

1 of 23 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2004 Federal News Service, Inc.
Federal News Service

March 2, 2004 Tuesday

SECTION: CAPITOL HILL HEARING

LENGTH: 21693 words

HEADLINE: HEARING OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

CHAired BY: SENATOR JOHN WARNER (R-VA)

LOCATION: 216 HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

WITNESSES: LES BROWNLEE, ACTING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY;

GORDON R. ENGLAND, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY;

JAMES G. ROCHE, SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

BODY:

SEN. JOHN WARNER (R-VA): Good morning all. We have a most unusual day before us. The Senate has on the floor a series of at least five, six to seven amendments, the votes start at 11:30 and therefore we're going to try and get this hearing completed in two hours time, otherwise it would be a very considerable inconvenience to our distinguished witnesses. So we welcome you with that cheerful news.

I know how well you've prepared and you've got, each of you, a half hour opening statement and ready for a barrage of questions. But I think in this instance Senator Levin and I will give short statements. We'll proceed then to receive hopefully somewhat abbreviated answers on your behalf, and then you'll just have to work with us as we have members coming and going through the course of the morning.

We start this hearing this morning with news reports out of Baghdad that are quite disturbing, and in our hearts and minds is the welfare of the men and women of the armed forces and a very large number of civilians who are doing their very best to bring about a degree of democracy in that troubled part of the world. So the posture statements this morning relate, of course, to the president's defense budget, which that in itself is subject to scrutiny here on the Hill by a number of persons who are considered with the overall fiscal situation facing the nation.

Acting Secretary Brownlee, Secretary Gordon England, Secretary Roche, we welcome you back. Start by recognizing again the professionalism of the men and women of our armed forces together with our coalition partners. They have been very successful in executing complex joint military operations around the world in the ongoing global war on terrorism. In Iraq and Afghanistan our forces defeated brutal regimes quickly, with precision and continued to provide stability and support as those nations move toward democracy.

The men and women of the armed forces, active, Reserve and National Guard supported by civilian employees and contractors who perform magnificently. This is proof of the training, equipment and readiness that you have provided them. Their service and their sacrifices, and the sacrifices of their family, we always must remember that, are deeply appreciated. Most particularly by those who lost their lives and those who bear the wounds of this conflict, and conflicts, of course, in Afghanistan.

Federal News Service March 2, 2004 Tuesday

Military operations continue at a high tempo in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Balkans and elsewhere around the world. At the same time we must prepare now for the future, a future fraught with new threats and new challenges. The president's budget request anticipates this uncertain future. And that's why this senator strongly supports the president's budget at the level of \$401.7 billion for Defense. The budget continues the president's strong commitment to safeguard America and sends a strong signal to the world of America's resolve.

Since our nation was attacked on September the 11th, much has been asked of each of your respective services. Over the past several years we've seen hundreds of thousands of soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines deployed around the world to fight the global war on terrorism and to maintain our forward presence. At the same time we have asked the services to transform to meet the future threats. We're all aware of the hard choices you must make in your departments when deciding whether or not to trade a dollar of today's readiness to invest a dollar in modernizing for this challenging and uncertain future.

I know each of you is looking for better, more efficient ways to use your limited resources from developing new capabilities to introducing new organizational structures to better integrating the Guard and Reserves active force. The Army's modular brigades, the Navy's fleet response plan and the Air Force's aerospace expeditionary force concept are but a few of the innovations and capabilities we look forward to discussing with you today. As Congress must work its will on the present budget request we must be mindful of the potential problems.

We are putting increased demands on our forces around the world, increased demands on their families and increased demands on our Reserve and National Guard. We are fortunate as a nation with a military that has responded to these demands with extraordinary commitment, but even the best military has its limits. As we perform our annual budget review we must and we will carefully analyze the effects of these challenges on our men and women in uniform and their families. Congress will, I'm confident, make the investments needed to ensure we have the people, the capabilities and the facilities necessary to meet these future threats.

There are many questions. To assist the committee I hope each of you will address the following in your opening statements. Do we have enough people in your respective military departments, the right mix of people and the capabilities in your departments to meet the threats for the foreseeable future? Are we doing all we can to ensure that our forces deployed overseas both active and Reserve components have the best possible equipment and support?

Are the lessons learned from recent military operations being rapidly real-time integrated within your departments in the operational forces? Have we repositioned forces to meet new global threats? Do we have the facilities, the infrastructure and the mobility that we will need? Are we doing everything we can to provide a safe, constructive environment for the patriotic young men and women who volunteer to serve our nation?

These are but a few of the issues we hope to explore with you today. We have the best armed forces in the world. We don't say that boastfully, it's absolutely substantiated by fact. It can be sustained with smart investments, strong leadership and the continued sacrifices of our individual soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines and their families.

We will do our part by providing them the resources they need to successfully execute their missions in the cause of freedom and to protect us here at home. And I commend each of you. You've been in office now for some period of time and I think you've done commendable performances in leadership of your respective departments.

So, Senator Levin?

SEN. CARL LEVIN (D-MI): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me join you in welcoming our witnesses and thanking them for their service to this nation, and our forces as you indicate continue this year to be heavily engaged in ongoing operations including a rotation of troops and equipment in and out of Iraq that has been said to be the largest since World War II. Nearly 120,000 troops will depart Iraq to be replaced by nearly 110,000 others.

The demands on the active force, particularly the Army, is so great that the proportion of Reserve component forces serving in Iraq will increase from the current 20 percent to nearly 40 percent of the total in this next rotation. Marine Corps units which were withdrawn last summer will be returning to Iraq in this rotation to replace some of the departing Army units. Those same Army units after a very short rest will be busy reorganizing, retraining and refurbishing their equipment in preparation for a potential return to Iraq in a year's time.

It is reported that 11,000 U.S. troops operating in eastern Afghanistan are coordinating offensive actions more closely

with Pakistani forces operating in western Pakistan, in a renewed effort to go after the principal terrorist threat to our nation. Additionally almost 40,000 more U.S. troops stand their ground in Korea, confronting the undeniably serious conventional and potentially nuclear threats posed by the regime in North Korea. Thousands more serve in stability operations in the Balkans and the Sinai and now, once again, in our own hemisphere in Haiti.

So I join with you, Mr. Chairman, and other members of this committee in renewing our pledge to our military men and women, to their families, that we will work to ensure that they continue to receive the best training and the best equipment that our nation can provide, and that they and their families are appropriately compensated and supported as is befitting the service that they render to our nation.

The president's Defense budget request for \$420 billion represents an estimate of the cost of the normal operations of the activities within the Defense Department, within the Defense budget function for Fiscal Year 2005. However, the budget does not include any request to support the incremental costs that our military forces in Fiscal Year '05 will incur in continuing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan or Haiti.

Administration officials have further said that they do not intend to seek any funds for a supplemental to pay for these incremental costs this calendar year. That is not a responsible way to support our troops and it is not responsible budgeting. We should provide for those costs that we can reasonably predict that our forces will incur. We should not force our armed forces to rob from existing requirements to pay for these operations.

Congress provided an extra \$65 billion to support operations in Iraq and Afghanistan during the current fiscal year, the year of '04. It turns out that these funds will not even be sufficient to cover all the incremental costs of these operations until the end of the fiscal year. So we cannot count on any excess carry over funding to address these problems in Fiscal Year '05 until a mid-year supplemental can be enacted.

At an earlier hearing before this committee, the chiefs of staff of the Army and Air Force and the commandant of the Marine Corps all expressed concern about waiting until after the end of calendar year '04 to submit a supplemental budget request. Hopefully our service secretaries will tell us this morning whether they share the concerns of their service chiefs and, if so, whether they are urging the secretary of Defense and the president to seek such supplemental funding from Congress on an urgent and a timely basis.

The delay in requesting the supplemental is only part of the problem. Press reports indicate that administration officials plan on asking for \$50 billion in supplemental funding in Fiscal Year '05, but the requirement will likely be much higher. If, in fact, the Army officials have indicated that the Army's requirement alone will equal or surpass that amount.

The Army chief of staff testified that the Army is currently spending \$3.7 billion a month in Iraq and \$900 million a month in Afghanistan. He has also testified that he received approval from Department of Defense to temporarily increase Army end strength by 30,000 soldiers, an increase that he intends to pay through supplemental appropriations. That will potentially add an additional cost of nearly \$4 billion a year.

One other point about supplementals. The current supplemental is probably insufficient to meet the current needs of the armed forces through September 30th. Ongoing funding needs are apparently several billion dollars higher than that which the president requested from Congress and which we appropriated for the supplemental for this year. Consequently, the Army will have to find the funding in its regular budget this year to make up the sizable difference. This under funding of supplemental requirements is already having an effect on the transformation effort.

Recently the Army decided to terminate its only new helicopter program, the Comanche. Although the Army leadership has said that the changing operational environment, coupled with the emerging ability of joint systems to provide the capability originally intended of Comanche were factors in that decision, it seems clear that funding constraints were of equal, if not greater, significance. Meanwhile, the Army must still deal with significant un-funded requirements to complete armoring of trucks in Iraq and Afghanistan and for the refurbishing of heavily used equipment from those ongoing military operations.

Having terminated its future air combat system, I would hate to see the Army forced to do the same to its ground future combat systems to meet requirements related to ongoing operations that may also go un-funded by future supplemental appropriations. And while perhaps not as extreme as the Army, the other services are facing similar challenges, as the leaders of those services have recently testified and we in the Congress cannot allow those challenges to become problems through the neglect to address them on a timely basis.

Federal News Service March 2, 2004 Tuesday

So, Mr. Chairman, I again look forward to discussing these and other issues with our witnesses this morning.

SEN. JAMES INHOFE (R-OK): Thank you, Senator Levin.

Without objection, some of you who weren't here during Senator Warner's opening statement, we will have votes at 11:30. We're going to try to expedite this so, if you don't mind, we won't have further opening statements and we'll go right ahead into the opening statements of our secretaries, and we'll start with Secretary Brownlee.

Secretary Brownlee, let me mention this morning we had an Army caucus meeting. It was very well attended, General Schoomaker did an excellent job, and we'll recognize you now for your opening statement.

MR. LES BROWNLEE: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today, along with the secretary of the Navy and the secretary of the Air Force and when I appear before this distinguished committee with the wonderful public servants to my left, I have to admit again I feel much like a mule entered into the Kentucky Derby here, but I shall do my best.

I'm especially honored to have the opportunity to testify before this distinguished committee on the status of the Army. I have a prepared posture statement and with your permission would like to submit that statement for the record.

SEN. INHOFE: Without objection all full statements will be a part of the record.

MR. BROWNLEE: Let me begin by expressing my gratitude for your tremendous support to our soldiers who are serving our country around the world, as well as to their families at home. This support comes from the members as well as from your dedicated professional and personal staff. Your interest and involvement in the Army's activities has made a significant difference in our soldier's welfare and their mission accomplishment. To the members and staff of this distinguished committee, on behalf of the United States Army, thank you all.

I know that you're deeply interested in the great work our soldiers are doing, their training and morale and how we are equipping them. In the last nine months I've visited our troops in Iraq three times and those in Afghanistan twice and traveled to our posts in Germany, South Korea and here in the United States. I'm grateful to have the opportunity to share what I've learned with you.

As Senator Levin indicated we have proposed to grow the Army temporarily by 30,000 soldiers over the next several years.

Using the authority in title 10 and to be paid for from supplemental appropriations. We will plan to use these resources to stand up at least 10 new combat brigades over the next several years and we ask for your support in that endeavor. Many of you have asked me about measures we're taking to protect our forces in Iraq. I would like to address two in particular.

First, a number of up-armored Humvees in the central command area of responsibility is now over 2,000 compared to about 500 last spring. You will recall that when General Schoomaker and I testified before this committee in November, we estimated then that we would be unable to satisfy the CJTF-7 requirement in Iraq of 3,000 up-armored Humvees until May of 2005. The committee indicated that they found that unacceptable as did we, and we have worked with the manufacturers 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, which with some redistribution will enable us to produce the current CENTCOM CFLC requirement of 4,149 vehicles by August of 2004.

