

duty to control the traffic. It was in Mariemont. He saw a car with a woman slumped over the wheel, and he pulled into action.

He put his body over the top of the car, rolled onto the passenger door. An unknown bystander stood there, helped him get into the car, and pulled up the emergency brake. He dumped the woman over and drove the car away from the crowd of participants and the crowd of runners.

I have no idea how many potential lives Officer Lewis saved. It could have been me, it could have been my husband and my brother-in-law standing there cheering me on at that spot, or my dear friends that were there. Who knows?

It's interesting because, in a local news broadcast back in Cincinnati, Officer Keith Lewis refused to be called a hero—he is a hero in my book—because he said he was doing just what he was trained to do.

Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully disagree with Officer Lewis. That man is a hero, and the bystander that helped him is a hero, too. Their selfless actions possibly saved countless lives and injuries. Who knows?

I am honored, Mr. Speaker, and privileged to represent folks like Officer Lewis and that bystander in Cincinnati. Thank you, Officer Lewis, for your dedication and your outstanding commitment to public service. Thank you for protecting us, the runners, the bystanders, and the volunteers. You helped make the Cincinnati Flying Pig, once again, a great, great marathon. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes. (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ETHICS AND NO-BID CONTRACTS

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

Mr. FLAKE. Tomorrow, I plan to offer a privileged resolution regarding earmarks and campaign contributions. This will be the eighth such resolution that has been offered.

The House leadership maintains that this privileged resolution is a blunt instrument and that the Ethics Committee is not designed to deal with issues of this magnitude. Let me be the first to concede the point. These resolutions are a blunt instrument, and the House Ethics Committee is not designed to deal with issues of this magnitude. But it's the only instrument we've got.

Here's the problem. Many of the earmarks that have been recently approved by the House represent no-bid contracts to private companies. In

many cases, executives at the private companies and the lobbyists who represent them have turned around, have made large campaign contributions to the Members who secured these no-bid contracts for them.

It would seem to me that overly burdening the House Ethics Committee should be the least of our worries here.

We're informed that with the PMA investigation, the Justice Department is looking into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions. The Justice Department just indicted former Governor Blagojevich, in part, based on allegations of official acts promised in exchange for campaign contributions. And we're worried about overburdening the House Ethics Committee?

Let me repeat. The House just awarded hundreds of millions of dollars in the form of no-bid contracts to companies whose executives and their lobbyists turned around and contributed tens of thousands of dollars to Members of Congress who secured those no-bid contracts. It seems to me that concerns about overly burdening the Ethics Committee are misplaced.

I want to applaud members of the Democratic freshman class who have now been subjected to intense pressure from their leadership. These freshmen came to this body with the bright and untarnished respect for the institution. The curtain has now been pulled back and my guess is they don't like what they see. I know just how they feel.

I think that they know that the ability of Members of Congress to award no-bid contracts to private companies whose executives and lobbyists turn around and give them campaign contributions cannot be explained, let alone justified.

I think that these freshmen and other supporters of this resolution fully understand that these privileged resolutions are an unwieldy instrument, but that the process these resolutions are attempting to expose is not being addressed in any other substantive fashion.

As for myself, I have been asked why I don't just file an ethics complaint against an individual. This is not about any one individual. This is not about any one party. The practice of awarding no-bid contracts to private companies whose executives turn around and make contributions to those Members who secured the no-bid contract or earmark goes on in both political parties. Consequently, the ethical cloud that hangs over this body rains on Republicans and Democrats alike.

This is not about retribution. I feel much the same about this issue as the President feels about enhanced interrogations or torture. Let's move on. But let's move on into a world in which we understand that awarding no-bid contracts to private companies whose executives and lobbyists turn around and make campaign contributions to the Member of Congress who secured the no-bid contract is neither right nor proper.

Now, some may say that these concerns are addressed in the earmark reforms that have already been adopted. This is simply untrue. Among the tens of thousands of earmark requests that have been made for the coming fiscal year are thousands of no-bid contracts for private companies.

I'm planning to give notice, as I mentioned, of another privileged resolution tomorrow, but I'm prepared to hold off asking for a vote on the resolution next week if the House leadership is willing to put a stop to the practice of awarding no-bid contracts for private companies.

The ball is in the court of the House leadership. If they want to continue to defend the practice of giving no-bid contracts to private companies whose executives and their lobbyists turn around and make campaign contributions to those Members who secure the no-bid contracts, then I suppose we'll have to continue to use this blunt instrument.

Mr. Speaker, we owe this institution far better than we're giving it. Let's treat this Congress with the same respect and reverence that it deserves.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1728, MORTGAGE REFORM AND ANTI-PREDATORY LENDING ACT

Mr. ARCURI, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-98) on the resolution (H. Res. 406) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1728) to amend the Truth in Lending Act to reform consumer mortgage practices and provide accountability for such practices, to provide certain minimum standards for consumer mortgage loans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MISSILE DEFENSE

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. It's a pleasure to be able to join you this nice spring afternoon. On a somewhat different subject than we have talked about in the last several weeks, the subject we're going to be dealing with for the next hour is the subject of missile defense.

It's a rather interesting story. It involves some history. It also involves some very interesting sort of political wheeling and dealing between various nations, and it is of particular interest to us because it is the subject of defending our homeland and our lives.

The story starts, at least as my memory allows, going back some years, back to a thing called the Antiballistic Missile, the ABM Treaty of 1972. That was an agreement between a number of

different nations not to develop a missile defense.

Now what does that mean exactly? What it means is different nations were putting together two pieces of technology. The first was the ability to make missiles. That was started at my old alma mater, actually, by a guy by the name of Robert Goddard, who was an experimenter, and he was doing experiments like you might see kids do to make model rockets and things.

So people started to realize that you could put a weapon on the end of a missile and could shoot it at your enemy.

□ 1645

That idea had been done with sky-rockets before that with just black powder. The Chinese did that, to some degree, and they even used them on Fort McHenry. But this was a new development, and this was coupled with the idea of these nuclear warheads.

