



**Federal News Service**

**May** 14, 2003 Wednesday

HEARING OF THE DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE **SENATE**  
**APPROPRIATIONS** COMMITTEE

SUBJECT: FISCAL YEAR 2004 **APPROPRIATIONS** FOR DEFENSE  
DEPARTMENT

CHAired BY: SENATOR TED STEVENS (R-AK)

LOCATION: 192 DIRKSEN **SENATE** OFFICE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C.

**LENGTH:** 17237 words

SEN. STEVENS: Good morning, Mr. Secretary, General Pace and Secretary Zakheim. We welcome you back before the committee. Because of the number of people I believe will come to the table before we get started, I ask that all members limit their comments to not more than two minutes as we get started on this hearing so we can listen to the secretary and get to senators' questions.

The committee continues to review the fiscal year 2004 Defense budget, and we're going to be very interested in hearing from you about the expenditure of the 2003 supplemental for military operations in Iraq and for the global war on terrorism. We also look forward to hearing today to your priorities for the -- in the budget request regarding investments for the future, as derived from lessons learned from these overseas operations we've been involved in. It may be too early to really understand all of those lessons, but we do hope to hear from you about our operations not only in Iraq, but Afghanistan. And I know we'll have many times in the coming month to review your statement in full, which we'll put in the record as though read.

And I yield to my good friend from Hawaii, and I hope all senators will abide by the two-minute limitation.

SEN. DANIEL INOUYE (D-HI): (Inaudible) -- be made part of the record.

SEN. STEVENS: (Aside to Senator Inouye.) Well, I don't want to cut you off altogether, old friend. At least say hello. You can say hello!

SEN. INOUYE: (Laughs.) He said to me, "At least say hello." (Laughter.)

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** Good morning.

SEN. INOUYE: Good morning, Mr. Secretary. And I want to join my chairman in welcoming you and your staff to be with us today for a very important meeting and hearing. And may I congratulate you, and through you, the troops of the United States of America.

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** Thank you very much, sir. They did a wonderful job.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Burns?

SEN. CONRAD BURNS (R-MT): I'll submit my statement for the record, Mr. Chairman. I want to welcome the secretary of Defense this morning and look forward to hearing his comments. We are looking at a different kind of a world now since the Iraqi operation, and I look forward to working with the secretary in doing some of that planning. Thank you very much.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Hollings?

SEN. ERNEST HOLLINGS (D-SC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I have supported you before you became popular. (Laughter.)

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: (Laughs.)

SEN. HOLLINGS: And the jointness that I have in what we call SPAWAR, down in Charleston, South Carolina, I want you to see that. That's a **Rumsfeld** operation, and I want you to come and visit it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Thank you.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Shelby?

SEN. RICHARD SHELBY (R-AL): Mr. Chairman, I'd ask that my brief statement be made part of the record. And I -- (off mike) -- welcome the secretary back here -- (off mike).

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Thank you, sir.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Byrd.

SEN. ROBERT C. BYRD (D-WV): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I want to congratulate the department on the work that it has done with respect to cleaning up the information concerning the status of accounts. We talked several months ago about the fact that the Defense Department could not trace -- could not trace \$3 trillion of its inventory, of its accounts.

And Dr. Zakheim, (they were ?) just telling me a little while ago that you've gotten that down now to less than \$800 million; you're still working on it. And I want to congratulate you on that progress. You indicated at that time that you were going to get your teeth into it, that you were going to get hold of it and you were going to turn it around; and you're doing that. You're doing that. I want to thank you and congratulate you.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Thank you, sir.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Feinstein?

SEN. DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-CA): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I'd just say welcome. I have a number of questions, and I'll reserve them for the appropriate time. Thank you.

SEN. STEVENS: I thank you all for your cooperation.

Senator Leahy, did I call on you?

SEN. PATRICK LEAHY (D-VT): You didn't, but I've -- I'm glad to see the secretary. When he first -- when he was first secretary of Defense, he was the youngest secretary of Defense. I was the second- youngest member of the **Senate**. I've aged; he's done a Dorian Gray: he hasn't. Glad to see him here.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: (Laughs.)

SEN. STEVENS: Again, I thank you all.

Mr. Secretary, pleased to hear from you. And the statements you've presented will be placed in full in the record.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I appreciate your putting the entire statement in the record, and I will make some remarks from that statement.

SEN. STEVENS: We don't have copies of that statement. You gave them out to the press, but we don't have them up here. It would be nice if we had one too.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I will see that that happens.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: Yes, we do. Yes, we do.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Others seem to have it. I don't know --

SEN. FEINSTEIN: Here's a -- pass this down.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: We can pass one up to you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I'm accompanied by Dr. Dov Zakheim, comptroller of the Department of Defense, and General Pete Pace, the vice chief of staff - - vice chairman, correctly -- the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in Dick Myers' absence.

We thank you for this opportunity to update the committee on our progress in our efforts to try to strengthen the department to meet the challenges of the 21st century, and to discuss the president's request for fiscal year '04 to '09.

I also want to thank the members of this committee, Mr. Chairman, and you, for the action, prompt action, on the president's emergency '03 supplemental request for the global war on terror. Passage of that legislation will certainly help provide the fighting men and women with the abilities -- capabilities they need to prosecute the war on terror in the weeks and months ahead.

As several of you have said, our troops have been and are doing a truly superb job all across the globe, and we are certainly grateful to them for their dedication and their courage, and also for the fact that they are all volunteers who stepped forward to serve their country. They crossed hundreds of miles in Iraq, facing death squads and dust storms, and liberated Baghdad in less than a month. What they accomplished is very likely to go down in history books.

The department, as you point out, can't wait for history to be written. We need to meet the threats that this dangerous new century poses, and threats that emerge often without warning. And we have to apply the lessons from the experiences in Afghanistan and Iraq to transform the department and the services as to how they organize, how they train, how they equip and exercise and fight. Even now, while the lessons-learned process is still in its early stages, we can already see that the experience in Iraq has validated some of the strategic decisions that we made in our defense reviews over the past two-plus years; decisions that, in some ways, contributed and drove this 2004 budget.

Consider a few of the lessons. One is speed, and it matters. Coalition forces pressed through southern Iraq in a matter of weeks. It seems likely that the enemy was not able to mount a coherent defense or use -- attack its neighbors, as it had in 1991, with Scud missiles, or destroy its oil wells. It did manage to destroy a handful or so, but not all of them, as they did in Kuwait 12 years ago. And we believe that, in part, this was because the coalition advance was so much faster than had been anticipated. The experience highlights that value of capabilities that can move quickly into theater, reach targets with speed and agility.

Another important lesson involved intelligence and the ability to act on intelligence rapidly. In Iraq, using time-sensitive targeting cells, the coalition was able to launch attacks on enemy targets, in some cases in 20 minutes, based on intelligence information that fresh. Planes taking off for bombing runs on occasion did not receive their targeting information until they were in the air and well on their way.

The success of Operation Iraqi Freedom helps to validate the recommendation in the budget for increased investments in command, control, communications, intelligence, and persistent surveillance.

Another is the importance of precision. The capabilities employed in Iraq were discreet. One new weapon, used for the first time in Iraq, a thermobaric Hellfire missile, can take out the first floor of a building without damaging the floors above, and is capable of

reaching around corners, striking enemy forces that hide in caves or bunkers and hardened multi-room complexes. It went from development to deployment in less than one year. Coalition military planners used a sophisticated computer model to determine the precise direction, the angle of attack, and the type of weapon needed to destroy desired targets, while sparing nearby civilian facilities.

It was important that we won, but it was also important how we won. And the fact that this conflict was done with greater precision than any conflict in history and, as a result, it had to have persuaded the Iraqi people that the effort was not against the country of Iraq, was not against the Iraqi people, was not against a religion but, in fact, was against a regime.

And we believe that these experiences support the decision to request increases in the 2004 budget for research and development, testing, evaluation, procurement, as well as the decision to try to begin changing how we develop new capabilities by employing spiral development to allow us to bring new weapons to the field in a matter of months or years instead of decades, which has been the pattern.

Another lesson in Iraq is the importance of joint operations. U.S. forces, as General Tom Franks properly points out, did not fight as individual services on a deconflicted basis, which has been, historically, the pattern. Instead, they fought as a truly joint force. One example is the rescue of PFC Jessica Lynch, which was made possible by a joint team of Navy SEALs, Army Rangers, Marines, Air Force special operators, of course with the help of an Iraqi citizen.

The joint war-fighting experience in Iraq supports the request in the budget to make new investments in joint training and in joint war-fighting capabilities.

Another lesson was the importance of Special Operation Forces. In Iraq, these special operators were the first coalition forces to hit the ground -- indeed, a number of them went in before the war formally began -- with hundreds more pouring into the western portion of Iraq and other regions just before the ground invasion, securing airfields, attacking terrorist facilities and regime targets, and taking out the regime's capability to launch attacks against neighboring countries.

These experiences, as well as the remarkable performance of special operators in Afghanistan, we believe, support the decisions that we've made and the proposals we've made to transform the Special Operations Command and to request needed new investments in Special Operations in the budget.

There will be other important lessons as we study Iraqi -- Operation Iraqi Freedom, but the point is this. This budget was developed with warfare of this kind in mind, and the experiences in fighting this war have confirmed the decisions made in the Defense review, which are reflected in the budget before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, over the past two years, the senior civilian and military leaders of the department have been working to determine how DOD can best transform to meet the changing threats of the new century. This year's budget request before you is the first to fully reflect the new Defense strategies and policies, and the lessons of the global war on terror.

Our defense review identified six goals that drive transformation efforts.

First, we have to be able to defend the homeland bases of operations overseas.

Second, we have to be able to project and sustain forces in distant theaters. That's clear after these two recent events.

Third, we have to be able to deny enemies sanctuary.

Fourth, we have to improve space capabilities and maintain unhindered access to space.

Fifth, we need to harness our substantial advantages in information technology to link up different kinds of U.S. forces, so that they can fight jointly.

