

systems and soldier protection. In the interest of global freedom, I hope and am confident that this friendship will continue in the future.

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

(Mr. PAUL 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 Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

GREEN ENERGY AS A SOLUTION TO OUR MANY CRISES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The crises facing our government and our country are broad in range. We are faced with an energy crisis, an economic crisis, an environmental crisis and certainly an unemployment crisis. President Obama, in his boldness of vision throughout the campaign for President and certainly in the infancy stages of his presidency, has made it very clear that he wants to deliver to the American public this new vision of how to resolve many of these crises in one fell swoop. It is important to recognize that we, as an American economy, are heavily dependent upon fossil-based fuels. It is important for us to recognize that some 60 percent of the oil on which we depend is imported from some of the most troubled spots in the world. We move forward here as we try to resolve our crises in a way that's creative and innovative and inspiring. It will require consumer behavioral change, and it will require investments. It will require policy formats

that will break from traditional dependency on fossil-based fuels and allow us to move forward in a way that addresses green jobs for a green economy, American-produced power to run our factories, our farms, our homes, the institutions that are important to us.

When we look at the opportunities, there are many. There are projections that some 5 million additional clean energy jobs could be created if just 25 percent of our electricity and our vehicle fuels are produced from renewable resources by the year 2025. That's a staggering statistic. Those are dollars that, when invested, will produce these 5 million jobs that will allow us to grow a cleaner environment, address favorably the carbon footprint and respond to the pressures of global warming. It allows us also to embrace the intellect of this Nation, that intellectual capacity represented through our many academic centers and our private sector R&D centers, which are tools that can really retrofit this economy, that can allow us to grow in ways that are measured in green terms for jobs and green opportunities for energy supplies.

Now we know that the unemployment rate, which was inherited by this administration, which has grown and is going to be resolved, we believe, with several reforms, is something that can be addressed through those sorts of jobs that are not yet on the radar screen. We need to also think of international competition. If I could, I would take this discussion back decades where many of us as youngsters, perhaps in an elementary classroom setting, heard about the race, the race for Sputnik. We were certain that math and science was important in that classroom and that this competitive race, this international race had to be won by the United States because it was going to set in the forefront, it was going to make the premier nation that nation that won that race.

Well, we know what history dictated via investments on the space race and putting a man on the Moon and creating technology that really inspired job growth and really pumped this economy to a high level. That same sort of situation decades later now is existing in terms of a competitive race to be the energy nation, the nation that will export the intellect and the ideas and the innovation in a way that will be a masterful response to the several crises that we try to resolve. We can do that by emerging the winner in this race.

When we look at the fact that China is now the number one producer of solar panels in the world, that should challenge our thinking and our response as a government. When we think of the fact that Germany's number two export, after automobiles, is that of wind turbines, that should challenge and inspire us. And when we think of the fact that only six of the top 30 solar wind and advanced battery

manufacturers are American-owned, that should inspire us.

I will now yield to my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York, Representative MASSA, who is a strong and outspoken voice on energy reform, on green jobs, on a green economy. He has a message that he'll share this evening.

Mr. MASSA. I thank my colleague from the State of New York, my neighbor just slightly to the east, and rise today to discuss from several new perspectives why it is, frankly, so critically important that we get energy legislation correct as we move boldly into the 21st century.

Just a short election season ago, this Nation was assaulted with a message from one side of the aisle that rang like a motto. It repeated itself over and over and over again on the floor of this House and, frankly, in the living room of every American family, often intrusively during dinner hour, where we heard, Drill here, drill now, pay less. How empty today those words ring. In fact, after the price of crude oil has tumbled from its height of almost \$140 a barrel, bottoming to somewhere near the low thirties without the new drilling of a single well, we ask ourselves the question, how empty that slogan was.