I've talked to the CEOs of these companies that build these up-armored Humvees and visited their production lines. They're committed to and capable of increasing production rates to up 450 per month to help us fill our requirements even faster. While this will require additional resources, I'm working within my budget and with OSD so that we can achieve this accelerated production level as quickly as possible.

Second, there's been concern about every soldier having the best available protection against bullets and explosive fragments. To provide this protection, we increased the production of interceptor body armor last fall and are currently producing and shipping 25,000 sets monthly to the theater of operation. There are now sufficient stocks of IBA, to interceptor body armor, to equip every soldier and DOD civilian in Iraq and Afghanistan and we will fill our requirement for the remainder of soldiers and DOD civilians in theater by the end of this month.

In summary, we are producing enough interceptor body armor to equip every soldier and DOD civilian in Iraq and

Afghanistan and we will fill our requirement for the remainder of soldiers and DOD civilians in theater by the end of this month. In summary, we are producing enough interceptor body armor so 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. Underlying everything we are doing and planning to do is the most important point I want to make here today. We are an Army at war serving a nation at war.

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 lesson 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 commit such actions as well as committed to providing proper care for the victims of such attacks. We are dedicated 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 as well as their peers. We will properly care for those who have been assaulted and investigate and take appropriate actions against those perpetrating these crimes. It is the right thing to do and we're going to do it.

The Army provides relevant and ready campaign quality land power to combatant commanders as a part of the joint force. To better do this, we are transforming the Army itself in response to lessons learned and experience gained by the Army's recent two and half years with combat in the global war on terror, as well as the operational environments envisioned in the foreseeable future.

Last Monday the chief of staff of the Army, General Pete 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 121 Comanche helicopters in the Fiscal Year '05 through Fiscal Year '11 future years Defense plan, we will propose to reallocate these resources to procure almost 800 new aircraft for the active and the Reserve components.

As a part of our total program over the fit up, 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.

Additionally, we are 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 the Congress fully informed. The Fiscal Year '05 president's budget we've submitted, when 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 costs. We appreciate the assistance of the Congress 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 in all that it will be called upon to do, the American soldier remains the single most important factor in our success. Today our soldiers are present in over 120 countries around the world, representing the American people and American values with courage and compassion.

I want to express my appreciation for the service and the enormous sacrifices made by our soldiers, especially those who've given the last full measure and their families, as we meet the challenges and risks posed by the war on terror. Our deepest thanks go to the members of our active and Reserve component units, as well as to the thousands of the Department of Army civilians who are also deployed overseas in harms way. Regardless of where our soldiers serve, they perform as the professionals they are with skill, courage and dedication. They embody the values of our Army and our nation, serving selflessly and seeking only to do what must be done before returning home.

Despite remarkable successes our fight is far from over. It will take time to win the war on terror. Our enemies are resolute but hard-line al Qaeda operatives in Iraq have already recognized that they cannot dislodge our forces with fear or intimidation. Our commitment to prevail in Iraq and elsewhere is unshakable. I have seen the resolution in our soldier's eyes and heard the determination in their voices. We must do our part to ensure they 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 accomplish 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 Fiscal Year '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 how the Fiscal Year '05 budget request will permit us to continue meeting our obligations now and in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like 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 a full member of the joint team deployed and fighting terror around the world. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today and I look forward to answering your questions.

SEN. INHOFE: Thank you, Secretary Brownlee, for an excellent opening statement.

Secretary England?

MR. GORDON R. ENGLAND: Good, Senator, thank you very much. And I know time is short so I'll keep my remarks also very short. First, I do want to thank the committee for confirming me the second time and allowing me to come back and have this great privilege and honor, firstly to appear before this committee but to serve our men and women in uniform, our sailors and Marines, they are absolutely magnificent.

I do — I am convinced this is finest naval force the world has ever seen, and I thank this committee for your great support, because without your support we would not have this — the ability that we have to defend freedom and liberty that we all so cherish in this country, so I thank you.

I am pleased to report that the naval forces we are deploying today and that we plan to deploy for the future which is contained in our FY '05 budget request, are vastly different and they're also vastly better than I reported during my first committee discussion here about two years ago. I can tell you the naval transformation is well underway, it is reflected in our budget and it is crucially important as we move forward into the future, so I would appreciate your support.

I do want you to know that the CNO and the commandant and myself are committed to being very effective and also very efficient so you will see in this budget a continuation the past two years, where we have continued to move money from what I call the back end of the business, into our weapons systems. We continue to be more effective, we continue to be more effective, we work very, very hard to be good stewards of our citizens money and we continue that and you will see that reflected in the '05 budget.

I do want to comment that people are indeed our most important asset. While we have a lot of requests in the budget in terms of weapons systems, people are our most important asset. We are a strong, well-trained and highly motivated and combat ready force, I would like you to know that retention across the Department of Navy our retention is at record levels. So we are retaining our people, they want to serve in our naval forces, they want to serve our country and our recruiting continues robust. We have the very best people, our morale is very, very high and they are pleased to deploy and defend and protect this great nation.

As I sit here today, the naval forces continue to demonstrate their invaluable value to our nation. We are today redeploying our Marines to Iraq, also our naval forces, as part of Operation Iraqi Freedom 2 and of course, is what's happened the last few days, our Marine forces are now also in Haiti. The Navy/Marine Corps team is a force in readiness, we are prepared at any time to support our nation whenever, wherever.

So ladies and gentlemen of this very important committee, I again thank you for the opportunity to be here, I thank you earnestly for the opportunity to again serve my nation as the secretary of the Navy, our sailor, our Marines and their families are proud to serve this nation and I'm privileged and proud to serve them. I'm also privileged and proud to serve with the other secretaries here today, and specifically with our great CNO and our magnificent commandant. So it's a pleasure being with you today, thank you for your support and I do look forward to your questions in discussion. Thank you very much.

SEN. INHOFE: Thank you, Secretary England.

Secretary Roche?

MR. JAMES G. ROCHE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Levin, members of the committee. My great pleasure to appear before this distinguished body to represent the 700,000 active, Guard, Reserve and civilian airmen who are engaged in defending our nation. John Jumper and I are extremely proud of their achievements and service this past year,

from combat operations and homeland defense to their daily efforts that guarantee the health, security and morale of our force. They've contributed significantly to our nations global fight against terrorism, to our military achievements in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are devoted American servants and have my utmost respect and confidence. I also would like to say how honored I am to serve alongside General John Jumper, he is an outstanding leader and like my two colleagues, it's a delight to work with them.

Our highest priority continues to be a focus on warfighting and delivering the capability that enables us to remain decisive in combat. Combatant commanders rely on us to provide a full spectrum of air and space capabilities, all while protecting our homeland. Through the efforts of this committee, your colleagues in the Congress and dedicated professionals in the department, we are proud to report that we are meeting these objectives.

As we highlight in our written testimony, we continue to adapt the Air Force to realize the president and Secretary Rumsfeld's vision of transformation. Our strategy is to exploit the sources of strength that give us the military advantages we enjoy today. Our goal is to build a portfolio of advantages, one that uses operational concepts to guide investments, is relevant to the joint character of warfare and is useful in the increasingly asymmetric conduct of warfare. To date we've made great progress in applying this approach.

In terms of strategy we refocused Air Force strategic thinking on core competencies. We refined our air expeditionary forces and focused our training to support homeland defense, close air support and close partnering with land, maritime and special operations forces. We are putting our space programs on track, we have increased the unity of effort among the Air Force, National Reconnaissance Office and intelligence communities, and we have enhanced space support to the warfighter, bringing a joint perspective to our role as the Department of Defense's executive agent for space.

We've made significant investments in our people over the past time. With respect to capabilities, we've delivered a transformed Air Force to the battlefield, armed Predators, Global Hawks, Bombers working closely with battlefield airmen on the ground, new tactics for time sensitive targets, network intelligence surveillance reconnaissance and the Combined Air Operations Center. Where it makes sense, we've integrated active Guard and Reserve units as part of our future total force and we continue to do so when it enhances our combat capability, increases our surge capacity and enables us to achieve efficiencies in how we organize terrain and equip our total force.

We've engaged with industry to stabilize production of critical Air Force capabilities. The F/A-22, C-17, Predators, Global Hawks and other systems, thereby increasing efficiencies in the supplier base. We are transforming the F/A-22 by integrating new avionics and weapons that will make it the premier air-to-ground strike system in heavily defended areas, as well as highly effective against cruise missiles in addition to its role in deterring any nation from challenging our ability to gain and maintain air dominance. Our F/A-22 budget request continues much needed program stability, and supports its transition from development to operational tests with IFC at the end of Fiscal Year '05.

Our next step is to focus in four distinct missionaries, all with demonstrable capabilities to support land and surface forces. We are realistically modernizing our special operations aircraft starting with needed recapitalization of a helicopter force, continuing with the tools essential to link air and ground capabilities. We are increasing our attention to close air support from various altitudes. In this regard, we will seek to update an as yet to be determined number of A-10's and we will require the STOVL version of the Joint Strike Fighter, further expanding our opportunities to integration with our Marine Corps brethren.

We are developing a long range strike strategy that includes an investment plan to sustain our legacy force and a possibly future stealthy regional bomber. And we are focusing on joint warfighting in space, working with other interested parties on rapid insertion of microsats as well as potential methods of protecting our space assets. Beyond establishing and maintaining air dominance, there are initiatives where we are pressing forward with families of UAVs and remotely piloted aircraft, many of which will support land combat directly and in real time. We are building a portfolio of sensing capabilities and we continue to develop ground moving target indicator capabilities, cruise missile defense technologies as well as new integration of battlefield C2 capabilities all focused on dramatic support of land forces.

In the interests of time, Mr. Chairman, I'll move past some of this. One of the concerns in our budget that I would like to highlight is the growing pressure and increased costs on our military healthcare system. Improvements to the TRICARE benefit over the past several years, coupled with escalating premiums and co-pays in the civilian sector are driving many retirees and family members to choose TRICARE. Over the past two years we have seen an 8 percent increase in the number of the retirees using our system.

From one point of view this is a good story, validation that we are caring for our retired service members. It comes, however, with significant cost growth.

This year, the department reprogrammed over \$600 million to pay for this growth, costs increasingly absorbed by the services. Although you will mark the Defense health program is a separate authorization, I ask that you keep this increased usage and cost in mind as you consider any proposed expansion of benefits.

Finally, our budget request includes increases in both RTD&E and procurement to support our emphasis on transformation of modernization consistent with the strategy we've discussed. Our proposed budget makes a significant investment in a number of critical joint programs, C-17, C-130Js, Predators, Global Hawks, joint space capabilities including transformational communications, space/space radar and military satellite communications. We are also investing in a wide range of joint weapons for close air support and precision strike, including more than 23,000 JDAMs. In addition to our increased focus on air to ground CONOPS, concepts of operations, we are proud of our continued investment in these joint warfighting capabilities needed by our combatant commanders.

Finally, and as you know, our tanker recapitalization initiative is on hold. The initiative is complicated enough so I am in complete agreement with Secretary Rumsfeld's desire to ensure that it was not tainted by an illegality. Meanwhile as I told the committee two years ago, we are programming money starting in FY '06 to conduct a KC-X tanker replacement program which will be a normal new aircraft procurement.

Let me close today on the subject of sexual assault. With the help of this committee, your counterparts in the House, the Fowler panel and the reinvigorated Air Force Academy Board of Visitors, we have taken a wide range of actions at the academy to protect our cadets and to implement a system of response, investigation and victim care consistent with that in the operational Air Force.

Since the implementation of the agenda for change in March of last year, and the release of the Fowler panel report, I am pleased to report that there has been meaningful progress across multiple fronts. The academy's senior leadership is aggressively focused on the areas of basic cadet training, officer development and cadet discipline systems. In the area of prevention we have sought outside experts to review and assist in training faculty, staff and leadership. We have incorporated almost all of the Fowler recommendations to enhance training, implemented a tough new alcohol policy and most important, have created an integrated response team for victims of sexual assault.

