

the text of the law, on conventional arms transfers from Russia to Iran. Something of a given, as far as the Clinton administration's posture was concerned, with that the Russian-Iranian military relationship had been largely contained courtesy of the former vice president's diplomatic skills.

Putting aside the subsequent abrogation of the secret Gore-Chernomyrdin Pact and the emergence of a more open and vibrant conventional arms trade between Russia and Iran, the issue of missile and nuclear-technology transfers was clearly presumed to be under control. But all available information points to the contrary. More disturbing, the relationship is unquestionably at the government-to-government level. The Clinton administration's arguments that individual Russian entities were circumventing good-faith Russian efforts at stemming the flow of nuclear and missile technology to Iran, the basis of its veto of the Iran Non-proliferation Act, were wholly without merit. In defense of this relationship, Russia's most prominent defense analyst, Pavel Felgenhauer, was recently quoted as stating, "We are brothers-in-arms, and have long-term interests together." And Defense Minister Sergeyev's December 2000 visit to Iran to conclude the new arms agreement was trumpeted by Sergeyev as ushering in a "new phase of military and technical cooperation."

A recent CIA report act on foreign assistance to Iran's weapons of mass destruction, missile and advanced conventional weapons programs, submitted pursuant to the requirements of the fiscal year 2001 intelligence authorization act, includes the following:

Cooperation between Iran's ballistic missile program and Russian aerospace entities has been a matter of increasing proliferation concern through the second half of the 1990s. Iran continues to acquire Russian technology which could significantly accelerate the pace of Iran's ballistic missile development program. Assistance by Russian entities has helped Iran save years in its development of the Shahab-3, a 1,300-kilometer-range MRBM \* \* \* Russian assistance is playing a crucial role in Iran's ability to develop more sophisticated and longer-range missiles. Russian entities have helped the Iranian missile effort in areas ranging from training, to testing, to components. Similarly, Iran's missile program has acquired a broad range of assistance from an array of Russian entities of many sizes and many areas of specialization.

Similarly, the Department of Defense's January 2001 report, Proliferation: Threat and Response, states with respect to Russian-Iran nuclear cooperation, that

Although [the Iranian nuclear complex] Bushehr [which is receiving substantial Russian assistance] will fall under IAEA safeguards, Iran is using this project to seek access to more sensitive nuclear technologies from Russia and to develop expertise in related nuclear technologies. Any such projects will help Iran augment its nuclear technology infrastructure, which in turn would be useful in supporting nuclear weapons research and development.

Finally, and not to belabor the point, the Director of Central Intelligence

George Tenet recently testified before the Intelligence Committee that Russian entities "last year continued to supply a variety of ballistic missile-related goods and technical know-how to countries such as Iran, India, China, and Libya." Indeed, Director Tenet emphasized this point several times in his testimony, stating, "the transfer of ballistic missile technology from Russia to Iran was substantial last year, and in our judgment will continue to accelerate Iranian efforts to develop new missiles and to become self-sufficient in production."

The significance of this relationship is considerable. Opponents of missile defenses have argued both during and after the cold war that the dynamics of warning and response have changed; that we will have sufficient strategic warning of serious threats to our national security to take the necessary measures in response. The entire basis of the Rumsfeld Commission report, and of much of DCI Tenet's testimony, on the threat from foreign missile programs, however, is that strategic—and, indeed, tactical—warning can be severely diminished in the event suspect countries succeed in attaining large-scale technical assistance or complete ballistic missiles, which Saudi Arabia accomplished by its purchase of Chinese CSS-2 medium-range ballistic missiles and Pakistan did in the case of the Chinese M-11 missile transfer. That is clearly the case with Iran.

The impact on U.S. national security policy of the proliferation of ballistic and cruise missile technology, as well as of so-called weapons of mass destruction, should not be underestimated. Presidents of either party and their military commanders will undergo a fundamental transformation in their approach to foreign policy commitments and the requirement to project military power in defense of our allies and vital interests if they possess the knowledge that American forces and cities are vulnerable to missile strikes. We have pondered the scenario wherein our response to an invasion of Kuwait by a nuclear-armed Iraq would have been met with the response the 1990 invasion precipitated. Similarly, the oft-cited threat against the United States by Chinese officials in the event we come to the defense of Taiwan should be cause for sober reflection—although the commitment to Taiwan's security should be equally absolute. The point, Mr. President, is that the development or acquisition by rogue regimes of long-range ballistic missiles will alter our response to crises in an adverse manner. Secretary Rumsfeld summed up the situation well in his speech in Munich when he stated, "Terror weapons don't need to be fired. They just need to be in the hands of people who would threaten their use."

The need for continued development and deployment of systems to defend against ballistic missile attack is real. We lost eight precious years during which the previous administration stood steadfast in opposition to its

most fundamental requirement to provide for the common defense. No where in the Constitution is there a qualification from that responsibility for certain types of threats to the American population, and I doubt one would have been contemplated. The Founding Fathers were unlikely, I believe, to have supported a policy wherein the United States would defend itself against most threats, but deliberately leave itself vulnerable to the most dangerous.