The nuclear warhead put a whole new different meaning on things, because it was such a powerful weapon that if you could put a nuclear warhead onto a missile and then shoot that at your enemy, you didn't even have to be too accurate, even, and it would cause tremendous damage.

So as I was just graduating from engineering school, what was going on was that we had negotiated a treaty with the Soviet Union called the ABM treaty in 1972, and what it said was that we were not going to defend ourselves from nuclear missiles.

Now, that is kind of a crazy idea in a way, because the job of a nation is to defend their own populace. The main job that we have in Congress, if you were to say, what is your main job? One of the main things needs to be to defend America, to defend our homeland. Yet this treaty said: We agree that we are not going to defend ourselves. In fact, the whole thing was called MAD, and indeed it was mad, Mutually Assured Destruction. If you shoot a nuclear weapon at us, we'll shoot one back at you. Everybody melts down and everybody loses.

So the theory is that that will create stability. Well, it was not so clear it was going to create stability, because if one guy could shoot first and take the other guy down, then it was not such a good thing not to be able to defend yourself.

And so it was that we went through a number of decades from the early seventies with this philosophy of mutually assured destruction. And it was really challenged in 1983 by Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan started doing some thinking and saying there has got to be a better way to do this thing than to have the Soviets and the Chinese aiming all these missiles at us, and they could melt down our different cities. So he came up with the idea of what was called SDI, Strategic Defense Initiative. He spoke at some length and did a very good job selling the idea that America should be looking at defending ourselves from these weapons.

One of the things that most people didn't know and that he educated the American public on was the fact that a foreign nation could shoot a missile from one continent to the other. We could see it on the radar coming in. We would say: New York City, you have half an hour before you're turned into dust, into a nuclear cinder, and there wasn't a thing we could do about it.

So Ronald Reagan said, there has got to be a better way to skin the cat than that and so he came up with the Strategic Defense Initiative. His detractors called it Star Wars, which actually didn't hurt from a marketing point of view. So Ronald Reagan talked about the different technologies that could be deployed in order to try to stop one of these incoming missiles.

That became kind of a hallmark of one of the things that Republicans stood for was missile defense, and it was one of the things that the Democrats decided they were against. They didn't like missile defense. Well, why was it they didn't like it? They had two reasons: One, it wouldn't work. And, two, it was too expensive. Also, they said it would destabilize relations between the countries, as though they were so stable during the Cold War period.

So that is what happened in 1983. Ronald Reagan made that proposal. It wasn't until actually many years later when I got to Congress, in 2002, that President Bush decided that it was time to move forward on this thing and protect our country. So he proposed and actually initiated the changes to give notice to the different countries that were involved in the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and said: You've got your 6 months' notice. We're going to start developing missile defense.

Now, that gives us a little bit of the background. I am joined here today and I am greatly honored to be able to have one of the outstanding experts in the U.S. Congress here on missile defense joining me on the floor, and that is my good friend, TRENT FRANKS from Arizona.

We are going to hear what TRENT has to say and kind of get into this subject. We are going to be joined by other Congressmen talking about something that is so fundamentally simple that it is very hard for me to understand how anybody could be opposed to our government defending our citizens from nuclear weapons.

I would now yield time to my friend from Arizona, Congressman FRANKS. Thank you for joining us.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. It is my honor to join you, Congressman AKIN. I thank my friend from Missouri for the work that you do not only on this area but so many others. You are a man committed to doing what is right for America and making sure that future generations have a little more time to walk in the sunlight of freedom. I have a great deal of respect and appreciation for all that you do and for who you are. It is my honor to be here with you.

I think that you stated so many things so effectively that it is hard for me to add to the fundamental premise. But as you said, there was once a time not so many years ago when America and the free world faced a Soviet Union that was armed with massive stockpiles of weapons that are the most dangerous weapons that have ever really entered the arsenal of mankind, ballistic missiles that can travel several thousand miles an hour and can deliver warheads that can decimate an entire city or even potentially interrupt the electrical systems of entire nations.

It is a very daunting challenge indeed. And you again laid out so well that we adopted this strategy of mutually assured destruction not because we really wanted to, but because we didn't have much alternative. We really embraced this grim equation that if the Soviet Union launched their missiles and killed our men, women, and children across our cities, that we could launch a counterstrike almost simultaneously, even before their missiles landed, that would do the same thing to their nation. And that was something that was so repugnant and so horrifying to all of us that it created this grim kind of an understanding between us that we wouldn't shoot each other because we knew that it meant sudden and horrifying death to both of our nations.

I suppose one could say, given the fact that we didn't blow each other to atoms, that there was some efficacy to the strategy. And, ironically, it still is the centerpiece of our own strategy to deter aggression on our homeland. A nation that knows that if they attack the United States with nuclear missiles, that we can calculate that trajectory. We know where they live and that we have a response capability second to none, and that we can respond in ways that are totally unacceptable to them. It is such an important subject.

Mr. AKIN. Let me just interrupt a second because you've brought up a couple of really interesting points.

The first one, I remember starting to have some interest in politics, and I was really skeptical of the idea of even negotiating that treaty, because what we found was the Soviet Union cheated on all of their treaties. As we look now, as the Soviet Union has collapsed, we find they were busy cheating on this thing all the way along. So we were kind of really out there, weren't we, with this ABM treaty not having any defensive capability.

The second thing I would just mention is, now, the equation has changed, hasn't it? It is not just one or two nations. Now we are starting to look at a different scenario, aren't we?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. We really are. What has changed it so dramatically the fundamental aspect that Ronald Reagan put forward, that it is much better to defend our citizens than to avenge them. But what has changed so much, Congressman AKIN, is that now

we are in a world where the coincidence of Jihadist terrorism and nuclear proliferation could change the concept of our freedom and of every calculation that we have made for homeland security, because they can no longer be deterred.

When we were dealing with the Soviet Union, we placed our security to some degree in their sanity. We recognized that they wanted to live, they wanted their nation to continue. And that was a tremendous impetus on their part to try to work with us, to try to keep it safe.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, they had a nation-state; and they knew that if they launched at us, the thing was, we might launch back at them.