But we continue to refine our approach. For instance, based on the Fowler panel's recommendation of confidentiality, we have attempted to strike a balance between the needs of the victim and the necessity of investigating felony allegations. While this is proving to be a difficult concept to implement, we sincerely believe it is in our best interests to move barriers to victims coming forward so that we can prosecute criminal offenders. Whether we look at the record numbers or increasing quality of female applicants to the academy, our initial indications are very positive.

As of today, the academy admissions office has received over 3,000 applications from women, an increase of over 35 percent, and the largest number of female applicants in the history of the academy. The increases in the average grade point averages across all four classes of cadets both male and female, appear to show that we are continuing to instill an improved climate for learning as well. These are initial good signs, but we are in a long term agenda to change the culture, and we know there is much to do. So we will remain focused.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to inform the committee of a recently commissioned assessment we've ordered of our sexual assault response system across the Air Force. General Jumper and I have tasked our major commanders to include education, training and prevention, reporting procedures, response programs and program oversight in these comprehensive reviews. We directed this assessment across our major commands prior to the recent articles about Shepherd Air Force Base and, in fact, we did very quietly in the fall of this year, do a review of our Pacific Air Forces in order to get a benchmark as to how our active force was doing, relative to the things that we learned from the Air Force Academy situation.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am proud to be a part of the finest Air Force in the world and am honored to be part of the joint team that has done much to defend America and our interests. With your continued support and the investment this budget makes in adapting our force to the demands of this new era, we will continue to deliver for our citizens. I look forward to your questions, thank you very much.

SEN. McCAIN: Senator Levin?

SEN. LEVIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary England, relative to our deployments to Haiti, I understand now that the lead element of a stability force could grow up to 2,000 American troops and could stay up to three months. What is the mission? How many Marines and other military personnel will we send? And do you expect Marines to remain in Haiti after a U.N. peacekeeping force deploys?

MR. ENGLAND: Senator, today we have 370 Marines deployed are actually in Haiti this morning, the latest number — we still have Marines going to Haiti. I understand the initiative will have about 900 Marines in Haiti. It could be more but I think that all depends. My understanding on what our support is from other countries, and of course we do have support from about five other countries. As of yesterday, I was aware of Canada, France, a couple of other countries here in the hemisphere.

So I believe we need to see what happens here in the next days and weeks but they should stabilize. So in the next 90 days, our Marines will be back in Camp Lejeune. But obviously, it depends on how things work out and the kind of support we have from our friends and allies. But it does seem to be coming together. The last report I had, just looking at the news this morning, at least where our Marines are deployed, things seem to be quieter. So hopefully, we will have a stable situation as a peacekeeping force and I hope we have a stable situation shortly.

SEN. LEVIN: The hope is that they'll be back in 90 days?

MR. ENGLAND: Yes, sir. That's our expectation.

SEN. LEVIN: In my opening statement I spoke about the adequacy of our funding and the lack of apparent decision of the administration not to request an '05 supplemental during this calendar year. The problem is that the budget that's before us represents a peacetime budget and it just doesn't pay for incremental costs of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. When the chiefs of staff of the Army and Air Force, the commandant of the Marine Corps were in front of us, they all testified to a cash flow difficulty that they are going to face if the Defense Department doesn't submit a Fiscal Year '05 supplemental funding request to Congress in this year, during this calendar year.

I am wondering whether or not you share those concerns that were expressed to us. First, Secretary Brownlee, do you share those concerns that unless we have a supplemental for '05 filed with us this year, that we're going to have some cash flow problems?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, we're certainly concerned because, as you indicated earlier what our burn rate is, out of the \$65.1 billion that the Congress provided for supplemental appropriations for Fiscal Year '04, the Army received roughly 40 of that. So by moving some funds within the Army and relying on some assistance from OSD, we believe we can get to the end of Fiscal Year '04 and when the Fiscal Year '05 budget is approved, we will have some limited ability to cash flow out of that. And again, with assistance from the administration, we believe we can get through some time early next spring before we would get into trouble.

SEN. LEVIN: So you believe that, without a supplemental for '05 adopted this calendar year, you're going to be okay through the Spring of '05?

MR. BROWNLEE: Conferring with OSD and looking within the Army at what we have in our current level spending, we believe we can get there, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: Secretary England.

MR. ENGLAND: Senator, as you know, at the Department of the Navy our deployments are in our base budgets. So we really — if you notice, for example, the worst supplemental, we draw down relatively small funds from the worst supplemental because we fund our own ongoing operations as part of our base budget. So all deployment of our ships, our sailors and Marines, we will forward deploy every day 24/7, that's accounted for in our base budget.

SEN. LEVIN: Is the rotation of the Marines accounted for?

MR. ENGLAND: It is. The Marines that are going overseas now is not accounted for. So we do now have a marginal cost there. That marginal cost, we are working with OSD. We do expect to be funded. That's how the FY '04 supplemental, that's how the Iraqi Freedom Fund. So we do not see a problem with that deployment. Now, if we have deployments next year, that's another issue. But nonetheless, for the Department of Navy, it is a relatively small amount of money and, of course, the CNO already testified it was not an issue with him.

I frankly believe that the Marine Corps costs, we can accommodate out of our total budget. Other Marine Corps funding, of course, comes out of the Navy side of the budget not the Marine Corps side of the budget.

SEN. LEVIN: I am wondering, going back to you, Secretary Brownlee, whether or not you are familiar with General Schoomaker's testimony.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, I am.

SEN. LEVIN: Because he said that the fact that the Army operation in Iraq was only funded until the end of September created a real concern as to how to bridge from the end of this fiscal year until the time when supplemental funding is available. He said he just didn't have any answer as to where he's going to get the funds. You apparently do have an answer.

MR. BROWNLEE: Well, sir, if you look just at the funds that have been provided to the Army today, he is certainly right. What I said was that, assuming that we will get additional assistance from the administration, from OSD —

SEN. LEVIN: Additional to what? Additional to what?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, OSD can move monies and provide additional assistance to us also from other services. They have transfer accounts. They have other monies there. I am assured by them that with their assistance, we can make it in accordance with the way I laid it out.

Now what General Schoomaker was looking at was strictly those funds that have been provided today in the Fiscal Year '04 budget for the Army plus the supplemental funds that we have received to date. And he is right about that. We would probably run out in '04. We would probably need some assistance, quite frankly, from OSD to get to '04 with some of the other things that we're planning to do.

SEN. LEVIN: He was talking about the bridge between the end of this fiscal year to the time when the '05 supplemental is adopted because there is no provision in the '05 budget for these incremental costs. So the question is —

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. And what I indicated was that, presuming the Fiscal Year '05 budget was passed and we got our share of that, we would have some limited capability to cash flow funds out of the third and fourth quarter funds early and with some additional assistance from the administration, we could probably make it through — I don't know — somewhere around this time next year, maybe the end of March. I wouldn't want to put a date on it because I don't know how much assistance we would get but I have been conferring with OSD and that's what they have told us, that they can release additional funds to us.

SEN. LEVIN: And you've got that assurance from OSD?

MR. BROWNLEE: I have conferred with them and that's what they have told me, sir, that they would —

SEN. LEVIN: My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. McCAIN: Thank you, Senator Levin.

Secretary Roche, when does the Air Force anticipate making a decision concerning the lease purchase of the tankers?

MR. ROCHE: Senator, we would expect that the inquiries that the secretary of Defense has asked to be put in place, which include clearly the inspector general's review of any illegalities, which also include the Defense Science Board review from scratch of the tanker recapitalization in the large to be done, plus one or two other things, that when those are finished then we'll make that decision. I don't know an exact date. It's months from now.

SEN. McCAIN: The Defense Authorization bill required the conduct of an analysis of alternatives, you are aware of that?

MR. ROCHE: Yes, sir.

SEN. McCAIN: Would you anticipate making that decision before the analysis of alternatives is completed?

MR. ROCHE: The way the analysis of alternatives is structured, Senator, is that it assumes that there was the NDAA approved lease of 80, purchase of 100 and then the analysis of alternatives picks up from that point forward. If, on the other hand —

SEN. McCAIN: You assume that? Why would you assume that, Mr. Secretary, when the language of the legislation says it calls for an analysis of alternatives?

MR. ROCHE: Senator, as I understand it, I've talked to Mike Wynn and others about this. It picks up that period. However, if there was continued delay, the work that would be done in that analysis of alternatives would also inform the basic initial purchases if we stay to the KC-X program, if we don't lease. And you recall, sir, the lease was a way to accelerate procurement, that all along we have been planning monies in the regular program for KC-X program and if anyone in the committees objected, we would stick with that plan. This NDAA desired analysis of alternatives would also substitute for the analysis of alternatives that would be done as part of the KC-X program.

SEN. McCAIN: Well, of course, e-mails that we received from Boeing clearly indicated that you intended to lease as many as 300 tanker aircraft —

MR. ROCHE: No, sir. With all due respect, sir, I never ever used a number greater than 100 because only the number 100 was used in the FY '02 Appropriations Act. Others used other numbers. I cut Boeing off in any conversations of anything above 100.

SEN. McCAIN: It's not what the e-mails indicate. But hopefully, we'll get to the bottom of that sooner or later. Now, who's going to conduct the analysis of alternatives?

MR. ROCHE: It hasn't been determined yet, sir. It will be one of the FDRCs/FCRCs. It will be determined by OSD as to who conducts it. I'm not sure who they would choose.

SEN. McCAIN: So they haven't even begun an analysis of alternatives?

MR. ROCHE: They haven't begun an analysis of alternatives quite separately. We have had the Rand Corporation doing work which is precursor to analysis of alternatives. But it's not clear that OSD will choose Rand to be the organization to do it.

SEN. McCAIN: But you have had the Rand Corporation do the precursor? Same corporation —

MR. ROCHE: That was for our own —

SEN. McCAIN: Same corporation that got \$30 million for Project Air Force last year and get \$25 million again this year?

MR. ROCHE: That's precursor for the Air Force, Senator. The OSD will choose which organization will do the analysis of alternatives as required by the NDAA.

SEN. McCAIN: Well, in a Boeing briefing to the board of directors on June of 2002, quote, "Element ORD objective established clearly to find requirements in ORD for the USAF tanker configuration results in an affordable solution. It meets the USAF mission needs and will prevent an AOA from being conducted." You never heard any information that the Boeing Corporation wanted to prevent an analysis of alternatives.

MR. ROCHE: Yes, sir. I never discussed that with them. As I told you once before, I did have a discussion with the deputy secretary of Defense in the presence of the other service secretaries, service chiefs, people from OSD as to whether or not an analysis of alternatives was required for the tanker lease. I argued at that time that, given the subject matter, that one was not and it was agreed to at that time. I testified to that effect to you, I think, last year, sir.

SEN. McCAIN: And you, of course, don't recall you telling the Boeing lobbyists to a meeting with the Boeing lobbyists where you told them to put pressure on Mr. Wynn on the tanker —

MR. ROCHE: Thank you for the question, Senator —

SEN. McCAIN: Let me finish my question.

MR. ROCHE: If I may answer the question, sir? May I answer the question.

SEN. McCAIN: Can I finish the question? Can I finish, Mr. Secretary?

MR. ROCHE: I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

SEN. McCAIN: Thank you. In other e-mails that we got from Boeing, you met with the lobbyists from Boeing and said, quote, "You have to put pressure on Mr. Wynn in order to get this deal expedited." That clearly does not indicate that you had some support for analysis of alternatives. But last time you testified — let me finish my question — you didn't recall that meeting with the Boeing lobbyists.

MR. ROCHE: Yes, sir. The reason was that you gave a name of a person and this happens to be the same name as the program manager of our FA-22 program. So it was very confusing. I then, at the time, asked you if you would read some of the introductory paragraphs so I could fix the letter in my mind and, in fact, we may have a difference on what we were looking at. This is an issue that occurs after (P&E ?) sends a letter on a Friday night to me objecting to the language in a report — in a report that I would be doing for Congress. This is done a month after the lease has been approved and a month after the lease has been announced.