We can research missile defenses in perpetuity and not attain the level of perfection some demand. We can, however, deploy viable systems to the field intent on improving them over time as new technologies are developed. We do it with ships, tanks, and fighter aircraft. The value of having fielded systems both as testbeds and for that measure of protection they will provide, while incorporating improvements as they emerge, is the only path available to us if we are serious about defending our cities against ballistic missile attack.

Yes, I know that a multibillion dollar missile defense system will not protect against the suitcase bomb smuggled in via cargo ship. But let us not pretend that we are not talking actions to defend against that contingency as well. Arguments that posit one threat against another in that manner are entirely specious. As I've noted, the history of the missile age is not of static displays developed at great expense for the purpose of idol worship. It is of weaponry intended to deter other countries from acting, and to be used when militarily necessary or psychologically expedient. We can't wish them away, and the fact of proliferation is indisputable. The deployment of a National Missile Defense system is the most important step we can take to protect the people we are here to represent. They expect nothing less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

---

## DEFENSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I was hoping Thursday afternoon to be on the floor with Senator BYRD as he spoke about some issues dealing with the Defense Department. I ask my fellow Senators and staff of the Senators who are interested in defense matters to read Senator BYRD's speech on page 1236 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8. I will comment, not as comprehensively as he did, about some of the problems at the Department of Defense. I will read one paragraph from his speech. It is related to a lot of work that I have been doing in the Senate for quite a few years on the lack of accountability in cost management and inventory management and just generally the condition of the books in the Defense Department, which is also the basis for my remarks today.

I quote from Senator BYRD's speech: So here's the question I have. If the Department of Defense does not know what it has in terms of assets and liabilities, how on Earth can it know what it needs?

We are in the position where the new President of the United States is making a judgment of how much money he should suggest over the next few years to increase defense expenditures.

The President this week is highlighting that. I think the President needs to be complimented. He has put off for a while until the new Secretary of Defense can do a study of Defense Department needs and missions before making the specific judgment of how much money should be spent.

This is somewhat different than what President Reagan did in 1981 when the judgment was that just spending more money on defense automatically brings you more and a better defense. Obviously, at that time more money needed to be spent, but exactly how much needed to be spent was not so clear. A lot more money was appropriated, creating a situation where an Assistant Secretary of Defense at that particular time said there was so much money allocated that we piled the moneybags on the steps of the Pentagon and said to them: Defense contractors, come and get it.

I think we look back and know some of that money probably was not wisely spent, although we do give credit to President Reagan for spending more, and in a sense challenging the Soviets in a way so they had to call a halt to the cold war. That saved the taxpayers a lot of money in the long term. Now we have a President who has time to think about what should be done and is giving it the proper consideration.

So I want to start out by complimenting President Bush for his approach to ramping up defense expenditures at a time in our history when there is a general consensus among both political parties that more ought to be spent. Since we are going to spend more, it ought to be spent very wisely. President Bush deserves the thanks of the American taxpayers for being very careful.

He has stated there is a need for an immediate increase in pay and housing for military people to enhance their morale and keep dedicated people who are already trained, give them a financial incentive for staying in instead of getting out and going into the private sector—he is moving ahead on those few things. But on the larger question of increasing expenditures, particularly for enhanced weaponry and new weapons, he is waiting until there is a study completed. I thank him for doing that.

Regardless, as Senator BYRD said, we ought to have a set of books, an accounting system, at the Defense Department that is not only such that we know what the situation is, how much we have in inventory, how much is actually being paid for a weapons system,

but when we have a bill to pay, we ought to know what we got for that bill. What goods and services were received? The point is, we do not now have that information. That was the point of Senator BYRD's question. It is the point of my question today. But my questioning is on ongoing points I have been raising with the Defense Department now for a period of probably 4 or 5 years or longer.

I am truly honored to have an opportunity to speak on the very same subject that Senator BYRD spoke on last Thursday. I am hoping the Senator from West Virginia and this Senator from Iowa can team up this year in a search for a solution. As many of my colleagues know, I have been wrestling with this problem for a number of years, and, candidly, without a whole lot of success in getting the Defense Department to change their bad accounting, and not having a basis, then, on which to ask for further increases into the future. I have come here to the floor of the Senate and spoken about this many times. I have raised these same concerns during hearings before the Budget Committee.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight, I have investigated this problem and held hearings on it. I have offered legislation on it and some of that legislation has been incorporated, thanks to Senator BYRD and Senator STEVENS, the ranking people on the Appropriations Committee, in various Department of Defense appropriations bills.

The General Accounting Office and the Pentagon's inspector general have issued report after report after report exposing these same problems. In fact, their investigative work has been the basis for some of my remarks in the past.

So here we have, again, last week, this issue being raised by the Senator from West Virginia. I am glad to have somebody of Senator BYRD's stature asking pertinent questions because then people pay attention. People listen up. That also applies to my listening and reading what the Senator from West Virginia had to say last week.