And sixth, we have to be able to protect U.S. information networks from attack, and to be able to disable the information networks of our adversaries, to limit their ability to communicate.

This budget request funds investments that support these transformational goals. Over the next six years, we have proposed a 30 percent increase in procurement funding and a 65 percent increase in funding for research, development, testing and evaluation above the 2002 baseline budget. That's an investment of roughly \$150 billion annually.

In addition to these increases, RT&D spending will rise from 36 percent to 42 percent of the overall investment budget. This shift reflects a decision to accept some near-term risk in order to accelerate the development of needed next-generation systems. One of the more important transformational investments we propose is a request for funds to establish a new joint national training capability. To ensure that U.S. forces train like they fight and fight like they trained, we've budgeted 1.8 billion over the forward year Defense plan to fund range improvements and to permit more of both live and virtual joint training, an annual investment of about \$300 million.

The total investment in transforming military capabilities in this budget request for 2004 is \$24 billion, or about \$240 billion over the forward year Defense plan.

Even as we accept some increased near-term risk, and this budget does accept near-term risk, so that we can prepare for the future, it also recognizes that new and unexpected dangers will likely to be (sic) awaiting us over the horizon. And that's why this budget request increased investments in critical areas such as readiness, quality of life, improvements for the men and women in uniform and to make certain existing capabilities are properly maintained and replenished. We made investments that should stabilize funding for training, spares and op tempo, and put a stop to past practices of raiding the investment accounts to pay for the immediate operations and maintenance needs, so we stop robbing the future to pay for today's urgent bills.

This request in -- for 2004, we increased the shipbuilding budget by \$2.7 billion, making good on our hope last year that we could increase shipbuilding from five to seven ships per year. We increased the Special Operations budget by a billion and a half (dollars) to pay for equipment lost in the global war on terror and for an additional 1,890 people. We increased military and civilian pay proposals by 3.7 billion (dollars), increased missile defense by 1.5 billion (dollars), including increased funds for R&D of promising new technologies and to deploy a small number of interceptors beginning in 2004.

The president's asked Congress for a total of 379.9 billion (dollars) for 2004. That's a 15.3 billion (dollar) increase over last year's budget. But even that increase only moves us part of the way, requiring us to make tough choices between competing demands, and that means that some desirable capabilities do not get funded in this budget. Yet in making those decisions, we believe we made better choices this year, because we followed a new approach to balancing risks that we developed in last year's Defense review. It's an approach that tries to take into account not just the risks to operations and contingency plans, but also the risk to the force, to the men and women in uniform, to make sure we can attract and retain the right people; and risks to modernization or the failure to modernize, if you will; as well as the risk to the future or the failure to transform, risks that in the past had often been crowded out by more immediate, pressing demands. And the result is, we believe, a more balanced approach and a more overall coherent program.

To free resources, the services have stepped up and will be cancelling, slowing or restructuring a number of programs so that they can invest those savings in transforming capabilities. In all, by retiring or restructuring less urgent programs, we believe we can achieve savings of some \$80 billion over the forward year Defense plan, money that will

be reinvested by the services in capabilities for the 21st century.

As you consider the budget, I'm sure you'll hear pleading for a number of programs and plausible arguments as to why this or that program should be saved or funded at a higher rate. I suspect some may disagree with decisions that have been made in this budget, and may want to make changes in the budget proposal.

And certainly, as a former member of Congress, I recognize that Article 1 of the Constitution, the Congress is Article 1, that the president proposes and the Congress disposes. I know that. But it's also important, it seems to me, that as the committee considers potential changes it recognizes that this budget -- we've tried to balance those risks. And it is not an easy thing to do.

This is not to suggest that the budget before you is perfect. Certainly, no one has a monopoly on wisdom. And there are a number of examples I could cite wherein Congress pressed the executive branch over the years to invest in programs such as JSTARS, UAVs that later proved critical to the success of the armed forces. What I am suggesting is that if changes are made -- and they will be -- that they be made in a coherent way, that we have a chance to talk them through, and that they're made with the full understanding of the implications, not only on the program in question that somebody may want to increase, but also on the costs in terms of the reductions that have to take place in other areas.

We've done our best to develop a budget with what we believe has been unprecedented transparency. We hope that the spirit of openness and cooperation will continue as Congress deliberates.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we really can't transform unless we have the ability to better manage the department. In an age where terrorists move information at the speed of an email, money at the speed of a wire transfer, and people at the speed of a commercial jet liner, the Defense Department is, to be very honest, still bogged down in bureaucratic processes that resulted from the Industrial Age, not the investment -- the Information Age.

Some of our difficulties are self-imposed, by the department, to be sure. Others, however, are the result of law and regulation. And together they've created a culture that too often stifles innovation in the department. The result is we're fighting the first wars of the 21st century with a department that was fashioned, organized to meet the challenges of the mid-20th century. Our legislative proposal, the Defense Transformation Act for the 21st Century, would give the department needed flexibility. Among the provisions in this legislation, many of which I admit are controversial -- I know that -- we've proposed more flexible rules for the flow of money through the department to give us the ability to respond to urgent needs as they emerge. We have proposed elimination of some of the more onerous regulations that make it difficult or virtually impossible for many small businesses to do business with the Department of Defense. We've proposed expanded authority for competitive out-sourcing so that we can get military personnel out of non-military tasks and back into the field. We've proposed measures for transforming our system of personnel management so that we can gain more flexibility and agility as to how we manage the more than 700,000 civilians who provide the department such vital support. We need a performance-based promotion system for our civilian work force that rewards excellence, just like the one Congress insisted on for the men and women in uniform.

Mr. Chairman and members, transformation, as you know well, is not an event. It isn't something that starts and then ends. It's a process. It's a culture. It's a frame of mind. Our goal is to set in motion that process and culture that will keep the United States several steps ahead of our potential adversaries.

To do that, we need not only resources, but equally, we need flexibility to use those resources with speed and agility so we can respond quickly to the new threats that we face as this century unfolds.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for your attention. General Pace and Dov Zakheim and I are available to respond to questions.

Unless you have a statement, General Pace?

GEN. PACE: Sir, I don't have a statement.

But I would be remiss, Mr. Chairman, if I did not point out the incredible performance of your armed forces in battle in Iraq is directly attributable to the Goldwater-Nichols Act and the sustained bipartisan support of the Congress. We deeply appreciate that, sir.

And if I may have the temerity to ask to put into the record that our thoughts and prayers are with the families of all those who lost loved ones in this battle, sir. Thank you.

SEN. STEVENS: Dr. Zakheim, do you have a comment to make?

MR. ZAKHEIM: No. I'm ready to take questions as they come at me.

SEN. STEVENS: Mr. Secretary, many of the things you addressed are really pending before the Armed Services Committee. I hope we will address the questions before this committee that pertain to the budget that has been presented.

And I would ask senators to limit themselves to seven minutes in the first round to see how well we can do. We may not get through them all in the time that's allotted to us today.

Mr. Secretary, much of what you said is correct, and I think we all stand in awe of this generation and what they've done. I've often compared this generation to the generation that Senator Inouye and I and Senator Hollings were part of. Some people call it "the greatest generation." But most of our people were draftees. The people you've dealt with now are volunteers, people that place themselves in harm's way on the basis of their own decisions. And I think they're the finest military force the world has ever seen. We're all proud of them, very proud of them, and want to do everything we can to assist you to see to it that we maintain that force as we go out into the future.

Having said that, though, I do express again our sadness that we were not able to go visit the war zone. We have done that on every occasion. I remember when Senator Bellman and I went into Vietnam, two or three times we were under attack and bombed and shelled and everything else. We've never asked for special protection. But in this instance, we have been denied, so far, the opportunity to see Iraq. I hope that those restrictions will be lifted in the near future. I don't ask for any commitment, just I do express that hope.

One of the things that continues to bother me, as a former cargo plane pilot, is the status of the tankers. They now average more than 45 years in age. At least one-third of them are in the depots for repair. And it was suggested to me the other day that I should ask you and Mitch Daniels to join some of us here and go out to Tinker and take a look at those planes that we're trying to repair. Even after we put them through a year of report, they're still unfit for service.

They still have rust and every kind of deterioration in terms of their structural capability, and yet we're insisting on putting them back out and putting money into them to try and make them fly some more, when they average 44 years of age.

Now, Mr. Secretary, we provided several times now for the funds to start a tanker leasing program. And I know -- I hope that you are going to be able to tell us what's going to happen to that program now.

SEC. RUMSFELD: Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I believe it is very important that members of the House and the **Senate** who are in relevant committees and interested have opportunities to visit the men and women in uniform and to observe firsthand and

fulfill their responsibilities, their oversight responsibilities.

I have talked to General Franks about this. We have worked out what we believe is an appropriate arrangement with the speaker of the House and with the leadership in the **Senate**. And there certainly will be an opportunity for you and your associates to be able to go to Iraq and Afghanistan in the period ahead.

Second, with respect to the tanker issue, everything you have said, sir, is clearly correct. The tanker fleet is old. It has to be replaced. It will be replaced.

The lease/buy issue is one that the department has been wrestling with for some time and, I regret to say, still is. We're plowing new ground here. It's not something that the department has done in the past to any great extent. It certainly will be precedent-setting. And it -- we -- I felt it required, appropriately, a look by an outside entity and asked one to make a study of it. That report is back.

The sheer size of this leasing proposal that was pending is something like 125 pages with 80 different clauses. And it is not something that can be done quickly or easily, nor is it something that should take as much time as it's taken. You're right about the corrosion. You're right about the need for replacement. And certainly the department will be pressing for a conclusion with respect to it.

One of the things that's taking place, I'm told at the present time by those folks working on it -- and you may want to comment, Dov -- is they are still trying to negotiate a better price. And there's some active debate about what the appropriate price ought to be.

SEN. STEVENS: Well, Mr. Secretary, I only have five minutes, so I can only say this. We suggested that leasing proposition when we came back from Afghanistan after talking to tanker pilots, who expressed to us their fear of flying those planes. That's almost two and a half years ago, I think. Oh, that's two years ago, at least. But I think we ought to put some of the people that are holding this up in those tankers and let them fly a little bit and see them and listen to them crank -- creak. But it's -- this delay is unconscionable, as far as I'm concerned. I hope we can find some way.

