. Speaker.

Moreover, any leverage over the Iranian dictatorship that we might once have possessed will now be completely lost.

Mr. Speaker, if Iran attains nuclear weapons capability despite our demands that its nuclear program be dismantled, what reason will that regime ever have again to believe America's word actually means anything?

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there is more. Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, and it continues to brazenly provide support, whether finances, weapons or warfighters, to its proxies, including Hamas, Hezbollah and other jihadist terror groups.

It should send a chill down our spines to consider that the same willingness Iran has demonstrated to proliferate missile technology to its terrorist proxies would undoubtedly also become a willingness to proliferate nuclear weapons technology to those same terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, in 1988, Osama bin Laden called it a religious duty for al Qaeda to acquire nuclear weapons. Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said, "My worst nightmare is terrorists with nuclear weapons. Not only do I know they are trying to get them, but I know they will use them."

This is the greatest danger of all, Mr. Speaker. If Iran does step over that nuclear threshold, rogue regimes and terrorists world over will then have the access to these monstrous weapons. No wonder the State of Israel is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Israel remains the truest friend America has in this world. And yet, in recent days, Israel has received more open rebuke from the Obama administration for plans to build houses in Jerusalem than Iran has received for building a secret ura-

nium enrichment facility to build nuclear weapons that would threaten the entire world. It astonishes me, Mr. Speaker. And may I remind this administration that Jerusalem is not a settlement. It is the capital of the nation of Israel founded and built by the ancient people of Israel 3,000 years ago. And when this administration criticizes Israel, do they not understand that Israel's enemies and ours see it as weakening of the Israeli-American alliance and an opportunity to boldly advance violence against Israel and the hegemony of our common enemies in the Middle East.

Israel and America need each other now as much as we ever have, Mr. Speaker, because nuclear Iran presents a threat to the paradigm of freedom for the entire world, and it truly represents a fundamental existential threat to the State of Israel.

A Jewish author, Primo Levi, was once asked what he had learned from the Holocaust. He replied, When a man with a gun says he's going to kill you, believe him.

At this moment, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, a man who, in the same breath, both denies the Holocaust ever occurred and then threatens to make it happen again, is arrogantly holding a gun with which he vows to wipe the State of Israel off the map.

In June of 2008, Ahmadinejad again made clear where he stands. "Israel," he declared, "is about to die and will soon be erased from the geographical scene."

□ 2210

Ahmadinejad has also said, "Anybody who recognizes Israel will burn in the fire of the Islamic nation's fury."

Sheik Hassan Nasrallah, the leader of Hezbollah, said, "We have discovered how to hit the Jews, where they are most vulnerable. The Jews love life, so that is what we will take away from them. We are going to win because they love life and we love death."

Mr. Speaker, indeed it seems that Hitler's ghost still walks through the streets of Tehran.

In December 2001, former Iranian President Ali Akbar Rafsanjani was commenting on the possibility of an Israeli retaliation after an Iranian nuclear strike. He said, "The use of an atomic bomb against Israel would destroy Israel completely while the same against the Islamic world would only cause damages. Such a scenario is not inconceivable."

Mr. Speaker, the small nation of Israel could fit geographically into my congressional district almost three times. An Iranian Shahab III missile can reach Israel in 12 minutes. If Iran can develop and attach a medium-size nuclear warhead to that missile, Tel Aviv or Jerusalem could be ashes within 15 minutes after the missile was launched from Iran. If the warhead was detonated above the atmosphere over Israel in an EMP attack, the entire Jewish nation could be completely incapacitated. Israel missile defenses

would only have about a 50-50 chance of knocking down even just the first of such missiles.

Mr. Speaker, Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir said many years ago: "In our long war with the Arabs, Israel has always had a secret weapon: no alternative."

Mr. Speaker, Israel has very few options and no margin for error.