But now you're talking about a terrorist that may not have a nation-state. That is a different formula. Isn't it?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. It is absolutely a different formula. Not only do we have rogue states and, really, non-state players, as you say, that don't have that risk that a nation-state does, but we have a different mindset. That is the part that frightens me the most. A terrorist that will cut someone's head off, while they are tied down in front of a television camera while the victim screams for mercy, with a hacksaw blade, we had better be very thankful that that hacksaw blade is not a nuclear capability. Because that kind of intent, that kind of a mindset that literally has been demonstrated to be willing to kill their own children in order to kill our children is the thing that frightens me the most, that intent.

Mr. AKIN. So what you are talking about is we are not only dealing with something that is not a nation-state, but we are also dealing with a different frame of mind, a different calculus on the value of life. You are talking about, if nuclear weapons fall into the hands of people that have this mindset, this whole thing is really a game changer.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. It really is, Congressman, because the reality is that this mindset cannot be deterred. This whole notion of mutually assured destruction was a deterrence strategy, and I am not sure that Jihad can be deterred.

There are really two factors to every threat to individuals or to nations, and that is the intent of your enemy and the capacity of your enemy. In this case, the Soviet Union had tremendous capacity, but their intent was tempered by their desire to survive themselves. You could even say that many of the Soviet people had a desire to see people live and let live. Their government wasn't quite of that mindset. But now we face an enemy that is committed to the destruction of the western world. And if they gain the capacity to proceed, I am afraid that my children and yours will potentially see the day of nuclear terrorism.

Mr. AKIN. Then is the only threat sort of the radical Islamic threat? Be-

cause it seems to me that North Korea also poses a threat.

Am I mistaken on that?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. North Korea, in my judgment, is the least free nation on Earth. This is a nation that has just a completely inhumane mindset in their government, and I am not sure that we recognize just how dangerous that country is.

Ironically, the Soviets—well, not the Soviets now. The Russians—I have to be careful; a lot has changed—the Soviet Union collapsed on itself. But there is still some remnants of that Cold War mentality. They assured America that it would be 20 years before Iran could launch an ICBM capability, and they assured us many years ago that North Korea was far from being able to produce a nuclear capability. But that happened much more quickly than we realized. And, as you know, North Korea just launched an additional test that went twice as far as their first one did. They have nuclear warheads now.

Mr. AKIN. You are giving us a lot of valuable information. You are saying North Korea now has conducted missile tests. The missile, of course, is a delivery system. And the most recent test that they shot just a couple weeks ago went all the way over Japan and went some considerable distance, twice as far as their previous test. So the range of their missiles is going farther. Not only that, they are equipping the missile, or they can equip the missile, with a nuclear warhead, and our understanding is that they are busy developing that nuclear capability. Is that correct, to the best of our intelligence?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. You have got it exactly correct. One of the key technical challenges of an ICBM is the ability to keep the missile stable during staging, where one stage drops off, and the missile can become unstable in that situation. In this last test, North Korea demonstrated that capability, and that to me from a technical perspective was the most frightening aspect of it.

I will say this on the floor of the House of Representatives. I believe that North Korea represents a potential threat to the homeland of the United States and that when the next missile from North Korea gets over international waters, that the United States and its allies should do what they can to shoot that missile down for a couple of reasons: To demonstrate our resolve. But, more importantly, to keep them from being able to demonstrate to their potential customers that they now have perfected missile technology that they can sell to potential nations or even rogue states or just groups like al Qaeda that could use this in a way that would be very devastating to the country.

I am very concerned about that. We must not let them demonstrate to the world that kind of capacity. They have already shown that they are willing to sell this technology. They were the

ones primarily who gave Iran their missile technology. Iran now has surpassed North Korea in missile capability, and yet they probably would not have been anywhere close to where they are had it not been for North Korea.

Mr. AKIN. So North Korea sold some of the technology to Iran. But Iran has then been able to develop it more rapidly even than North Korea, perhaps because they have more money to put into the project. I don't know.

So now you have got North Korea and Iran both that we consider that the leadership is highly unstable in those countries, and they have the capability, or are rapidly developing the capability, of projecting a missile either into Europe or even potentially onto the continental United States with a nuclear warhead on it.

□ 1700

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, that is correct. I believe that there is no greater danger to the peace of the human family today than a nuclear Iran—I think they are even more dangerous than North Korea. And ironically, if North Korea was able to give Iran missile technology, how is it that we would forget that they could certainly give them warhead technology if they need it, or even a warhead?

So I am really concerned that the world in general must recognize the danger that we face, both with a nuclear North Korea—which is already de facto now, this has happened—and with an Iran that is working with missile technology that, before long, they are working with solid propellants. And I believe that they can range parts of the United States even now. And I believe that an Iranian missile poses a profound threat to the country and to the world.

But even more so, probably the point I would make most strenuously is that an Iranian nuclear program means that an Islamist nation now has their finger on the nuclear button. And they have that technology in their hands where they could pass it along to terrorist groups where they don't even need a missile, where all they need is a Volkswagen to carry it across our border, or a small aircraft, anything. There is a lot of danger there.

Mr. AKIN. That is a scary thought. Thank you. And we will get back to the Congressman, as the expert.

We are also joined by some other wonderful patriots and people who have been paying some attention to this subject as well.

Congressman COFFMAN from Colorado, I would be happy to yield you some time. What is your thought on this? I want you to be part of our conversation here this afternoon.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you, Congressman AKIN.

I was just in a discussion with the Armed Services Committee, which we both sit on. And it is interesting that the discussion today was on missile defense, and that those who were opposed

to saying that missile defense is a strategy, wish to rely on the Cold War strategy of mutually assured destruction.

I think the problem with that strategy—

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I want to be very direct here. This has really been a very partisan debate, hasn't it?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Yes. And it surprises me. I am not sure why or the origins of the partisanship.

Mr. AKIN. I think it was a Ronald Reagan thing. But this has been a straight Democrats one way, Republicans the other for many, many years. But that is starting to change some, isn't it?