And again, I urge you, I ask you -- we'll get one of your planes and fly down there next week and let -- just take the people from OMB that are holding this up and let them see those planes, because if they see them and understand that the concept of really metal fatigue and the whole concept of rust and what that means to these people that are flying them -- the idea of putting money into them so they can go out there and fly again for another 20 years is just absurd.

I have got one other question to ask, and I'd like to get down to the money, if I can. I want to ask particularly, because of the problems we face now, we passed the Iraq supplemental in record time. And that was based mostly on cost models and upon operational assumptions. I'd like to know, do you have enough money to finish this year, fiscal year '03? Are we going to be able to see through the remainder operations of Afghanistan and Iraq with the money we've provided you?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: The -- I guess it's now May 14th; the fiscal year ends October 1st. We still have a number of months in fiscal year '03. I can say that I have not seen anything at the moment that persuades me that we will necessarily have to come back for an additional supplemental in '03.

(To Mr. Zakheim.) Is that -- ?

MR. ZAKHEIM: Yeah. That's right. As things stand now it looks actually that our target, which we submitted and that the Congress gave us, is pretty accurate. And we are reviewing very carefully the spending rates. We have four and a half months to go in this fiscal year. We have already released over \$30 billion out of the supplemental with more to come. But it's looking like we're pretty much on target, sir.

SEN. STEVENS: Thank you very much.

Senator Inouye?

SEN. DANIEL K. INOUE (D-HI): Mr. Secretary, the Defense Transformation Act that you discussed in the closing moments before the authorizing committees -- (word off mike). And I gather that chances of passage this year don't look too well.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I can't hear you very well, sir.

SEN. INOUE: I gather that the chances of passage would be rather bad at this moment. If the act is not resolved and passed, how would it affect your program?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, let me make a couple of comments and then have Dov make a couple of comments.

One, I'm told that we have 300,000, 320,000, to be precise, men and women in uniform doing jobs that are not jobs for men and women in uniform. They're jobs that should be done by civilians, they're jobs that should be done by contractors. And we're doing that because people are rational. And we've got three choices in the department. We can either use someone in uniform, who you can manage; or you can use a contractor, who you can manage; or you can use the Civil Service, which is very, very difficult to manage. So people do the logical thing: they go and put a military person into a job that's not a military job. We're worried about the OPTEMPO. We're worried about the fact that we've had to call us Guard and Reserve. We're worried about the fact that we've had to have stop losses. And we prefer to have fewer stop losses and fewer Guard and Reserve activated and have them activated fewer number of times and be more respectful of their lives. But with 320,000 military people doing civilian jobs, why? Simply because the rules are so difficult, they're so burdensome.

A second example. We can't hire people right out of school. It's almost impossible.

Anyone else -- a company can go over and go to a job fair at a college, they can walk in and offer someone a job. We can't. Takes months to work through all the paperwork, all the Civil Service requirements.

Now, we've had a bunch of experiments going on at China Lake and other places that -- through authorities that Congress gave us. And they've worked. They've done a good job. China Lake's one of them.

In my view, we need some flexibility to manage the department, and we are wasting taxpayers' dollars because of the absence of that flexibility, in my view.

SEN. INOUE: Mr. Secretary, everyone agrees that our military must transform, and the Army has taken the lead with the creation of the Stryker Brigades. This year, the Army has testified that it needs six brigades. Do you support this?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: We have supported it by putting in the budget the money for all six Stryker Brigades. As I recall, the decision that was made was to -- the first three are already funded, and en route. The next one has been funded and approved, as I understand it -- correct me, Dov, if I'm wrong.

MR. ZAKHEIM: Correct.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: And the next two will be subject to a discussion as to the Army coming back and discussing ways they think they might improve or strengthen the Stryker model for the fifth and sixth.

MR. ZAKHEIM: I could add to that, if I may. The first brigade is actually undergoing a congressionally-mandated evaluation at Fort Polk, Louisiana, for its operational effectiveness. The second one is being fielded; it's at Fort Lewis, it's being fielded with the Stryker vehicles -- the team, that is. And the Army's plan is coming in in July, so it's relatively soon.

SEN. INOUE: I gather that advance drafts have been distributed, and they seem to support the fifth and sixth. Is that correct?

MR. ZAKHEIM: Well, the funding for all of them is in the plan, and then it will be with

the secretary of Defense. And the secretary will decide when he looks at the Army plan as to how and in what way the Stryker is being improved.

SEN. INOUE: Mr. Secretary, if I still have time, on the Navy's LPD-17 -- that's had some problems like cost overruns and schedule slippage. What are your plans on this?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Do you have that?

MR. ZAKHEIM: Yes, I do.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Do you want to comment on it?

MR. ZAKHEIM: Sure. As you may -- as you know, we essentially are gapping, as it were; not funding an LPD-17 in fiscal year '05. We will have an LPD-17 again in -- two LPD-17s in fiscal year '06. And it looks like, we believe, that the shipbuilding industrial base can support the production gap.

In addition, we are talking about a move from these sorts of ships to a new kind of maritime prepositioning ship, which is also in the out years. And we're going to evaluate how that transition will take place.

So, the line remains open, we're funding those ships -- the LPD- 17 -- but at the same time, as part of our overall transformation, we're looking at this new kind of prepositioning ship.

SEN. INOUE: And what sort of ship is that?

MR. ZAKHEIM: Well, they're looking at designs right now. The concept is to incorporate some of the elements of the amphibious type LPD-17, which simply stands for a landing platform dock ship, but in addition, to take account of the prepositioning needs that were demonstrated again in Iraqi Freedom, as well as Enduring Freedom before it.

SEN. INOUE: Hasn't it served its purpose and continued to do so?

MR. ZAKHEIM: There is a sense on the part of the Marine Corps and the Navy that for future requirements, you may need considerably more flexibility than the LPD-17 gives you. Again, by definition, in funding one in '04 and two more in '06, you're committed to those ships for 30-odd years beyond. So it's not a question of those ships being useless, or anything. The real issue is when you go past those, do you want to have a further flexible capability than what they give you? And there seems to be a consensus that the answer is yes, and they're looking at just how to design it.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: And the Navy Department, and the chief naval operation and the secretary of Navy have been reviewing that as part of a broader look at the shipbuilding budgets generally.

GEN. PACE: There's no backing off at all, sir, from the requirement to be able to project combat power from ship to shore. But as Admiral Clark and General Hagee, and General Jones before General Hagee, have looked at this, and are looking at the opportunities presented by the Joint Strike Fighter and the Osprey and the potential adding of a flight deck of some limited capability to the prepositioned ships, that opens a whole new horizon, and they want to make sure that the recommendations they give to the secretary and the money that's spent is spent on the most capable ship in the future.

MR. ZAKHEIM: Let me also add that we'll continue to buy these ships through fiscal year '10; which, again, is an indication that we're not giving up or anything on a ship like this, it's just a matter of -- (aside) -- you can't hear me?

SEN. STEVENS: Were running out of time, Mr. Secretary.

MR. ZAKHEIM: Sorry.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Burns?

SEN. CONRAD BURNS (R-MT): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just have a question and maybe a thought, Mr. Secretary, this morning. As we have seen in the operation in Iraq, it was pretty evident that the technology and the training that we

had done prior to that operation really paid off. I am told that your ability through communications, the ability of systems that were interoperable, that it give the striking force a lot of flexibility, even before the operation started, and during the operation, that any mission could be changed.

We are -- there's no doubt about it, that it was a force -- we have the most physically fit and, I think, mentally alert military this nation has ever known, and really people who understand technology and know how to use it.

We're also seeing in this country, as we train for the force that you visualize, that will be our force of the future, we're also seeing our ability to train, both in the airspace and land-based facilities, for our troops and our equipment, we see that being eroded due to encroachment, environmental laws, and a variety of other challenges that we have in front of us.

I would wonder, you'll be making the decisions of what kind of facilities and what we're going to need to train for the future, and make that assessment, and then probably would start dealing with those challenges ahead. Can you tell us if there is a process in place now where you're making those determinations, based on what we have experienced in the Middle East, and such -- such time as when Congress will be advised or assessed of what your needs will be in the future areas of training and new technologies?

**SEC. RUMSFELD:** Senator, thank you. You're right, the armed forces of the United States have -- are living in the world.

And they have training ranges and facilities. And as the world's rules and requirements change and evolve, the restrictions grow, and the ability to function is limited. We currently have proposals in the transformation legislation before the Congress that would provide some relief from some of the laws that are hampering defense training and that type of activity.

For example, we've been delayed over six years in deployment of a surveillance towed array sensor system, low frequency active sonar system, which is needed against ultraquiet diesel submarines. It's part of the Marine Mammal Act. And we proposed last year several adjustments. They tend not to really be directed at any of the laws that exist, but rather at the legal interpretations that have evolved over the decades since those laws were passed that we feel we need some freedom from.

(To General Pace.) Do you want to comment, Pete, on this -- ?

**GEN. PACE:** Sir, thank you.

Senator, we want to be good stewards of the environment, and we believe that we can do both be good stewards of the environment and train. And one of the provisions is for this national training center that will be both live fire environment, such as Twenty-nine Palms, and the National Training Center in Ellis Air Force Base, and the virtual environment that you can pull together people throughout the entire nation without having to move anywhere to do a very, very robust exercise.

So we are looking at that, sir. We do have a process we're working through the Defense Department to highlight those things that are current constraints, but also to be able to project ways that we can protect the environment and train.

