

22 of 29 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2004 FDCH e-Media, Inc.  
(f/k/a Federal Document Clearing House, Inc.)  
FDCH Political Transcripts

March 10, 2004 Wednesday

**TYPE:** COMMITTEE HEARING

**LENGTH:** 16978 words

**COMMITTEE:** EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS SUBCOMMITTEE

**SUBCOMMITTEE:** HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE; FOREIGN OPERATIONS

**HEADLINE:** U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JERRY LEWIS (R-CA) HOLDS HEARING ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS  
FY2005 APPROPRIATIONS

**SPEAKER:**

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JERRY LEWIS (R-CA), SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

**LOCATION:** WASHINGTON, D.C.

**WITNESSES:**

LES BROWNLEE, ACTING SECRETARY, UNITED STATES ARMY  
PETER SCHOOMAKER, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

**BODY:**

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE HOLDS  
A HEARING ON FY 2005 APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE  
UNITED STATES ARMY

MARCH 10, 2004

**SPEAKERS:**

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JERRY LEWIS (R-CA)  
SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRMAN  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE C.W. BILL YOUNG (R-FL)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE DAVID L. HOBSON (R-OH)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE HENRY BONILLA (R-TX)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT (R-WA)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM (R-CA)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN (R-NJ)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TODD TIAHRT (R-KS)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ROGER F. WICKER (R-MS)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE C.W. BILL YOUNG (R-FL)  
EX OFFICIO

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN P. MURTHA (D-PA)  
RANKING MEMBER  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE NORMAN D. DICKS (D-WA)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE MARTIN OLAV SABO (D-MN)

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE PETER J. VISCLOSKEY (D-IN)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES P. MORAN (D-VA)  
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE DAVID OBEY (D-WI)  
EX OFFICIO

\*

LEWIS: Gentlemen, normally our committee has very excellent attendance. I have the hunch that my colleagues know they are going to be faced with a series of votes in a few minutes, and that's causing them to wait until after that.

So we might begin the preliminaries and that'll give us a lot of flexibility relative to questions. We'll try to organize the schedule in a way that doesn't totally destroy your day, but in the meantime this committee's pleased to welcome both the Honorable Les Brownlee, the acting secretary for the Army, and General Peter Schoomaker, chief of staff of the Army.

Both of you gentlemen have made a tremendous contribution to the future and the transformation of America's Army, and we're very pleased to have you here today.

We recognize that this is the first opportunity you have had in your current positions to testify before the committee. And so in a formal way, my buddy and I, Jack Murtha, want to welcome you here and want you to know that we're very, very proud of the work that you and our soldiers are about. We're quite anxious to spend as much time in interchange today relative to those issues that relate to transformation.

But in the meantime let me say on behalf of the members and myself that as the world continues to shrink, we look at that world in ever different and in many ways more treacherous ways. The struggle we face in the war on terrorism is very real. It's not going to be short term, and it is our future as we see it.

One thing I would like to share with you about this subcommittee is that I think you know that over the years we've been able to work very closely together. This subcommittee does not know a partisan line, and we go out of our way to try to avoid some of the pure politics of this place. And I must say that among other things I'd like you to know how much we appreciate the support and help that my colleague from Pennsylvania has been to the subcommittee.

With that, Jack, let me call on you for any remarks that you might have, and then we'll go their testimony and probably get close to votes.

MURTHA: Yes. I appreciate it, Mr. Chairman.

And just want to say how much we appreciate the work you're doing. We know that you've got some problems with funding. We know that you're trying to increase the size of the Army without adequate funds. We know that you're trying to reorganize the brigades and everything. And as you know, we'll work it all out. And I know it's very difficult for you when you go through a period when there's inadequate funding and you have to reach way ahead to take money out of other programs. We appreciate that.

I know the staff's been working with your folks, and hopefully, we'll be able to work it out in as a efficient manner as possible. But this election year is always a problem. As the chairman says: This is as bipartisan a committee you'll ever find. I think we only had 16 people vote against our bill. So we're real pleased. It used to be 150-200, so we're real pleased about the way we work it and try to do what's best for all the services.

When you talk to the Air Force, they say take money out of the Army; when you talk to the Navy, they say take to take money out of the Army. But the Army's got plenty, they say. But we'll see.

LEWIS: And I think you know that the committee has been very supportive for some time now with this transformation effort as it changes and matures. You know, we are all in this together.

Mr. Secretary, we will include your entire statement in the record. The same for you, Chief. And if you'd proceed as you will, the time is yours.

BROWNLEE: Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you. And Congressman Murtha, you as well.

I just want to begin by saying what an honor it is for me to appear as a witness before this distinguished committee. I've admired the courage and support this committee has continually displayed for our men and women in uniform, and had the opportunity to work with you and your great professional staff. They are terrific, and we were always coordinating

things that we did back and forth across the way here.

So, for me, it's a special honor and privilege to be here before you this morning first time as a witness. And I do thank you for the opportunity to appear here with my good friend, the chief of staff of the United States of Army, General Pete Schoomaker. Our Army is benefiting greatly from his marvelous leadership.

General Schoomaker has literally transformed the Army's transformation. He has revitalized the spirit of our soldiers with his emphasis on the warrior's ethos and the soldier's creed, and he has literally rejuvenated the spirit of our soldiers.

It's a great honor and privilege for me to work along side of him every day in the Army, and it's a distinct honor for me to appear with him here today representing the Army before this committee.

We do have a prepared posture statement, Mr. Chairman. We do appreciate your including that in the record. And let me begin by expressing our gratitude to the members and staff of this committee for your tremendous support to our soldiers who are serving our country around the world, as well as to their families at home. I know that you're deeply interested in the great work our soldiers are doing, their training, morale and how we are equipping them.

I have had the opportunity to visit our troops in Iraq three times and those in Afghanistan four times, and recently to posts in Germany, South Korea and here in the United States, and I'm grateful to have the opportunity to share what I have learned with you.

Underlying everything we are doing and planning to do is the most important point I want to make here today; and that is that we are an Army at war, serving a nation at war. To better cope with the demands of this war, we have proposed to grow the Army temporarily by 30,000 soldiers over the next several years using the authority provided in Title 10 and to be paid for initially from supplemental appropriations. We will plan to use these resources to stand up at least 10 new combat brigades over the next several years before returning to our authorized level, and I ask for your support in this endeavor.

We are also restructuring our active and reserve forces to meet the challenges of the day and to more effectively use the resources the Congress and the American people have entrusted to us. This is an ongoing process, and we will keep this committee fully informed.

Let me comment on a matter of grave importance to the senior leadership of the Army: sexual assaults on soldiers by fellow soldiers. Such attacks not only weaken unit cohesion and lessen combat power, they are wrong, they will not be overlooked and they will not be tolerated.

The Army is committed to identifying and holding accountable those who perpetrate these crimes, as well as providing proper care for the victims of such attacks. We are committed to creating an environment and command climate where these young women feel free to report these incidents through multiple venues: the chain of command, medical channels, chaplains and their peers. We will properly care for those who have been assaulted and investigate and take appropriate action against those who commit these crimes.

It is the right thing to do, and we're going to do it.

Many of you have asked about measures we're taking to protect our forces in Iraq. The funding provided in the fiscal year '04 supplemental has enabled us to accelerate production of a number of key pieces of force protection equipment, and we greatly appreciate this committee's support in providing us these needed resources.

The funds within the FY '04 supplemental have sustained and supported our troops and literally saved their lives.

I know that our soldiers and their families appreciate your unwavering support on these issues.

I would like to address two force protection measures in particular.

First, the number of up-armored Humvees in the Central Command area of responsibility is now over 2,000 compared to about 500 last spring.

When General Schoomaker and I testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in November, we estimated then that we would be unable to satisfy the CJTF-7 requirement of 3,000 up-armored Humvees until May 2005. This was clearly unacceptable.

We have worked with industry to steadily increase production of these vehicles and will continue to do so.

Going from 185 produced this month up to 220 per month by May, with some further redistribution, will enable us to fulfill the current Central Command requirement of over 4,000 vehicles by August of this year.

I have talked to the CEOs of the companies that build these up-armored Humvees and visited their production lines. They are committed to and capable of increasing production rates up to 450 per month to help us fill our requirement even faster.

While this will require additional resources, we are working within the Army budget and with OSD so that we can reach the theaters' requirement as quickly as possible.

To provide the best available protection against bullets and explosive fragments, we have greatly increased production of interceptor body armor last year and are currently producing and shipping 25,000 sets monthly to theater of operation.

There are now sufficient stocks of interceptor body armor to equip every soldier and DOD civilians in Iraq and Afghanistan.

All soldiers now rotating into theater will be issued a set of body armor either before they deploy into Iraq or immediately after arrival in Afghanistan.

To better provide relevant and ready campaign-quality land power to combatant commanders as part of the joint force, we are transforming the Army itself. This is in response to lessons learned and experiences gained by the Army's recent 2.5 years of combat in the war on terror as well as the operational environment envisioned in the foreseeable future.

Three weeks ago, General Schoomaker and I announced the termination of the Comanche helicopter program as part of a major restructuring and revitalization of Army aviation.

In lieu of completing development and procuring 125 Comanche helicopters in the fiscal year '05, fiscal year '11, future years defense plan, we have proposed to reallocate these resources to procure almost 800 new aircraft for the active and reserve components.

As a part of our total program over the FYDP, we will also enhance, upgrade and modernize over 1,400 aircraft in our existing aviation fleet. This program to revitalize Army aviation reflects the changed operational environment and will provide the modularity and flexibility we must have to achieve the joint and expeditionary capabilities that are so essential to the Army's role now and in the future.

The fiscal year '05 president's budget we've submitted, as amended to reflect the termination of Comanche, represents a balanced consideration of both our current and long-term requirements and provides our Army with the resources we need, excluding war-related costs.