And so we rise as we build a new national energy policy, one based on thoughtfulness, one based on science, one based on economic reality and not on sloganeering. So while I ran to become a Member of this House, motivated by such things as health care and an economic recovery, I have now become a very, very aggressive individual on this issue, looking at the absolute need to get this right. The first step I took as I approached my job was to go to the only hydrogen fuel cell propulsion research and development system and center in the United States, located in Upstate New York in Honeoye Falls, where to my astonishment as an engineer lifelong and a graduate of an engineering school, I saw the application of science. They took us not into science fiction but into science reality there in Honeoye Falls, working tirelessly for the last several decades, having taken engineering work that had been done out west 25 years ago and propelled us from the NASA Apollo program into the reality of some 116 reality-based automobiles. I had the opportunity to drive one of them, actually two, from Honeoye Falls all the way here to report for my first day. This was like driving an Apollo spacecraft. My eyes were opened to the fact that we were on the verge of a great industrial revolution, and we are at this moment leading the world. But if we listen to sloganeering, if we listen to the naysayers, if we allow the argument to be shaped by narrow special interests, we will never, ever cross the threshold of economic and industrial greatness that these and other technologies put in front of us. It's not just the fact that we have to get it right because we need to rebuild an economy

based on 21st century jobs, it's not just the fact that we believe as a caucus and myself personally that our impact on this world, through the burning of fossil fuels, is actually changing our climate, but it is also coming from the fact that I am a 24-year military veteran who realizes the vast and dramatic expenses that we are committing in our military just to secure an ever-increasing and yet rarely obtainable source of overseas fossil fuel.

Imagine, if you will, if we were not held hostage to the noose of Middle East oil. Imagine the trillions of dollars of resources that we would not be expending in the protection of, the extraction of and the transportation of oil sources from the very nations who use the money that we pay to feed our enemies and their hostile intent against us. This must be broken, and nowhere is that future clearer than right in Upstate New York. I know that my colleague, with his career in innovative engineering where he took his leadership to the New York State Energy Development Agency that has pioneered so much of the technology we need to move forward, agrees and understands with what we can do together standing as a Nation instead of listening to well-crafted and, frankly, crafty sloganeering.

So I rise with my colleague today to put an exclamation point at the very end of the reality that we must move ahead to get this right. I agree with the President's vision for a future. I agree with our caucuses that we need to move boldly into the future with an economically viable, science-based, thoughtful energy plan that breaks this ridiculous stranglehold that foreign oil has on us. It's not just a matter of drill here, drill now, pay less. We have grown beyond that sloganeering.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you. I reclaim the time, Mr. Speaker.

I, with curiosity, listened to Representative MASSA from New York. As a fellow colleague from New York State, I think of the impacts we can make in just New York alone. And when we then extrapolate that over the map of the United States, what a powerful statement.

□ 1915

He's right, that with this grip on our economy that was allowed to grow just through the Presidential tenure of President Bush, \$1,100 more per year was demanded of our American families for that dependency on oil, gas and electricity. We can go forward and inspire this green innovation of an economy. The green thinking that we can embrace can allow dollar for dollar to be a much more lucrative outcome. Four times as many jobs, would be created.

Mr. MASSA. Would my colleague yield on that point?

Mr. TONKO. Sure. Sure.

Mr. MASSA. I would like to pick up a very critical point my colleague just made about jobs. Around Lake Seneca,

that great deep and beautiful Finger Lake in Upstate New York, every year we run something called the Green Grand Prix. I'm sure you would love to be a participant in it. It is a road race, or a road rally, where navigation is important. I must confess that more than once I made a wrong turn. But I made a wrong turn in a vehicle this year, as I did last year, powered not by imported, foreign, distilled gasoline but rather by alternative fuels. We had ethanol-powered vehicles. We had steam-powered vehicles. We had solar-powered vehicles, hydrogen-powered cars. And this year I drove a Ford F-150 modified at a dealership in Elmira, New York, once a bustling hub of heavy manufacturing, to accept a dealer-approved kit that allowed this heavy truck to be powered by propane with some 350 miles per filling at one-third of the cost of gasoline. This was a technology that was unbeknownst to me, one that Ford Motor Company, in engineering innovation, has now authorized several dealerships around the United States to install without even voiding their basic engine warranties.