**SEN. BURNS:** Well, General Pace, you know as well as anyone else that Camp Pendleton has come -- parts of Camp Pendleton has come under fire, that we cannot train in that we used to use many years ago, or even in modern day you're training out there. And this sort of concerns us. We look at air space use, especially in the southwestern part of the country, where you have a lot of commercial flights, where we see a restricting of air space both in the space and altitude in which we can train. And I'm wondering if those assessments are not going on now that we will be able to be sharp as we were in this 21 days in the Iraqi operation. If we cannot train and we cannot train under conditions like

we're going to have to fight, then I worry about those kind of conditions. We can talk about equipment, we can talk about money and that. But if we can't -- if we can't train our troops, that's something that we've got to look at very seriously. And I would also add that maybe my home state of Montana might have something to offer. (Laughter.) Strictly parochial.

Thank you, Mr. -- thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. STEVENS: Thank you very much.

Senator Byrd?

SEN. ROBERT C. BYRD (D-WV): I have no questions.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Hollings?

SEN. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS (D-SC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, that's an outstanding statement, and I congratulate you on bringing defense into the new century. What happens -- and the reason I take the committee's time here to ask about this little installation down in Charleston, back in '92 at the base realignment and closure there was one thing that both George Bush Senior and Clinton could agree on, and that was we're not going to close the Portsmouth Navy Yard.

I mean, we got the run-up there in that primary. So they closed Charleston, which had won all the (naval-ese ?) and everything else. But at the time I debated and argued to have NAVALEX that you would remember as a former secretary back in the '70s. And NAVALEX was combined into SPAWAR. They combined Pautucket (sic - probably means Pautuxent), Maryland, Nebraska Avenue, where Secretary Ridge is right now, on Nebraska Avenue, Norfolk and Charleston. And the reason for the question, of course, a comment, is an admiral now has asked for a study to find about the cost of moving it. I hope we get that study, because Boos-Allen, the secretary of the Navy, has just completed a cost efficiency study of 15 Navy engineering centers, and they found that the SPAWAR facility down in Charleston was ranked number one in overall efficiency. So it's the jointness. We don't receive appropriated funds. What we do is we design, build, test and support computer, command and control systems. And they're a bunch of a little small contractors. And since the big Navy yard was closed, the rent is cheap, they love it down there, and they got room to move and expand, and they serve Army, Navy, Air and Marines. But they serve the White House, the Secret Service, the FAA and everything else. It's all contract. It's the jointness that Secretary **Rumsfeld** is insisting on. And if you could come visit us down there you'll see it. And I think you can use that as an example of succeeding in this jointness effort.

Otherwise, Mr. Secretary, with respect to rebuilding Iraq, do you look upon that as a military or a contract operation?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, I think I'd rather say what I think of it as rather than either/or. First of all, I think it is ultimately a task for the Iraqi people. You don't -- I don't think anybody can rebuild another country for a person. It's up to them to do that. They're going to have to invest their time and their energy and their funds in seeing that that country rebuilds after decades of leadership by a vicious despot who did not invest in the people, did not invest in the infrastructure. He was building palaces and building weapons and putting money in his own accounts outside the country. So it's going to take some time.

The -- it's probably, second, going to be a task for the international community to create - - to help the Iraqi people do what needs to be done. And it'll take time.

Third, I don't think it can be done unless the country is in a reasonably secure and permissive environment. And that's what we need to help with.

SEN. HOLLINGS: And that's the main point: it's got to start off military because --

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Exactly. Exactly. Exactly.

SEN. HOLLINGS: -- if you don't establish law and order, even after law and order is established, I look upon and remember the countries of Greece and Portugal coming into the Common Market. And the others -- Germany, Italy and all -- taxed themselves 5 billion over five years so they could develop the entities -- free speech, free press, a respected judiciary, property ownership, and all of those kind of things. Otherwise, if you -- you begin with the people, and the people themselves doing that, I agree with you generally. But specifically, if you allow that, you're going to end up with an Islamic democracy. It'll be quite some time before we get one man, one vote in downtown Baghdad. And the military is going to have to -- I had this experience with all of the demonstrations and everything else -- *salus populi suprema lex* -- the safety of the people is the supreme law.

And when you've got all kind of entities demonstrating, breaking in, stealing and everything else of that kind, you've got to establish the safety of the people.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: You're absolutely right. Unless it's a reasonably secure environment, nothing else happens.

SEN. HOLLINGS: Right.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: It just doesn't work.

SEN. HOLLINGS: That's -- thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. STEVENS: Yes, sir. Thank you very much. Senator Shelby.

SEN. RICHARD SHELBY (R-AL): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary **Rumsfeld**, I'm want to first talk a little about intelligence community cooperation, DoD with the intelligence community. Would you give us a little analysis of how far the department -- that is, the Department of Defense -- has come since September the 11th in improving your own intelligence capabilities and cooperating with other intelligence agencies, and what this budget would do to continue that work?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, let me answer the second part first, the cooperation. I suppose that nothing's ever perfect in life. We're all human beings, and we're not perfect. On the other hand, having been in and around government for a lot of decades, I honestly believe that the linkages between the director of Central Intelligence and Central Intelligence Agency and the intelligence agencies that reside in the Department of Defense and the combatant commanders is, I would say, better than ever in my knowledge. It is -- it is -- I mean with George Tenet probably several times a week, but we have lunch once a week, and we have been able to knit it together at the top. General Franks was able to do that in the region, and is currently doing it in Iraq. It is a -- it is almost not quite seamless between the two.

SEN. SHELBY: But it's better than it's been, hasn't it?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Absolutely.

SEN. SHELBY: Uh huh.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Absolutely.

SEN. SHELBY: Thank you.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I -- and we work hard at it. And I think it's much better.

How much progress are we making generally in the intelligence community? That's a tougher question. I think time will tell. And we are -- we're doing some big things. We're -- as we rewrite war plans and contingency plans and think of them in the 21st century with the changed circumstances, there are things that can be done in intelligence that will inform those plans and enable us to do things differently. And if we have in one case, for example, the sake of argument, two weeks warning instead of two days warning, or two months warning instead of two weeks warning, it can effect how we arrange ourselves. We're into that, but we have not completed it. We're working hard at it.

SEN. SHELBY: But the intelligence initiative we're talking about, that's central to what

you plan to do and how you do it, is it not?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Absolutely.

SEN. SHELBY: The National Aerospace Initiative -- Mr. Secretary, you've been outspoken on the importance of space to military operations and in your support of the National Aerospace Initiative. While the Air Force is partnering with NASA on various technology development initiatives that support both their shared and unique mission objectives, I think we can and should do much more to support the National Aerospace Initiative. Would you elaborate, if you could, on DoD's partnership with NASA in this regard? Do you see it growing or not growing?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I don't know, to be very direct. The department has had multiple linkages with NASA, dating back to the time when I was on the Space Committee in the Congress in the 1960s. And they have shifted as the focus of our space efforts shift. They each have a distinctive role, the civilians side and the military side. But we have over the decades -- the department has benefited by the relationship, and certainly NASA's benefited by the relationship. And how it will evolve in the future, I think really, I'm just not in a position to say.

SEN. SHELBY: Okay.

Would you talk briefly, if you would, about using space superiority to fight smarter, and what space-based radar will add to the department's war fighting capability? How important is space to all of this? I'd say very important, but I'd like to hear you.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Indeed, it is. Dov just reminds me here that this budget does provide \$118 million for the National Aerospace Initiative to continue the development of the integrated approach.

In the Information Age, space plays a critical role. And it will increase, not decrease, over time the need for information and the leverage it provides and the force multiplier it provides through improved situational awareness and through the ability to interconnect the different services and, indeed, different countries' services into combined joint efforts. Space plays a critical linking role there. So you're absolutely correct.

GEN. PACE: Sir, as you know, our -- in space, some of our sensors are affected by weather, to answer your question about space-based radar. That would give us 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week capability to see what we want when we want.

SEN. SHELBY: Very important, isn't it?

GEN. PACE: Yes, sir.

SEN. SHELBY: Secretary **Rumsfeld**, lastly, the Predator and the Hellfire missile, a lot of us view that as a real achievement, you know, integrating the Hellfire missile onto the space-based -- to the Predator, an unmanned aerial vehicle. Do you see that growing in the future, the unmanned vehicles, weaponizing them and so forth?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I do. I think that the things that unmanned aerial vehicles -- indeed, I would go so far as to say unmanned vehicles. They may be aerial, and they may be surface, they may be sub-surface, they may be a variety of things, we will see evolving over the decades ahead in ways that we probably don't even imagine today. We have been significantly advantaged in the past two and a half years by the availability of unmanned aerial vehicles.

SEN. SHELBY: And a lot of that was put together very quickly with the help of our organic labs, was it not?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: It was. And, indeed, as I mentioned in my opening statement, with some prodding from the Congress.

SEN. SHELBY: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Hollings? No, Senator Byrd.

SEN. BYRD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and thank you, General Pace and Dr. Zakheim. I note in yesterday's Washington Post the following headline: "Baghdad Anarchy Spurs Call For Help". I read excerpts therefrom:

"Baghdad residents and U.S. officials said today that U.S. occupation forces are insufficient to maintain order in the Iraqi capital and called for reinforcements to calm a wave of violence that has unfurled over the city, undermining relief and reconstruction efforts and inspiring anxiety about the future."

I was interested in your reference to the lessons that we need to have learned from the past and your comment that we need to apply the lessons from the experience in Iraq. It seems that we're learning the same lesson that Hannibal learned. When he went through the entire length of Italy in 16 years, he learned that he needed an occupation force. He needed a force that could stabilize. He had the speed. He was a great general, and I think he was -- it was stated by Napoleon that Hannibal was the greatest general of antiquity. So he could level the cities, he could take the cities, but he could not hold them, because he didn't have the forces to occupy and to stabilize. And as a result, although he had numerous victories throughout the 16 years that he was in Italy, he simply didn't have the forces to keep the cities, and as a result, city after city, such as Capua, went back over to the Romans after a while.

And it seems we're having that same problem in Iraq. The news reports out of Iraq are using words such as "turmoil," "chaos," and even "anarchy" to describe the situation in Baghdad.