The tempo of our current operations is high and has human and material cost.

We appreciate the assistance of the Congress, and especially this committee, in addressing these issues as we work to restore our units and equipment to the high levels of readiness necessary to continue to meet our obligations to the nation.

In all that the Army has accomplished and all that will be called upon to do, the American soldier remains the single most important factor in our success.

Regardless of where our soldiers serve, they perform as the professionals they are with skill, courage, compassion and dedication. They embody the values of our Army and our nation, serving selflessly and seeking no reward except the knowledge of a job well done.

Despite remarkable successes, our fight is far from over. It will take time to win the war on terror. Our enemies are resolute, but our commitment to prevail in Iraq and elsewhere is unshakable.

We must do our part to ensure our soldiers have all they need to do the job we have set before them. When the American people and our leaders stand behind them, they can do any task on earth.

We are transforming the Army while retaining the values critical to the Army's achievements of the past 228 years. The FY '04 defense legislation and supplemental appropriations have enabled the Army to do that which it has been asked to do.

And I look forward to discussing with you the fiscal year '05 budget request will permit us to continue meeting our obligation now and in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like, again, to thank you and the members of this distinguished committee for your continuing support of the men and women in our Army, an Army at war and full member of the joint team, deployed in fighting terror around the world.

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today, and I look forward to answering your questions.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

LEWIS: General Schoomaker?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, thank you very much. Chairman Lewis, Congressman Murtha and other distinguished members of the committee, I am proud to join Secretary Brownlee here before you. This isn't my first time before you. In my former life, as commander in chief for USSOCOM, I had the privilege to be here. And, as you've stated, we've always enjoyed great support of this committee. We appreciate it very much.

I join Secretary Brownlee in our statement, and I affirm his statement that he just made. Secretary Brownlee's a great partner, having served a distinguished career as a soldier himself, retiring from the United States Army, two tours in Vietnam, having been decorated for valor. He's a great soldier, great partner. And as you know, he also continued to serve in the Senate as a staffer for 18 years, which — though I commend you for it now...

(CROSSTALK)

(LAUGHTER)

SCHOOMAKER: He's continuing to serve in some tough times, challenging times here with our Army, and I appreciate his partnership very much.

I'd like to also recognize Lieutenant General Ron Helmsley — who's here to my left rear — who heads up the U.S. Army Reserve, and Lieutenant General Roger Schultz, sitting next to him, who heads up our Army National Guard.

They're here because we're one Army. There's no daylight between us; we're moving forward as a total Army team. And I appreciate their presence here and what they do everyday for us.

I'd also like to recognize behind me Lieutenant General Jerry Sinn who is out of our financial management shop. So we may be calling on him to help.

I'd like to recognize the American soldier. And I use that in the broadest sense: soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, their families and the civilians associated with what we do. I couldn't be more proud of them, and I couldn't be more proud to join them again in service to this nation. I'd just like to recognize, as you already have, their important contributions they're making every day.

We are in an extraordinary window of opportunity to transform our Army using the momentum we have while we're at war to set it for the future. My view is this a short window of opportunity, and I know that one of the things we all see on the horizon is increased pressures on the defense top line.

And where many people look at this as the huge challenge in a dark cloud, I think those of us sitting at the table here and those of us behind us see this also with the silver lining in this cloud that we can use this momentum and this extraordinary level of resourcing we're receiving as part of this war to reset ourselves for the future. And that's exactly what we're committed to. And I would ask for your support for some the great transforming changes that we're doing.

I'd like to wrap up here just, kind of, foot-stomping two things. One of them is we made a very, very deliberate choice on the Comanche. We did not start out to kill Comanche. We started out to find out what it would take to make Army aviation whole for the future.

It's about 40 percent — Comanche was about 40 percent of our aviation budget. And when we took a look at what we would get, Secretary Brownlee has talked about the number of new aircraft that we will buy and the 1,400 aircraft that we will reset.

But what is also in there is aircraft survivability equipment for all of these aircraft. What's in there is all of the ammunition, the rockets and the Hellfires that makes us whole in that business. What's also in there is UAV money, MILCON, training, fly-by wire, common cockpit with the special operations commands — some very, very important initiatives that in my view will serve us very well for the future.

And we also have the opportunity to leverage what we've done in Comanche and the future tech base working toward a joint rotorcraft solution for 2020–2025 time frames. So as you look at that and as we ask for your support, it's a very holistic approach. And I would not like it just to be a platform view. It truly puts us into the future with Army aviation not only for our current needs, but as we look ahead.

And then the other thing is on the growth that we've asked for, the temporary growth. We've looked very hard at what it would cost us to be able to afford that growth if it were, in fact, absorbed within the top line. It's unaffordable. It's just as simple as that.

And what it would cost us in terms of mortgage in the future and what it would cost us in readiness because the outlay problems that exist as you go looking for that money is just — we can't go there. We need your help to support us in this endeavor.

We are convinced that we can increase the number of brigades in our army which will significantly increase our ability to sustain this level of operation across all components. And if you will support us in this, I believe that we will deliver something for the long-term that will address an army that's ready to do things for a long time in the future.

So I'll terminate there. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today, and am prepared to answer your questions. Thank you very much.

LEWIS: General, your entire statement will be included in the record.

SCHOOMAKER: Thank you, sir.

LEWIS: Mr. Secretary, if you will, let me comment to General Schoomaker.

Sir, a piece of the backdrop of this hearing today is a reflection of the fact that my partner, Jack Murtha and I both have a great respect for the fact that you are a soldier's soldier, a guy who has spent his lifetime committed to the Army and committed now to the transformation that we think is so fundamental to our future.

So we're proud to be associated with both you gentlemen and the work that you do. And we want you know that we appreciate it.

The fact is, in recent years that the Army has met the demands of the global war on terror with more than 325,000 troops deployed around the world. As of January, more than 164,000 reserve component soldiers were mobilized with 139,000 serving overseas. These deployments coupled with planned future rotations in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom represent the largest movement of troops since World War II.

The prepared statement of the acting secretary and you, Chief, suggest that we've had not just a few stresses in the process of moving forward with this transformation. In connection with that, one of the stresses we are concerned about is that the '04 to '05 appropriations budget process suggests that we can increase our numbers, we can move forward with this transformation knowing full well the reality that there's a shortfall out there.

There's not any doubt that while the public will focus a lot upon a 6.5 percent to 7 percent adjustment upward in the money available, the appropriations available between those two years, when you consider the supplemental, those dollars are actually in excess of \$38 billion short.

The Budget Committee is right now struggling with the thought that you haven't put supplemental dollars in your initial process and they've added, I understand, that they're about to add some additional dollar amount. But in the mean time, there's a lot of controversy about where our money will come from.

So as you discuss stresses, would you help us better understand how we're going to actually fund these temporary increases when that \$87 billion is running mighty short?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

Sir, let me address, if I can, how we would plan to get through the '04-'05 years here because we have looked at it very carefully, and the Army has been under stress. There's no doubt about that.

But we believe that with the funding that was provided in the fiscal year '04 pledges — and of course the department got about \$65.1 billion in the supplemental and the Army got about 40 of that. And we believe that those two together, with some assistance from OSD that we will look through in the mid-year review, will get us to the end of fiscal year '04.

When the fiscal year '05 budget is passed, then we also believe that we can get to it some time this year next Spring or thereabouts, by cash flowing out of third and fourth quarters as we've done in the past until the Congress will return and then pass another supplemental. But there again, we will probably need some assistance from OSD. We have had discussions with them, and they've indicated a willingness and a capability to help. And that would be our plan for how we would get through '04.

LEWIS: Anything to add to that?

SCHOOMAKER: I really have nothing to add to that. I think that's a good description of that. I think your question also went a little further, and that is how we planned to use that funding.

When I laid this out, the secretary of defense, or the secretary and I did, and the president about the temporary headroom that we needed, it was very clear that we were looking at help by the supplemental funding.

I need to explain right now under the authorities that the president has delegated to the secretary of defense under Title 10, we have the authority to exceed our statutory end-strength because of the emergency. And we have done that.

We have done it through the use of stop-loss, stop-move, which means the units that we alert and deploy are stop-loss, stop-move and therefore we get headroom there. But of course when those units come back and reset, that headroom goes away.

The fundamental difference of what we're asking to do here is to deliberately recruit and train and organize that headroom to give us the headroom that we need to organize these additional brigades. And while we're using that headroom to do that, we have a whole series of efficiencies that we're executing, things like military to civilian conversions, things like, as we reposition from overseas, things like our stabilization programs where we are going to generate inside of our current force offsets to that 30,000.

So the units will stay that we create. The temporary headroom will be offset by the efficiencies that we get over the next three to four years. And we will let the air out of the tires and go back down to our statutory end-strength. And our plan was to use supplemental funding to do this in a deliberate fashion. And of course we believe that supplemental funding will be required for two years beyond the emergency just like we did in previous — for instance, Desert Shield, Desert Storm — because we have an enormous amount of resetting of the force as we come home.

So that's a brief description. I mean, we could go on in quite a lot of detail on this. But we have thought through this very, very carefully. And we believe it's executable, but we're going to need some help to do it. And we believe that the short-term thing in the long-term over the next several decades will pay off. If we take another route, I'm afraid that what we're buying into is several decades of real pain and real danger to the health of the force.

LEWIS: Gentlemen, I think you heard the bells. They are about five minutes from the first vote, which is a 15-minute vote. And we have two five-minute votes after that. We ought to be back probably no later than 10:45.

LEWIS: As you know, our clock constantly moves along regardless of what we try to do with it. Before I call on Mr. Murtha, I wanted to mention that Mr. Wicker, who was going to be with us earlier this morning, unfortunately received news that his mother passed away last night.

Mr. Murtha?