Israel understands that Iran is currently ruled by a regime whose present leaders embrace an evil, poisonous ideology that causes mothers to leap for joy when their children blow themselves to pieces so they can kill other innocent human beings. And a responsible Israeli leader facing a mortal threat from a nuclear armed terrorist state will do whatever is necessary to defend his people.

Mr. Speaker, Israel will not be made to walk silently into the gas chambers again.

And when the day comes when the head of Israeli intelligence tells the prime minister that Iran is on the brink of an operational nuclear weapons capability, Israel will act, and in their own self-defense, and no one will have any right to blame them.

So let me say this, Mr. Speaker: If and when the people of Israel find themselves with no time left and no choice but to defend themselves by taking preemptive military action to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons, the Obama administration will owe an apology to the whole world for failing to act, but especially to Israel for leaving them with no choice but to act on behalf of all of us.

America and the western world will then have a moral responsibility to stand with Israel in whatever follows.

Mr. Speaker, there is a moment in the life of every problem when it is big enough to be seen by a reasonable person and still small enough to be solved. Almost 5 years ago, I stood at this podium and called upon the United States to recognize that Iran was pursuing nuclear weapons and should be referred to the Security Council. Soon thereafter, Iran announced it had enriched uranium using an array of 164 centrifuges. Today, Iran has over 8,000 centrifuges.

Mr. Speaker, our predictive time-tables have also often been wrong altogether. Both North Korea and Iran stunned the international community with the extent and rapidity of their development of missile capabilities. In 1998, the intelligence community said North Korea was years away from developing long range missiles. And then on August 31 of that same year, North Korea launched a Taepodong-1 missile that landed between Japan and Hawaii. And of course, Mr. Speaker, North Korea now has nuclear weapons.

Today it is also clear that the 2007 NIE report on Iran woefully underestimated the urgency of the Iranian nuclear threat. My point, Mr. Speaker, is so very simple. We are running out of time to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons.

But where is the Obama administration? While some of the greatest security threats in a generation are rushing upon this one, the Obama administration has been busy insulting our friends and emboldening our enemies, all the while taxing and borrowing and spending our economy into such a place of vulnerability that our capacity to respond to these threats in the future will be demonstrably diminished. And when it comes to the growing incontrovertible danger of a nuclear armed Iran, this administration has been asleep at the wheel, Mr. Speaker.

During Mr. Obama's entire tenure, the administration's policy toward Iran has been appeasement, denial, broken deadlines, and talk of sanctions. And now just today—just today—the Wall Street Journal reports that the administration actually plans to soften its position on sanctions toward Iran.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming very clear that the Obama administration has now embraced an unspoken policy of allowing Iran to develop nuclear weapons and is even now preparing to embrace a policy of containment afterwards. This administration's refusal to make the hard choices now translates into capitulation and acquiescence to Iran's fanatical goal. What an inexplicably naive and inexpressibly dangerous policy.

Whatever challenges there are in dealing with Iran today, Mr. Speaker, they will pale in comparison to the dangers of dealing with them after they have gained nuclear weapons. Because once that threshold is crossed, Mr. Speaker, Iran will be able to pass that technology and those weapons on to the most dangerous terrorists in the world. And this administration and so many to come will face the horrifying reality of nuclear jihad. And those of us who have been blessed to walk in the sunlight of freedom in this day will be consigning our children to walk in the minefield of nuclear terrorism tomorrow. If the Obama administration allows this to happen, Mr. Speaker, future generations will remember it as a treacherous betrayal of the entire human family.

Seven decades ago, a murderous ideology arose in the world. The dark shadow of the Nazi swastika fell first upon the Jewish people of Germany. And because the world did not respond in time to such an evil, it began to spread across Europe until it lit the fires of World War II and the hell on earth that followed. It saw atomic bombs fall on cities and over 50 million people dead worldwide. All because, Mr. Speaker, the world's free people did not respond in time.

History has taught us that evil ideologies must ultimately be defeated in the minds of human beings, but in the meantime they must often be defeated upon the battlefield.