At this point, there is little evidence that the U.S. had in place any coherent plan for the reconstruction of Iraq following the end of combat. I fear that we may see a repeat of the situation in Afghanistan, where our forces have worked hard to contain the chaos in Kabul, only to see the outlying cities fall back toward warlord control and turmoil. And so I think we have other lessons to learn besides those that you have appropriately listed. We must learn from our mistakes and not be doomed to repeat them. Going into Baghdad, the military had the aim of overthrowing the existing government. Going into Baghdad, we were warned by U.N. agencies and nongovernmental organizations about the lack of water and the unsanitary situations in the city. We knew that medical supplies were scarce. We knew that military action would likely lead to mob action. I hope that the recent shake-up in the civilian leadership of the U.S. occupation authority will help the situation and will not amount to merely rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. But for the time being, it is the U.S. military that has the responsibility of maintaining order in Baghdad. What specific and immediate steps are you taking, as secretary of Defense, to improve the security situation in Baghdad?

**SEC. RUMSFELD:** Senator, let me comment on a number of pieces of that. We are -- first of all, I think the characterization of anarchy is not accurate. It's a headline writer's phrase, and it certainly grabs attention. But we were on the phone in the SIVITS (ph) today with the people there, and the circumstance is something other than anarchy. You're quite right; you don't need to learn that lesson that it's important to stabilize. That lesson's been learned throughout history. And the -- General Franks and his team had plans, have plans and have put in place plans to provide for the security in that country. There are -- it is important to note several things. Number one, every jail in that country, to my knowledge, was emptied. So on the street are looters, hooligans and bad people. They have to be rounded up and put back in. That takes a little time. You don't do that in five minutes. If we emptied every jail in the United States of America today, you wouldn't in 50 days or 40 days or 30 days or however many days since that war has

ended -- what is it? Twenty? Twenty days, I guess, it's -- three weeks. You wouldn't be able to round up all those criminals and bad people and put them away again. There are also Ba'athists there. Not everyone was captured or killed. And they don't wish us well. They still are part of the old regime. And they have to be rounded up and identified.

Next, we do have a good force there in the country. I forget what it is, but it's -- U.S. is probably 140,000, 2(00,000), and coalition forces are probably another 20-plus thousand. They have recruited and put back on the streets in that country, I'm going to guess, close to 20,000 Iraqi police people. We have had donors' conferences and force generation conferences in England and elsewhere, to get coalition countries to come in and supply -- provide additional forces. We have, if I'm not mistaken, plus or minus 15,000 additional U.S. forces that are due to arrive in Iraq over the next seven to 20 days.

The deployment of those forces and how they are actually utilized in Baghdad -- and you asked: Did we have a plan? The answer is yes. We were briefed on it again today, and it's being implemented.

My personal view is that the idea of chaos and turmoil and anarchy in the city is, as I say, an overstatement. We were told today that maybe two-thirds to three-quarters of the city is stable. Now that's not permissive. It's stable. It -- another portion of it, particularly in the North, is less so. And most of the city -- at night the hooligans are out, and the criminals, and trying to loot and do things. We've had people shot, wounded and killed in the last 48 hours there, in Baghdad.

And it is a problem. It is critically important, as Senator Hollings said, that -- the one thing that's central to success is security. We have a full court press on that. The forces there will be using muscle to see that the people who are trying to disrupt what's taking place in that city are stopped and either captured or killed.

SEN. BYRD: How many U.S. troops are currently in Baghdad? Do you expect to increase that number? And are there any other coalition forces currently in Baghdad?

GEN. PACE: Sir, if I may, the current number of coalition forces -- U.S. troops in the greater Baghdad area is about 49,000. There are additional troops arriving as we speak. General Franks and his commanders are reviewing the situation on the ground to see how they might reset themselves in the city to be able to provide the kind of patrolling and presence that's necessary to provide the stability they need.

SEN. BYRD: Can you speak to the number, the increase in forces?

GEN. PACE: Sir, right now you have -- the 1st Armored Division is arriving as we speak, and that's an additional 20,000 troops who are arriving right now, sir. And they will be --

SEN. BYRD: So that would bring it up to 69,000?

GEN. PACE: If General Franks and his commanders determine that that's where they should go, yes, sir.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: But it is up to the combatant commander to decide how he deploys those troops, and he has not, to my knowledge, made a final judgment on --

GEN. PACE: He has not, sir.

And sir, we're out of time, but I'd be wrong if I didn't point out that Jay Garner is a great American doing a great job. And the term "shake-up" with regard to him and his administration, what he's been doing, really does him a disservice. This new civilian going over has always been part of the plan.

I should defer to the secretary on this, but Jay Garner, under the U.S. military command he's been working under, has done a fabulous job.

SEN. BYRD: My time is up. Let me ask one further question. What commitments has the U.S. received to date for peacekeeping forces from other nations?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: First let me just underline what General Pace said about General Garner. This is a first-rate individual. He's been working since late last year. He's done a spectacular job out there. He's put together a team of people, and they're living in very difficult circumstances. He is not being replaced. He is -- he -- from the very outset it was clearly understood that at some point a senior civilian would be brought in, and Ambassador Bremer is that individual. They are working closely together. And it's unfortunate when the implication is suggested that there's some sort of a shake-up because there's a problem: there is no shake-up. This has been part of the plan since the very outset.

I can't answer your question about how many foreign troops have agreed. There are, I believe, already something like eight or 10 countries that have indicated their willingness to send troops. Some of them, it depends on their parliament approving it; some of them, it may depend on having a U.N. connection of some sort, which is now being worked on in New York. But there -- the talk was of --

(To General Pace.) How many divisions, do you recall?

GEN. PACE: Sir, two divisions initially between now and the next several months.

SEN. BYRD: Would you please list those --

SEN. STEVENS: Your time has expired. I'm sorry, Senator.

SEN. BYRD: Yes, I understand that.

Would you please list -- list those countries for the record?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: If they have publicly so stated, we'll be happy to.

SEN. STEVENS: Very well.

Senator Cochran?

SEN. THAD COCHRAN (R-MS): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, the recent experience in Iraq indicated that the Army Patriot PAC-3 system successfully defended our forces against Iraqi missile attacks. My question is whether or not your assessment is consistent with the reports that were made available to us in the press that this system worked as it was intended and expected to work, and does the budget contain funds to continue to build systems like this and others that might protect our forces and our country against even longer-range missiles?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: The budget does have, as I note here, some \$736 million for PAC-3, 561 (million) of which is for procurement and 174 (million) for research, development, test and evaluation.

My preliminary impression is identical to yours. I know that the lessons learned will be coming back with greater specificity. But from what you hear anecdotally, there is no question but that the PAC-3 was effective. I should also add, however, that we do have to do a better job of deconflicting. And you may recall that there were some incidents where PAC-3s actually intercepted U.S. aircraft and friendly aircraft. And how that -- what those lessons are and how we can improve that -- it's always been true in every conflict that those things happen. But our goal, obviously, is to do it perfectly. And in that case, we didn't.

Pete?

GEN. PACE: Yes. Yes, sir. U.K. aircraft, sir.

SEN. COCHRAN: General Pace, I understand that the medium extended air defense systems -- MEADS -- may offer significant enhancements over the PAC-3. But because of funding constraints and other considerations, it's not to be fielded until fiscal year 2012.

Is this an accurate assessment of when we will see this system deployed? And what is the outlook for deployment of other systems that build upon the PAC-3's successes?

GEN. PACE: Sir, there's about \$280 million in this particular budget for the medium-

range missile. I do not know the date, as you've stated. I'll have to take that for the record. But I can reinforce the fact that the PAC-3 system and, in fact, all the Patriot systems in Iraq, in Kuwait, were -- first analysis is that every troop concentration was under an umbrella of a missile system, and that no missile got into any of those umbrellas.

SEN. COCHRAN: Well, I want to congratulate you and the secretary in the leadership that's being provided to ensure that we can continue to build upon those successes of missile defense. We know that "testbed Alaska" is under construction now, and the intent is to deploy a system that can defend against much longer-range missiles in the future. Do you think the budget request for those longer-range systems and the construction schedule is sufficient to meet our needs for a defense capability for our homeland?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Senator, I know you've been long and active in this important area. With the end of the ABM Treaty and the ability for the first time to go out and actually test different ways of doing things, we were able to move into a period that has contributed to our knowledge and to the country's knowledge in these technologies, and that's a good thing. It's a good thing from the standpoint of each possible alternative of boost and midrange and terminal; it's a good thing from the standpoint of the system you mentioned for Alaska; it's also a good thing from the standpoint of sea-based systems. And my feeling is that General Kadish, who's done a terrific job in that role, in my view, has got a pretty good balance in his proposals as to where we ought to put our money to gain additional mileage, and as you point out, to also develop this beginning of a capability to intercept relatively low numbers of ICBMs.

SEN. COCHRAN: On another subject, and I know that both the Navy and the Army have been experimenting with leased vessels to define the requirements of the littoral combat ship, in the case of the Navy, and the theater support vessel that the Army considers important for its purposes. I understand, too, that the Army is considering leasing a lot more of these vessels; they're catamaran-type vessels, high-speed vessels.

We have shipbuilding firms on the Mississippi Gulf Coast that are very capable of building cost-effective ships for our military, and I wonder whether you will look at this leasing plan and see whether or not it might be more appropriate to build these ships rather than to lease foreign vessels for experimentation and analysis.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Let me have Dov answer that.

MR. ZAKHEIM: Well, one of the reasons, Senator, that these leases are being looked at is because they're still trying to define exactly what kind of platforms they have in mind. Littoral combat ship is a good example. I know down in Mississippi, you have a tremendous composite facility, which would come up with a completely new type of composite ship. The issue really is defining requirements, and until they've got that nailed down -- and as you know, the Navy has been working on that for its part, and the Army for theirs. In order to just get a sense of what requirements might be needed, they are leasing. I don't believe that that is the long-term intention.

SEN. COCHRAN: Thank you very much.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Leahy?