At that time, the person, who has never met me before, uses the word "pressure" but it doesn't make sense because the lease has already been approved, the lease has already been publicly announced. The concern and my upset was the fact that it appears there was a rear guard action going on against my cover letter bringing the matter to the point of the Congress. I've told you there was no pressure. Mr. Wynn has told you there was no pressure and, Senator, I believe, if you read a few lines down that same e-mail, the individual reports that there would be a meeting that afternoon — this is a Monday — that afternoon.

Further, if I may answer, sir, this was not a lobbyist. Nor did I call him and this meeting had been scheduled weeks in advance and the individual was the head of all of the military programs in the Boeing company and we discussed other programs as well. And, by the way, the matter of concern was resolved by 4:00 that afternoon.

SEN. McCAIN: Well, I have never heard of a secretary of the Air Force calling in a lobbyist to tell him to, quote, "put pressure" on a member. That's in the e-mail.

MR. ROCHE: I did not call any lobbyist, Senator. Please, I'm trying to answer that. I did not call in any lobbyist. The meeting you're referring to was a meeting with a line executive. He was not called in. The meeting had been scheduled well in advance. I did not ask to put on pressure and, Senator, the subject matter was my report that I would sign or not sign not the lease itself. That all occurred months earlier.

SEN. McCAIN: Obviously, your testimony is in direct contradiction to the e-mails that we received. And if you would be forthcoming with the e-mails that you used and other members of the Air Force during the conduct of this investigation and your steadfast refusal to do so indicates that everything is not going to be cleared up until such time as we find out all information. And there is more than — and I think that the Defense inspector general's report will have some very interesting things involved in it.

The ORD — is my time — my time has expired, Mr. Secretary, but I want to repeat again. I've never seen, in 22 years in the United States Navy and now 22 years in the Congress, anything like the deal that you tried to pull off and we will continue to try to save the taxpayers \$5 billion or \$6 billion which would have happened if we hadn't had the right kind of intervention and the right kind of information because you are greasing the skids with the Boeing Aircraft Corporation. Boeing is taking appropriate action by relieving their chief executive officer and their CFO of their responsibilities. Unfortunately, we haven't seen a single thing done by the United States Air Force to correct this kind of situation which evolved in a most scandalous fashion

MR. ROCHE: And, Senator, you know that I respectfully disagree with your characterization of that. I was trying to get a more rapid acquisition of tankers and I believe that everything was done in accordance with the FY '02 Appropriations Act, that everything was done by the book as best as I could tell. I did not call in lobbyists. I never have for the companies. I certainly did not tell him to pressure anybody and the pressure, under the circumstances, if you look at the date of the e-mail, Senator, makes no sense, having to do with the lease. The issue had to do with a letter, a critique of my draft report to the Congress.

SEN. McCAIN: But obviously, we will let others judge the facts. And, again, it's very unfortunate particularly in light of all the investigations that are going on that you and the secretary of Defense will not allow the Senate Armed Services Committee to exercise its oversight duties by having access to all communications which, by the way, I'm sure, by the standard form that you signed when your nomination was submitted to this committee for your confirmation as secretary of the Air Force, which says, as we showed Mr. Wynn, that you will make available to the committee all communications as requested. But as I think you may know, Mr. Secretary, we won't quit and there's lots more to come.

SEN. WARNER: I have been working with Senator McCain on this issue with the secretary of Defense. I am hopeful that we can reconcile this issue because, right now, exercising rights that this senator has in the Senate, all civilian nominees for the Department of Defense are in advance by floor action and that's your right and that sends a very strong signal as to the support Senator McCain has to establish the rights of co-equal branch of the government to perform their

respective work. So it may well be above the pay grade, Mr. Secretary, but we simply have to resolve this issue.

Senator Akaka.

SEN. DANIEL K. AKAKA (D-HI): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

It's good to have you here this morning. I want to say that I want you to know that I am and we are proud of our soldiers, our sailors, our Marines and our airmen for what they are doing for our country. And personally, I would like to do all I can to support our troops.

This is a question for all of you. I want to follow up on discussions you were having earlier with Senator Levin. We were talking about funding shortfalls for the remainder of the Fiscal Year 2004. Secretary Brownlee, your Army officials have cited unfunded requirements of up to \$10 billion for this year, what you suggested OSD might be able to help you with perhaps by moving funds from other services.

However, press reports note that the departments of the Navy and Air Force may have shortfalls of \$1.6 billion and \$375 million respectfully. I have two questions for you. Would each of you please tell me how much your department expects to seek during the upcoming mid-year review and if you do not receive these funds, the second part is what action will you take to continue conducting operations for the rest of the fiscal year?

Secretary Brownlee, I want you to know we had a good Army caucus meeting this morning. It was filled with standing room only and we heard from the chief. We had a good exchange and look forward to more of that in the future. Will you start, Secretary Brownlee?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. We are still putting together what we're going to ask for in the mid-year review and I'd be happy to provide that for the record. But we are just not complete in putting that together.

I can tell you that I've consulted OSD requesting assistance with some of the actions we've taken to accelerate the production of up-armored Humvees and body armor. We still do have some capability with any army to reprogram funds and move those around, and we will intend to do that we can.

But I have conferred with people in the OSD controller shop and they assure me that they will help us, and to what extent, I can't tell you right now. But I have gone to them with this situation and they have assured me that they are capable of providing assistance. Some of it I'm sure we're going to have to find ways to do ourselves, and we will. And whether or not there will be a significant shortfall from that, I think we'll know better after the media review.

SEN. AKAKA: Secretary Brownlee, I and some of my colleagues visited some of the troops who were wounded and injured, and I tell you that we're so happy to know that the body armor that they now have has saved many of their lives. Are there any other improvements to the body armor that are being planned? And I say that because many of them had limp problems and leg problems.

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, could we talk about that in a different session?

SEN. AKAKA: Surely.

MR. BROWNLEE: I do not want to talk about the capabilities of our body armor and what it might or might not be able to do.

SEN. AKAKA: Thank you.

Secretary?

MR. ENGLAND: Senator, the \$1.6 billion you referred to in the press that was reported, quoted a letter from the Navy comptroller to the DOD comptroller, Mr. Zakheim, a request in that general amount of \$1.6 billion. That \$1.6 billion is to cover the incremental cost FY 04, sending our Marines to Iraq, so it's the cost of being there, plus special equipment, armoring for their vehicles, special equipment, and we have frankly told the Marine Corps anything they need we will fund and provide to them, and so we are evaluating a lot of the new capability, and I thank the Army because a lot of the lessons learned in working with them — our Marines have physically been with the Army many, many months — lessons learned to apply when our Marines deploy.

Those funds — we are working with OSD, we have received some of that money from OSD. Some things we wanted to do right away, so we did our own reprogramming to provide some money right away, because we did not want any time

lags because the Marines were going quickly. So we do not have an issue here. I mean, it's a relatively modest amount of money within our total budget. We are getting help from OSD and we do have some flexibilities within the budget. So those bills are being paid. That is our FY 04.

There is the Iraqi Freedom Fund, which was the FY 04 supplemental, that is available because we are substituting, as you recall — Army was originally going to be going, and we are substituting for some of the Army personnel, right. Marines are taking Army personnel in terms of 82nd Airborne. So some of that funding that was going for that total effort with the Army will now come to the United States Marine Corps. So this is not an issue for us, sir.

MR. ROCHE: Senator, in the FY 04, the Air Force should be able to make it without a problem, assuming there are no new contingencies and assuming this source of money that OSD supposedly has for the Army does not come from the Air Force. It could be a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul. But assuming none of that, we should be able to make '04 fine.

SEN. AKAKA: Mr. Chairman, my time has expired.

SEN. JAMES M. INHOFE (R-OK): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you very much.

Senator Inhofe.

SEN. INHOFE: Yes. I wonder — it seems to be —

SEN. WARNER: Senator Inhofe, I ask forbearance of the ranking member.

SEN. LEVIN: Just for three seconds.

SEN. INHOFE: Certainly, certainly.

SEN. LEVIN: And I do appreciate that and appreciate your — I just want to get back into this question of documents on the Boeing lease just for one minutes. You know, transcending the whole issue of — the issues involved in the Boeing lease and the questions of whether or not the Congress has a right to documents, it is a very fundamental issue. And, frankly, the Defense Department has been kicking this can down the road and raising the argument that somehow or other we may not be entitled to pre-decisional so-called documents.

It is — there's no basis in law for the Department of Defense denying Congress pre-decisional documents. The only legal basis for denying documents is executive privilege, which obviously is not involved here and not being asserted here. Now, we had Mr. Wynn in front of us. He said it was above his pay grade. Then we had the secretary of Defense in front of us and he said something like it's still being considered.

And I just talked to the chairman, Senator McCain, and I think we have a responsibility frankly representing the Senate here as just a committee of the Senate, and insisting on these documents, and if necessary, getting the secretary of Defense or the general counsel here to the Defense Department in front of us to answer this because there is no way that a self-respecting Congress cannot insist upon these documents unless there's an executive privilege issue. It's got nothing to do with the issues involved in the Boeing case. It's separate and apart from those issues.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know, you've got plenty on your plate, and I know, but nonetheless, this request of Senator McCain is really a request that relates to the powers of this body to oversee the operations of the Defense Department. If this were a FOIA request, then the pre-decisional issue is relevant. This isn't a FOIA issue, this is an oversight issue on the part of Congress. So, Mr. Chairman, I would support Senator McCain in really insisting that we get the documents, but get an answer so that if the answer's going to continue to be no, then the whole Senate — and I think this becomes a leadership of the Senate — will decide whether when we can accept a stonewalling on this kind of a request from an executive branch.

And I don't care if the executive branch is Democratic or Republican. This goes beyond any political issue. It's got nothing to do with the merits of this issue. It has to do with an institutional question of obtaining documents which are not subject to executive privilege.

SEN. WARNER: That's clear very much, Senator. And as you know, I've been trying to work with Senator McCain on this. So I think you see a unified front. Gentlemen, this is, of course, at the secretary's level, but I think it's helpful to communicate in this type of forum the sincerity and the commitment of this committee, because we are a coequal branch of government and we have our functions to perform, and it's essential that we have the appropriate documents to do our

oversight.

So we'll proceed now — thank you for your indulgence, Senator Inhofe.

SEN. LEVIN: Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

SEN. INHOFE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Senator Levin.

I know, Secretary Brownlee, you're unable to respond fully to Senator Akaka's question, but I would like to have you repeat something that General Schoomaker said this morning at the Army Caucus and that I believe you said, but I want to reemphasize that is because this is media here and I want everyone to hear it. And that is that every troop in Iraq and Afghanistan, in terms of body armor, how are they equipped?

MR. BROWNLEE: Body armor. Sir, as of yesterday afternoon, there were some additional combat service support troops in Afghanistan to the tune of about 2,700 that I understand did not have intercepted body armor. Now, that doesn't mean there's not enough in central command to outfit everybody.

There is. But they have to get it to these people and —

SEN. INHOFE: Yeah. The point the general is making, if we hadn't taken action, it would take some 20 years at the rate that we're going to get adequate body armor —

MR. BROWNLEE: That's true.

SEN. INHOFE: — to these troops, which are now —

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. We now have more than enough in theater to equip every soldier. It's a matter of distribution within the theater, sir.

SEN. INHOFE: Okay. As all of you know, we've been talking about presidents' budget and there is right now some talk about another \$9 billion cut we're up to, I think to be fair with them. If this was to take place and it could be up to around \$3 billion for each branch that you represent here today, can you tell us where that would come from?

MR. BROWNLEE: No, sir. It would be very difficult for us to absorb any cut right now. As I indicated earlier, I think we'll require assistance from OSD at our current burn rate to get to Fiscal Year '04, and in Fiscal Year '05, we will probably be cash flowing out of the third and fourth quarters in the early months of Fiscal Year '05.

SEN. INHOFE: Any comments, Senator England?

MR. ENGLAND: Yeah, I do want to make a comment here because, Senator, my comment earlier about efficiency and effectiveness — we have been reducing the cost of our naval forces. As you know, we're actually reducing the number of people in the Department of the Navy, so we have become very, very efficient and I believe much more effective. Now, when you become much more efficient and it is much harder to absorb, you know, reductions in terms of funding because you don't have any margin left.