Mr. Speaker, our choice with Iran is no longer a choice between the way the world is now and the way the world might be after a military strike to pre-

vent them from gaining nuclear weapons. No, our ultimate choice now is between what the world will be like after a preemptive strike on Iran or what the world will be like after Iran gains nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, we are out of time. America must absolutely make the necessary decision to impede Iran's nuclear program through the immediate imposition of comprehensive, coordinated and crippling economic sanctions, both unilaterally and in concert with our allies, to strike at Iran's petroleum trade and its finances. These actions must be taken regardless of our success or failure within the United Nations Security Council.

We must also actively work to support Iran's courageous and noble dissidents and assure them that America stands with them in their quest for democracy and freedom. Their protests represent what may be one of the very last remaining hopes for peacefully destabilizing the regime and sending it toppling into the dust of history once and for all.

But finally, Mr. Speaker, let there be no mistake. It must be unequivocally clear to the radical leaders of Iran that military action will occur if they continue in their maniacal pursuit of nuclear weapons.

For these reasons, I have introduced a bill called the Peace Through Strength Act which would express support for the Iranian dissidents and would significantly expand economic sanctions against Iran and those nations that continue to do business with Iran including in banking and in oil. My bill would also require that the Secretary of Defense would be required to develop and maintain viable military options to prevent the successful development or deployment of a nuclear weapons capability by the Government of Iran.

□ 2220

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, may I remind us all that we face an enemy in jihad that's even more insidious than Soviet communism and we live in a time when a terrorist state is on the brink of developing nuclear weapons. I think Brink Lindsey said it best. He said, "Here is the grim truth. We are only one act of madness away from a social cataclysm unlike anything our country has ever known. After a handful of such acts, who knows what kind of civilizational breakdown might be in store?"

Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that the last window we will ever have to stop Iran from gaining nuclear weapons is very rapidly closing.

So I end my comments tonight with Winston Churchill's prescient warning to the leaders of his day. He said, "If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without blood shed, if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly, you may come to a moment when you have to fight, with all the odds against and

only a precarious chance of survival. There may be a worse moment. You may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is still better to perish than to live as slaves.”

Mr. Speaker, let us resolve for the sake of our children and for future generations that we of this generation will do all within our power to prevent a dark chapter in history being written on our watch and to hasten a day when Iran and its proxies will no longer be able to threaten the world with nuclear jihad, and when the persecuted and repressed and noble citizens of Iran can walk together with free peoples across this world in the sunlight of human liberty. God let it be, Mr. Speaker.

SATELLITE TELEVISION EXTENSION ACT OF 2010

Mr. MAFFEI. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 3186) to authorize the Satellite Home Viewer Extension and Reauthorization Act of 2004 through April 30, 2010, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 3186

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

This Act may be cited as the “Satellite Television Extension Act of 2010”.

SEC. 2. SATELLITE TELEVISION EXTENSION.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO SECTION 119 OF TITLE 17, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 119 of title 17, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (c)(1)(E), by striking “March 28, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2010”; and

(B) in subsection (e), by striking “March 28, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2010”.

(2) TERMINATION OF LICENSE.—Section 1003(a)(2)(A) of Public Law 111-118 is amended by striking “March 28, 2010”, and inserting “April 30, 2010”.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—Section 325(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 325(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “March 28, 2010” and inserting “April 30, 2010”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “March 29, 2010” each place it appears in clauses (ii) and (iii) and inserting “May 1, 2010”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEALTH REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE of Maine). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, it is always and ever an honor to get to

speak in this body. It touches the soul when you think about the freedoms that have been afforded to people in so many places that have been discussed right here on this floor.

Apparently, this is the last that we will be addressing the House before we break for what's considered the Easter break, and so it's time to pause for a moment and think about what we have been doing. We just passed the most incredible bill, not in a good way, that most Americans, a much bigger majority of Americans than voted for President Obama, had made clear that they did not want passed. We didn't pay attention to them. I say, “we,” collectively. I thought it was a big mistake, especially the more I read.