MURTHA: First of all, let me compliment the Army on the way they handled Aberdeen. I would hope that your handling the same way, the sexual assault charges, as you did that. Because it was a tough road and you have some stiff punishment. And it's an example to the other services as to how they should handle a very, serious situation. And also Mr. Secretary, I remember how gracious you were when I went over to introduce Greg Dahlberg as the secretary of the Army and how well you treated us. And I appreciate that. That was a...

BROWNLEE: My pleasure.

MURTHA: And mentioning Dahlberg, working with Kevin and the chairman and myself and the whole committee, we were so involved with transformation. He was one of the guys who believed in it and convinced us that we had to go forward with it. I wish you'd go with a little more detail on this money because you don't seem as worried as I am about the money. I mean, I think I hear what you're saying.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

MURTHA: You've got 30,000 more people. We haven't put any money for that, haven't requested any money at this point. We have the brigades that we're trying to work out. We're spending more money than we get each month. I think we need to know a little more detail. You seem to be saying we're going to get through the year, but I don't see how it happens. Could you go into a little more detail about that?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. And if I could just say a couple things about what you said. Sir, first of all, about Aberdeen, I was not in the Army when that occurred but I also admire the way the Army handled it.

But since I have come back to the Army, I've asked on two separate occasions that we go back and review the lessons learned from that and ensure that we were still doing those things we learned from that. Too often, you know, you determine you need to add a person somewhere and over time it just disappears, or he disappears. And so I wanted to ensure we were still doing those things.

The second thing, you mentioned Greg Dahlberg and his work with transformation here on the committee staff. He did invaluable work in the Army while he was down there. And his fingerprints are still on a lot of things, and they were very good. And so the Army is still benefiting from his great service as the undersecretary.

Let me address and more particular, if I can, of course the additional brigades that we want to form. Initially, for sure in '05, we requested that that be paid for out of supplemental appropriations. Now, we have already gone to OSD and indicated to them that we will need some help. I'm not at liberty here to discuss the amount, but we have informed them that we will clearly need some help in the mid-year review to get to the end of '04.

The members of the committee and the Congress were very good to us in providing the amounts they did in the supplemental and, as I said, especially some of the specific things you've funded. And those have been very helpful. And we're taking advantage of that.

But we have also, in the meanwhile, generated some new requirements for such things as up-armored Humvees by accelerating the production of those. As I said, I went out to AM General and met with the CEO of AM General and O'Gara-Hess at AM General. And all three of us went through that plant. We then all three went to the O'Gara-Hess plant, went through that, then went into a room and sat down to determine the most accelerated schedule they could achieve.

And they've done a marvelous job. There's wonderful people working out there. And I also had a good opportunity to speak to the workers, the groups in both places. But the bottom line is that we have generated some new requirements by accelerating some things like that.

General Schoomaker and I determined fairly early on that if it had to do with force protection, it was the most urgent priority in the Army. If it deals with soldiers' lives and safety, there's nothing higher. And we've put in writing to the Army months ago that anything that's force protection will be worked on 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week basis. And that is development, testing, procurement, distribution — all of it.

So, yes, there are some additional costs. And we're working with OSD on a daily basis to be sure they know what our needs are. And they have indicated, certainly as I indicated, a willingness and the capability to help us on these things. And we do have some capabilities and move some funds around. And with your help, we'll be asking for that, as well.

MURTHA: I would hope you keep the committee informed because it's such a serious thing. And, for instance, a lot of us fly out to the hospitals as often as you do. And I had a mother say to me not long ago that she was so thankful that the inserts finally got to the field because the day that her son was wounded, that he lost his legs, that he was saved by the inserts. All of us know how important that is.

Tell me about the Strykers and how they're doing, General.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, first of all, we had a lot of confidence the Stryker would do well. And it's not just the vehicle, it's the whole system. It's the idea, the whole doctrinal concept, the organization, the amount of infantry that's resident within that brigade, which is extraordinary.

But there was a lot of focus on the vehicle itself and some questions in terms of its survivability. I'm happy to say it's done very, very well. And we know of two IED attacks against Stryker, one of which occurred right below it. And the only injury we received, was a fractured ankle on the part of the driver. We know it's been attacked at least twice by rocket-propelled grenades, and this slat armor and the inherent protection of the vehicle and, once again, no serious

injuries...

MURTHA: There's only two. I had heard it from the company that it was a lot more the netting on the outside or whatever you call it...

SCHOOMAKER: That slat armor, yes, sir.

MURTHA: Only two. I mean, two,...

SCHOOMAKER: There's two confirmed that I know of. There could be many more but the bottom line is it's performed as advertised or better. Of course, you know, we're looking to the continued improvement of the vehicles so that we can remove that slat armor and go to, you know, to the original design of protection.

It's also been involved in some direct combat operations that performed very well because of the infantry that's there. So it's an extraordinary concept. And in our view, it's part of our current force today but it's a real peek into the future as we look to the future combat...

MURTHA: I'm glad to hear that the IEDs only broke a foot because in so many of these unarmored Humvees, they lose their legs.

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir.

MURTHA: And I keep hearing stories from the wounded out there about how an RPG went right through and it took — as a matter of fact, three of them lost their leg in one instance with an RPG. So I'm glad to see it's working a lot better.

SCHOOMAKER: Well, sir, I think you understand that, as all of us do, that this is a matter of, you know, you can keep getting bigger with these things. I mean, we've lost M-1 tanks to...

MURTHA: Yes, I saw one.

SCHOOMAKER: Yes, sir. So but what I can tell you is that we're very, very pleased with the performance of that brigade. And as you know, it's now up working very effectively in an area that the 101st formerly occupied in Northern Iraq. And again the inherent capabilities of the organization to effectively operate over far greater distances than what traditional organizations have been able to do — all of these are very, very important aspects of it, and we're happy with it.

MURTHA: One other thing is the recapitalization. Now, I noticed a normal amount of money's been for recapitalization. Obviously, you're going to have to reconstitute all this equipment. Are you looking at that, is that part of your supplemental request? Is that what it's going to be?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, you're exactly right.

SCHOOMAKER: And that's what the supplemental is there for. And as you know, we've had previous experience with this. We have a lot of rolling stock that requires repair and refurbishment and resetting as a result of the major combat operations that took place. We have to reset our prepositioned stocks that are over there. We have to reset aircraft, wheel vehicles, track vehicles, major systems. And that's what supplemental funding is for.

Now, having said that, part of this whole issue of affordability is, as we reset, we want to reset for the future, not reset as we were in the past. And so you get some economies out of this momentum and this reset process that we have within the supplemental funding. And that's part of what we're doing as we form these modular brigades, is to use that momentum and that funding and that reset effort to set ourselves in a different way than we were when we entered the war.

LEWIS: Thank you, Jack.

Mr. Cunningham?

CUNNINGHAM: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary and General, I've got three programs real quickly I'd like you to at least take a look at.

One, when I was gone on extended deployments on carriers, my wife used to take my picture to both our little girls, and before they went to sleep at night talk about daddy. And it kind of kept me alive to my kids, so I wasn't Uncle Duke when I came home, I was Daddy Duke — and not David Duke.

(LAUGHTER)

When I came home, I remember the importance that that was, to me and I think to my daughters.

The Navy and the Marine Corps have adopted a program that allows our troops to videotape a little story reading for their children. And then when they're on deployment they also read to their children. You know how important reading is, especially at the beginning years when children are upset because they don't have both parents there. And we found it an invaluable program. The Family Literacy Foundation does that for the whole fleet. It costs less than a million bucks. And the value of that to our troops is very, very important, and I wish you'd take a look at that.

Another thing that I've become aware of, the reflux program that the Army's been working on for 20 years, the FDA turned it down. There is currently today a little package to where in the field — I don't know if you've ever gone hunting and you look at a stream and you wonder, "It looks clear, but can I drink that water?" Well, this will actually take sewage water to where it's palpable to use it for wounds and things in the field, and it's already adopted. It's inexpensive, and I'd like to bring that up to you, too.

I was with Duncan Hunter, with that part of the trio, and Duncan is working on a system to where if we get the steel to our troops we can re-armor a lot of your trucks underneath and on top. It takes this rolled steel, three-eighths inch to stop, you know, a system coming in, and the IEDs. I think that's going to be a thing of the future, that we're going to be looking at those. When you got troops carriers, when you got the driver and stuff, they can do that in the field if we get them the steel. And it'd be very, very inexpensive and another system that I think we would look at. And if you'd just kind of take a look at those.

The last thing I would tell you is that, when I went to West Point, I looked at the material condition of the academy. And looking at the other academies, the conditions that they have to operate in, those kids, it's disgraceful for our young men and young women that are going to represent our country in defense to have facilities like this.

And this committee, Mr. Chairman, I think really needs to take a look at when we break some dollars loose for West Point.

They were fencing in the passageways because they didn't have a place to do it. I know you got a new gym, and I know you have some other facilities. We're still going to try and beat you in football, but we also need to make it fair on that.

(LAUGHTER)

We'll beat you fair.

SCHOOMAKER: We're going to make sure it's not fair, if we can.

(LAUGHTER)

CUNNINGHAM: I understand that, sir.

This committee is one of the most bipartisan committees that I serve on. And I tell you what: You don't know Republican from Democrat in here, in this particular committee.

But, you know, I want to say one thing, and it may seem partisan, but it's not. I'm very, very proud of the people that I served with in Vietnam. I see Silver Stars, I see Service Crosses, I see Purple Hearts in that field of green behind you.

And the people that they served with, they served with a lot of pride. And it makes me so mad to have somebody characterize all of us as war criminals, doing things as a daily matter in the press that chastises and slaps us all in the face. And I think you know what I'm talking about, and I won't get any more specific. But it bothers the heck out of me.

When I was on 7th Fleet staff, I worked with the Guard and Reserve that supported us, a team spirit, a bon secours and those things, and they were a vital, important part of national security. And for someone to degrade their service to this country also upsets me. And I hope that you'll take note of that very seriously.