So we have not looked at this. Obviously we have to do some analysis, but certainly it would be difficult to absorb. We have to do — certainly we would do it, but it's very hard, based on what I believe has been very effective work on our part in being a much more efficient organization.

SEN. INHOFE: Secretary Roche?

MR. ROCHE: I would not know where to get that money from at this point, sir.

SEN. INHOFE: Yeah. I wanted to get you guys on the record because this is going to be a discussion on the floor. And I agree with you. I don't know where it would come from. And, you know, I look at some things, Secretary Brownlee, such as the law that says you have to field an NLOS by '08.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. INHOFE: And the definition of fielding, you know, is that a prototype or what it is. Nonetheless, we know that we need that for our kids, for our troops over there, the capability. I was — let me make one comment. I was — I'm sorry that Senator McCain left. I just wanted to mention something about the discussion with General Jumper before this committee as to Tinker Air Force Base and some of the things that were stated about doctoring up charts and so forth.

I did some checking myself to find that when they talked about the degree of corrosion that had taken place, they broke it down in different areas: fuselage, bulkhead fitting, wings, such as that. The fifth point was left off, which they should not have done, and I agree with Senator McCain in that respect, and that is the chart using bulkhead fittings, and the fact that there were four occurrences out of 82 aircraft, or a 5 percent occurrence factor.

I think that it was kind of implied, and I would have felt the same way if I looked at this in isolation, that we're hiding the fact that — we're presenting a problem that's greater than it is. However, when you stop and realize that only a third of that which is done is done at Tinker, it could very well be that the others, in order to get up to the service life of all vehicles is 11.5 percent. That would mean perhaps in some other areas it's 20 percent.

Secondly, if you look at some of the other parts of the charts, such as the chart that would be corrosion-ed in service life report on the fuselage skin body, that report which — the fifth point that was left off said "The history of 82 aircraft and 18 occurrences." Twenty two percent occurrence factor, which is greater than the 18.5 percent. And if the intent were to try to make it look as if the problem is not as great as it is, I don't think that that would have been left off. And it's just my comment. I'm not requiring any response, just that I did take the time to go down and look and see what that situation was, and I believe that to be true.

End-strength, Secretary Brownlee, we've talked about all the things that you guys are doing over there. We've talked about up-tempo over and over and over again before this committee at all levels of the United States Army, and I would say the same thing with perhaps the Marines too. And the temporary increase is up to 30,000 soldiers. I'd just like to, you know, just ask you the question, where are we on end-strength? What would you share with us this morning.

MR. BROWNLEE: Well, sir, as you know, what we have proposed is to grow the Army by 30,000 over the next several years to create at least 10 additional combat brigades and to use the authority in Title 10 that allows the president to waive the requirements of end-strength to allow us to do that. And you will recall when we were — the chief of staff and I were here last November, we advised the committee then that we were already 20,000 over our authorized end-strength, and that we had done that in accordance with that authority in Title 10, and we were paying for those additional 20,000 out of supplemental appropriations.

So it seemed reasonable to presume that if we took those 20,000 and about another 10,000 and used that to stand up 10 new combat brigades that could then be of very much use in the fight we're in now, that that would be appropriate to do, both in terms of the authority and in terms of the intent of the funding, and that that would allow the Army then the kind of headspace and flexibility we could also use to go in and over the next several years find within our current authorized end-strength an additional 30,000 spaces of efficiencies so that hopefully at the end of a three or four year period we will be able to keep those 10 combat brigades, but at the —

SEN. INHOFE: Yeah. Thank you very much, Secretary Brownlee.

Mr. Chairman, I'm hoping we'll have a second round. I had some — I've been spending quite a bit of time in California —

SEN. WARNER: Well, let's see what we can do. The votes will start at I think it's 11:35, given the first one's 15 minute vote. Let's try and do that because I myself have not taken time on questions yet.

Senator Ben Nelson.

So we'll try that, Senator.

SEN. E. BENJAMIN NELSON (D-NE): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, I would say that trying to find \$1.6 billion and moving it around may be, as Secretary Roche said, something like robbing Peter to pay Paul. But it may be robbing Peter to pay Peter. I think that's the concern that I would have. And the budgeting process back here is the equivalent of making a pie a piece at a time. I know the accountants try to account, but I would hope that we don't end up obscuring in the process of creating money and obligations. So I'm very cautious — I want to exercise — I want to suggest caution because pushing off obligations into the future isn't the most accountable way of handling these ongoing obligations or contingent obligations.

Secretary Roche, I'd like to go back to a little less controversial subject, ongoing sexual assault cases in the military. Last week the Personnel Subcommittee of this committee had a service-wide hearing on the subject, and I know that since the new Air Force Academy leaders took over, there have been a continuing number of reports, 21 reports of sexual misconduct.

Secretary Rumsfeld has ordered review of the department policy on sexual assault and the treatment of victims, and last week we heard about that. Do you see any further delay in the completion of the department's investigation of the Air Force Academy and sexual assault cases? We have issues with soldiers, airmen and cadets, as you understand, and perhaps you could give us your thoughts and projections about that.

MR. ROCHE: Yes, Senator. To begin with, the numbers that are used pick up many different things. Sometimes the numbers that you hear are old cases that are only now being reported. If you look at incidents that have occurred since the —

SEN. NELSON: Subsequent to —

MR. ROCHE: — subsequent to the gender for change, we've actually had only 10 of cadets — involving cadets. There have been others on the base itself, and down at the prep school we've had two incidents. The inspector general's report on — there's two parts to that. The Air Force inspector general I had asked — was folded into the larger picture — to look at every single case that had been adjudicated or not adjudicated where a victim or an alleged victim had problems either with the way it was handled or the way they were dealt with. I would expect that Air Force part of that to be done in this month, and most of the cases, in fact, have been submitted for extra review down to OSD.

With regard to the inspector general, the department's overall review, you would have to ask him. I know that as cases came up, it took more time, as there were more leaders from the past that had to be interviewed. That took more time and I can't tell you where they are on that.

SEN. NELSON: Okay. Well, last week I suggested that I thought the military was taking a serious approach to this, but I was a little concerned about the lack of outreach. I must say, Secretary Brownlee, what you said today was as close to outrage as I've heard. It seems like perhaps we are getting to the point where it's not simply a matter of taking this seriously, but being outraged by the fact that it has occurred in the past and other outrage will continue — will emerge if it continues into the future. I can assure everyone.

MR. BROWNLEE: Senator, do you recall that I gave a speech at the Air Force Academy a year ago right about now which was all outrage.

SEN. NELSON: I just want to make sure we're outraged by these incidents.

MR. BROWNLEE: And more importantly, we're serious about dealing with them.

SEN. NELSON: I think there is a sincere effort. I do think that we need to continue to pursue it aggressively with modifications to current systems, as we discussed last week. Secretary Brownlee, with respect to the Patriot Advanced Capability, I'm a strong advocate of the Missile Defense System and I've supported the Patriot Advanced Capability-3, PAC-3. But after the recent reports from weapons experts saying that the problems with the Patriot missile system weren't fixed before the weapon was deployed in Iraq, I must admit I'm greatly concerned. You may — and I'm sure if you haven't, you will, see the 60-minute segment concerning the flaws.

My understanding is that the Patriot had 12 engagements in the Iraqi war, of which one-quarter of these engagements were with our own planes, not something that we had planned on, nor something that we can accept as being normal. In fact, during March of last year, a U.S. Air Force pilot, flying an F-16 fighter jet, received a signal he was being targeted by radar he believed to be coming from an enemy missile. He fired one of his own missiles, obviously in self-defense, and hit one of our own Patriot batteries which was tracking his aircraft as an enemy target.

I guess the question I have is what evidence can the Army provide us to ensure that in the future, for aircraft and servicemen and women, that they will not be targets of our own defense system? What steps are being taken? Clearly, this is a serious concern. It's one I've had about deployment before all the research and development has been concluded.

Racing to judgment, racing to deploy has its adverse consequences. It appears that that's what occurred here. No one expects perfection but it looks to me that the malfunction is related to the lack of total research and development before deployment.

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, I don't think we know the answer to that yet. As you know, I'm sure, the Central Command investigation is not complete. We are still waiting for the result of that. But we've looked very specifically at the system. These things occur as a result of not just problems with the technology — and this may be the case —

SEN. NELSON: But it could be training as well?

MR. BROWNLEE: It could be training. It could be other situations on the battlefield. This was a very highly electronic battlefield, as you well know. These systems and the way they are employed have a lot to do with this.

In this particular case, and again we don't have the conclusions of the study, but we know that we had moved our systems forward more so than we had done in previous wars. And we did this for obvious reasons as the troops near Baghdad, everyone was concerned that they might come under chemical attack of some kind and so we had moved these systems forward. We're looking very closely at what impact that might have had both on the awareness of the pilots as well as the systems and how the systems operated.

So, quite frankly, sir, we are still awaiting the outcome of the Central Command investigation to see what that says.

SEN. NELSON: Well, two thoughts. One is were our military men and women safer as a result of the battlefield testing of this program or would they have been safer without it? Did it make our men and women safer and our military capacity stronger?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, given a threat that had emerged as we had expected it to emerge, I certainly would say they are safer and even given what they did come up against, I would say they are safer.

SEN. NELSON: But is battlefield testing, while it's important to do so, risky with high-tech equipment until we know what the incident of intervention with other technologies and other sensitive equipment might bring?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, if you're focusing on the PAC-3 interceptor, and again we don't know yet, but I would be surprised if that turned out to be what was at fault here. There may be problems within the Patriot system but I would be rather surprised if it were in the PAC-3 interceptor.

SEN. NELSON: But we would hope to get a better success ratio than we had. Would you agree with that?

MR. BROWNLEE: I certainly don't believe we can have the incidence of fratricide. None of those are acceptable in any way and whatever we have to do to fix that, we have to fix it.

SEN. NELSON: Thank you. My time has expired, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you, Senator, for raising the important subject of this sexual abuse. The full force and the fact that this committee is behind you in making it hopefully a zero-tolerance correction of that problem.

Senator Collins, that's a problem in which you've been problem. You're next recognized.

SEN. SUSAN M. COLLINS (R-ME): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Brownlee, like many of my colleagues, I have heard repeated concerns expressed by the families of our Guard members and Reservists who are serving in Iraq about the shortages of body armor and fortified Humvees.

In fact, one soldier was home on leave in December and called me personally to talk about this and the consequences that he feared for the members of his unit. I am very pleased therefore to hear from you this morning of the progress that has been made.

But when I look at your chart in your testimony, it indicates that, a year ago, only 12 percent of the soldiers in Iraq were equipped with body armor and only 500 Humvees were fortified. Why were we so ill-prepared? Why didn't we have more body armor and more fortified Humvees available to protect our troops? There seems to be such a discrepancy. I am pleased with the progress but I'm wondering why it was so misjudged.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, ma'am. Quite honestly, we were not producing this body armor at a rate that would allow us to equip all the soldiers with body armor before we went in. What we did was use what we had and equip those soldiers that were infantry and frontline soldiers that would be most likely to come under attack. The requirement for up-armored Humvees proportionally had never been that great because most of these kinds of Humvees were not viewed as favorably for tactical situations because their performance is somewhat degraded by the heavy weight of the armor.

So there was not a feeling that all Humvees should be up-armored. It was when we got into the operational environment in which we found ourselves in — that began in June or July, last summer, that we realized that all soldiers were being exposed to these kinds of attacks and that convoys in particular were exposed to these kinds of IED attacks. That's when we began to ramp up to provide those as soon as we could and we've redistributed from all over the world. The up-armored Humvees that we've had in other places, we've moved. I think the last ones we're just moving in there now should

all be in there in April.

And we began a crash program on the body armor. We're now producing at the rate of up to 25,000 per month. I also regret that we were not more farsighted here. We simply were not prepared for that kind of a counterinsurgency that attacked our convoys, our soldiers in the rear as it has proven to be.