SEN. PATRICK LEAHY (D-VT): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm interested in listening to this -- I am interested in how much we have improved in the high-tech area of our military, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Secretary, you and I have talked before about such things as using drones and all. And I think we're in absolute agreement on the fact, especially for surveillance, and everything else, it's a lot easier to stick something up there that if it does get shot down, you've lost a drone, you haven't lost a person. They can stay longer, and you have more flexibility.

We also -- I know this committee funded an advanced data link that allowed targeting

information to go to our aircraft quickly. That was an initiative that I had worked on; this committee had funded it. I hear that -- from pilots over there that the Gateway made a real difference. And I want to compliment those who used it.

In Iraq, we confirmed the total-force concept. We had the Guard, the Reserves, the active force fighting side by side. The commanders tell me they were an integral part of our military victory. I am concerned, however, that benefits for our essential reservists don't -- haven't changed. For example, about 20 percent of the Reserves don't currently possess adequate health insurance. I'm told this undermines readiness, undermines recruitment, and so on -- retention.

Would you support legislation to make reservists eligible for TriCare on a cost-share basis?

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** Senator --

SEN. LEAHY: And I must say, I ask that -- I'm the co-chair of the Guard Caucus, and I'm -- we have a lot of -- it's a bipartisan group. We have a lot of members who are interested.

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** I've discovered that I best not answer questions like that until I look at the numbers and the costs and see what one has to give up to have something like that.

SEN. LEAHY: Would you do that and submit it to me?

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** We will be happy to take a look at it and see what the costs are.

I would add this, that you're quite right, however, in the -- the total-force concept works. It worked in the conflict; it is working today. But one of the delays in calling people up was that -- you're right -- their teeth needed to be fixed, and various other things that they hadn't paid attention to. And it may very well be at some point that there would be some advantage in having certain elements of the Guard and Reserve more ready, that is to say having had their teeth checked, and having had those kinds of physical checks, so that there is not a delay and a big paperwork rush when you're trying to get people on active duty.

SEN. LEAHY: Well, I'm also concerned about the health insurance there's a long hiatus they may be without it. And I'd be glad to work with your staff on this. But this is a growing concern that those of us in the caucus, in both parties, are concerned about. We hear from our home states, and all. And I think it is something -- we're pushing for legislation on this. I think it's something that could be done. I think ultimately it would be a very cost-effective thing.

And I realize this is not a question where you'd have the answers on the top of your head, but would you direct your staff to work with mine so we can share this information with the whole Guard caucus.

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** We'll be happy to dig into it. Thank you.

SEN. LEAHY: Secretary, were you surprised we haven't found any weapons of mass destruction in Iraq yet?

SEC. **RUMSFELD:** Not really. I've believed all along that the inspections, or the U.N. inspectors had very little prospects of finding anything by discovery. I've always believed that they would be -- they or the people on the ground -- in this case, us -- will have the best prospects of finding the weapons programs and documentation and the weapons themselves through people who've been involved in those programs and come up and tell us where to look.

The government lived many lives, but one of the lives they lived for decades, at least better than a decade, was the ability to fool the inspectors. They actually arranged themselves so that they could live with U.N. inspectors.

SEN. LEAHY: No, I understand that, and I read a number of the reports, as you have, the reports we can't go into in open session. But we are on the ground now. We've gone to a number of the areas, gone extensively into a number of the areas that we had felt, that our

military and our intelligence had felt would be areas of weapons of mass destruction, have not discovered anything. I wonder, if those weapons were there, why, if they were, they were not used against our troops. I'm very thankful for that, as are you and General Pace and everybody else. But I wondered why they weren't.

I'm also concerned, if they were there, especially in the areas that we had said we wanted to look at and now have looked at, is there any possibility that they've seeped out and are now in the control of terrorists whose interests are inimical to us?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I certainly wouldn't say that something like that is not possible. With porous borders -- and that country, I suppose, had borders pretty much like we do with Canada and Mexico. There are plenty of things that move back and forth across those borders in Iraq that --

SEN. LEAHY: You probably don't want to go too, too far with comparing Iraq's, Iran's, Syria's borders with ours with Canada and Mexico. We're a little bit friendlier with those two countries, I hope.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, my goodness, yes. And we've got --

SEN. LEAHY: I live only an hour's drive from Canada.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: We have wonderful people on both sides trying to maintain the border, but the fact is that things move across those borders. And they're moving, clearly, across the Iranian border, the Syrian border, into Iraq and out of Iraq. And I don't think that I could say with certainty that thing weren't moved out either by the government of Iraq or by others.

SEN. LEAHY: But you don't have any indication that they had set up with the intent of using such weapons against our forces when we began to attack.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: There was -- I'm trying to think what I can say in an open session. And I guess there's not much I can say in an open session.

SEN. LEAHY: Well, then perhaps what you may want to do is submit, in the normal classified fashion, a response on that one.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I mean, the fact is we do see intel chatter that suggests that things might have moved. But --

SEN. LEAHY: I'm talking about the fact of why they did not use it against us.

Mr. Chairman, could I request that the staff so cleared for such information follow up on that last question in a classified report? Thank you.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Domenici?

SEN. PETE V. DOMENICI (R-NM): Mr. Secretary, -- (off mike) -- familiar with what happened to Hannibal in Rome.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: (Laughs.)

SEN. DOMENICI: Let me tell you, I came here just as concerned as Senator Byrd of how the stability, lack of stability in the daily lives of the people of that country. And I am -- I remain genuinely concerned that we are in a situation where we may have won the war and we lose the battle. And so I can't stress enough that we do whatever is necessary to bring law and order to that country and that we establish some kind of a plan quickly for the orderliness of that society.

I understand that we were surprised by a number of things, such as the condition of their infrastructure. We assumed it was better than it is. It is breaking down in places and in intervals that we had not expected. And that causes confusion, causes concern, and ultimately blaming Americans if things aren't going right. In that regard, I wonder why your answers continue to be that this will be handled by the distinguished general who won the war. I wonder why it is his job to keep that situation going and why there is not some other kind of order that is going to be established quickly that is not under his direct command. If you might answer that for me in a moment, I'd appreciate it.

Secondly, it seems to me that it is absolutely imperative that the United States maintain order regardless of how difficult it is, because without it, there is a real chance that the people of that country will assume that the victory that we claim is not a victory at all. Could I have your comments on that quickly? And I have two other very brief questions. **SEC. RUMSFELD:** Yes. Number one, the president has said publicly that the United States and coalition forces will put whatever number of forces are needed for as long as they're needed, and there is no disagreement about the importance of providing security. Second, the command arrangements are as follows. The combatant commander reports to me, and I report to the president. He has the responsibility for security in that country. The humanitarian side of that and the non-security side, the non-military side, is now in the hands of the individual who has been mentioned previously, Ambassador Jerry Bremer. And he has under him all of those things other than security. And he reports to me, and I report to the president.

The infrastructure, as you properly point out, was badly degraded over the decades. The power situation, for example, in Baghdad is so fragile that getting it back working a hundred percent of the city a hundred percent of the time is not a simple matter. And it takes some time.

For example, prior to the war, only 60 percent of Iraqis had reliable access to safe drinking water. Ten of Basra's 21 potable water treatment facilities were not functional before the war.

Now, you -- as I said earlier, you empty all the jails and you put a bunch of hooligans out, and you look at an infrastructure that wasn't working before the war, and then everyone says, "Well, my goodness!

It's chaos! It's turmoil! What's the matter with you? You've been there for 21 days and you haven't solved all the problems."

I think that they are doing a terrific job. They will continue to do a better job. The circumstances of people in that country are better than they were before the war. They're going to get better every day. We're finding mass graves, thousands of human beings that were killed by that government. What should we do? Would you rather have a policeman here or someone down there guarding those graves? Would we rather have someone here? There's lots of priorities.

And we cannot make a country that has been badly treated and abused and a people that have been badly treated and abused for decades -- we can't make it right. We can't make it like the United States in five minutes, and we know that.

And we've got wonderful people out there doing a darn good job, and their circumstance is going to get better every single day.

**SEN. DOMENICI:** Mr. Secretary, I wholeheartedly agree with you, and I'm not arguing with you. I am merely suggesting, for the public record, that if there's one thing we are good at, it is establishing order and establishing a way of putting things into a sense of order and developing construction techniques and construction formats that are credible and that the people will believe and can see. And I merely urge that these happen quickly.

I haven't heard much about that. I assume that I will. And I thank you for your answer. My second question has to do with one of -- that has bothered me in terms of informing the public of something we did that was rather spectacular. Our ability to target our weapons was a spectacular achievement. It is a combination of technology, much of which is secret, much of which we cannot divulge. And I have wondered whether or not it is possible that you could have a neutral group evaluate the -- how we went about -- what care we took, how much emphasis, energy, time, money and resources we put into this episode, and have it as some kind of a feature to show the world what we've done. So far, it just something that we can see in terms of the effect. It would seem to me it

would make an incredible story, put forth by credible writers, as to what we had to go through to get there.

I can imagine the hours spent in trying to determine which target versus another target. I can imagine time spent looking at a building to see who occupied it, and when, so we would know whether or not to strike it or not, because the occupants are innocent people. In fact, I happen to know those kinds of decisions were made.

It seems to me that to get that out in a tabloid form, where everybody could understand and see it, would be a remarkable positive for American involvement in this particular war. I would like your comments, and I thank you for your testimony.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Senator, you're certainly obviously very knowledgeable and exactly correct. The amount of -- the hundreds of hours and the hundreds of people that were involved in looking at targets and making judgments about which targets would give the greatest advantage, with the least potential for collateral damage. What time of day to strike a target, where there would be the fewest innocent people in any area. What direction the weapons should be directed, so that it would avoid civilian areas. What type of weapon to use, how to use that weapon, how to fuse it.

All of those things were gone into with enormous care and detail. And you're right; it would be a story that would reflect very well on the United States and on the people involved.

SEN. DOMENICI: Would you mind taking a look at whether that could be done?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I will certainly take a look at whether it could be done.

SEN. DOMENICI: I don't mean to burden you, with all the other things that you have, but it seems to me to be in public relations, a very, very positive kind of thing.

Thank you.

SEN. STEVENS: The gentleman's time has expired.