We have an abundance of propane in rural New York. This is an alternative fuel that helps us break the cycle of dependence on foreign oil, and for pennies on the dollar, for a mere tax break, to those who invest in this technology, it becomes competitive and real. And not only do those automobiles, those trucks, then get sold, but the individuals who modify those trucks have jobs. The dealerships that sell these vehicles to the public have jobs. The individuals who use them have extra money in their back pocket because they are not paying these overseas foreign fuel providers.

It is not just hydrogen or propane. It is the entire menu of alternative fuels and alternative electrical capability that we need to put on the table. And I will tell you what, if we can spend \$700 billion, a move, by the way, I opposed, bailing out banks who don't put a penny of that back in the consumer's pocket through alternative credit sources, we can certainly fund the single most important national security requirement we have before this Nation today. And that is to get an energy policy that is science-based and thoughtful.

Mr. TONKO. I couldn't agree more. And all while we speak, we need to recognize that China is investing \$12.6 million in its economy for green energy technology every hour. Now, that is a challenge to us. We can stand still and watch the emerging powers of energy out there as a nation, be it China or Japan or India or you name the country, or we can make a plan and implement a plan and move forward accordingly.

The President understands this is so critical to resolving so many of the crises we mentioned earlier. Speaker PELOSI and the leadership of this House, Energy and Commerce Chair WAXMAN, Ways and Means Chair CHAR-

LIE RANGEL, and many, many other leaders who are making their voices heard and helping construct the right outcome here.

The jobs of which my colleague and friend, Representative MASSA, just made mention, offer four times greater job creation than an investment, dollar for dollar, in oil and gas. And we certainly in New York State, as colleagues from that New York delegation, can attest to the projections that are made for the New York economy, over 130,000, nearly 132,000 clean energy jobs at a time when our unemployment statistics are perhaps beyond 8 percent. We can see flowing into the New York State economy as much as \$20 billion. And our taxpayers in New York State pay some \$2.8 billion, it is calculated, to pay subsidies for big oil companies, and certainly those gasoline corporations out there that are draining our economy. We hear this discussion about, it is a tax, it is a tax that is coming, that is befalling. Well, \$400 billion is the savings, that is a tax, call it whatever you want, that we are paying now to Venezuela and Middle East countries for every annual installment that we make in foreign energy imports. That is a huge price tag that could be avoided.

When we look at the potential out there in R&D investment that could be part of this great energy resource, it is limitless in terms of our academic institutions and our private sector partnerships out there. We can make this happen. We need to be innovative. We need to think outside the barrel. And we need to move forward in a progressive fashion.

I yield to my colleague from New York, ERIC MASSA. I yield to you, sir, to continue the discussion.

Mr. MASSA. Thank you, Mr. TONKO. And I have to tell you, you used two turns of a phrase that I thought were particularly appropriate. You talked about energy flowing. We come from a part of the world that pioneered cheap electricity. And we did it through one of the largest and one of the first great hydropower facilities in the world, capturing the hydro energy of Niagara Falls. And western New York, the great industrial cities of Buffalo, Rochester and Syracuse benefited thereby. This was 100 years ago. Now we must look 100 years into the future. And you are right to say we need to think "outside the barrel" because unfortunately what we will hear in the coming debate is the demonization of the individuals making the argument and not the thoughtful discussion of the policy. I fear that we will become, once again, held hostage to the economic and energy sloganeering that will make it so difficult for the American people to understand that doing nothing is moving backwards, that doing nothing is surrendering without a new idea to the forces of Big Oil who so clearly ripped off from the American public trillions of dollars just this time last year as gasoline shot up to over \$4 a gallon

with no real economic excuse other than gross corporate profiteering.

We cannot continue to be held hostage by the annual cycle of explained gasoline price increases and gasoline price fluctuations. And the only way that we are going to reclaim our own energy future is by looking beyond the slogans of the other side in a thoughtful, science-based, economically proven capability to explore all the new sources of alternative energies, not just for automotive propulsion, but also for fundamental electrical generation.