SEN. COLLINS: Secretary England, I know that you're expecting, of course, a ship building question from me and I'm not going to disappoint you in that regard. I very much appreciate the commitment that you've shown in your budget to fully fund the construction of three DDG destroyers this year. And we've certainly made a lot of progress. When I look back at 2000, the year 2000, I think we were spending only \$4.8 billion for shipbuilding and conversion budget. It's now more than twice as much as \$11.1 billion. That's a significant and much needed improvement.

I remain, however, very concerned about the department's future shipbuilding plan particularly as it affects the transition from the DDG to the DDX. The Navy appears to be slipping the construction of a second DDX destroyer by one year, from Fiscal Year 2006 to 2007. If this occurs, it would be the first year in more than 20 years that our Navy will not be procuring a major surface combatant.

My concern is twofold. One is that it will exacerbate the already significant problem with regard to the size of our fleet and we have the (CNN's ?) recent testimony on the ideal size of the fleet of being around 375 vessels. But it also has a significant impact on our industrial base, our ability to keep the skilled workers that we need and to keep some competition in the shipbuilding industrial base. So I would ask that you comment on what are the Navy's plans to ensure that we keep moving toward increasing the size of our fleet, something study after study has demonstrated we need, and also the impact of the stability of our industrial base.

MR. ENGLAND: Thanks, Senator. Two comments here. First of all, for the DDG to DDX conversion you're right, we do have a void in one year. My hope and expectation is we can fix that as we go along because that is an out year. That's a plan, it's not an actual at this point.

Our issue, of course, is affordability. You know, we are required to fully fund this ship at the very beginning, and of course that's very difficult for us to do. I mean, it would be better if we could partially fund. But we have to fully fund so in this case we literally had to move the total amount of about \$2 billion to the right rather than to the left. Now, hopefully we can fix that as we go along.

On the other hand I will tell you the industrial base is always of a concern. We do not want voids in the industrial base. That's not good for our industry, and it's also not good for us cause it's costly and disruptive. We do have a study underway. Assistant Secretary John Young has been conducting a study on the industrial base. That is finished, I believe, now and will be briefed to you very shortly. It could be today, tomorrow, but I mean this week I believe we will be briefing you.

And as part of that we have worked with the leadership of all the major shipyards to make sure we do understand their issues and problems, because it's in our issue not to have those problems in our shipyards. So we are paying attention to it. We do not want breaks in our production line and we will continue to address that so it's not an issue for the industry. We don't want that to be an issue in the industry.

SEN. COLLINS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Thank you, Secretary Brownlee.

SEN. SAXBY CHAMBLISS (R-GA): Mr. Chairman —

SEN. WARNER: Senator Chambliss, I wonder if you'd indulge the chair? I haven't asked any questions. I want to ask one question while our distinguished colleague from Maine is here, because she has been an absolute leader on this issue.

And that is, Secretary England, that it's been reported that the Navy will be the first service to implement the new flexible hiring authorities contained in the National Security Personnel System which the Congress adopted last year, and additionally that you will take on a special role for the entire department, it's my understanding, to assist in the implementation of the new civilian personnel by law and regulation. And I commend you for stepping up and accepting that challenge. So give us a little overview as to how the department has handled the initial steps toward the implementation of the National Security Personnel System, and how you see your role in the coming year.

MR. ENGLAND: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Deputy Secretary Wolfowitz has asked if I would assist in the implementation just because of my experience and background with large organizations, and particularly with the union groups and representative employees. So about two weeks ago I did start to engage in this process. I have had the first

review with the Department of Defense personnel. I have another one scheduled for this Thursday, so I'm still myself trying to understand the total implementation process.

I do know it has moved along rather quickly. The question really is one of consultation and the process that we're using, so this is really a question of process. The Department of the Navy did volunteer to be the department — the lead department in implementing NSPS, which is perhaps how I got asked to assist in this matter. So I'm really not in a position to give you definitive inputs at this time, but in approximately two weeks I would be pleased to come back and meet with you and other members of the committee —

SEN. WARNER: We'll accept that because there has been some concern — my understanding, the senator might wish to elaborate, about the Office of Personnel Management, a separate entity within our federal system, and their coordination, collaboration, whatever you want — partnership I would hope in this implementation. I correct in that, Senator?

SEN. COLLINS: You are correct. The OPM under law is supposed to be involved in the development of the new system, and that's very important because OPM has unique expertise in the federal government that I think can be very helpful to the department. And I think it's very important that even at these very initial stages that not only the department go forward, but that it engage in a collaboration with OPM and with the federal employee unions.

SEN. WARNER: Well, I thank you, Senator.

MR. ENGLAND: Senator, I will be meeting with the director, Mrs. Kay Coles James, at a breakfast meeting this Friday so — it would have been sooner, frankly, except my own schedule, out of town, et cetera.

So we will be meeting and having those discussions this week.

SEN. WARNER: Good. Well, that's reassuring because this committee took a very strong leadership role on this issue which was quite controversial, and I think we moved very strongly in the direction which the president and the secretary of Defense so desired because of the uniqueness of this particular department. But we're also running comparisons as to how this is operating in your former department, Homeland Defense. So we're going to be a constant oversight on this as you move ahead on it.

MR. ENGLAND: No, and I appreciate it, sir. This is a very important piece of legislation. I thank you for passing it last year. It is incumbent on us now to do it appropriately and correctly and we are working to do that, sir, and I will be pleased to work with you and other members of the committee.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you.

Senator Chambliss, thank you very much.

MR. BROWNLEE: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't sure if Senator Collins might have to leave and I'd just like to correct the record on one thing —

SEN. WARNER: Yes.

MR. BROWNLEE: — that I said. I indicated there were 2,700 soldiers in Afghanistan who did not today have body armor. That's 700, not 2,700, and I'm advised they'll have them by Friday.

SEN. COLLINS: Thank you very much. That's good news.

MR. BROWNLEE: And one other issue. With respect to priorities to Reserve components versus activities, just so you'll know, we are — we have mobilized and will deploy three separate brigades from the National Guard Enhanced Brigades: 30th out of North Carolina, the 39th out of Arkansas, and the 81st out of Washington state. The chief of staff of the Army and I made a decision that they would have first priority over the active components in equipping them with the Rapid Fielding Initiative equipment, which also includes the body armor. So they will get all the array of soldier items that each — about \$3,000 per soldier. It includes sunglasses and kneepads and all these things. And they have a higher priority on that for this deployment than any of the actives.

SEN. COLLINS: Thank you.

SEN. WARNER: Senator.

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Before I ask a question or two, I just want to make a comment. First

of all, to associate myself with the comments of Senator McCain and Senator Levin on this critical issue of document production. This is a fundamental issue that we've got to resolve and I know under your leadership, Mr. Chairman, we will. And, secondly, with respect to the implementation of these new civilian rules, as the chairman and Senator Collins know, I had some real misgivings about moving as quickly as the Department of Defense wanted to move last year during the authorization process. And thanks to Senator Collins' particularly strong leadership on another committee, we did work through that and we've got something I think will work.

And, Secretary England, you know what great respect I have for your abilities and I'm very pleased to hear you say that we're moving on this and we're going to do it in the right way, because it's very sensitive with our civilian force. And the morale is pretty high and we don't need to do anything right now to jeopardize that, so I'm very pleased to hear your comments on that.

MR. ENGLAND: Thank you, sir. Thank you.

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Secretary Roche, I want to visit with you for a minute about the F/A-22. As you know, last week I had a visit with the Air Force as well as visited the plant in Marietta production facility to discuss the status of the program, and I came away with great confidence that while there are still some minor glitches — and I say minor. Any glitch in a weapons system is a glitch.

But when you look at the complexity of this weapons system and the problems that we've had with it, as we have with every major weapons system through the course of research, development and now in production, the glitches we have now are truly minor glitches. But we're working through those and that everything is headed in the right direction. We may be a little bit behind on the testing schedule, but it's anticipated by both the Air Force and Lockheed that we're going to catch up on that testing within the short term, not the long term.

There's an article in the paper today by the "Bloomberg News" that has a less positive assessment, and I wanted to get your comments on that article. And there's one statement in there that I'm particularly concerned with. We have an independent assessment being done by the Pentagon and the director of the Independent Program Analysis that's doing that study makes a statement that indicates to me that he doesn't understand the capability of this weapons system and the real ability of this weapons system to ensure that we're able to maintain air superiority.

We've been able to maintain air superiority over the last several conflicts we've been involved in. It's been the reason — the reason — that we have suffered the least amount of casualties in any major conflicts that we've been engaged in in the last 30 years. The F-15C has been a great weapon system. It's done its job well. But it's my understanding that there is in production right now by the Soviets a weapon system that is comparable to the F-15C and that if we're going to rely on the F-15C with upgrades or modifications in the future, that we are not going to be able to maintain air superiority.

The F-22 has the ability to penetrate enemy lines, fire one, two three shots in some instances before it's ever detected. And I want to make sure that you have an opportunity to address this issue relative to air superiority and the real need of the F-22. I understand it's your number one program and I appreciate that fact. But if we're going to continue to have these darts thrown at a weapon system that's going to allow us to maintain air superiority and to ensure that we're going to be able to engage in conflicts with the least loss of life possible I think it's critically important that we get that message out to the American people as well as to members of the House and the Senate. So I'm throwing that out to you for your comments on what I know is a very important issue to the United States Air Force.

MR. ROCHE: Without filibustering the issue, sir, let me make the following points. With regard to the status of the program now, we know of no major obstacles. But as you go through tests and evaluation, things come up. It has in every other program, it has in this — it will in this one as well. But the major problems that came up, I think we have two track records to be proud of. One, each issue that people were so concerned about in the past we've fixed. Two, the stability of funding has caused a stability in the production line, which is making the production of the aircraft more efficient over time. It is a very complex system.

The entry into initial tests and operational tests was based on events, not dates. The limiting problem we have now is having the sortie generation rate, which has to do with the failure of small parts on the plane such that you don't get enough sorties per day. We are working that.

Part of the problem is the diminished material sources, very few subcontractors, and parts that were presumed to never fail are failing. And that will apply to any plan that we build in the United States. Joint Strike Fighter will face the same problem. It's good to know it now so that we hopefully can prepare a bit for that. But we are working each of those down

and we will enter into the test program when we have the sortie generation in place.

The pilots who have flown the program — have flown the plane just are awestruck at it. I've had a chance to be with them at Edwards, at Nellis, at Tyndall, and at Tyndall meet with all the maintainers and then the planes took off, flew, came back, no discrepancies whatsoever on the aircraft. Its capability as a stealth super-cruise, advanced avionics are all playing out as we expected them to play. We also have modified the aircraft so that it's much more of an air-to-ground airplane than it was in the past, specifically support land forces.

So one of the reasons that the Army could give up on a deep stealth system is that that's a responsibility that we will take and that the F/A-22 would be our premier system to go to deep to focus on moving targets, which are very hard to bomb typically. And we're doing that. It's also the only aircraft that really gives you a good chance against cruise missiles, mainly because of super-cruise. You can put the same electronics on an F-15, but you can't super-cruise.

The F-15s will never be stealthy. They are large in radar cross-section. We will maintain some as a bridge as we transition into the F/A-22. But the F/A-22, among other things, deters anybody from building a system and thinking they could achieve air dominance, because they can't.

The planes that the former Soviet Union is now constructing are very good. And, in fact, if we put our pilots in those new planes against our pilots in our planes, our F-15s, our pilots in their planes will win because it's advanced technology. But you bring the F/A-22 into the picture and that changes dramatically.

So I believe it is a system that is more and more oriented towards ground support in terms of deep interdiction, moving targets, working with special operating forces that are distributed. It is specifically being oriented to targets that are moving, and increasingly enemies of ours know that if you stand still, you're easily bombed, but if you move, you can in fact avoid us. And it is the only aircraft that we have that gives us a reasonable chance to take more than one shot against a cruise missile.

So I believe it will stand the test of people looking at it, and if someone wants to do yet another study of it, I believe that's not unreasonable. This is not a Cold War system today, just as the B-1 is no longer a Cold War system. We've made enough transitions in the B-1 to make it very, very appropriate for this era and we believe we've done the same thing with the F/A-22.