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Well, there is some thawing of that, some signals of change. But certainly the majority still fall, unfortunately, on the other side of this issue. And the thinking is that nation states will behave rationally and that they will not attack the United States because the United States could in fact retaliate in kind, and that their nation would be destroyed.

The difficulty, I think, with that is if we look at a nation state like Iran gaining nuclear weapons capability, if we look at Pakistan, should the government be destabilized and fall into radical Islamist hands, will those nation states behave in a rational way? Will North Korea continue to behave in a rational way?

Mr. AKIN. It is hard to understand that mindset for me after September 11 to say that somebody is going to behave rationally, that you are going to assume, you are going to bet your city that somebody is going to behave rationally. And that is an interesting question.

We are also joined by a good friend of mine, Congressman BISHOP, who wants to be part of the conversation as well, from Utah. And I want to include you in the conversation, too.

Thank you for your good work on these questions and willingness to take on some areas that some people don't want to think about or debate or discuss, just want to say it won't work and these people will never be mean to us, they will never go after one of our cities. I yield time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for allowing me to be part of this.

I am probably the oldest guy here right now; I've got the white hair. I grew up in the era when our missile defense was "duck and cover." I was one of those elementary kids that had to hide under the desk, except I only lived a block and a half away from the school, so I got to run home as long as I could run home soon enough. And I was dumb enough to realize I should have just filled out my time so I could go play, but I didn't, I actually ran home.

Somehow, I think we have moved past the idea that our defense of this

country is merely hiding under a desk. This is the defense of this country, as has been mentioned by my good friends from Colorado and Arizona, who know a whole lot more about this. And you have probably said some of the things I am going to say, so if I am repeating it, just nod your head and I will move on, but just know I am reinforcing and agreeing with the comments that happen to be here.

It is significant that the commission with former Defense Secretary Schlesinger and Perry both said the same thing, we still need a strong military defense for what North Korea can do. If Iran is already testing the ability of exploding something at the apex of the trajectory, we know we need some kind of defense system against that. It is common sense that we have. And for us to really talk about cutting \$1.4 billion from this defense system is a frightening concept.

Let me just go into the weeds with one last area. In my area, we do the solid rocket motors for the ICBM. This is the last year for the Minuteman III propulsion system that they will make any more solid rocket motors. There will still be some maintenance to it, but it is the last time we do anything that is associated with that large-scale fleet.

This becomes a very specialized manufacturing line. Now, one of the problems is, as soon as you let go of that line, we no longer have the expertise if we wanted to bring it back. And the biggest problem we face in this country, especially with defense, is in our manufacturing base. In the sixties, when we started doing the F-16s and these missiles, and a whole bunch of other things, and our NASA space program, we had some exciting new things this country was doing that brought the best and the brightest into our manufacturing sector that thought these things through. If we only build one airplane every 20 years, if we decide not to try and improve on our system and simply maintain what we have, where are the best and the brightest going to go and where will that expertise and creativity when we need it take place? Because what we are doing is not for today. If the North Koreans attacked us, we have a defense today. I am talking about 15 years from now and 20 years from now. You don't just restart up again. Twenty years from now, our defense and our diplomacy options will be defined by the decisions we make today, this year in this bill with this particular area.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, you are talking about the fact that we are going to be cutting missile defense. There are going to be cuts to this program. And the question is, is that a good strategy given the light of what's going on? Now, if the only people you are dealing with is the Soviet Union or the former Soviet Union, that is, Russia and China, that is one thing. But we are not dealing with that anymore.

I appreciate your perspective. I hope you will stick with us a little bit.

What I would like to do is get back to our technical expert here, Congressman FRANKS. And I would like to get into the weeds just a little bit further because people need to understand that every missile is not a missile, they have different ranges and they require a different response. And so when we start taking a look at our modern missile defense system, it basically is done in pieces and layers.

I would like to turn to my good friend from Arizona, and let's talk a little bit about the first way we break things down, which is the boost phase; the midcourse is that the missile is actually at times up in space; and then the reentry as it is coming down. And we treat those differently because there are different vulnerabilities. And we have actually started to build weapons that work—even though people said you can't do it and it won't work, we have these two missiles that have the capability now, which we have tested, where they are coming together, going 15,000 miles an hour closing velocity. And we don't just have one missile hitting another missile, we have one missile hitting a spot on another missile.

One of those missiles is pictured here to my left. This is called the ground-based missile. This is our longest, most powerful missile. And it can stop a missile launch from another continent from more than 10,000 miles away. It can see it coming—not this missile, but the system that goes with it—see the missile coming, has time to casually get up to speed, go out across the ocean, and intercept that missile with no explosion whatsoever, closing velocities of 15,000 miles an hour. Now, some of you might consider what it's like to have a car accident; two cars going 100 miles an hour coming down a highway and hitting head to head. Now, that's a nasty car wreck. But that is just one-twentieth or less than what we are talking about here.

I would like to call my friend from Arizona to give us the logic of how these things work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. AKIN. I would yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Thank you.

I couldn't help but overhear some of the comments that have been made here. And I am compelled to respond in support of the strength that we must continue to have in the air, on the ground, our ground troops, our naval, our cyberspace efforts, which have, by the way, not been as—we continue to have our systems penetrated by folks who are not authorized to do so. And so that is going to be a fight that we have to continue.

And lastly, but not least, the Star Wars issue, missile defense. I hear folks often mention that there is no need for certain things because the Cold War is over. A lot of folks really want that to be the case, but unfortunately in the

annals of human history thus far, we have always had to prepare for Attila the Hun or someone who wants to take over the whole world and do it by force. America cannot assume that there will never be another Cold War or another situation like December 7, 1941, sneak attack that we weren't quite ready for.

And so I fully support our efforts to continue to engage in research and development because we have got to continue to be, for our freedom, as a Nation—we would be shirking our responsibilities.

Mr. AKIN. Well, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that common sense. We have just seen people who are too willing to use terrorism as a tool for us to assume that we can just relax and not defend ourselves. It just doesn't seem to make any common sense.

