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.

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.

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.

And just to reclaim my

time.

I recall—and even that was a very

troublesome kind of truce, because one

thing we found was they cheated on

every treaty that they signed, and we

didn’t cheat. And we had made an

agreement that we were not going to

develop a defense against nuclear missiles,

and then that whole idea was

challenged.

Now, why don’t you run through——

Reclaiming my time.

I think the one thing that I really recall—

and I think it’s something we historically

skip, and that is really the

guy—we have an awful big ‘‘thank

you’’ to say to Ronald Reagan. He had

the imagination to take a look at this

mutually assured destruction and say,

This is nuts. I mean, as you said, all

through history of mankind, somebody

picks up a rock and somebody picks up

a garbage can lid, you know? I mean,

there’s always offense and defense. He

said, If we’re saying we’re not going to

defend ourselves, we’re crazy.

So we start talking to scientists and

came up with this idea that we could

use different kinds of technology to

stop those missiles so they wouldn’t

come and hit our children and families.

And then he went a much more gracious

step and said, What’s more, we’re

going to share our defensive technology

with our opponents so that

mankind does not have to live under

the threatening shadow of the nuclear

mushroom cloud. And he sold that idea

to the American public. And, of course,

the liberals all made fun of him. They

said, You can’t do it. It won’t work and

it’s too expensive, and all of those

kinds of things. But he hung on and

kept talking about it, but he actually

didn’t build it, did he?

You know, the funny

thing was—I was elected in 2000, came

here in 2001 and started right off in the

Armed Services Committee. And we

had these debates in the Armed Services

Committee in those long hearings,

and every year for about 4 years or 5

years when it came to funding missile

defense, it was a party line vote. The

Democrats never wanted to do anything

with funding missile defense. And

yet, because we had a majority, we

voted for it.

And President Bush became very unpopular

in Europe and with Russia. He

went over and he gave them their 6

months’ notice. I think the treaty required,

give us 6 months’ notice. So he

went over and said, Okay, guys. The

clock’s running. We’re going to start

developing missile defense in 6 months.

And the Russians just had kittens,

Putin went nuts, and the Europeans

were all upset about this. They thought

he was some kind of cowboy from

Texas. And yet at the end of that 6

months, we started funding it in the

Armed Services Committee, totally

party line vote, and we started on the

path of actually building the dream

that Ronald Reagan had passed down

to us.

Wait, wait, wait. Reclaiming

my time.

What you just said is pretty important.

When Bush left office, the setup

was there was—we were going to build

a couple of sites. One was a radar site

and one was an actual place to launch

these ground-based missiles. The radar

site, was that in Romania?

So the Czech leadership

responded to our initiative, said, We’ll

put the radar site in the Czech Republic.

The leadership of Czechoslovakia

had a public that was not that enthused

about that idea, but they sold it

to them. We are going to move ahead.

And so you had the Czech Republic was

going to have the radar and the actual

missiles were going to be loaded—was

it in Poland?

This has been, with the

new administration, President Obama

has traded that away to the Russians,

is that correct, or do we know what the

deal was? Because he’s cut all of the

money out of it.

Reclaiming my time.

Now, wait a minute. This isn’t supposed

to be funny hour. We’re here

talking about missile defense because

Iran just launched a missile. Is that

the sort of influence that Russia has

over Iran, that it’s going to help them

launch solid rocket loader multistage

missiles that can go 1,200 miles? Is that

what we traded away in order to give

up missile defense for Europe? Wait a

minute. I don’t see—the logic of this is

incredible.

Reclaiming my time.

These are some of the missiles. This

picture was taken before the launch

this morning. And then we have a picture,

I believe—I believe this picture

was one released of the actual launch

this morning. So you can see this appears

to be a multistage kind of a missile,

but we don’t know the details on

it yet because we haven’t had the brief

on it.

Just reclaiming my time.

Is this a multistage, do you believe?

We have a few more minutes

to talk about that. I think people

might be interested in how did this—

how does this technology that we have

work, because for years, people are saying,

You can’t do it; it is impossible.

I’m an engineer by training, and

what we have developed in America—

basically on the dream of Ronald

Reagan—is an incredibly elegant solution.

And from a physics point of view,

this is the kind of thing that should inspire

kids in school to be studying up

on physics. And I didn’t know if other

Members want to join us.

We have Congressman BISHOP here.

We’ll talk a little bit about the way

the thing works, and then we’ll jump

in.

And what we have when you talk

about missile defense is you’ve got—basically

you’ve got the boost stage

where the enemy’s rocket here, if this

is aimed at our country or one of our

allies, this is taking off. It’s called a

boost stage. Then as the missile starts

to go more horizontally, it goes into

what’s called midcourse. And eventually,

when it comes down on the target,

and that’s where it’s reentering—if it’s

a very long-range missile, reentering

the atmosphere.

So we kind of break missile defense

into these three areas, and we have different

technologies to try to shoot the

thing down before it hits us. And our

thinking is, well, the more shots you

can get, the better, because if you miss

with the boost phase, you may get it in

midcourse. And if you miss in midcourse,

you may still stop it in reentry.

So we have different kinds of technologies.