SEN. DOMENICI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. STEVENS: Ms. Feinstein?

SEN. DIANNE FEINSTEIN (D-CA): Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to take this discussion in a slightly different way, and I wanted to talk about the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. I read the Nuclear Posture Review when it came out in 2002, and saw where, if that were put into actual public policy, there would be a substantial departure from where this nation in the past was going with respect to nuclear weapons. And then, if I looked at the doctrines of unilateralism and preemption, and see the authorization that's been requested for \$15 million to begin a tactical nuclear weapon such as a Robust Earth Penetrator, the likelihood is that that will pass, and then we will be faced with an **appropriation** of money to begin that movement. The way I see it, it is a blurring between conventional and nuclear weapons that may very well undermine our efforts to limit proliferation and give nuclear armaments a role in this new United States doctrine of preemption.

So I am, obviously, very concerned about it, and wonder why, with the massive conventional weaponry that we have at our disposal -- you know, whether it be a Daisy Cutter or a bunker buster or the other things that we have used -- why it is necessary at this particularly tenuous point in time to begin a new effort with respect to nuclear weapons, which can only, in my view, take us down a disastrous course.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Senator, let me make a few comments on some of the things you said so that the record is very clear. You indicated that there's a proposal that you think is going to pass to develop a tactical nuclear weapon, I believe you said.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: Just an authorization for \$15 million for the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Right. And I think that's not accurate. I think that there is a proposal

to fund a study -- not the development, not the production, but a study. And let me tell you why. And you smile, but it's a serious matter that we do not have in the inventory the ability to deal with an underground, deeply-buried target.

We are looking and studying a variety of ways that that might be done, one of which is the one you're mentioning, which is a study -- not the development, not the building, no major departure, as you suggested. And I would say this, that I don't think it would blur -- studying the possibility of developing in several different ways, one of which is the one you mentioned, an ability to hit a target that's deeply buried is not going to, in my view, blur the distinction between conventional and nuclear weapons.

You're right, if you study it, someone might say, well, then you could build it some day. And that's true, you could, you could decide it. But that's a totally different issue and it is not part of what's before the Congress, as your statement suggested.

Why do I not think that it would blur it? Nuclear weapons were used once, in 1945, and have not been fired since in anger. That's an amazing record for human beings. Never in the history of mankind have there been weapons that powerful, or anything approximating it, that distinctly different, that haven't been used. They have not been used.

Now, what does that mean? It means at least civilized countries, democracies, the ones that have those weapons thus far, and the few that are not democracies that have them, have made a conscious decision that there's a big difference in crossing that threshold. The United States has been in war in Korea, we've been in war in Vietnam, we've been in war lots of places since 1945, and they've never been used. No president with -- is going to be -- think that the line is blurred suddenly because of a study to see if we can develop an ability for a deep-earth penetrator, in my view. I correct in --

SEN. FEINSTEIN: May I engage you further on that?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Sure.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: The unclassified version of the Nuclear Posture Review puts forward several scenarios in which the United States would consider a first use of nuclear weapons. I can mention them here, if you wish. And when that comes out in 2002, although it was somewhat debunked by the administration, a year later we find that the studies are beginning to develop tactical nuclear weapons.

Yes, this was only used once before, but it was used by the United States. And now we have concern about India and Pakistan; we have serious concern about North Korea. And our efforts have been to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

To me, it's counterproductive to our overall purposes of limiting proliferation to begin studies that take us into the area of the use of tactical nuclear weapons.

Would you comment?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: You bet. I have to again correct what you said. You say we now found out that the U.S. is beginning to develop tactical nuclear weapons. No --

SEN. FEINSTEIN: No I didn't. I beg your pardon.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Oh, I misunderstood, then.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: No, no. I say we now find that a study -- I mean, I accept your word. I have no reason not to accept your word that this is a study --

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Yeah. My point is, we have tactical nuclear weapons, theater nuclear weapons. We've had them for decades. They exist. We have lots of them. We have a fraction of those --

SEN. FEINSTEIN: Well, confine it to the Robust Earth Penetrator, which is nuclear.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I did. I pointed out it's a study, and it's not the development of a tactical nuclear weapon, as you suggested. It just isn't.

We have lots of studies, and we should do studies. We have lots of war plans and

contingency plans, and we should have those. We don't use them all. Obviously, the job of the Department of Defense is to be prepared to defend the American people. And that's what we do; we plan, we study things, we try to develop different kinds of capabilities from time to time.

But any development program would have to come before this body.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: No, I understand that. It is just in the public policy that one might look at nuclear weapons, then. If we are trying to discourage their use, now that we have this well established doctrine of preemptive action, unilateral action, and you add to this possible scenarios where nuclear weapons could be used, why does that not encourage other nations to become nuclear in response?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, first, let me say one thing. You mentioned unilateral action. In the Iraq effort there were 49 nations involved. I don't -- I keep reading in the press about unilateral this, and going it alone that. It was baloney. There were 49 countries in one way or another assisting in that effort. It seems to me that that's just a fact.

The -- if you think about the proliferation problem, it's a serious problem. And I agree completely with you. And I worry about it a great deal. The fact is, we could have 50 percent more, or even a hundred percent more nuclear nations in the next 15, 20 years. And that's not a happy world to live in. It's not a good thing.

The idea that our studying a deep-earth penetrator -- studying a nuclear deep-earth penetrator -- is going to contribute to proliferation I think ignores the fact that the world is proliferating. It is happening. It is happening without any studies by us. It is going on all around us. North Korea is -- will sell almost anything it has by way of military technologies for hard currency. That's what they do. I think that any implication that a study in the department for that would contribute to proliferation simply isn't consistent with the fact because we've got a world that is filled with proliferation. It is pervasive.

SEN. STEVENS: The senator's time has expired.

SEN. FEINSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

SEN. STEVENS: We'll now go to a second round, and a limit, if it's agreeable, to five minutes. I have agreed that the secretary and the general and the deputy secretary would be able to leave at 12:30.

Let me start off with just one statement, Senator -- Senator Feinstein. The implication of the senator's questions are that Harry Truman was wrong. Two of us sitting here were part of the 2-million- man force that was in the Pacific that might have had to be used to invade Japan. I think Harry Truman goes down in history for having the courage to make that decision. Not that I think any future president will make the same decision, but if in that same position, I hope we have the weapons and I hope we have the president that has the courage to make the decision for our national survival.

My question to you now though is, Mr. Secretary, we -- (laughter) -- that took five minutes? We have a situation on these weapons of mass destruction. Several of us were among those who were briefed by your intelligence people at CIA and others on the probable existence of those weapons. I think it's just absolutely necessary we follow every possible avenue to get them. My question is, have you advertised a reward for those people who might have that knowledge? Any one of those people who come forward and gives us the knowledge of the existence of those is dead unless we take care of them. I hope we're advertising a substantial sum of money for creating a new life if they come forward and help us get that information.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I have not seen radio or leaflets or specific documents that do that. I do know that we've asked that that be done, and that there are reward systems and that people are being encouraged to come forward. And that I have said publicly to the Iraqi

people that their circumstance will be much better if they come forward.

And the problem of amnesty is a difficult one because of the fact that the Iraqi people may decide to make judgments about Iraqi people who served Saddam Hussein's regime. So, it's a tricky business.

SEN. STEVENS: Well, we moved this gentleman who came forward on Private Lynch and brought him to this country immediately. I think we have that power now. I hope we use it in terms of this search for these weapons.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I agree, it is extremely important.

SEN. STEVENS: Let me ask one last question, so others may have some time.

I know that we've taken into the regular service -- I guess we've called up guardsmen and Reserve people. We are now, I'm told, demobilizing 50,000 reservists and guardsmen per month, but we're still calling other people up. What can we see in terms of this process of demobilization, as far as the Guard and Reserve is concerned?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Senator, let me say a couple of things. First of all, we are not demobilizing 50,000 a month. I don't know where that came from. What we --

SEN. STEVENS: That was a statement that was made to us during the supplemental, on the record here; that we would demobilize 50,000 a month.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: We "would" is what it said, I think. You said "we are," I thought.

SEN. STEVENS: That was the aggressive assumption that was given to us at the time --

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Maybe I misunderstood you.

SEN. STEVENS: -- that we would demobilize 50,000 a month.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: I think that may have been an assumption in a proposal that suggested at that point where it was possible to do so from a security standpoint on the ground, you would then begin demobilizing. Thus far, what we've returned to the United States, both active Guard and Reserve, are essentially Navy and Air Force personnel. Practically no Army or Marines have been brought back.

GEN. PACE: That's correct, sir.

The projections, sir, in that budget supplement was, about, we thought, perhaps 90 days of combat; that turned out to be not the right number. We thought there would be 50,000 per month, because we had to have some kinds of projections so we could prepare a budget supplemental that had some validity to it. That's where the 50,000 per month comes from.

As we sit here, the services are going through their own analyses, and will present to the secretary later this week, or the beginning of next week, their proposals on how to reconstitute the force, active and Reserve, in a very systematic way that allows us to have the force on station that's needed today, and allows us to regenerate our long-term capability.

SEN. STEVENS: Okay. I don't want to take the time for it now. But that assumption was the assumption for our supplemental. I started today by asking you about have you got enough money. That's tied into that matter. If we're not going to demobilize them, then you don't have enough money to keep them much longer.

Would you give us a statement for the record of what we can see in terms of that demobilization, how it affects the money that you've still got available?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Yes, sir, we will do that. I will just say briefly, what we did was we made a set of assumptions and said they were only assumptions, and that if it played out this way, this is roughly what it would cost. And then we said, if this were longer, this would be shorter, and therefore, it balanced.

And we thought that regardless of whether the assumptions proved to be exactly right, which, as Pete points out, they're not right, nonetheless the money might be roughly the same. And at least at this moment, the comptroller believes that's the case.

SEN. STEVENS: But it looks to me like both were longer, Mr. Secretary.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Well, the war was shorter.