Thank you.

BROWNLEE: Sir, if I could just comment briefly. I also had the honor of serving two tours there. And all I can say is that the troops that I was privileged to command in combat, a rifle company and the 173rd Airborne Brigade and later an advisory to Vietnamese airborne battalion on a second tour, I'm very proud of what they did and their service to the country, many of them draftees. And I will always feel honored to have been a part of their lives and the sacrifices they

made and their families made.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Frelinghuysen, you're up.

FRELINGHUYSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you both for being here. I note you have a Wyoming connection, both of you, is that right?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, we do.

FRELINGHUYSEN: Well, when most of think of Wyoming, we think of former Senator Alan Simpson and plain talk. And I hope you'll take this in the spirit in which I give it, for the last three or four years, as the Marines have visited this committee, as the Navy's visited this committee, they've brought some of their troops.

You have a lot of troops behind you, but what I'm talking about are some of those who have recently returned from combat. I think the Army ought to be every bit as proud of their equivalent top guns and Marine combatants. And I hope when you do a post-mortem on this hearing, that next year when you come you will bring some of your people in the uniforms in which they are serving our country so well and so proudly.

Another comment, I haven't heard it said, but isn't it true that 99.9 percent of the troops on the ground in Iraq are Army troops?

It's an overwhelming number, whatever it is. I heard it out of the mouth of one of your two-stars, so I assume it's accurate. I think that in and of itself is an important measure of the Army's relevance.

And I'm aware if you look at the appropriations pie, you get probably the slimmest picking. But I think if you're on the battlefield and doing an incredible job, you ought to get the recognition.

And I think the military, the Army ought to be talking a little more about that.

I know in your remarks, General Schoomaker, you mentioned the issue of jointness, and that's something we count on. But obviously the Army is playing a major role, both in Afghanistan and Iraq, and I think we ought to be talking more about what it's doing and what it's needs are.

I'd like to learn more in the whole area of combat capabilities. We obviously have the regular Army, we have the Guard and Reserve. And they're indistinguishable in the sense that you've trained them to make sure that they are — everybody's combat ready; everybody's working together. I'd like to know more about the issue of what people are doing on the ground.

When we first got there, it was evident that we didn't have enough MPs and civil affairs people. What's the mix today in terms of, you know, we have artillery and air defense components in the Army. We have Guard and Reserve units going over there, some of those with those types of military occupations.

But to what degree have some of those people, sort of, been retrained for the new era of combat duty?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, thank you very much. First of all, we are working very, very hard to make one Army a reality. And I'm talking about now the active and reserve components as one. And if you take a look at how we have prepared the three brigades of National Guard that are currently en route to OIF II, specifically the 30th Brigade out of North Carolina, the 39th out of Arkansas, and the 81st out of Washington State, you will find that their equipment and the equipment we've put on those soldiers is the first-rate, top-line equipment, the most modern we have to field, in some cases ahead of the active force.

Secondly, the training that they have received, not only through our mobilization sites, but through the National Training Center and their Joint Readiness Training Center, is superb. We have created, re-created the experience that they will have when they get into the theater to a T.

SCHOOMAKER: We have brought people back from the theater. We have put Arabic speakers on the battlefield, civilians on the battlefield. They are giving us very high marks in terms of our preparation.

Now, over Christmas time when both the secretary and I spent our Christmas period in both Afghanistan and Iraq and other places on separate routes so that we got maximum coverage, I had the opportunity in the Fallujah-Ramadi area, out

where the 82nd is, to go on a combat patrol at night with the 124th Infantry of the Florida National Guard. And I can tell you that those soldiers performed magnificently in very, very dangerous conditions. And I was very proud of the degree to which they were operating and doing things.

So we are working very hard to make this a seamless Army. And I think it's the only way that we're going to be able to go forward in the future is to make sure that the over a million people that we have wearing Army green are available to us to do these things.

Part of this whole notion of modularity and the ACRC restructuring that we're doing and to a large — I mean, the load is really being carried by General Schultz and General Helmly back here. We are restructuring over 125,000 spaces across the active, Guard and Reserve. We are taking down major artillery formations to create more MPs, more transportation, special forces, civil affairs, sci-op, special operations aviation. All of these things that are in high demand that are in relatively low density, we are addressing. And that is all a part of this transformation.

FRELINGHUYSEN: The issue to me — and I think that's commendable — I think that the general public needs to know more about it. Obviously your being here and using other forums is to talk about troop strength. Obviously the focus of this committee is resources. That's our primary focus. But I think you've done a magnificent job doing that.

Obviously, in the public mind, they feel that they can shut the war off by just turning off the television. But your people are on the ground in a very dangerous situation.

But what has been the result of what they call all this, remember, combat fatigue, the stress that you accentuate in your remarks on recruitment, retention? Could you just give us in general views as to where we stand?

I know everybody's standing tall and they're proud. When we were over there with Chairman Lewis, we were able to think about our people from our own state, not necessarily talk to the military about their morale. It seemed to be good. But where do we stand relative to the whole issue of...

SCHOOMAKER: We exceeded our goals last year both in recruiting and retention across the entire force — active, Guard and Reserve. This year, we're on track to do the same thing. And I will tell you that the Army National Guard is leading the pack on retention.

FRELINGHUYSEN: One just last question: Is there anything you need over there? I mean, when we were over there, some of us were briefed by General Petraeus. Some of us were briefed by General Odierno. What we really asked, we'd ask you: Are you getting everything you need over there?

SCHOOMAKER: Well, sir, you know...

FRELINGHUYSEN: Or all the resources that you need?

SCHOOMAKER: ... if we could snap our fingers, we'd like about 5,000 up-armored Humvees and we'd like to have — but we are making major progress in that regard. I just sat with General Petraeus this morning in my office before coming over here. He's back in town telling the story that you're talking about in all sorts of fora.

He would say that the surp money was one of the most valuable tools that he had over there to do the fabulous things that the 101st did up on Mosul and that whole northern tier. And I know from talking to the other division commanders on a routine basis, all of them feel the same way...

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN: Well, if these accounts are dry or getting short, we need to know. I think we want to help. I think that's sort of the message that I would make.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BROWNLEE: Could I make one comment, sir, if I could?

LEWIS: Yes.

BROWNLEE: I just would like to respond to Congressman Frelinghuysen on one thing that you indicated. Please don't think that the absence of any of our soldiers here indicates any degree of not having full pride in them. We certainly do. And both General Schoomaker and I know — and I know members of this committee get out to Walter Reed frequently and visit them...

FRELINGHUYSEN: We're proud of those soldiers.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

FRELINGHUYSEN: I think sometimes in a public setting...

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

FRELINGHUYSEN: ... since we see the top guns, we see the Marines, that it's good know that there are — that you have the ability to do that as well.

BROWNLEE: We'll take that under advisement, and next time we come, we'll be sure we note that.

BROWNLEE: I guess we might have considered that this might be a form of punishment for them as opposed to being treated...

(LAUGHTER)

... but we would welcome the opportunity and we'll do it, sir. Thank you.

LEWIS: Mr. Tiaht?

TIAHRT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Speaking at Walter Reed Hospital, I was out there last week, and I was in the amputee wing, and I was overcome by the enthusiasm that the troops have when they're facing such difficult circumstances.

But I would say the one thing that was giving them all hope, every one of them wanted to go back and serve in the Army. And one said, he was in amputation below the knee, and he says, "You know, since it's below the knee, I think I can still stay in the Rangers." They're tough, great Americans. We're very proud of them.

Half of the people I talked to, though, were sitting in a Humvee and hit a land mine or an IED and lost an appendage because of that. You mentioned the need for 5,000 up-armored Humvees. There's new technology — we talk about the steel. I heard about a guy that's come up with an idea of Kevlar panels that can be actually pasted on or glued on, stick-ons, so that the vehicle has just a temporary thing.

Anything we can do — one of the guys I talked to was talking about having sand bags on the outside of his Humvee, but because of where the land mine was, it actually got his right leg instead of his left leg. He was a driver — very unfortunate, but a great spirit. But anything, I think, we can do to take these unarmored Humvees and give them some kind of a stick-on or steel or whatever they need. Are there plans to do that?

BROWNLEE: Sir, we're doing exactly that. We are manufacturing kits and shipping them by air as we speak to do exactly that. One of the things you should know is I had a day when I brought all of our truck-makers including Humvee-makers into the Pentagon along with an assortment of different armor producers — some of them ceramics and composites, steel.

And what I asked them to do was to leave their proprietary interests at the door. We were all there to do what we could to save soldiers. And we all took that approach. And then that resulted in some of the visits I made, as I indicated earlier, to AM General and O'Gara-Hess where they make the up-armored Humvees. And it was a marvelous experience for me to go and help these workers who take great pride and know what they're doing. But it was good for me to go have the opportunity to tell them how important it is.

TIAHRT: One last point I'd like to make is accepting those troops back into service is a wonderful thing. And I think the spirit that they take with them has got to be an asset to the service.

BROWNLEE: Sir, and we have a program in the Army now called our Disabled Soldier Program that has two facets. One is what you just described. And I get the same thing when I go out there: "Sir, is there any way I can stay in the Army?" And so we do have, some of our soldiers who have, despite the loss of a limb, or so. And for some of them, they can't.

But I have coordinated with Tony Principi in the Veterans Affairs Department. We have a program now where nobody gets handed off and "Go find your way to the VA" It is a program whereby they have people at our hospitals like Walter Reed. And they start speaking to them very early about what's available to them. And it is a seamless program.

And we also have a program for those soldiers who are disabled and have to leave the military, where we help them

find the kinds of good jobs they ought to have.

These are wonderful people, Americans who have made great sacrifices to their country, and we want to make sure that they are treated in that way.