So thank you to my colleague from New York for allowing me the opportunity tonight to raise some key issues that this issue is not only about energy. It is about national security. It is not only about energy. It is about job creation for the future. It is not only about energy. It is about using the resources that we have to ourselves in the great American innovative manner that has always persevered in the face of challenge instead of surrendering to the foreign economies who, like they have been doing so aggressively lately, are taking over economic sector after economic sector. This is a battle that we can win. This is one that we can put "Made in America" on for future generations. And we can start right here, right now, tonight, by committing ourselves to thoughtful debate that raises issues and not sloganeering.

I yield back and thank my colleague for the opportunity to join him in this great discussion.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you to the Representative from New York, Representative MASSA.

Let me reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker. We have heard all of this talk about innovation economy. We have heard about the gluttonous dependency we have as a Nation on energy, in this case, fossil-based fuels, 60 percent of that need being met by imports from some of the most troubled spots in the world. We cannot continue along this dangerous path. It is a rocky road that needs to be addressed.

The approach, I believe, comes from an investment in American jobs, a green jobs agenda, growing a green energy transition that allows us to inspire an innovation economy. We do that with investments in R&D. While I served as president and CEO at NYSERDA, New York State Energy Research and Development Authority, I saw first hand up close and personal just how it happened. We invested in R&D. Not every one of those investments might be a success story, but the prototypes that are developed and funded then need to be addressed through additional funding that deploys that investment, that magic in the research lab, into deployment into manufacturing and then into the commercial sector, utilizing these shelf-ready opportunities that are the emerging technologies to respond to the needs of retrofitting energy efficiency mechanisms into our businesses,

our factories, our industries, our farms and our homes. That potential exists today. It is underutilized. We need to see energy efficiency as our fuel of choice. We need to address it just like we would any other source of fuel, to use it as we would mine coal or drill for oil, we need to mine and drill energy efficiency as that outcome that will address the demand side of the equation. Both supply and demand need to be addressed by this innovation economy.

I believe that through the leadership of the President and certainly Speaker PELOSI and others that I have made mention of, we can go forward with the soundness of an agenda that will really spark the kind of creative genius that speaks to the pioneer spirit that has always existed in this country. We need just to formulate the concepts that will take us there.

Just recently at GE's R&D center in Schenectady County, New York, GE announced its intentions to now move to an advanced battery technology that will create somewhere between 350 and 400 manufacturing jobs that will be the key that unlocks the doors to golden opportunity, or perhaps green opportunity. The battery situation, whether it is applied to transportation, transportation of light vehicles or heavy vehicles, energy, energy generation, energy storage for intermittent purposes or with transmission improvements that are being addressed by SuperPower in Schenectady County again, these are the formula outcomes that we need to promote and encourage.

We can do it. We have this skill set to do it as a Nation. We need to invest in green collar job opportunities. We need to invest in R&D making certain that research and development is part of that energy comeback. And we need to change our behavior in a way that will produce this new golden opportunity for New Yorkers, in my case, and for Americans across the board. We do have that potential, the immense potential.

I saw also what happened when we applied these retrofits for energy purposes, energy efficiency at dairy farms, first in a demonstration project and then across the board to some 70 farms where, as dairy farms, they are dealing with a perishable product. And where they are dealing with ebbs and flows of energy need, they cannot necessarily because of mother nature demands and dealing with off-peak situations. They can't cleverly quite construct that outcome. But what they can do is utilize the resources of energy efficiency which was done through these demonstrations. And it was a success because a great deal of savings, 35 to 45 percent, was made available for these farms simply by addressing their demand through energy retrofits that were done in partnership with the local utility, with the staff from Cornell University, with the staff from NYSERDA and certainly with groups

working as ESCOs, the Energy Services Companies, that were helping in this effort to change things at these given dairy farms. The result was remarkably strong.

That is the sort of real-life experience that we ought to apply to our policy creation and innovation and to our resource dedication that comes through the budgets that we will deal with here in Washington. It is a great opportunity for us to respond in an innovative way, responding to challenges of several crises out there and allowing us to emerge very strong in that outcome.

So it is about green power. It is about green jobs. It is about Americans producing for their needs, and it is allowing our industries to be all the more prosperous and all the more productive simply because we have given them a break in the energy area.