And I completely agree with your comments. But I had yielded to the gentleman from Arizona to try to get a little bit of the technical thing. And we will also hear from a good friend of mine, Congressman LAMBORN, who is great on this subject, also, from Colorado. But I want to go to my friend from Arizona first just to get the mechanisms of how this works.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, I appreciate, first of all, the gentleman's comments about history. Ever since mankind took up weapons against his fellow human beings, there has always been a defensive response to an offensive capability, whether it was the spear and the shield or whether it was bullets and armor; I mean, it has always happened that way. And yet there are those today that would debate whether we need a defense against the most dangerous weapon that has ever come into the arsenal of mankind, which is a ballistic nuclear missile.

As Mr. AKIN said, the primary divisions of missile defense are as follows; we have the boost phase, which is where potential enemy missile is coming off of the launch pad—or it doesn't have to be a launch pad, it is just where it is beginning its flight. This is the most vulnerable stage for an enemy missile. And this is, in my judgment, where we need to do everything that we can to make sure that we have the capability.

One of the tragic things about the defense budget—that looks like it is going to be put forth here, Mr. AKIN—is that they are cutting one of our main boost-phase systems, the airborne laser. I believe laser will some day be to missile defense what the computer chip was to the computer industry because it travels at Mach 870,000. It is very, very fast. It can reach anywhere on the globe, if the reflections are properly made, in a second.

Mr. AKIN. So just reclaiming my time, what you are talking about—and I am a little bit of one of these Popular Science-type guys, it is sort of interesting—one of the strategies that uses what I described, you shoot a missile at a missile, and both of them are traveling, and you have to wait until your

missile gets there to do something. And the trouble with that is it takes time. And what you are talking about is boost phase. How many seconds is boost phase typically?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, boost phase can be several seconds. To give you an example: Say a missile left—well, let's say Russia now, because they have the largest arsenal of missiles. I don't suggest that they are going to be our biggest danger. It would probably take somewhere between 28 and 31 minutes for that missile to arrive. And its longest stage is the boost stage. And this is the opportunity that if we have the airborne laser or if we have what we call the kinetic energy interceptor or, in some cases, in the future, where we are coming up with faster missiles that could even be shot off of our ships, so we could potentially catch those missiles in their boost phase. With airborne laser, it could get six inches off the platform and we could destroy it.

Mr. AKIN. You are getting to the point. A laser is like a flashlight; if you could aim it at the right thing and hit it, you don't have to wait for anything; whereas a missile, even if it's a fast one, you still have to wait for it.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Right. And the characteristics of the laser are that it has exactly parallel sides, and it can be a directed energy that you can increase almost without bound, depending on the focus of the energy.

□ 1715

Mr. AKIN. So then if you catch it in boost phase. The other thing is it's really fragile, isn't it? I mean, it's got all of these gadgets and tanks of pressurized fuel. You don't have to do much to it, and it gets it all confused. It just literally blows right over the enemy's territory and they get to do the clean-up.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. That's right. What you do is you use the fuel of the missile to blow it up.

Of course, there are other ways. Even if you're not shooting at a fuel tank on a missile, if you hit it with laser and damage the outer casing of the missile, you can cause it to become aerodynamically unstable and fly to pieces at that speed.

Mr. AKIN. So, now, that's the boost phase. But I want to jump over to the gentleman from Colorado here.

Congressman LAMBORN, I appreciate your work on this and also your concern for our country. Please jump in.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. AKIN. I really appreciate what Representative FRANKS and what Representatives COFFMAN and BISHOP have also contributed to this important dialogue. Thank you for your leadership in setting up this time.

And I like what our friend across the aisle, Representative JOHNSON, was saying as well. We really have to use this technology in this day and age more than ever, and it's of a great concern to all of us here, I'm sure, that the

Obama administration is proposing a \$1.4 billion cut in missile defense funding for the next fiscal year. And as Representative FRANKS has mentioned, airborne laser is one of the things that's on the chopping block. Two other things that are on the chopping block: one is the Multiple Re-Entry Kill Vehicle. That's where we send up a missile that has multiple kinetic interceptors on it that could take out even a decoy or several decoys if they're using countermeasures and take out multiple incoming rounds and get the warhead that's hidden among a number. That's the Multiple Kill Vehicle. And to cut the funding for the research of that right now when we know that the bad guys are developing this capability is really a bad decision.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, let's develop that a little bit and go back over to some of our other experts here on this.

The first thing is the airborne laser, and let's describe that a little bit. First of all, I actually was onboard the plane that's going to be the first plane that carries it. It's like Air Force One. It's a huge aircraft with these multiple, multiple tires on the landing gear and everything, and it's full of some very high-tech equipment. And the purpose of this thing is to shoot a laser, as I understand it, and it hits that fragile missile on the boost phase.

Now, Congressman FRANKS, is it true that that's what is being targeted in the budget that we are going to get rid of that thing that we've spent all of this money on? We're supposed to fire it for the first time this summer. Are they really going to cut that thing?

I yield.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. The airborne laser program is more than one aircraft, but they're doing everything they can to decimate the budget there. It is potentially possible even under the Obama administration budget that we will be able to maintain the one aircraft, which is a 747-400B aircraft with a chemical iodine laser aboard. And it has three different lasers. One's an aiming laser, one's a compensating laser, and one is a kill laser. And this is one of the most advanced mechanisms that we have in our entire arsenal, and it will do so much to build the entire technology if we can show that it's effective.

Mr. AKIN. Could you imagine if we had a bunch of those planes traveling around? Any nutcase that wants to shoot a missile with a nuclear device on it, we just poke a hole in it and plop it and it will just fall down. I mean, we could protect incredible numbers of human beings with that kind of technology. I don't understand why we would want to cut that.

But the gentleman from Colorado would like to jump in.

Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado. Thank you, Congressman AKIN. I think that Congressman FRANKS is right in discussing that this administration is de-emphasizing missile defense at the

very time when we need it the most in the uncertain age, international environment, security environment that we're coming into. And I think to say that, well, if we develop it anyway, they will develop the capability to overwhelm the system I think presupposes that we're not going to be able to continue to improve technology as we always have been.