For example, this body, our friends across the aisle, pride themselves, they constantly talk about helping the little guy. Well, how about the little guy who is working, working, trying to get by. He doesn't make all that much, he doesn't make all that much, but they make just under 133 percent of the poverty level.

That means under the bill that has now been signed into law, that person, that person's family, are eligible for Medicaid, which means under this law that person, their family, will have to do one of two things, and this begins in about 3 or so years. They will either go on Medicare, which has got to be scary for them because, you know, Walgreens came out—I read somewhere that they were not going to be accepting Medicaid to pay for prescription drugs. Doctors all over the country have complained that Medicaid does not pay them for their own out-of-pocket expenses so they can no longer accept it. So doctors across the country are saying we are not going to take Medicaid.

Under this bill that has been passed, signed into law, even with the so-called reconciliation, what a misnomer. That poor working man, woman, family, they either go on Medicaid, with more and more people refusing to accept it, or get nothing in the way of insurance.

□ 2230

If their employer is providing it, they cannot accept it. They have to say, I am not allowed, under this punitive so-called health care bill, to accept the wonderful insurance that you have been providing. The law now says I take Medicaid or I take nothing. There is no in between. So much for helping the working poor.

And, heaven forbid, if you are working as hard as you can and you are not quite making enough to buy the level of health care that will now be mandated by the Federal Government. Well, we are going to help you. We are going to pop you with a fee or tax to teach you a lesson. That makes no sense. That just makes no sense.

So you have 14 States, as I last heard, who have said, We are filing suit. We are going to do what we can to stop it. Twenty-five other States that are looking into it, looking at whether they

should pass a bill in their State to nullify or stop it or say we are not going to take it, see what they should do.

For the State of Texas, for example, we have been frugal. Our State leaders have done an admirable job. We have got, I think, \$8 billion or \$9 billion in reserve for a rainy day. You have States like California that are in the tank. You have other States that are just barely hanging in there. Well, I know it's Easter time, but it's time to say, Merry Christmas. You States, guess what you just got. You just got billions of dollars that you are going to have to pay in Medicaid in this bill.

Now, what we have done, since the country is about broke and we are selling bonds, printing money to try to keep from announcing that we are broke, we have decided, You know what? To try to keep BEN NELSON from looking bad, we're just going to pay all of the State portion of the Medicaid expense for a while, for a few years, and then you are going to have it. And the States will not be prepared for it.

You know, when Art Laffer was the economic adviser for President Reagan, he advised him when Reagan asked, How do we get out of double-digit inflation? They had way over 10 percent inflation, double-digit inflation; they had over double-digit employment, worse than it is now, coming out of the Carter years. There was double-digit interest rates. My wife and I, our first home we bought just off of post there at Fort Benning when I was in the Army and we had a 12¾ loan and some people were envious that we had such a low interest loan. Interest rates, some have told me they had 15 percent, 18 percent, just crazy. It was an economy that was a disaster.

So Reagan asked Art Laffer, What do we do to come out of this terrible economic mess? And Laffer said, You have got to cut taxes by 30 percent. That's how you stimulate the economy.

Well, the Democratic-controlled Congress at that time refused to do an automatic 30 percent tax cut the first year, 1981, so they phased it in, 5 percent the first year, 10 percent the second year, 15 percent the third year.

As time went on, Art Laffer became prophetic, because when President Reagan had called him, President Reagan said, Great news, Art. We've got the 30 percent tax cut, just what you asked. And he said, Well, that's great. And he said, Well, you ought to be ecstatic. This was your idea. He said, Well, I am happy. Fine.

He says, Why aren't you happy? He said words to the effect that, Look, I understand you are going to phase this in over 3 years: a 5 percent cut the first year, 10 percent cut the second year, 15 percent cut the third year. And President Reagan said, Well, that's right. The Democratic-controlled Congress said that's the only way they would do it. They weren't going to give us a 30 percent tax cut the first year.

And Art said, Well, Mr. President, let me put it to you this way. If you are