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

My time has expired, Mr. Chairman, but I have a written question that I'm going to submit.

SEN. WARNER: Why don't you go ahead? You can take another question.

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Okay.

Secretary Roche, we have — I notice in your written statement you make reference to the 116th Control Wing at Robins which flies the Joint STARS. And 116th is the first blended Active Reserve Wing in the Air Force in the entire military, and I'm proud of the work the 116th has done and you know we worked through some difficult issues there and, boy, I tell you the morale of the Guard and the active force is unsurpassed within those folks. And unless you know what a great Joint STARS does for your folks — and it's such a great weapons system and this is a great integration of the active and Reserve component and this model truly does move us to the total force concept that the secretary is talking about with respect to every branch of the service. And I want to just ask each of you if you have looked at the blend between the Guard and the active force that we've accomplished with the Air Force and, Secretary Roche, how you intend to expand on this as we move forward?

And this issue of force structure continues to be an active and vital issue and, Secretary Brownlee, you have addressed it in a certain way within the Army. But I think this blended force concept is the wave of the future with the way Secretary Rumsfeld is talking. So I'd ask each one if you would just comment on what you see here, how you think your respective branch is going to deal with this, are you going to move in that direction?

MR. ROCHE: Sir, we're —

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Secretary Roche, why don't we start with you cause you're the one with the experience on it.

MR. ROCHE: Well, and you as well since you helped me and we did have to get through some difficult times. It has proven itself in combat which, as Admiral Burke once told me, is the only real test of a weapons system is how it performs

in combat. The Joint STARS, the blended wing has performed magnificently. We should also make sure everyone realizes that there are Army officers onboard the Joint STARS at all times, so it's not just Air Force officers.

It has worked very, very well. We've taken that concept and expanded it, especially in the area of unmanned vehicles and remotely piloted aircraft. We've done another unprecedented move with the help of some wonderful Guardsmen in California and Nevada. We actually have California Guardsmen and Nevada Guardsmen in with the Reserves and active force right from the beginning on our Predator developments and our Predator control so that will begin at the same time

We are looking at other areas. We have some in space, some for helping out Strategic Forces Command. We're looking wherever it may make sense to do it because it brings the Guard into our most modern systems and because the newer systems are so much more useable, we can have multiple crews for the same aircraft. So we expect to do this with the F/A-22 as well. It appears to be something that where it makes sense to do, it really, really pays off, and there are other constitutional issues you've helped us with.

So I commend it. It doesn't work in every case but we're finding more and more places where it is in the interests of both the Guard and the active force to bring the experienced folks from the Guard together with the full-time people in active duty, and you get a much higher crew ratio. And if you have to go to war, the active people take it but then, coming behind them, are the Guard folks who supplement the original active group. And Joint STARS works just beautifully and I'll be flying with them in the area here shortly.

MR. ENGLAND: Senator, of course two services. First I want to comment about the United States Marine Corps. Our Reserves are ready to go at literally seven-day notice. Whatever their transportation time they're ready to go into combat, so they actually work with our active force, indistinguishable, ready to go at a moment's notice literally. And that's working well, has worked well in the United States Marine Corps. Department of the Navy, as you know, we are combining our assets between active and Reserve. We are actually reducing our assets as a result because we do want a total force in terms of integrated Reserve and active force, and in fact we are reducing the size of our force, largely brought about with our integration between our active and our Reserve components.

So we do this across the board. Our ships, our airplanes, everything we do, this is a very active integration. I think you will see over time that we will likely continue to shrink both our assets and our force somewhat as we continue this integration. So we're committed to it.

At any given time about 25 percent of our reservists are actually doing active duty. You know, the pilots that fly commercial airlines, when they're not flying commercial airlines they're flying for the United States Navy a lot of them, those that are in our Reserve organization. So you will see more and more integration of our Reserves and our active force, and again our Marine Corps is already highly integrated at the moment.

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, we have some multi-compo units at echelons above division, they're primarily headquarters units. As we stand up these new brigades in the active component, we will stand up new brigades in the Reserve component. They will all be standardized and modularized.

There is not an intent right now to blend them I don't think in the sense you are talking, because although we do have, as you know, active component soldiers integrated in with our Guard and Reserve units anyway — we have some 5,000 that are out there — senior officers and NCOs integrated in these units. They're not blended in the way that you might have described, and we'll have take a look at that to see how it would work with these kinds of units. I'm just not sure how it would, but we'll certainly take a look at it.

SEN. CHAMBLISS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you. It's a very important question, Senator Chambliss.

Just to follow on with the secretary of the Army — just a minute. We see that the force structure in Iraq now will be comprised of 40 percent of National Guard.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: When will that figure be reached, that 40 level?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, right now, as you know, in the rotation that we're doing of moving forces over and bringing them back, we are about 30 percent complete with shipping forces over and about the same amount coming back. We will not complete these rotations until some time in April-May, so I would say it would be — in that timeframe is when it

would be complete.

SEN. WARNER: As those units depart, to what extent can yourself and the secretary of Defense assure the individual Guardsmen that subject to some changes which are not foreseeable, their commitments will be for what period of time?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, their commitments are for one year, boots on the ground in theater.

SEN. WARNER: In Iraq?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: In Iraq?

MR. BROWNLEE: In Iraq, yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: So maximum is 365 days the boots depart?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. But their deployments — their mobilization periods of course are longer because they have to be trained up —

SEN. WARNER: Correct.

MR. BROWNLEE: Mobilized, trained up and then brought back and demobilized. So it can be, you know, up to another six months, depending on how long they're training. In some cases longer than that.

SEN. WARNER: What's the composition in Afghanistan of Guard and Reserve?

MR. BROWNLEE: I'd have to look at the proportions. I know we have a unit from the 45th National Guard Oklahoma who is — that unit is operating Operation Pegasus which is training the Afghan Army. I'd have to look at the proportion. I know there are about 11,000 troops there. About 10,000 of those are Army and I would suggest probably about 20 percent of that may be Guard. I'll have to get that number for you.

SEN. WARNER: My understanding is perhaps there's a unit from Alaska. Would you check on that and provide —

MR. BROWNLEE: I will.

SEN. WARNER: And I thank you very much. Now that my colleague the ranking member has returned, I was absent on the floor during the course of your opening comments with regard to the budget. But I would like to make these observations, and that is in a report released last November the Congressional Research Service examined 46 cases since Fiscal Year 1990 in which funds were appropriated for military operations. CRS concluded, and I quote, "Since 1990 Congress generally has funded combat operations with supplemental appropriations," end quote. Some have suggested Congress begin budgeting for operations in Iraq through the regular appropriations process.

So I'll call on you, Secretary Brownlee. You've had possibly the longest experience in this area, both with this committee and other periods of your distinguished career. Can you, in your judgment, as the acting secretary reliably estimate the cost for your respective service of military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan for Fiscal Year 2005 today?

MR. BROWNLEE: No, sir, and I certainly couldn't have done it at the time we put the budget together. And that's why I think that the Congress has routinely funded military operations like this out of supplementals. If I'm correct, I think we did the operations in the Balkans for at least three years or more — funded them through supplemental appropriations, and I would suggest that those operations were far more certain and stable than the situation we find ourselves in either Afghanistan or Iraq.

SEN. WARNER: Good. Before I leave you I'm just going to ask for the record — you were questioned by members of the committee with regard to the body armor, and you very frankly said we just failed to estimate the needs. But my recollection is that the orders for this originated in the previous administration and the build up.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: So I think it would be important for the record — and I'm not trying to be political, but this is a sequential operation and having been in your job some many years ago, what occurs in the previous administration is carried over and it takes time to wrap up and get second sources to meet contingencies.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir. It does, sir, and we — while we had already looked and started to increase the numbers of

these, we just weren't there yet in terms of volume.

SEN. WARNER: Well, I think it would be helpful if you would —

MR. BROWNLEE: I will do that, sir.

SEN. WARNER: — talk about the origin of the program and how it transitioned from the previous administration to the Bush administration, and the steps taken by the Bush administration, the most recent you mentioned today, to try and bring up an adequate supply.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you very much. Now, back to the question of the budgeting.

Mr. Secretary, can you estimate the cost of your military operations, Navy and Marine Corps, for 2005?

MR. ENGLAND: No, sir, we don't know what our requirements will be for 2005. I mean, we are now operating off of FY '04 funding, and of course that all changed late last year when the Marines were requested to go to Iraq. So even that was very late for the Department of the Navy, so I don't know what the situation will be next year, what we will be requested to do next year. I mean, our budget —

SEN. WARNER: And for the balance of this year. I mean, you've got the Haiti operation. That's a costly one.

MR. ENGLAND: Yes. But I —

SEN. WARNER: It's an example of how you couldn't answer?

MR. ENGLAND: Yes, it is. Right, sir. It is a situation that you cannot anticipate in advance, absolutely.

SEN. WARNER: Secretary, you concur with your colleagues?

MR. ROCHE: Absolutely, sir.

SEN. WARNER: On the Comanche, Secretary Brownlee, frankly I support the decision of the secretary of Defense and yourself on that. Please provide in today's record if you feel there were any facts that were not stated by the administration at the time this important contract was terminated. Do you have any new information regarding that termination that you can share with us this morning? And I presume it's going on in an orderly way?

MR. BROWNLEE: It is, sir. On the 26th we met with members of industry who were involved in the program, and Mr. Bolton met with them and I spoke with them and we certainly told them that — you know, exactly what the decision was and how it originated and why we made it. And we — there is — of course as a result of this, with the program of revitalizing Army aviation, this will in fact require the procurement of an additional 800 new helicopters plus the refurbishment of about 1,500 others.

SEN. WARNER: Well, I want to commend the manner in which you personally and others handled this very difficult decision.

Cancellations are not easy. But, you know, I'm the focal point of all types of communications and criticisms from 360 degrees and I would say it's been a fairly low level on this one. Obviously there's a good deal of disappointment in various geographic sectors of our nation, and with certain producers and manufacturers. But I think thus far it's the right decision and it's going to stay in place.

MR. BROWNLEE: Thank you, sir. I hope that the amended budget arrives over here this week. It left the Army last week to OSD and I understand it's already at OMB, so hopefully the Congress will receive it hopefully this week.

SEN. WARNER: The Congress, understandably — and in the 25 years that I've been here with my good friend Senator Levin we've seen many, many efforts to work on behalf of Guard and Reserve and this year we anticipate the committee will receive requests from members, so let's just talk a little bit about it. A steady stream of legislative proposals have been brought forward in Congress that would greatly enhance the benefits provided Guardsmen and Reservists, and I think they're well deserved. I don't criticize them at all. Lowering the age at which retired Reservists may start collecting retired pay has been proposed. Extending TRICARE benefits to all Reservists has been proposed. There are various other proposals, all very expensive.

Now, what impact would let's say that entire program have, if we were to enact it, on the regular forces? I come

back, you know, drawing on modest experience of my own as a member of the Reserve and integrated during the Korean conflict into active units. There's a certain statute that the active person has and his family, he or she as the case may be, and the commitments that they make. But if we bring them up to where they're all absolutely equated in benefits, how does that work? Does it work?

MR. BROWNLEE: Let me just suggest two things, Senator. First of all, you and I both know how valuable Reserve components are, both Guard and Reserve and —

SEN. WARNER: Let's say essential.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, absolutely. They're just —

SEN. WARNER: Absolutely essential.

MR. BROWNLEE: They're just absolutely critical to our operations now, and I've referred to them as the second greatest generation and I believe that. But I do have some concerns. If all the benefits are the same for both active and Reserve, then people in the active might question why they shouldn't just have a second job and be in the Reserves. The other thing is that when the cost of the Reserve components begin to equate to the cost of the active components, then within the Department of Defense decisions will have to be made as to where the money should be invested and should we invest as many of our dollars in a Reserve component as opposed to an active component, which does still have some restrictions on their use as opposed to the active? So I just think we have to move very carefully in that area.