Mr. AKIN. We've heard that before, that you can't do it, and it turned out you can do it.

Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate everything that has been said. And, Mr. AKIN, I appreciate your using this time especially with the expertise of those on the subcommittee to try to explain to the House exactly the details of what we are talking about because too often we slosh over this. I know I don't know the details as much as I can. What I do know, of course, is that Russia, even though it may not be our biggest threat, is driving much of our decisions and they're totally revamping their ICBM program: by 2016, 80 percent new missiles.

And the key element here by everything is still the concept of the deterrent. There are a lot of people asking why are we investing in this kind of stuff when we might not ever use it. And that's the wrong question. The right question is, When is that deterrent used? And the answer to that is, every day, whether we actually fire anything or not.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, that is an incredibly important point you just made. People are asking the wrong question. It's not whether we're using it because, as a deterrent, every day we protect ourselves, we are using it. Is that what you said?

I yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. AKIN, I appreciate that and I can't claim credit. I stole that line from the commission, who gave their report today. That is what they have said. A deterrent if it's effective is in use every day, and that's still important. I wish I could claim credit for having come up with it, but I stole it. It's still true.

Mr. AKIN. I am going to yield to my friend from Colorado, Congressman LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. AKIN, the other thing that's proposed to be cut by this \$1.4 billion slashing of our missile defense program by the Obama administration, unless Congress stands up and restores that funding, and I think we're going to work to try to get both sides of the aisle hopefully to accomplish that, but that is we are going to cut the number of interceptors. We're going to just stop where they're at now.

We have a couple of dozen interceptors in Alaska and California. And North Korea is testing intercontinental missiles they say for the purpose of putting up satellites, but no one believes them. And right when they're developing that capability, this is the

wrong time to say we've made our last interceptor, we're not going to build any more. The timing is bad. And yet that's what this Obama budget cut will result in.

Mr. AKIN. Reclaiming my time, I am concerned at a number of different things as it relates to missile defense that the current administration is doing. One thing we are doing is cutting the airborne laser. Another thing is this multiple warhead re-entry situation where we basically gave or sold the Chinese the technology of being able to send a missile up and then have the warhead split into parts and those parts targeting different things. So that's a more complicated target to stop, and we're giving up the technology to do that. But then we're also, in some sort of a diplomacy thing, going over to Putin and telling him we're not going to deploy missile defense in Europe to protect Europe and the eastern seaboard. That doesn't make sense to me either.

And I would like to go back to my friend from Arizona. Help us out with some of these things because this just doesn't add up, my friend.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. You mentioned two key things. Congressman LAMBORN mentioned the GBI, the Ground-Based Interceptors, with our GMD, our Ground-Based Midcourse system. This was meant to have 44 interceptors. The Obama administration said we will build no more than 30. And, of course, at that point then the system could atrophy and we may not even sustain it. But it is the only system that we have. I want to emphasize this. GMD is the only system that we have in the United States capable of defending us against incoming ICBMs.

Mr. AKIN. That's this missile right here. Am I correct in that?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Yes, that's the GBI.

Mr. AKIN. We have how many silver bullets like this right now?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Right now we're scheduled to build a total of 30. We have around, I think the Congressman is correct, around 26 or 28 in the ground now.

Mr. AKIN. I thought I remembered 24 but—

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. But we're saying that we will build no more than—

Mr. AKIN. So that's it. We have got 26 or 28 silver bullets here, but that's about all we've got in case somebody shoots an intercontinental. That means more than 10,000 miles. It means it's going up pretty high. You have got to have a big missile to stop a big missile.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Those are not only fast missiles and not only do they have a very complex DACS, they call it, which essentially what we do here is we take our sensors and we run them directly into the incoming missile and the kinetic energy destroys the incoming missile.

But the reality is that in many cases we would want to shoot more than one

of our interceptors at an incoming missile to make sure that we have the best chance of hitting it. Sometimes it can be two or three to one or even more. So this is a capability of maybe stopping as many as 10 or 12 incoming missiles. And that's not that many. We have a limited capability against a growing threat, and GMD is the only thing that we have that will protect our homeland against ICBMs at this time.

Mr. AKIN. I really appreciate having you here just to clarify and give us the detail on some of these points, Congressman FRANKS.

Congressman BISHOP, I thought I remembered that you were a little tight on time, and I would yield to you if you would like to clarify some points that you were making.

You were saying that some of these solid rocket motors are actually made in your district and that we're basically losing our industrial base capability to try to continue building some of these things, and that's, of course, worrisome as well.

I yield.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. You're exactly right. They were made in our district. We are done with that phase right now. The problem is what do we do for the future?

And I actually would like to ask any of my colleagues right here, when Secretary Gates announced his blueprint for this budget, that was the very day that North Korea fired another long-range missile test that endangered Japan. And I would like somebody to express is this a legitimate fear for us. Is that something for which we should be concerned? And what approach is the best for this kind of future threat that comes from North Korea?

Mr. AKIN. I would go back to our resident expert, Congressman FRANKS.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Well, in all the ways in the past, what we have tried to do is to say what is the capacity of our enemy, what is the intent? When we are talking about enemies like North Korea and enemies like Iran, we're not completely clear of their intent. Some of their goals are rather irrational and sometimes they've acted very irrationally. So the only wise thing for us to do for our people is to make sure that we have the capacity to meet that threat. They are now gaining the capacity to have missiles that can range the United States, and we need to make sure that we can meet that threat. We have a limited capability now, but if we back away now, we could be in a situation in the future where we will not have the ability to meet that threat.

Mr. AKIN. We're also joined by another good friend of mine, Congressman TURNER from Ohio.

I would like you to have a chance to be a part of our conversation and discussion because this is something that affects all Americans and it's something that apparently has not been given a high priority budget-wise; so we want to talk a little bit about that.

And I think we could get into the budget a little bit and where we have been spending money if people want to do that.