MR. ZAKHEIM: The war was shorter. And in addition, if you keep the people out there, then you're not spending the money that we did assume and budget to bring them back. So there really is an offsetting factor, and we're still pretty confident in the number that we got from you for the supplemental.

SEN. STEVENS: Right. I'd like to see a paper on it if we get it.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: And sir, if we were continuing the war instead of -- like 90 days, think of the ammunition we'd be using and the cost of replenishing all of that. So there were so many variables, that I think we're probably in the ballpark.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Inouye?

SEN. INOUYE: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, if the information is not classified: Three weeks ago, in the height of our battle there, can you give us the statistics on number of troops -- Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines -- in that theater?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: (Pausing to examine materials.)

STAFF (?): I don't think it's there, sir.

GEN. PACE: Sir, I can give you a rough guesstimate and give you the exact numbers for the record. But right now, Army is at about 160,000; the Marine Corps is at about 65,000; the Navy and Air Force are both at about 30,000 each, sir.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: That's in the theater, not in Iraq.

GEN. PACE: In the theater. That adds up today -- I don't know if these numbers, the numbers I just gave, but I do know that the overall number today is right at about 309,000, of which U.S. in-country correct number is approximately 142,000.

SEN. INOUYE: Is it correct that the Marines sent about 60 percent of their combat-available forces there?

GEN. PACE: I think that math is right, yes, sir. They had 66,000 of their operating forces there. That sounds about right.

SEN. INOUYE: And the Army, the equivalent of four divisions?

GEN. PACE: That sounds right, sir.

SEN. INOUYE: And the Navy, the equivalent of six carrier battle groups?

GEN. PACE: Five, sir.

SEN. INOUYE: Five? I ask because --

GEN. PACE: (Inaudible.)

SEN. INOUYE: -- this was the bulk of our military, wasn't it, Mr. Secretary?

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: It was certainly a --

SEN. INOUYE: There are 10 divisions available in the Army. Sixty percent of the Marines were there. Five carriers out of nine that are available. My question was, with that type of commitment and assignment, should we be discouraging some of our fellow Americans to consider ourselves invincible? Soon after the battle, they were talking about going to Syria, possibly North Korea.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Yeah. I see your point. I don't -- I'd like to answer for the record the answer as to whether it was the bulk, because the Reserve call-up was not the bulk, and therefore, if we took the totality of the United States armed forces, I think I would guess that it was not a majority.

GEN. PACE: That's true, sir.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: And second, you're certainly right that they were -- I should add, they were only there for a relatively short period of time.

There was a gradual buildup and then a gradual drawdown, with the Air Force and the Navy moving out within, some cases, a relatively short period of time.

But you're right; no nation is capable of doing everything on the face of the earth at every moment. And certainly, those people in the Department of Defense who worry with these things every day and recognize the costs and the circumstance of our forces understand that fully.

SEN. STEVENS: Senator Byrd?

SEN. BYRD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The word that I used earlier, Mr. Secretary, was "shake-up," yes. And you seemed to take some -- not necessarily, I would say, umbrage, but you sought to differ that classification. Let me read from the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 13, as follows:

"The new U.S. civilian overseer, former diplomat L. Paul Bremer, who arrived yesterday to take over the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance from retired Army Lieutenant General Jay Garner, is facing his own housecleaning. Barbara Bodine, the State Department official overseeing the reconstruction of Baghdad, was reassigned after three weeks on the job, and at least five other senior members of the ORHA" -- Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance -- "of the ORHA staff also will be returning home, a senior U.S. official said yesterday."

So, I offer that for the record in support of the word which I used, that being shake-up.

Now --

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Could I comment on that?

SEN. BYRD: Oh, yes, I only -- how much time do I have, Mr. --

SEN. STEVENS: About three-and-a-half minutes, sir. Depends on when the secretary wants to leave.

SEN. BYRD: Oh, he's in no hurry to leave. (Laughs, laughter.) He's in a fighting mood, I can see that.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Senator, let me comment on that article from whatever paper it was. Because something's in the press, of course, doesn't make it so.

SEN. BYRD: The Philadelphia Inquirer.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Right. Now, first of all, just some facts. Number one, he was not sent out there as part of a shake-up. He was sent out there as presidential envoy. He was not sent out there to replace Mr. -- General Garner as head of the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance, he was sent out there as a presidential envoy. The individual you mentioned who was reassigned had not been there three weeks. I can remember seeing her in December or January, which is months ago, when I visited their office in the Pentagon, and then again, when I saw them off in the parking lot of the Pentagon to see them away, which was in, I believe, December or January. So it's a lot more than three weeks. There are a number of things in that article with which I would differ.

SEN. BYRD: For months, Mr. Secretary, the administration warned of the potential nuclear capabilities of Iraq. Indeed, one of the main justifications for U.S. action in Iraq was to ensure that nuclear weapons and material did not fall into the hands of terrorists. It has been widely reported that U.S. troops in Baghdad have secured some buildings, including the Oil Ministry. But according to a story in the Washington Post on May 10, our forces failed to prevent looting at seven nuclear facilities.

I quote from the article:

"It is not clear what has been lost in the sacking of Iraq's nuclear establishment. But it is well documented that looters roamed unrestrained among stores of chemical elements and scientific files that would speed development in the wrong hands of a nuclear or a radiological bomb. Many of the files and some of the containers that held radioactive sources are missing," close quote.

The administration argued that war against Iraq was necessary to prevent the spread and

development of nuclear weapons. And yet, by failing to protect these sites, we may have actually facilitated the spread and development of nuclear weapons.

I understand the importance of protecting the Oil Ministry, so that the daily running of Iraq could continue. But given that one of the reasons for invading Iraq was to prevent the spread of nuclear materials and capabilities, why were there sites not protected, Mr. Secretary?

**SEC. RUMSFELD:** Senator, I don't believe anyone that I know in the administration ever said that Iraq had nuclear weapons. So the statement I think you read, which -- that we've warned of potential nuclear capability and weapons and materials in the hands of terrorists, in terms of their having them now, I don't know anyone who suggested that that was the case. The Central Intelligence Agency I know has assessed that they had a nuclear program and assessed that they had chemical and biological weapons. Slight difference from the article.

As to looting. My understanding is that a number of sites were located by U.S. forces, coalition forces on the ground. They were looked at, and a judgment was made that they should go to a different site and look at those other sites. In some cases, before they got there, things were looted; in some cases, possibly after they got there and went to another site, things may have been looted. The -- it is not possible to have enough forces in a country instantaneously to guard every site before somebody can get into it.

I don't know about the choice between the Oil M Ministry and the -- some site that that article may be referring to. I do know that they had a lot of tasks to do. They had to win the war. They had to deal with death squads of Fedayeen Saddam. They had to deal with Ba'ath Party members in civilian clothes that were trying to kill them. And all in all, I think they did a darn good job. We have no evidence to conclude, as that article suggests might have happened, that, in fact, nuclear materials did leave and get into the hands of people. I don't have evidence that it did or didn't. That's the best I can do.

**SEN. BYRD:** Why was protecting these well known nuclear facilities not at least as high a priority as protecting the Oil Ministry?

**SEC. RUMSFELD:** I -- my impression is, from what I know -- and I'd have to check -- that a number of sites were protected. There are something like at the present time -- the number changes every month or every week. But I believe there are something like 578 suspected weapon of mass destruction sites. What does that mean? Does it mean they're all sites that -- where something -- no. It just means that there was a scrap of information here that suggested that somebody might have been doing something there and you ought to check it out. So -- but there are hundreds of these possible sites. We also have intelligence that suggested that they took the documentation and a number of the materials, dispersed them and hid them. Some -- in some cases in private residences. So how does any force of any size instantaneously get to all of those locations and provide perfect security for them so someone can't loot them? I think it's an unrealistic expectation.

**SEN. STEVENS:** Senator, I'm sorry, I've got a bunch of appointments and we guaranteed the senator -- the secretary we'd be through here at 12:30. He has, as I understand it, to go to the White House for a meeting. So if you're -- with your cooperation, I'd like to let him go.

**SEN. BYRD:** Is this a filibuster you're shutting off? (Light laughter.)

**SEN. STEVENS:** Well, you're not filibustering yet, Senator. I've seen you filibuster. This is not -- (laughter).

**SEC. RUMSFELD:** (Laughs.)

**SEN. BYRD:** Well, we'll be talking with the secretary again. Thank you.

And thank you, Mr. Secretary.

SEC. **RUMSFELD**: Terrific. Thank you, sir.

SEN. : And we appreciate you --

SEN. BYRD: Mr. Chairman, let me -- may I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Washington Post of Tuesday, May 13, entitled "Baghdad Anarchy Spurs Call For Help", that it be included in the record in its entirety?

SEN. STEVENS: It will be.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, General Pace, and Secretary Zakheim.

GEN. PACE: Thank you, sir.

SEN. STEVENS: The subcommittee will re-convene Thursday, May 15th, to consider testimony from public witnesses concerning the president's budget request. Thank you very much.

END

**PERSON:** TED STEVENS (93%);

**ORGANIZATION:** JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF (84%);

**COUNTRY:** UNITED STATES (94%); IRAQ (90%); AFGHANISTAN (79%);

**STATE:** DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, USA (92%); HAWAII, USA (79%); SOUTH CAROLINA, USA (79%);

**CITY:** WASHINGTON, DC, USA (60%);

**COMPANY:** JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF (84%);

**SUBJECT:** sen-approps-defense **APPROPRIATIONS** (91%); US REPUBLICAN PARTY (90%); LEGISLATIVE BODIES (89%); DEFENSE DEPARTMENTS (89%); US DEMOCRATIC PARTY (87%); DEFENSE SPENDING (76%); GOVERNMENT BUDGETS (76%); ARMED FORCES (70%); TERRORISM (54%);

**LOAD-DATE:** May 16, 2003

**WITNESSES:** SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DONALD **RUMSFELD**; GENERAL PETER PACE, VICE CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF; DOV ZAKHEIM, UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND COMPTROLLER

**TYPE:** International News

Copyright 2003 Federal News Service, Inc.