And I appreciate your sentiments very much, sir. And I share them. And already we've had several soldiers because of just their drive and initiative and the wonderful advances that have been made in some of these prosthetics that have enabled them to remain in the military.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, if I could add very quickly, I had a soldier from Mogadishu that we kept in Special Forces through retirement that lost a leg. He was able to pass the physical training test and we got him back on jump status. So all kinds of things are possible. And certainly the prosthetics and the whole program that we have today is far better than it was 12 years ago.

TIAHRT: I'm amazed that...

SCHOOMAKER: I'd like to give you very quickly, just to show you the order of magnitude on this Humvee add-on. This is the add-on armor now. The requirement for add-on armor Humvees is \$8,400. We've already produced over 1,500 of those kits and applied them. We have 6,900 of them being produced now at the Army Research Laboratory that will be available May of this year.

On the larger vehicles, the FMTVs, the 5-ton truck equivalent, there's a requirement for 1,150 of those and they will be finished delivered by October of this year. On the HEMTTs, there's a requirement for over 1,000, almost 1,100 and the same thing.

And so the magnitude of this effort over and above the up-armored Humvee with the add-on stuff that you're talking about — and by the way, we support the Marine Corps in this effort. That's where they get this stuff. It's huge. And we're taking that on in a big way, a big effort.

TIAHRT: I appreciate that very much. I've got a couple of questions. And some of them you may want to get back to me on. You're consolidating the RRCs, the Reserve Command Centers and Region Reserve Commands from, I think, 10 to 6. I'd kind of like to know what the rationale for the consolidation, the status of it, and what timetable it's going to be on. I don't have to have that right now, but if you can just get back to me on that.

The 89th RRC is in Wichita, Kansas. And I think they rank them among the top, and they've done a great job. And I'd just kind of like to know what the status of the consolidation is.

A couple of things I'd like to do to comment on is how the base consolidation is going over in Iraq? And also the transfer of technology now that we've canceled the Comanche program. It looked like from the press account that we were just going to take that money and buy old school Apaches and other aircraft. And I would hope that there is some kind of a technology transfer because I know we gained a great deal of new technology through the Comanche program.

TIAHRT: How are we going to get that on to the other aircraft?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. And I'll start here and then let General Schoomaker pick up.

But to address your question directly about the Apache versus the Comanche, we will upgrade the Apache to a Block Three Apache. It will have the same capabilities as the Block One Comanche would have had with the exception of it will not be low observable stealthy. And it's probably not quite as fast.

Everything else it will have, to include the communication, the electronics, the ability to control unmanned aerial vehicles will all be built into that helicopters. So it will have essentially the same capabilities as the Block One Comanches will have had.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir and I'll just add, we're going to common — we're going to have common cockpit for special operations command on the Chinook, the Blackhawks and the others. We're putting fly by wire in. We're going to put in what's called the ATIPS (ph), which is all of the harnesses that are required as we rebuild these aircraft. That allows us to put the aircraft survivability equipment on these aircraft. It's a major — we're talking about major upgrades to over \$100 billion inventory that we have for 121 Comanches.

And by the way, the Comanche would not survive the current battlefield. It is not protected against the threat that we have. And for us to protect it against that threat not only takes down its low observability capability, but it would cost us

billions of dollars to do so.

from the operational perspective and from a business case, this was the right decision. And we stand very firmly on it.

TIAHRT: That's great.

The consolidation of the bases in Iraq, we're going from — at one time I think we had about 68 bases. Then we're going to get down to — plans to be down to six or eight. Is that correct? Do you know?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I don't think it's that low. We can take it for the record because it's a moving target. But I think it's more than that. But there is a consolidation going on. And as you know, there are far more Iraqi security forces today that are available. And what we're — what General Abizaid is doing is allowing them more and more control and having us look over the shoulder, be available in support of them. And part of that is consolidating some of these bases.

TIAHRT: All right.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Tiahart.

Mr. Dicks?

DICKS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary and General Schoomaker. I'm sorry that I was late. You know, each of us has other subcommittees that we're on and have (inaudible) responsibilities there. But I want to welcome you here to the committee.

Let me — I want to go back to a couple things here, just get your comments.

Before the — I've been very concerned about the lack of procurement funding, not just for the Army but for all of the services. And you know, the Joint Chiefs did a review of this a couple of years ago and said we were \$30 to \$40 billion short of where we needed to be. And so that's the context of where I'm kind of headed with these questions.

Before the submission of the budget amendment, due to the cancellation of Comanche, the Army got a \$400 million decrease for procurement from \$10.8 billion in '04 to \$10.4 billion in '05. This follows a \$1.4 billion procurement reduction from '03 to '04. This year's cuts includes the termination of another 14 Army programs in '05.

In FY '04, the Army terminated its programs to sustain the heavy force. OSD mandated that the Army cancel M1A2 SEP program, which pays for the digitization and upgrade of the Abrams tank and also the upgrade of the M2A3 Bradley Fighting Vehicle.

This was on top of the 18 Army procurement programs canceled in the FY '03 budget and the close to 40 programs canceled in the '01 and '02 budgets. JCS and CBO have estimated the Army had a \$5 billion per year shortfall in procurement.

Now, can the Army sustain the elimination of all of these programs? And what's going to happen in the area of procurement if the Army's budget keeps getting cut back, which may happen this year because of a budget resolution that's going to call for cutting back on defense spending, which I certainly oppose. But what — can the Army continue to sustain these cuts in procurement spending?

BROWNLEE: First of all, sir — and thank you for your support. We also would be very much opposed to any reductions in the budget that's been submitted.

But what the Army has been doing the past few years was to focus on the future as opposed to the current because the Army had seen that we had kind of a strategic pulse here and we were really focusing on modernizing in the future.

Now, General Schoomaker and I have moved that back some because clearly we are in a fight today that we are going to win. And we need to ensure that we're adequately funded for that. And we've talked about some of those issues of resetting the force and making sure that we have enough funds in there to get our rolling stock back into shape, as General Schoomaker indicated.

And one of the things that the termination of Comanche does is to reorient our resources in the '05 to fiscal year '11 program. So that while 40 percent of those funds would have gone to build 121 Comanches, it will now be used to acquire, or buy, some 400 new aircraft and upgrade hundreds more. And that is one indication of the shift in focus here.

But again, that was primarily done because of the operational environment that we were in and an analysis of the Comanche's capabilities. Wherein even if we had had the Comanche now, we couldn't have deployed it into the operational environment in Iraq and Afghanistan because the threat is not radar-guided systems. The threat is heat-seeking missiles and quite frankly, bullets.

And so we would have had to spend additional millions of dollars to put those survivability enhancements on the low observable airplane, which is very expensive to do, as you would know.

DICKS: You know, I understand that. But these kind of cuts, this kind of a systematic reduction in the funding for the Army worries me. The American people want to know, of course, why we didn't have the Humvees that we should have had and why we didn't have the SAPI plates for the body armor.

And if we keep cutting procurement back, I mean, isn't that part of the problem here that we're not getting enough money to take care of the legitimate requirements the Army has in putting these kids in harm's way. If we can't fund this because we keep cutting the budget on procurement, it seems to me that's got to be part of the problem. Why didn't we have this stuff?

BROWNLEE: Sir, let me address that. And I want, at the same to, if you'll permit me, to put in context some remarks attributed to me.

When we went to war in Iraq, certainly our troops were prepared for that war. And you need to understand that there are some things..

DICKS (?): How can you possibly say — with all due respect, Mr. Secretary, how can you possibly say that when we didn't have the Humvees that we needed with the extra protection, we didn't have the SAPI plates, we didn't have the equipment to do the jamming.

How can you say we were prepared when on those three things right there, we didn't have the stuff we needed?

Somehow we didn't buy enough of what we needed. And I'm arguing the reason is because we didn't have the money in the procurement accounts to get that done.

BROWNLEE: Well, sir, as you well know, every dollar we get is appropriated. People have been on these committees for years, and if you saw that, well, then certainly the invitation is there to help.

Let me say that when we went to war in Iraq, what we were up against was not the threat we were up against later. War's (inaudible), as you know everything's not knowable. And when we attacked in Iraq, no one can deny that the forces that blitzed Baghdad were not prepared for that war, because they were. And they got there in record time and they fought a marvelous battle and they were well equipped.

And, yes, the SAPI plates we were dealing with at that time were state-of-the-art, and we made sure we had enough of them for all of our combat troops, the frontline troops. And at that time, we allocated the ones we didn't have to the combat service support, as at least one to three, so when they went on a mission they would have them.

Now, we then moved to upgrade and build them as fast as we can, and we're doing that.

But when we went from the major land campaign battle phase into the stability phase, the enemy gets a vote. This is a very resourceful and adaptable enemy. And they began to use these IEDs against our forces, and we've adapted.

We've adapted and responded with more SAPI plates for everybody; every soldier is equipped. We responded with more up-armored Humvees. And they're rolling off the line at rates they never did in many years past, through several administrations.

BROWNLEE: And we have also done the applique phases that I mentioned.

So the simple fact, in the past there wasn't a huge requirement for up-armored Humvees because when you put all this weight on them they're not quite as fast as they are before, the performance is degraded somewhat. And it was not recognized in the Army that it was a requirement that every Humvee be up-armored. It is a different vehicle.

There are still some infantry troops in Iraq today who don't want up-armored Humvees. They want cargo Humvees with big engines. They want to take everything off of them — doors, windows, everything — put the seats in the middle so they're facing out, because they're not out there to protect themselves, they're out there to get the bad guys, and they

want to be equipped to do that.

LEWIS: General Schoomaker...

BROWNLEE: So the up-armored Humvees are primarily to protect the troops in convoy, and we're getting them over there as fast as we can. But we shifted from a major land campaign phase into a stability operation.