But I yield to my friend Congressman TURNER, a fine Congressman and great reputation too in the House.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. AKIN. I appreciate your leadership on this and your leadership on the Armed Services Committee, and I want to thank you for doing this this evening. This is such an important issue.

And, Congressman FRANKS, I appreciate his leadership in trying to highlight where we have been, what we've accomplished, and, of course, the threats that we have in front of us.

Many people are not necessarily aware that we have missile defense currently deployed to protect portions of the United States and to respond to some of the threats. It's not a complete shield for the area, and it's certainly something that we moved quickly to deploy in the face of the issue of the threats of North Korea. Our system currently has 26 Ground-Based Interceptors in Alaska and California, 18 Aegis Missile Defense ships, 13 Patriot battalions, and five Ground-Based Radars all supported by satellite-based systems and command and control systems.

The issue here is that this is deployed initially to respond to emerging threats, but it's an incomplete system. It's one we have not fully yet assembled, and it certainly is technology that is emerging. The more that we work with this, the more that we learn, the greater ingenuity that we have and the ability to respond to what are real threats to our country.

As we all look to what Iran is doing and what North Korea is doing, we know that there is a real threat to our country, a real threat to our allies, and a real threat to our interests. So we have to preserve in this budget round our ability to fund the deployment of these systems, the maintenance, the upgrade, the research and development that will help us look to the future as to how do we protect our country and our allies. This is a very important function, and I really appreciate your bringing this to light and all those who are participating.

□ 1730

Mr. AKIN. Well, I appreciate your joining us here and recognizing what we have got going on. You have also mentioned quite a number of other missiles.

And just for some of our colleagues that are involved watching our discussion, and I started at the beginning, there is all different kinds of missiles an enemy can shoot at you. Some of them are little ones, some of them are medium-sized, some of them are big ones, and some of them are really big.

They all have different trajectories. And so depending on the trajectory, we match that with whatever size missile that we need to be cost effective to try to stop something coming.

The picture that we had before is a ground base. This is the big daddy. This is the one for the missiles that are coming over 10,000 miles, but there are a lot of other kinds of missiles. Some of them are more in the 3,000- to 5,000-mile range, and that's where you have our ships, our Aegis-class cruisers and our Arleigh Burke destroyers, with missiles inside these destroyers that they can direct at what's called a ballistic missile, but not an intercontinental ballistic. That's sort of the 3,000 to 5,000 range.

And then you have got your Patriots, that literally we have batteries, those defending a particular area or something like in South Korea, where there is a military base. You have Patriot missiles just defending against short-range North Korea.

So there is quite a range of these different missiles, and I appreciate your bringing that very important point out, and also the fact that this technology is moving and we need to be putting money into it and keeping ahead of the power curve on this; otherwise, we are going to see some one of our cities paying a big price on this kind of thing.

I want to go back to my friend from Colorado, Congressman LAMBORN.

Mr. LAMBORN. Yes, if I could just step back a couple of steps and look at defense spending in general. It's the only department where there are massive cuts being proposed. Everything else in the budget is going up. Social programs are going up, entitlement programs are going up.

Anything you can shake a stick at in our budget is going up, except for defense, and we are living in an increasingly more dangerous world. It's the wrong time to be cutting defense.

We are cutting F-22s. After this next year, we are going to build a few more and they are done, even though the Air Force would love to have many more than the roughly 200 that would be built by then. They wanted close to 400. I know they are expensive per unit, and yet they don't get shot down because they are so much more advanced than anything else existing in the rest of the world.

We can't decide what to do on tankers. Our heavy lift capability is being questioned. Some of our naval ships, classes of naval ships are just being zeroed out completely.

So we have some major defense cuts that are being proposed when everything else is going up in the budget. I don't understand that priority.

The first responsibility of a government is to protect the safety of the citizens living within its territory. So the first responsibility of the U.S. is the defense of our country, and yet we are slashing defense budgets and yet everything else is going up. I just don't understand that way of thinking. It's hard to understand that.

Mr. AKIN. I don't understand it either, but I have got a chart. Unfortunately the printer was down so I

couldn't put it up on the board, but I could just read some numbers off of it.

You go back to 1965, and in 1965 our entitlement spending was between 2 and 3 percent of the budget, of the gross domestic product. It was 2 or 3 percent of gross domestic product was entitlement.

Now that entitlement has gone from the high 2s to 8.4 percent in 2007. So it has gone from a little over 2 to 8.4 percent. That's the entitlement growth. And yet the defense spending, at about '68 or so, was almost 10 percent of GDP, and that's gone all the way down to 4 percent.

So what you are saying in terms of numbers is absolutely true, and that is we have been slashing defense spending over a period of a number of decades and increasing entitlement. Now, maybe there is a good reason to have entitlement spending, but the one thing is sure: If our country gets hit with nuclear weapons, there isn't any security at all if you don't have military security.

I wanted to defer to my friend from Utah, Congressman BISHOP.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I do just want to add one thing, and I am so appreciative of what the last comment by Mr. LAMBORN was, and what you have simply said. We have been talking a great deal in this Congress about jobs. Every one of these programs creates jobs. It creates a work line. It creates the knowledge that we need. Everything Mr. LAMBORN was talking about are jobs. These are critical jobs for our country, and we need to do it.

I appreciate so much the experts here, the ranking member on the committee, Mr. FRANKS, who knows so much about it, your input into this thing, because as I said originally, when I was growing up, our defense was duck and cover. I don't want to have to go back to that.

And if we are not ready to build this program and to multiply and expand what we are doing, I am back to going under desks. And you can see there are only four desks in this room and there are 435 of us, and I am big. There is not enough room for my cover right here. This is essential and important.

Mr. AKIN. That duck and cover and the idea that somehow you can kind of stick your head in a hole like some sort of an ostrich and hope that thing isn't going to land on you, that sort of thing just doesn't work when you start to talk about nuclear weapons.

So I think we have gotten into a little bit of this question about funding. And I find it somehow a little bit cynical when in the first 5 weeks that we met in this Chamber this year we passed this bill to spend \$840 billion, you put that in defense spending, that's equivalent of the average cost of an aircraft carrier. We have 11 aircraft carriers. That would be like building 250 aircraft carriers end to end.