But the main one that’s been developed

that’s just incredible, from a

physics point of view, is a metal-onmetal

kill. We don’t use any explosive

in it. We just send the missile up, and

the guidance is so accurate, and the

head-on collision that we energize generates

so much energy that it just literally

vaporizes the missiles. And I

would encourage my friend from Arizona

to just sort of flesh out how it’s

done.

Reclaiming my time, it’s

interesting that you just explained

something that really put a little

spring in the step of a lot of Americans

and should give an awful lot of our kids

that are reading Popular Science and

Popular Mechanics, that should fire

them up, jazz them up a little bit, and

there’s not a word about this. All we

hear is, oh, it won’t work, it won’t

work, and the amazing thing is I’ve

seen some of those pictures where here

comes the enemy missile. These things

are taken in fractions of a second, and

you see basically the thing is creating

through a sighting mechanism a target

on the side of the enemy missile, and it

is literally picking a spot, as you said.

It’s not hitting a bullet with a bullet.

It’s hitting that spot right on the missile

where they want to hit it.

And to be able to do that—I’ve always

been awfully skeptical as an engineer

about when people say you can’t

do it. You know, when you tell Americans

you can’t do something, it’s like,

oh, yeah? Well, the fact of the matter

is, we did, and as you said, not only did

we hit the first missiles dead-on, we

just picked off the biggest piece of

scrap metal that was left after.

We’ve got our friend, Congressman

BISHOP from Utah. If you would like to

join us, we would love to have you in

our discussion this evening.

Reclaiming my time, let’s

take a look at what this budget is

doing because the gentleman from

Utah has brought up some good points.

What’s happened is the Democrats

are basically cutting component parts

of missile defense. They know it works.

They have seen the tests. They know

the stuff works. They can’t say it

doesn’t work, but they are not going to

fund it. They’re funding some of it, but

they’re not funding some of the key

programs that are important.

The first thing they’re cutting is the

number of what’s called ground-based

missiles. Those are the ones, if you

think about a missile and how far it

can go, the missiles that go the farthest,

we call them intercontinental

ballistic missiles, and those missiles,

the only way you stop them is with

that ground-based defense. And so

we’re going to freeze the number of

those ground-based defenses, but that’s

not all that we’re cutting.

What we’re also going to do is, we’re

going to stop the kinetic kill. Is that in

the reentry aspect? Is that what that

was for, or is that a different part?

So what’s happening,

though, are they cutting the funding

for the airborne laser, also?

So, in other words, what

we’re doing is we’ve got the three

stages where you can shoot at a missile:

when the missile is being

launched, which is in some ways the

place where the missile is most vulnerable

and where you turn it into junk, it

falls on the country that launched it at

you. Then you’ve got the mid-course

and we’re limiting that. And then

you’ve got the reentry part of it. So

what you’re saying is we’re doing some

serious cuts in all of those areas.

And so here you have Iran just this

morning launches this, and their technology

is moving fast, moved to solid

rocket, multiple stage. They’re busy

putting the centrifuges together to

make the nuclear devices. Let’s take a

look at what a range of 1,200 miles

would mean.

Here from Iran, as you come out in

these circles, what you are saying is,

first of all, you can hit all of Israel,

and second of all, you can threaten sort

of the southwest part of Europe with

that range missile. Is that correct, gentleman

from Arizona?

And yet our President has

negotiated away, from what we know,

putting the radar that we need and the

battery of missiles to protect Europe

and eastern United States.

I’m going to reluctantly

recognize the gentleman from Utah.

He’s been bringing a lot of bad news tonight,

but still I guess we better know

what the truth is.

Reclaiming my time, now

you’re stopping the preaching and getting

on to meddling.

What you’re saying is in the first five

weeks that this Congress met, we

passed this porkulous bill or stimulus

bill or whatever you want to call it at

$800-something billion, and you’re talking

about cutting missile defense by

less than $2 billion. Did I understand

the number correctly?

So we’re talking about

less than 1 percent, a minuscule part of

our defense, to protect our cities from

being turned into dust. I don’t understand

the logic of that.

Also, this is a North Korean ballistic

missile threat. So it’s not just Iran,

and Iran threatening Europe. We’re

also talking about North Korea developing

longer and longer-range missiles,

and as they stack more—as you have

said before, you take these solid rocket

motors and you stack them up into

multiple stages. You get the velocity

to get the distance to start threatening

the continental United States from

North Korea. And he hasn’t shown any

signs of backing off. He’s still busy

making nuclear weapons and still busy

working on his warheads. And even if

he doesn’t use them, he wants to sell

them to other people. So why would we

want to be cutting our missile defense

at this time? It just seems like about

insanity.

I yield to the gentleman.

So we’re talking out of

both sides of our mouth here again.

What you are saying is, on the one

hand, they’re saying we need more

testing, and second of all, they’re cutting

the budget so we can’t test.

It just comes back out to

the same thing. There’s this hostility

to developing the defense that we need

to protect our homeland, and the excuses

that it won’t work have been

proven—test after test, these things

are working extremely well, and the

fact is that if there’s any function of

this Congress that we should be paying

attention to, it’s protecting our own

citizens. And so I just find it impossible

to understand the decisions that

are being made in cutting the missile

defense.

I don’t think that’s the right thing to

do. I can certainly say that on the

Armed Services Committee, I will not

vote to cut missile defense.

And I would yield back to my friend

from Utah, Congressman BISHOP.