LEWIS: General Schoomaker, I can just see you anxious to respond. Then we've got to move on to Mr. Hobson. But would you?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, I wasn't indicating I was anxious at all.

(LAUGHTER)

I was going to throw more gas on the secretary here.

DICKS: I do have a final question.

(CROSSTALK)

DICKS: ... my time has expired.

LEWIS: You've had 10 minutes so far, Norm. But, you know, you can select how much time you like, but in the meantime...

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, could I add...

LEWIS: We'll give you five minutes on Peter's time.

(CROSSTALK)

DICKS: No, no. I will just take one minute on this one question.

DICKS: I'd like to ask one other question: How is the Stryker Brigade doing in Iraq? They came out of Fort Lewis, that's in my area, and we're very proud of them. How are they doing?

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, the Stryker Brigade is doing great. And I'll restate what I said, it's not just that the vehicle is doing great. The whole concept is great. The notion of the amount of infantry, the lethality, the protection, the mobility, the digital connection, the whole business, it's a real beacon to the future, and we're very, very proud of them. They've been attacked by IEDs; they've been attacked by rocket-propelled grenades; they've been ambushed. And the Stryker Brigade is doing very, very well.

I would just add to your thing, first of all, I share your concern. And procurement was an issue. I think we've made some major moves to rebalance. What we were doing before this war was investing in future at some expense to our current. What we have done is balanced that bill.

And what you will see in this budget, in fact addresses the M-1 set problem on the third ACR. It procures another 310 Strykers at almost a million dollars. It's got 18 lightweight 155 Howitzers for Stryker 5. It continues the M-1 Abrams upgrade. It procures the set for the third ACR. There's lots of things in there that you're interested in.

Going back to the other question, when we went to war, up-armored Humvees were for MPs and scouts. And nothing else was up-armored because they were in Bradleys tanks, you know, howitzers and all this stuff. When we transitioned to this stability and support operation, this is a whole new concept altogether. And I back the secretary. I think there's been a monumental effort made here to adapt and to do the kind of things we have. But nobody ever saw fighting as the Humvee being the basic armored platform for people to fight from.

In the future, every Humvee chassis we build will be the heavy chassis, heavy engine, heavy transmission that allows us to up-armor them with add-on kits and all these things.

But this is a whole different transition that we've made here, an expensive transition. And I think there's a very logical explanation to why we are where we are.

DICKS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Dicks.

Mr. Hobson?

HOBSON: I'm going to start out being nice and say it's good you've got Colonel Rommage (ph) up there with you now, sir. You're in good hands.

But then I'm going to get to the Humvee, and you're going to hear some of my frustrations.

I was at Fort Campbell yesterday, and I looked at some of the stuff. I got out, and I looked at a Humvee that's been armored in the field, by the kits, by other people. And I'll tell you my frustrations. My ranking member on my other committee was very helpful to me. I have fought with the Army. We used them in Bosnia, we should have known. We had them. We went around to procurement. I have added money, I don't know how many years, in spite of the Army, for up-armored Humvees — in spite of the Army.

One year, the Army didn't even have anything in its budget for Humvees at all, since I've been on this committee.

So if I'm frustrated, yes, I'm frustrated when I go out and see these kids have been shot up because somebody didn't think along the way about what we were going to get into. But others did. I can tell you, when we did FMTV, I tried to armor some of them. I was told, "We don't need trucks like that."

We tried to have some armored. We didn't.

So what do we do now? They're putting plates on them, they're putting sandbags around, on the floors.

If we didn't think about it, we should have looked in Afghanistan to see what platforms the enemy was using there. They were using pickup trucks with machine guns on them. So what are we doing now? We're putting stacks on Humvees, and we're armoring them. And the next ones — you know, you can go down there and see them. The kids improvise. We're copying them.

I think we should have — and I don't know why we send all these people to school to study all this stuff, because they didn't study it until we got into the battle. And some of us who don't know anything — we only sit on the committee and we're here longer than some of the people making decisions down in the Pentagon, we don't know anything.

So we've had to add money for up-armored Humvees for I don't know how many years.

Now, we've got a requirement that we have to do. And they are heavy, but there are composite materials out there that people can look at, that you can put on them.

One of the things we're trying to do that now.

But if I'm frustrated, yes, I'm frustrated. Because we get told we're pork barrel people. We're pork barrel. Well, the GM Humvee is not made in my district; it's made in Indiana someplace. And it's not armored in my district — it is in my state.

But I'm frustrated because we've tried to help the Army and we got pushed back on both the truck, on the FMTV, and we got pushed back on the Humvee. And now we're trying to lighten it, and I don't know where that's going to go.

And the other problem you've got, you've got to make kits that you can put on and take off, because the helicopters can't pick up very well an armored Humvee. And the kids know this. But I'm not sure that the Army's figured it out up at the upper levels. And it's frustrates me.

And now I want to give you a good news story, partially. This call-up has been a big boondoggle as far as I'm concerned, relating to the Guard and Reserve, and I've told the secretary and we've all had this discussion before.

And I had some kids I went down and put some medals on yesterday who were a public affairs unit, called up, without a commander, the commander sent in, who turned out all right, from Texas, into this unit.

HOBSON: The unit was told seven days before that they weren't going to be called up for a year, and they were called up in seven days and sent — boom. They responded. They did their job.

They were attached to a Marine; the Marine's didn't want them.

But they did a great job. And when they left, the Marines were thrilled.

And they've been moved around a couple of other places.

So kids will react to adversity. And they've come through it.

When I went over there the other day, or in November, you know, reservists — we tried to go through this, but I don't know if we got any response, or active duty for annual training, which does not give veterans benefits.

They need promotions. I know one kid who didn't get promoted because he's in Iraq. And there was not a photograph in his thing.

There's two pay systems. They're not integrated.

The Thrift Savings, the reservists had to do a check to get into the Thrift Savings. The active duty doesn't have to do that.

I was in Iraq, in Baghdad, the active duty had up-armored Humvees to patrol at night. The other kids, the Guard, couldn't patrol at night because they didn't have up-armored Humvees so they weren't able to do it.

They have M-16s; the active duty has M-4s.

I mean, this is not right, sir. We're supposed to be a one-force, but there's a difference between, I still believe it, there's still a difference.

My question is: Are these things — when are we going to get this changed around to where we treat Guard and reservists similar when we call them up in the Army?

And when are we going to get some of this stuff straightened out on procurement, on trucks and Humvees?

Charlie Wilson ought to be here to fight this war, too, because we started it and then he left and wrote a book.

But it's very frustrating to sit here on this committee and go through this time and time again on this same stuff, whether it's call-ups — and it's not just in this. We had screw-ups before. We've still got them. We've got bureaucrats down there — I don't want to get into names, I've done that before — that are out of the big think tanks that don't get it done.

We just need to fix this stuff. And I don't understand why it's not fixed. Can you give me an answer to some of that?

BROWNLEE: A response, sir?

HOBSON: Yes, sir. Well, I'm not through ranting, but that's all right.

BROWNLEE: Well, first of all...

HOBSON: Mr. Secretary, welcome to the hearing.

BROWNLEE: Thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

I kept waiting for the good part there, but...

(LAUGHTER)

HOBSON: Well, let me tell you, let me tell you something. In spite of all the bureaucracy down there, the kids still did their job. The kids in the field do their job in spite of all the other stuff. The American soldier is great. But they have to fight through all this stuff.

One kid said to me, he said, "My blood's just as red as the active duty and I do my job as well if not better. But I'm not treated that way." And he said, "I can handle most of the Army, but I can't handle when they mess with my family."

BROWNLEE: Well, sir, you and I have had this discussion, and we are working on these things. And one of the best indicators of this General Schoomaker mentioned earlier, and that is we mobilize and are training now three National Guard enhanced brigades. We put them above all the active component units to receive the rapid fielding initiative. This is all the soldier items that soldiers get. Now it's about \$3,000 and includes a new, improved helmet, rifle scopes and all that, all the things they get from sunglasses to knee pads and elbow pads. And they got it at a higher priority than the active component units. And that's the way we intended.

So we are moving to address these things. General Schoomaker and I are both committed to one Army. And right now, General Helmly and General Schultz are sitting right behind us. We hope there's prima facie evidence of that.

Some of the other things you mentioned, I thought that I was the one on the Senate side adding all the Humvees those years. I didn't know you were doing it over here.

Anyway, I know that we added them also. I wish we were clairvoyant and smarter and could have foreseen some of these other things.

But please don't think for a minute it's because there's any lack of caring or anything at this level. There is not. We are totally committed to the force protection of our soldiers, and that comes before everything.

So we're doing this. You know, it's true on both the up-armored Humvees, it's on the armored kits, and you probably know also that when an up-armored Humvee rolls off the line, it has an air conditioner. And when you go out and applicate armor to a standard Humvee in the field, it doesn't have an air conditioner. And when it's 130 degrees in Iraq, you can't close all the doors and windows on these vehicles and survive.

So we are also procuring air conditioners for these vehicles on which we're adding the applicate.

HOBSON: Let me tell you one other thing that occurred to me. They told me yesterday, and I didn't realize this. On a regular Humvee, not an armored one, an up-armored one, but a regular Humvee, I didn't realize that the glass in the windshield is not shatter-proof. I was told that a rock goes through it or a bullet goes through it and the glass comes right back into somebody's face. That doesn't happen in a civilian vehicle. But I was told that yesterday down here. And somebody ought to look at the...

BROWNLEE: I'm not aware of this.

(CROSSTALK)

BROWNLEE: I think that they have safety glass. They don't have ballistic glass.

HOBSON: No, I understand that. But it's not that...

BROWNLEE: I'll check for it. If they don't have safety glass I'd be very surprised.

HOBSON: Well, they told me they didn't. I talked to kids who drove them.

I've got on other question — I've got a lot of questions, but I'm going to end with this one right now in this round.