So with all of that being said, I encourage us to look strongly at the opportunities that exist today in this given Chamber that will allow us to go forward in progressive fashion. And we will be able to look back and say that this was the generation that provided that response that ignited this new energy thinking that really turned around the American economy and has helped save the environment in a way that was immeasurably important to coming generations.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the good works of the faith community to protect the integrity of God's creation. As a seminarian, I appreciate the advocacy of people of faith for protecting this earth.

The Catholic Climate Covenant has contacted me about the St. Francis Pledge to Care for Creation and the Poor. Members of the Covenant include Catholic Relief Services, Catholic Charities USA, The Franciscan Action Network, and the Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. Religious charities are on the front lines battling poverty around the world. Whether it is a church in Fairfax providing housing to the homeless to prevent hypothermia or an overseas mission to build housing, members of faith-based charities have direct knowledge of the realities of poverty around the world.

The faith community is telling us that climate change poses a dire threat to the world's poor, whether they are residents of New Orleans, Bangladesh, or coastal communities in the Mid Atlantic. Based on the best available scientific data, faith-based charities' concerns are well founded. Experts predict that rising sea levels and increased incidence of severe storms will create 100 million climate refugees in the next hundred years. As former Virginia Senator John Warner noted in his testimony to the Energy and Commerce Committee, this volume of refugees will strain our capacity to respond to national security threats.

We can see these threats right here in the National Capital Region. Neighborhoods in Fairfax County like Huntington and Belleview have experienced unprecedented flooding within the last five years. With their proximity to tidal reaches of the Potomac River, they are threatened by rising sea levels. These older neighborhoods are important because they

have maintained a stock of affordable housing that is increasingly scarce in this region. Whether it is in Bangladesh or Bellevue, climate change poses a threat to the welfare of working families around the world.

I haven't heard any expression of concern from the minority party about the millions of families that are endangered by climate change. Maybe they assume that these folks are politically powerless, that their loss of homes, land, and livelihoods can be ignored with impunity. But even if one is comfortable with condemning millions of people to refugee status, I would dispute the assumption that such an approach has no financial impact on the rest of us. Here in Northern Virginia, the Army Corps of Engineers is planning multi-million dollar flood prevention systems for low-lying neighborhoods. The cost of these systems will only rise with the level of the sea. Senator Warner noted that we cannot ignore refugees overseas lest we create conditions in which political organizations such as the Taliban will thrive.

The Catholic Climate Covenant and other faith groups remind us that we have a moral responsibility to protect the world's poor. That moral imperative coincides with self interest: If we do not arrest the rising concentration of greenhouse gasses in the atmosphere then we will saddle the next generation with ever-rising costs of dealing with climate change and its human costs. Whether those costs come from floodwalls or humanitarian support for refugees, we will not be able to avoid paying the bill. We must act now to reduce greenhouse gas pollution—for the sake of millions whose lives are tied up in the stability of our climate and because inaction will create an insurmountable cost burden for the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, every challenge presents an opportunity. Sometimes the opportunities are difficult to identify. As we attempt to reduce global warming pollution, we are fortunate to have many models from which we can learn. I would like to focus on the acid rain reduction program that we initiated under the Clean Air Act nearly 20 years ago.

During the 1960s and 1970s, sulphur dioxide pollution was poisoning rivers and streams across America while inflicting damage on infrastructure and some of our most famous public art. This pollution came from some of the same sources that are emitting global warming pollution, including coal-fired power plants. In 1980, polluters released over 17 million tons of sulphur dioxide in the atmosphere. Since implementation of a cap and trade program to reduce acid rain pollution, we have eliminated 8.9 million tons of sulphur dioxide pollution annually, a 50% cut.

When Congress was considering capping acid rain pollution in 1990, polluters claimed that such a cap would drive up electricity prices and cripple the economy. In fact, the acid rain cap and trade program has saved \$40 in costs for every dollar spent on pollution controls. This 40–1 cost to benefit ratio saves Americans \$119 billion every year. Each dollar that we don't have to spend on premature health problems or damaged infrastructure is another dollar saved or invested. Nor did the acid rain program hurt American energy production. Coal companies installed scrubbers that remove sulphur dioxide as well as other pollution like mercury. Installation of these scrubbers created high paying jobs right here in America, creating new sources of employ-

ment for electricians and other skilled tradesmen.