That's how much money we spent in the first 5 weeks, and we are saying that we can't defend ourselves against

these kinds of missiles that are being developed by rogue nations. That, somehow, just doesn't seem to make sense.

And when you see that we have the capability of putting one of these systems into the air like this, and we can basically buy the lives of millions of people in a city for this kind of investment.

Now, I am going to ask my friend from Arizona here, you know, is this a big part of the defense? My understanding is we are only talking about 2 percent of the defense budget to be able to do this to protect our citizens. That doesn't seem like too much. Am I about right on the numbers?

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. No, you are essentially correct. The budget was about \$9.4 billion. It is being cut about a \$1.5 billion and then some of the other systems are being moved around to where the total effective cuts are about \$1.8 billion.

But here's the bottom line. All of the money that we have spent on missile defense is just a little over \$100 billion since we started 25 years ago. And it took almost that much just to clean up after 9/11 hit New York, and 9/11 cost our economy about \$2 trillion.

So if we are talking about being cost-effective here, we should remember that if that attack on New York that morning had been an ICBM with, say, 100-kilo ton warhead, it would have killed maybe 120,000 people instantaneously and half a million more within a couple or 3 weeks.

I am just astonished that we are so shortsighted that now, in this kind of an age that we live in, that we would cut missile defense. And I pray that we don't have to, in some future date, look back on this debate and say how could we have forgotten? If we build a system and we don't need it, then it must have worked.

And I would just say in closing that I will be glad to apologize if we build one that we don't have to use, but I don't want to stand before the Nation and have to apologize to them for failing to building a system that could have protected them.

Mr. AKIN. My good friend from Ohio, Congressman TURNER, please fill in some more of the details here, because you are the person in the committee that's really paying attention to this and we really appreciate your leadership on this.

This is so important, a lot of times I am sure your constituents are on you to do all kinds of things, and they probably don't realize how much time and attention you have to give to some of these issues. But we appreciate you and we are very thankful that the people of Ohio send you here.

Mr. TURNER. Again, I want to thank you for your focus on this because there is an information gap, I think, between our capability of what we are able to do and what the American people know that we can do. So many times when people talk about missile

defense, they remember the past criticisms, that this is a system that would not work, it's an impossible task.

Well, this is a system that not only works, it's deployed. And many people are not aware that we actually have missile defense systems that are deployed for the purposes of protecting the United States from the threat of North Korea. Again, as you and I were discussing, it's an incomplete system in that we have not fully deployed all of the system that's necessary to protect the United States. But, again, this is a system that has not only been tested fully, responds to some of the threats that we have, but it's actually deployed.

Now, it is just the first phase of a system. We have to continue our research, continue the American ingenuity that is so great. The missiles that you have behind you that are able to intercept are so important, again, and technology that people said would not work.

We have other technologies that we need to explore; for example, the airborne laser, being able to take high directed energy and actually apply them to some of the missiles that threaten us. That's the technology that's so important to pursue.

Because as we pursue research and development, as we pursue testing and find out the ways in which we can utilize this, these technologies to protect ourselves, we are going to perfect it. We are going to find the American ingenuity that we all know and apply it in ways that protect our families and our communities and our cities.

Mr. AKIN. There is one thing I promised that I was going to toss in here, and this is something that I don't think people understand. We need to answer this question, and that is, if somebody could smuggle a nuclear weapon into our country, why do we care so much about something on a missile?

And the answer is that when a nuclear weapon is exploded high over a city, the amount of damage it does is hundreds of times what would happen if it were on the ground.

And I think that's something that people forget, that it's a combination of the missile getting the altitude and no problems with security, and then all of a sudden you have this tremendous burst in the air over a city, just wreaks absolute havoc and kills millions of people. I want to make sure you hit that point, because people say, oh, this is a waste because somebody could just bring it in a suitcase. Not so simple. Please talk to that point.

Mr. TURNER. I think the real easy answer as to why we should have missile defense is because our adversaries are so interested in funding missiles, and they obviously see that missiles are a way that they put us at risk because they are investing so heavily in it, in research and technology. And we are seeing in the rogue nations, now North Korea and Iran and their capa-

bilities, the fact that they are reaching for these shows that we need to reach for the defense.

One area that I wanted to raise and that I know that we need investment in is in the area of intelligence and our space capabilities that give us the eyes and ears and the ability to understand what some of the threats are, to be able see them, to be able to respond.

It is good to bring this information to light for the public, because people need to know what's out there, what we are capable of, but also what is left to do.

Mr. AKIN. It is such a treat for me tonight to be able to share this time with my colleagues, people who are patriots, good friends of mine, people who love this country, want to see our cities and our citizens defended, people who continue in the tradition of Ronald Reagan.

I am a little bit surprised that we want to be cutting these programs. I don't think it's the right thing to do.

I don't think if the American public knew about our vulnerability, knew about the development of North Korea being able to fire missiles from North Korea and actually hit parts of America, this is not something that we want to play around with. We want to have a robust capability, and we need to make that investment, and the idea that we don't have enough money is absolute foolishness.

PREDATORY MORTGAGES AND FORECLOSURES

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

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, when Barack Obama was sworn in as the 44th President of the United States, there were a number of statements that were subliminally made to the Nation and, indeed, to the world. And one of the statements was that we, as a Nation, had moved significantly from the days of not only chattel slavery but even the days of Jim Crow and the bitter segregation that enveloped the entire United States.

I can remember growing up in Texas, in Wichita Falls, Texas, and my father purchased a home in what was then, very clearly, what was known as a white neighborhood. And when my father purchased the home across the street from, I think, a shopping center that was going to be built, a strip shopping center, he had to move the home from its location to the east side of the tracks, where the African American community lived.

He purchased the home, hired a moving company that moved homes, and the home in which my father lives in today, the home in which I and my three sisters grew up in now stands at 818 Gerald Street in Wichita Falls, Texas, and it has been moved, probably, 8 miles from where it was built,