HOBSON: In February '04, the Army announced the restructuring of the force — maybe you answered this when I wasn't here, and I apologize for that — to create a modular brigade-based army. I understand that you used the supplemental dollars to reset the active component. How do you plan on funding the conversion of the reserve components to this modular-based structure?

SCHOOMAKER: Well, those reserves that we've deployed, we will also reset with supplemental funding. But both the Guard and the Reserve have a — General Helmly and General Schultz both have a major restructuring plan in the Guard and Reserve that we are together on and going to help them on. And a lot of it perhaps — which one of you guys would like to comment at all about that, Roger?

ROGER SCHULTZ, DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD: We're dealing with a Guard-wide proposal where we line our units, our brigades, with the same kind of formations that Pete just outlined here. So as we do this, we're pulling together in budget detail for the program here that — '06 to '11 for us, what that requirement looks like. We're in the process right now of developing our requirements to reshape our units to align with active (OFF-MIKE)

HOBSON: Just one other thing they said with that — and you talked about this earlier — on the M-4s, particularly a good weapon, I think, as long as you give them all the other items that go with that system — there's some sight and some other things — that they say really improve their effectiveness in that systems.

SCHOOMAKER: We've equipped the three brigades that are going (inaudible) up to have all been equipped with the M-4 carbine with all of the stuff that goes on it.

HOBSON: And I understand that the food court has been resolved. Nobody knows who gave the order, but...

SCHOOMAKER: That what is?

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Hobson.

HOBSON: The Wendy's problem — not Wendy's, but the Burger King and a Taco Bell and stuff that's going in is going in again. It was stopped, but it's going.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Hobson.

For a while, I thought you were a former staffer here.

(LAUGHTER)

Mr. Sabo?

SABO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And welcome Mr. Secretary and General Schoomaker.

I expect today is the day you hear of lots of frustrations.

In 2002, after the Crusader cancellation, at the request of senior Army leadership, Congress set a statutory requirement that mandated the fielding of a non-line-of-sight cannon and resupply vehicle by 2008. This legislative mandate was renewed in 2003. So it occurred twice.

And I expect you're better versed in Army regulations than I am, but I do know that the term "fielding" has a specific meaning in the Army. Two Army regulations — AR 700-142, material fielding, and AR 70-1, Army acquisition policy, described the decision-making, logistics training and other processes necessary to achieve the fielding status. AR 700 that describes the process necessary to achieve a first unit equipped which includes achieving a material fielding release, provision of spares and logistics and the conduct of new equipment training.

The other one describes the type classified process occurring and the production decision and prior to fielding. This includes successful completion of operational tests.

Since the Army had a well-documented definition process for fielding, and therefore knew what it asked of the Congress when it requested the fielding of a new cannon by 2008.

Secretary, can you explain why in two years since the Crusader termination, the Army has not implemented an acquisition approach for the non-line-of-sight cannon that complies with the law, the Army's commitment to Congress and its own definition of fielding first unit equipment?

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. I'm fairly familiar with what the law says. And we have sent a letter over to the respective defense committees indicating that it would be not technically feasible or possible to field in accordance with the definition you used — a non-line-of-sight cannon by 2008.

We could and we have asked consideration that if we in fact field pre-production prototypes by 2008, if that would be considered by the committees as fielding. The alternative here is not readily available. That's as fast as we can get there. I mean it's a matter of — I guess we can be bugged, but I don't know if that helps. That's as fast as we can get that system into place. This is a — not an easy thing to do to build a cannon this light with these capabilities. And we are deeply involved in it. And it is a part of our centerpiece modernization effort for future combat system, and in fact, it is the lead system and centerpiece of all of that.

So there is no lack of emphasis on the program in the Army, but you know, if you pass the law saying we could cure the common cold, we couldn't do that either. We're trying to ask if they committees will consider that fielding that we do field preproduction prototypes. If they don't, then we'll have to ask the committees to consider changing the law.

SABO: Mr. Chairman?

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Sabo.

Mr. Nethercutt?

SABO: No.

LEWIS: You want some more time?

SABO: Yes.

LEWIS: OK. You deserve more time. Go right ahead.

SABO: I must say that the request for fielding a cannon by 2008 was part of an agreement between the Army and the Congress. It was part of the process of terminating the Crusader. And the committee's expressed its concern to you regularly with appropriated monies specifically for that purpose. It hasn't been used for that purpose. And I just find it difficult that — to understand why what the Congress had said two different years and a requirement that was written into law with the understanding — approval — of the Army simply isn't being followed.

BROWNLEE: Sir, first of all, I'm not aware that we're not spending the monies for the purposes which they're appropriated. I'm not aware of any departure from that. And I believe we are spending the monies for the purposes for which they're appropriated and it will possibly do what you said. If we knew how to do that, we would.

I just don't think we can be there by the time period that's in the law, and we're coming over now advising — in a letter in February, we advised the committees of that and asked if the committees would consider if the preproduction prototypes would be considered fielding. I don't — we haven't had a response to that yet, but we want to continue working with the Congress. We want the cannon. It's essential to what we're doing. It is the centerpiece of our future combat system. There is no lack of enthusiasm for it. I'm just not sure how we comply with that part of the law.

SABO: Well, Mr. Chairman, the law has been there.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SABO: It's clear. It's been precise. And clearly there's been no attempt by the Army over the last several years to comply with what was a very specific legislative act by Congress.

Chairman, I thank you.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Sabo.

SCHOOMAKER: I would just — the NLOS-C — the non-line-of-sight cannon — is an inherent part of future combat assist. The strength of the future combat system is it's on a common chassis. NLOS-C is going to be on a chassis that the cannon is going to be on a chassis that's common with the rest of them.

Our intent is and what's physically possible for us to field the unit that will be a prototype unit will have people on it in concert with the future combat system which reaches IOC and as a system in 2010 and FOC in 2012. And I think that's the fundamental thing. I know we are committed to NLOS-C. We've talked here on the Hill about it. And I don't know of anything that we're doing that is not in concert with money going where it's supposed to go. But it's a matter of physics and that's why — not to have it as part of a common chassis is a big mistake.

SABO: Mr. Chairman, if I might have — is it a wheeled or tracked vehicle at this point?

SCHOOMAKER: That decision has not been made to the best of my knowledge.

SABO: When will that decision come?

BROWNLEE: We'll be happy to provide it for the record. I know that it is development. I know we are working on it. What General Schoomaker said is absolutely factual: It is to be the centerpiece of future combat system which means it will be on a chassis that is common with other vehicles in that family, and that is the intent.

I'm not sure — we certainly want to comply with the law and we intend to do that. And that letter we wrote on the 27th of February was to indicate our difficulties with doing that and asking the committees if the pre-production prototypes would be considered as fielding.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Sabo.

BROWNLEE: Then, that's all I know to do.

LEWIS: Mr. Nethercutt?

NETHERCUTT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, welcome. I'm sorry to have been late for the hearing. I appreciate your testimony. I want to thank you for your service. I know I was in Iraq with the chairman and other members in September, and saw nothing but dedication and commitment on the part of the Army. And I know you've got some challenges out there trying to manage all those personnel.

I want to ask you just three questions. I had an opportunity last weekend out in my state of Washington to meet with a woman — a mother — in Longview, Washington. She's started up an operation as part of — it's called Mothers of Military Support — MOMS. Their motto is, "Until they all come home." And they're concerned about the young men and women overseas, and want to get them home and make sure that their needs are being met.

NETHERCUTT: Elizabeth Johnston started this organization after her son was deployed to Kuwait. And what they do is they provide care kits to the soldiers in Iraq, and it augments the equipment the soldiers are issued with donations from the community. It's a good program.

She tells me that as many as 60 percent of the soldiers she helps do not have the financial means to purchase all of the personal equipment they will need for their deployment.

This committee has previously directed the Army to review shortages in personal equipment. Soldiers going to Iraq shouldn't have the additional burden of purchasing boots and socks and reliable GPS receivers and so forth.

What progress are you making in the area? I know Mr. Frelinghuysen mentioned the 81st Brigade, and I know that they're in the process of deploying. I went to their deployment ceremony in Tacoma. It was a wonderful ceremony, and there's a lot of dedicated people, a lot of families who care deeply about their people and their loved ones.

So I know that they out West and certainly across the country want to know that these young people, these Guard and Reserve forces, are being cared for, that their personal needs are being met.

I just want to know if you can reassure us that these personal needs are going to be met. It appears that they're not being met. And it may be anecdotal, but on the other hand, there it may be substantive. So could you testify for the record...

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

Sir, in order to get at this problem you identified — we found the same thing. When we deployed soldiers, we found that they took money out of their pockets and went and bought certain items that we didn't think they ought to be buying, that we ought to buy.

So that's when the Rapid Fielding Initiative, the RFI, was developed within the Army, to buy these kinds of items for each soldier and equip them. And we started that program. It's sunglasses — the Wiley sunglasses and knee pads and elbow pads and the enhanced sighting devices that go on the ankles and all that.

And the three brigades, including the brigade from Washington, were all put at the highest priority to receive this equipment. In other words, they were put at a higher priority than the 1st Cavalry Division and the 25th Infantry Division and the active components that were also going.

And one of the reasons we did that was because we didn't think these soldiers had had the time to train with this equipment as some of the actives had. So they were put on a higher priority list to get this stuff than the active.

And so we've done that. And we have funded that as a very high priority within the Army. And this committee did put money in the supplemental for the Rapid Fielding Initiative, and that's what it goes for. Along with up-armored Humvees and body armor, you put money in for those things, and we are very grateful, as I know our soldiers and their families are as well.

NETHERCUTT: Your assessment is that the needs are being met and that you're prepared to meet those needs and that you're committed to meeting those needs?

BROWNLEE: With the RFI, the Rapid Fielding Initiative, we'll equip 120,000 soldiers this year with that.