The non-partisan Congressional Research Service has conducted several reports on the efficacy of the acid rain cap and trade program. A recent CRS memo notes that the acid rain reduction program has nearly one hundred percent compliance in pollution reduction and has not experienced any problems with market manipulation.

Today, the minority party claims that we cannot afford to reduce greenhouse gas pollution because it will increase costs and hurt the economy. We've heard all these arguments before, during the acid rain debate in 1990, and they have all been proven false. We have saved money by cutting acid rain pollution, created clean energy jobs, improved public health, and achieved our goals of reducing pollution. Far from being a burden, reduction of acid rain pollution improved our quality of life.

Today we face a different threat: global warming pollution. Unlike in 1990, however, we have a very successful model that we can follow. The American Clean Energy and Security Act emulates many of the successful components of the acid rain reduction program, and offers Congress a proven model of cost-effective pollution reduction.

IRAN'S MISSILE TEST

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

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is a pleasure to be able to join you this evening and my colleagues on a couple of very interesting topics. I think the first thing that we will talk about is something that has been on the minds of people since this morning. That was when we got an announcement from Iran that they had just fired a missile some 1,200 miles. That is what they claimed.

□ 1930

We don't know the details. We're waiting for a brief on the Armed Services Committee on exactly what it was that Iran did, the nature of the missile that they fired. But this is something that has captured the attention and the concern of Americans because you have coming together here a combination of three things that we find to be of high level of concern.

The first is the ability to make these long-range missiles; particularly, we're talking about solid fuel missiles that have multiple stages. That allows a missile to go some considerable distance and therefore target larger areas of the Earth's surface.

The second thing is nuclear energy. That is a weaponized nuclear energy in the form of a warhead. So now you have a missile that can go some distance; it has a nuclear warhead on it. That becomes extremely dangerous.

And now when you add the third element, that is radical Islam, to that, people who think it is their destiny and

their duty to destroy other people who don't think the way you do, you put those three together and you have something that has indeed captured the news for the day. So I thought that would be important today to look a little bit at what do you do when you have an adversary that has a missile, a nuclear warhead, and a will to use it against you.

That was the question that was faced historically some years ago by Ronald Reagan. Up to that time, there had been a whole series of treaties and different things had come along, and we had gotten to the point where we said, Well, they have got missiles; they can blow us up. We've got missiles; we could blow them up. And that would be so crazy, we will have a Mexican standoff. We will call it mutually assured destruction. But that really was a very, very foolish idea.

I'm joined tonight by one of the foremost authorities in the U.S. Congress on the subject of missile defense and strategic missile defense, my good friend, Congressman FRANKS. And it's a treat to have you here on the floor, and talk about a timely subject, Iran just having launched a missile.

And surprisingly, this has been a matter of a great deal of partisan division and a lot of debate on this subject, and if you could help us with a little bit about the logic and the history. I would like to do the background on missile defense so we can understand what is going on today in context.

I would yield.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I appreciate what you're doing here tonight, Congressman AKIN.

Ever since mankind took up arms against his fellow human beings, there has always been an offensive capability that essentially, in time, has been met with the defensive capability. And first it was the sword or the spear and the shield, maybe, and then—

Mr. AKIN. Or a rock and somebody had a shield to stop the rock or something. So one offense, one defense.

I didn't mean to interrupt. Go ahead.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. When we came to having firearms and bullets, we came to find armor and came up with a tank, and it has been an ongoing back-and-forth for a long time. But now that we face the most dangerous weapons in the history of humanity—that being a nuclear warhead borne by an intercontinental ballistic missile which can reach thousands of miles with accuracy—all of a sudden there became a debate whether we needed a defense for something like that. Now, for a time, there wasn't really the technological ability to defend against something like that.

And as you said, when the Soviets had thousands of warheads and hundreds of missiles that were capable of destroying every city that we had that was of any size, we had to come up with this equation to where they knew that if they attacked our cities and they