SEN. WARNER: Time is so short and we're going to have to vote here in a moment. I think you've answered it very carefully. As much as we all desire to give the Guard and Reserve everything to which they are entitled, the Army would have to decide, well, if it's — costs are parallel, then probably we're better off having an active person versus a Guard or Reserve, because that individual has continuity and stays in and they're subject now, as we well know, to recycling back over to these forward posts with a greater frequency.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. WARNER: Secretary England?

MR. ENGLAND: You've expressed it very well, Mr. Chairman, and the Department of Navy —

SEN. WARNER: I expect no less from a former secretary to an old timer, but I appreciate that.

MR. ENGLAND: (Laughs.) No, you've expressed it very well and I would say that you've captured exactly the feeling of the Department of Navy, sir.

SEN. WARNER: Well, I would hope — Secretary Roche?

MR. ROCHE: I concur.

SEN. WARNER: Concur. I hope that in your capacities you'll counsel with the head of the Guard and Reserve units and meet with the very important retired organizations who take an active role in this because we're getting pretty close to that parallel situation.

I think we'd better touch a little bit, Secretary England, on the Osprey. We did the 22, and those programs are always under close scrutiny here. This year we limited production of 22 to a minimum sustaining rate, identified as 11 aircraft, until certain testing was successfully accomplished. The Fiscal Year '05 budget for eight 22s for the Marine Corps and three for the Special Ops represents the fourth in a row at the minimum sustaining rate. I visited down with the Special Ops Command in the recess period and they're very heavily relying on the prompt delivery of this system. So give us a little update on the 22, how it's progressing and when you would anticipate these tests will be completed?

MR. ENGLAND: Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to tell you the testing is going well. We do have what I guess you'd call a few hiccups, but the testing is going very, very well. We're very, very pleased with the progress. I continue to believe that the V-22 is one of the most transformational programs we have. It will change the character of our Marine Corps in terms of the ability to do deep type operations. We would like to have had them for the operation we had in Iraq, frankly, because we were so far inland. It would have been a magnificent airplane to have. So it is very, very important.

We are designing literally our future in terms of some of our ships and our Marine Corps as we go forward, and our Navy, to accommodate the V-22. So the testing is going well, we support it very, very strongly. This is the final test in

terms of major items, although I believe frankly the major items are behind us. So we should be increasing our rate. We plan to do this about 50 percent a year now, starting next year because we don't want the rate to go up too fast and cause problems. But you will see this rate continue to increase now as we finish up the test program. We then want to get this at maximum rate as soon as possible.

SEN. WARNER: Yes, Secretary Roche?

MR. ROCHE: Mr. Chairman, it's an interesting program. It's run by the Navy for the Marine Corps and it's an Air Force colonel who is the program director. The reason is that our Air Force Special Operations Command has a great interest in this program. And so I'd like to second all the comments made by my colleague Gordon England. We follow this very, very closely.

And in fact the reason that we have the organization we do now is that two-and-a-half years ago I went to Gordon and said, "Wouldn't it be better if we were part of your program now rather than waiting two-and-a-half years and telling you what we thought you should have done better?" He absolutely agreed, opened it up to the Air Force and we have been key to it ever since. Our special operators are looking forward to this aircraft.

I think you know that the one that we will buy will have various and sundry additional equipment on it, which will give the Marine Corps a chance to see some of that tested as well. We see this as being very important for our infil and exfil in Special Operations, potentially for long range combat search and rescue. So we are gearing our Special Operations Command on the assumption that this aircraft will be part and parcel of our Air Force.

SEN. WARNER: As you proceed on this, I got into considerable detail and I was given an exceedingly good briefing by knowledgeable people on the Special Ops. But they explained to me just sort of some basic concerns that they're having, which I think are relatively understandable by all, and that is on your descent. In the vertical descent oftentimes you've got to kick out that rope or other sustaining devices for those very brave individuals to exit that aircraft and hit that ground.

The amount of the thrust down is complicating that. Has that been brought to your attention?

MR. ROCHE: Yes, sir, and in particular —

SEN. WARNER: The safety of those individuals.

MR. ROCHE: In particular for search and rescue, having the hoist all the way aft was not a good design. But the program has looked at a center box which would be just inboard from where the normal door on the port side would be for a rescue helicopter. That box works out and you fly in in such a way you actually put a null — an air null beneath that one area, and we believe that that will allow us to do CSAR. If you can do CSAR, you can certainly send people down the ropes but they have had a problem with —

SEN. WARNER: Time won't permit more detail. I just wanted to alert you to a concern.

My colleague Senator Levin?

SEN. LEVIN: Mr. Chairman, thank you. Just on that first budget issue, the Army chief of staff when he was here testified that the Army is currently spending \$3.7 billion a month in Iraq and \$900 million a month in Afghanistan in incremental costs for those operations. Is it not foreseeable that those incremental costs are going to continue into next year, since we know it's 110,000 troops rotating in?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, that's the current burn rate. I anticipate that it might continue somewhat at that level, but I don't know. I mean, we could reach a situation where we had to send more forces, or we could reach a situation where we might draw down.

SEN. LEVIN: Well, isn't it reasonably foreseeable that it's going to be at least 110,000, since that's your plan?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir —

SEN. LEVIN: That is your plan?

MR. BROWNLEE: That's our plan.

SEN. LEVIN: Well then why don't we budget for it? This isn't in the middle of combat. You've got a plan: 110,000 folks.

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, at the time that we submitted our —

SEN. LEVIN: No, no, no.

MR. BROWNLEE: — FY '05 budget —

SEN. LEVIN: Now. The question is not whether there's a supplemental. That's a given there's going to be a supplemental. The question is whether we have a supplemental in a timely way so that we can avoid some gap in there. That's the issue. There's going to be a supplemental for '05.

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, I —

SEN. LEVIN: The question is since you know now, you're planning there's going to be at least 110,000 soldiers in there, why not fund for what you're planning? Why not budget for what we're planning —

MR. BROWNLEE: Senator, if you —

SEN. LEVIN: — (cross talk) — supplemental.

MR. BROWNLEE: If you're talking about the timing of the supplemental?

SEN. LEVIN: Yes.

MR. BROWNLEE: Is that what you're talking about? Sir, you know, that's again above my level. But I —

SEN. LEVIN: Well, have you talked to the secretary about the need for that?

MR. BROWNLEE: It's been discussed in meetings, sir, but I'm not sure where he is on that.

SEN. LEVIN: Have you —

MR. BROWNLEE: Whether it's his —

SEN. LEVIN: Have you urged that the supplemental be filed before the end of the year so we can know that we can properly, without gaps in funding, sustain that level of forces in Iraq and Afghanistan?

MR. BROWNLEE: Sir, I make my needs known to the OSD comptroller and to the secretary of Defense and if they believe they have sufficient funds to do that, then they tell me that. I really don't — I'm not part of the decision making process on when supplementals get drawn up or requested.

SEN. LEVIN: Well, it's really an unsettling answer for me, I've got to tell you, because we know we're planning on 110,000 being rotated in and so that's our plan, and yet we're not funding for that plan. So this is a reasonably foreseeable expense because it's based on a plan that we filed, and so I'll express myself on that. I guess I'll ask the question again. Have you — you've indicated that you believe we'll need a supplemental at some point?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: And are we better off with that supplemental before those incremental costs have to be spent? Are we not better off having a supplemental for '05, since we know those incremental costs are going to be there, in a way in which we have the funds to pay those incremental costs as they're incurred? Isn't that better budgeting?

MR. BROWNLEE: We would be better off having those funds before we had the cash flow out of other accounts, to the extent that we did harm to those accounts.

SEN. LEVIN: All right.

MR. BROWNLEE: But, Senator, you know, because you've been here longer than I was around here, that routinely these supplementals have been requested and approved by the Congress and sometimes when they came too late, yes, it was detrimental. If they were timely, the services were able to adjust and get by.

SEN. LEVIN: Again, there's no argument over whether there's going to be a supplemental so when you say routinely there are supplementals, that's a given.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: The issue is when will this supplemental be presented to us and when we will get —

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: Just a couple of other questions. Secretary Brownlee, there's a program in Korea I understand called the Korean Augmentation to the U.S. Army?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: Are you familiar with that program?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: I think it's called KATUSA?

MR. BROWNLEE: The KATUSA program, yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: Where individual Republic of Korea soldiers are integrated into our units?

MR. BROWNLEE: That's right.

SEN. LEVIN: In a number of positions that would normally be filled by U.S. soldiers?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir.

SEN. LEVIN: This program was begun during the Korean War and apparently has continued with some success. Would that program have merit in Iraq?

MR. BROWNLEE: I've asked the same thing, sir, I really have and it may have. We're kind of embarked in a little bit different direction here than we were in Korea in that right now we are standing up an Iraqi government. We're in the process of doing that and I think we want to build some institutions rather than taking them into ours. But it's interesting and I've asked the same question whether or not that might have merit.

SEN. LEVIN: Would you let the committee know then about the — what your thinking is on that as it evolves?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, I will. Be happy to.

SEN. LEVIN: Two quick ones because we're I see in the second half of our vote already. And this has to do with a comment which was made to me by a family support group president for a deployed National Guard unit last weekend, telling me that soldiers have to wait in line for hours to use a phone in Iraq. When they get their calls through they're charged a connectivity fee that can be as high as \$9 and then a permitted fee up to \$6, again depending on the calling card. And we authorized last year service members who were in Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom to be provided without cost prepaid phone cards for we thought was an adequate amount, 120 callings minutes. But apparently that provision of the act has not yet been implemented, and I don't know why if it's true. Would you find out if in fact —

MR. BROWNLEE: I will, sir, and —

SEN. LEVIN: And would you also just take a look at this problem, because this is a very striking problem when we've got people out there who are being charged apparently that much to make phone calls home when they're not supposed to be charged anything to make phone calls home.

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes, sir, and I — after the hearing if I could get the information for where that is. There are still some isolated spots that continue to get reported where we don't have adequate phone service, so I'd like to know where that is.

SEN. LEVIN: All right. Well, I can't tell you where in Iraq it is offhand, but we will give you the name of the lady —

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay.

SEN. LEVIN: — who's in charge. There was some discussion about the sexual assaults problem that we obviously have here, which seems to be endemic and deeper than anybody could have hoped. Does the Army have systems in place and programs in place in deployed locations to offer victims of sexual assaults there the medical and psychological and legal help that they need? In deployed situations. And cause we're running out of time, let me just raise that, bring it to your attention and if you could give us an answer for the record to that?

MR. BROWNLEE: I will.

Federal News Service March 2, 2004 Tuesday

SEN. LEVIN: Secretary England, you and I have talked about the civilian personnel issue and I know that's been raised again here today by a number of my colleagues. I'm glad it has. I'm glad you're in charge now. I hope you'll, frankly, start from ground zero on this one. It got off on the wrong foot. There was a lot of effort made by our chairman, by Senator Collins and others here to work out something which would preserve collective bargaining rights, which would also involve the unions collaboratively and working out the processes and I'm glad you're willing to take a fresh look at that. And that's your assurance to me personally and I gather your assurance here this morning, and we look forward to that.

MR. ENGLAND: And I'll get back with you on that subject, Senator.

SEN. LEVIN: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to all of our witnesses.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you, Senator Levin, for your very strong and constructive participation on this committee. I likewise have a number of questions, gentlemen: Joint Strike Fighter, joint unmanned combat aerial system, and obviously I was going to end up on shipbuilding. But that's not possible. We've done our very best under the time constraints given this committee today, and I think your responses and participation have been very, very constructive and helpful to the committee in the continued responsibility we have on oversight.

I said when we started I commend each of you for the work that you're doing. I continue to finish this hearing with that commendation. Well done. And I also think your chiefs did a very good job the other day, Senator Levin —

SEN. LEVIN: They did.

SEN. WARNER: — when they appeared before the committee. So that civilian uniform team is working for the best interest not only for the men and women of the armed forces, but the whole nation. I commend you, thank you very much.

END

LOAD-DATE: March 5, 2004

107140

***** Print Completed *****

Time of Request: March 11, 2004 08:37 AM EST

Print Number: 1862:0:8357237

Number of Lines: 1091

Number of Pages: 30

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