NETHERCUTT: The other thing that was mentioned, I've had an interest in this on this subcommittee, the lingering concern of many reservists about sort of the frictions of continuing and recurring deployments, potential friction with their employers.

As you know, the Guard and Reserve members in many cases have taken substantial pay cuts, and then to know that their absence is creating friction with their employers compounds the problem.

Last year, in the House report, I added some language directing OSD to report to the committee with specific details about the state of reserve-employer relations by the end of this month. The directive also calls for legislative

recommendations.

Since the preponderance of Guard and Reserve forces are either Army Guard or Army Reserve — I understand it's 155,000 out of 180,000 — I expect that your office is playing a major role in drafting the recommendations.

So if you have some thoughts that you can share with us at this point, I'd be grateful.

BROWNLEE: Sir, if we could take that for the record, I'd like to. I wouldn't want to give you any — I just don't know where it is in stages right now. But we'll be happy to provide it for the record.

NETHERCUTT: I proposed a reserve credit, for example, for the employer to make, as they deploy people overseas, that they would be grateful to have a tax credit for the sacrifice that the employers are giving.

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

NETHERCUTT: So that's something — I appreciate...

BROWNLEE: But this is an issue that I've raised several times and asked what can we do to reward these wonderful companies, many of whom are paying their citizen-soldiers while they are deployed. They're paying them either their full salary or making up the difference between the military salary and their other salary.

And this is widespread. It's not something that's isolated. And we just have to do a better job of recognizing them. I have no problem at all with what you just mentioned — I don't know tax policies — but I certainly would subscribe to some way of recognizing and rewarding these employers who do make sacrifices themselves.

What we have found, though, is that those people who get hurt the most when they are called up from the Reserve components are those who have a small business themselves, small business, they are self-employed.

I've run into at least two veterinarians. Usually that's a business where the veterinarian performs and the work and some member of his family does the administration, and when he's called away there is no business.

There was a fellow I met who was a tree surgeon. Same kind of situation.

And so they really — their economic world kind of falls apart, and we need to find a way to help them, too.

LEWIS: Will the gentleman yield?

NETHERCUTT: Yes, sir.

LEWIS: Expanding on this subject area a bit, what we're really talking about is the OPTEMPO, the stress that is putting this on the kids out there. I'd like to know if that's having an impact that's measurable on retention, what the Army's going to be doing about that.

It's very clear that when you have a brigade going out for the third round, between Bosnia and Afghanistan and Iraq, that pressure's being built. So describe that for us for the record.

BROWNLEE: Sir, certainly within the active component we're having to send people on, some of them for the second time here. And some of them have been on tours before in Afghanistan and other places. So, clearly this kind of stress on the force is real, and that was a part of the human cost I mentioned earlier.

And we are very sensitive to it. The secretary of defense has a whole program of 25 to 30 things we need to do to try to reduce these kinds of stresses. And the Reserve components, where we have a high demand, low density of that speciality, gets caught in this sometimes, too. But the numbers for those who have been called up more than once is a very small fraction.

Now, what we need to do is restructure the Reserve component, which General Schoomaker and I, along with General Helmly and General Schultz, have indicated we plan to do, because there are parts of the Reserve components that are not very usable in the kind of situations we find ourselves in today.

For instance, in the National Guard we have like 17 brigades of artillery, and that's not very useful to us right now.

BROWNLEE: We are, this year, converting 18 artillery batteries out of the National Guard into provisional military police companies so they can fill some of this void that we find where we have a high-demand, low-density. MPs is one of them, civil affairs is one of them.

And what we want to do is take that force structure and convert it from artillery and air defense and things that are not very useful to us into military police, civil affairs, transportation, aviation, medical — the things for which we do have high demand.

And we have a plan to do that. And we're already some of it; we're going to do more.

NETHERCUTT: Well, that's fine, and I appreciate that.

My concern is making sure that the employers are aware that you all are aware with respect to the sacrifice they're making, and the employees who are called up whose little families sometimes is on military pay the same as the outside private pay and so they're struggling to make mortgage payments.

So my point to you is, to the extent that DOD and the Army can stand up and say, "Congress, we support this kind of legislation," or "We support this kind of consideration for these families" — and the disparity that exists.

That would be very helpful. And would, I think, go a long way towards helping us make judgments about what you folks think is needed among your people in the field and the families which are affected.

So I would urge you, in the strongest terms, as you formulate these legislative recommendations that are due at the end of this month, according to our report, to be strong with respect to advocacy for a policy that's going to meet the demands and needs of the service, but also the needs of the employers.

We're sacrificing...

BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, and the families as well. And our family support programs within the reserve components are more difficult, of course, because we don't have them consolidated in single locations like we do primarily for the actives. So it's more difficult. We've used hot lines and Web sites and a lot of other things to try to help. And we're working very hard at that.

NETHERCUTT: Well, we'll look forward to receiving that report at the end of the month. Thank you very much.

LEWIS: Thank you, Mr. Nethercutt.

Gentlemen of the committee, we are scheduled to come back into H-140 with the senior acquisition people at 1:30 p.m. I'm open to other questions at this point, if you'd like. But beyond that — please, go ahead.

(UNKNOWN): I'd like to associate myself with Mr. Sabo's line of questioning on the non-line-of-sight cannon and really like to know where we're going relative. We're looking towards 2008?

I'd also like to associate myself with some of the remarks of Representative Hobson, some of the frustration, as well as there's been — the Guards and Reserves have been working with the regular troops. There are these perceived and real inequities.

We're on your side. If these inequities exist, I hope there's a top-level team addressing them.

But the whole idea of a regular Army person being a short-timer, maybe the term is too old-fashioned, and then the Reserves having whatever they call it, an ETF, still, I guess, that somehow their departure would be suspended if they're in theater — if those types of inequities are occurring, somebody needs to address them. Because if there's a greater potential for the Guard and Reserve to be mobilized — and it's still unclear to me if something like 60 percent that have never been mobilized, or something. Maybe it's higher, I don't know.

I would think that it would be a God-awful morale situation in the future. Maybe it is now if somebody isn't on a high level working on those types of issues.

I don't associate my comments with everything that Mr. Hobson said. But we are eager to see that the right thing is done for our soldiers.

Thank you.

HOBSON: If I may interject, it may not sound like we're on your side, but we are. But we are frustrated. I mean, we had a long time to look at these MOSs. We have all these planning guys out here and we're supposed to be looking at stuff.

And we've known at least, I think, since 9/11 that the MOSs were wrong in how they were set up. You got military police that are on the Guard, you've got airport bases being — I mean, it's changed things.

I don't know — and you need to tell us if you are, how that's being changed. I don't see it yet. We don't feel that coming through. Maybe it is. Maybe you're doing it. But I don't see it when I talk to people.

SCHOOMAKER: Sir, the best way to get to your frustration is to help us do this transformational thing we're doing by restructuring the Guard and Reserve, my modularizing the Army.

The answer to the stress on the force is they have more brigades available for us to get time between rotations.

Right now the Guard and Reserve are so overstructured that there are no whole units there. And so you start with swiss cheese. You got fewer people than you got units. And then you call out individuals, and you get bigger holes in the cheese.

And then you call out all of the other kind of things that happen, and so when you go to reach into the Guard and Reserve to get a unit, like a truck company, you end up having to mobilize three or four of them.

And then you get them that are fully equipped, they're not trained, it takes us longer to do it — all the rest of it.

One of the reasons why we went the direction we did on the three Guard brigades — the 30th, 39th and 81st — gave them the top line equipment, we gave them first-class training. We've done everything we can do to make them first-class citizens.

And I thank the leadership back here who ascribed to this — as well as the soldiers. We've been out there with them and they'll tell you this.

If you look at OIF-3, which we're already planning, we've already alerted the Guard and Reserve combat forces — we've got more on the combat support side to go yet — but we've given them four months' notice as to when their alert will come.

I mean, we're going to school on ourselves and we're getting better at it. And if you will help us get through this transformation, we'll have an Army that can sustain this level of stuff as a first-rate Army for a long time.

But if we continue to do what we've done in the past and part-time this deal on and off, on and off, on and off over the years, we're going to continue to have a dissynchronous outfit that is a problem.

That's the challenge. That's why I came back in the Army, to help fix this because I'm frustrated too.

(CROSSTALK)

BROWNLEE: Sir?

(UNKNOWN): I'm worried you're going to be back driving your pickup truck on the ranch and we're...

(CROSSTALK)

BROWNLEE: I'm not going back driving it until we fix this stuff.

(UNKNOWN): That's good. That's what I want.

LEWIS: General, and Mr. Secretary, that's a great place to end this morning's session.

Please know that there are questions the members have that we'd appreciate your responding for the record. Otherwise we'll see your acquisition people at 1:30 in the other building.

Thanks a lot.

BROWNLEE: Thank you, sir.

END

#### NOTES:

[????] - Indicates Speaker Unknown

[—] - Indicates could not make out what was being said.[off mike] - Indicates could not make out what was being said.

**PERSON:** JERRY LEWIS (94%); C W (BILL) YOUNG (72%); JOHN P MURTHA (71%); DAVID L HOBSON (57%); GEORGE R NETHERCUTT (56%); HENRY BONILLA (56%); TODD TIAHRT (55%); RODNEY P FRELINGHUYSEN (55%); ROGER

F WICKER (54%); NORMAN D DICKS (53%); MARTIN OLAV SABO (53%); DAVID OBEY (52%); JAMES P MORAN (52%);

**LOAD-DATE:** March 13, 2004

107140

\*\*\*\*\* Print Completed \*\*\*\*\*

Time of Request: March 15, 2004 08:14 AM EST

Print Number: 1821:0:8756586

Number of Lines: 908

Number of Pages: 27

Send To: MAYFIELD, ALEX  
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU-PUBLIC AFF.  
1411 JEFFERSON DAVIS HWY  
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-3231