Senator BYRD started his inquiry maybe months and years ago, for all I know, but it came to my attention when he was participating in a hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee on January 11, the hearing on the nomination of Mr. Rumsfeld for Secretary of Defense. My gut sense tells me Senator BYRD's question sent shock waves through the Pentagon. When I read about it in the newspaper the next day, I asked my staff to get the transcript and fax it to me because I was home in my State of Iowa. I studied the exchange between Senator BYRD and Secretary designate Rumsfeld very carefully. What I heard was music to my ears.

In a nutshell, Senator BYRD was talking about the Pentagon's continuing inability to earn a clean opinion under the Chief Financial Officer's Act audit.

That act was passed in 1990. So we have been down this road, now, for 10 years. I hope in most departments of Government we have accomplished something. It does not seem as if we have in the case of the Pentagon.

Under the Chief Financial Officer's Act, the Pentagon must prepare financial statements each year. Those are then subjected to an independent audit by the General Accounting Office and the Inspector General. Senator BYRD, on January 11, questioned Mr. Rumsfeld about the results of the latest Chief Financial Officer's audit by the inspector general. Senator BYRD stated at that time, and I quote from the transcripts:

DOD has yet to receive a clean audit opinion in its financial statements.

Senator BYRD went on to quote from a recent article in the Los Angeles Times about the Pentagon accounting mess. Again, I quote from the transcript of a statement of Senator BYRD:

The Pentagon's books are in such utter disarray that no one knows what America's military actually owns or spends.

As Senator BYRD knows, this quote contains a very powerful message. This is the message that I glean from that quote: The Pentagon does not know how much it spends. It does not know if it gets what it orders in goods and services. And the Pentagon, additionally, does not have a handle on its inventory. If the Pentagon does not know what it owns and spends, then how does the Pentagon know if it needs more money? We, as Senators, presume already that the Pentagon needs more money—because there is kind of a bipartisan agreement to that, and President Bush won an election with that as one of his key points. We need to know more, and a sound accounting system is the basis for that judgment.

Of course, that is the logic that was the foundation of Senator BYRD's next question to Mr. Rumsfeld. I will quote again from January 11:

I seriously question an increase in the Pentagon's budget in the face of the department's recent [inspector general] report. How can we seriously consider a \$50 billion increase in the Defense Department budget when the [Department of Defense's] own auditors—when DOD's own auditors—say the department cannot account for \$2.3 trillion in transactions in 1 year alone.

I agree with Senator BYRD's logic 100 percent. Ramping up the Pentagon budget when the books are a mess is highly questionable at best. To some it might seem crazy. And, of course, as I said about President Bush, and I compliment him for it, he appears to be reacting cautiously to pressure to pump up the defense budget, at least to do it now. He will do it in his own deliberate way, and hopefully with the adequate information to make a wise decision of how much the increase should be.

I am encouraged by front-page stories in the New York Times on January 31, 2001, and again on February 5. These reports clearly indicate there would be no decision on increases:

. . . until the Pentagon has completed a top-to-bottom review of its long-term needs.

I think this was reiterated by the President yesterday in his message to our men and women in uniform when he was down at Fort Stewart. So this sounds good to me. I only hope the review the President is asking for includes a searching examination on the need to clean up the accounting books.

This brings me to the bottom line, Senator BYRD's very last question on January 11:

What do you plan to do about this, Mr. Rumsfeld?

This is where the rubber meets the road. What do we do? What does the Secretary of Defense do, because he is in the driver's seat on this, to clean up the books? As I said a moment ago, I have been working on this problem for a long time and I am not happy with the Pentagon's response today, even though I am happy with the response of people such as Senator STEVENS and Senator BYRD to help us get some language in appropriations bills to bring some changes in this behavior.

I think the Pentagon has a negative attitude about fixing the problem.

The bureaucrats in the Pentagon say that this is the way it has always been. And it ain't going to change—at least not in our lifetime. It's just too hard to do.

The former CFO at the Pentagon, Mr. John Hamre, compared it to trying to change a tire on a car that was going 100 miles per hour.

Well, I just can't buy that. That is not acceptable to me.

This reminds me of the football team that loses one game after another. If I were the coach, I might say: Hey, it's time to go back to basics—like blocking and tackling drills every day.

I think the Pentagon needs to do the same thing—go back to basics—like accounting 101.

I will be the first to admit that I lack a full and complete understanding of the true magnitude of this problem.

Bookkeeping is a complicated and arcane field. And it's very boring. So it does not command much attention around here.

But over the years, I have learned one important lesson about government bookkeeping. Bookkeeping is the key to controlling the money, and making sure that the taxpayers money is well spent.

Bookkeeping is the key to CFO compliance.

If the books of account are accurate and complete, it's easy to follow the money trail. That makes it hard to steal the money.

By contrast, if bookkeeping is sloppy—as at the Pentagon today, then there is no money trail. That means financial accounts are vulnerable to theft and abuse.

And that is exactly where the IG and GAO say that the Pentagon is today.

Every one of their reports shows that bureaucrats at the Pentagon fail to perform routine bookkeeping functions day in and day out.

The IG and GAO reports show that financial transactions are not recorded in the Pentagon's books of account as they occur—promptly and accurately.

They show that some payments are deliberately posted to the wrong accounts. Sometimes transactions are not recorded in the books for months or even years and sometimes never.

They show that the Pentagon regularly makes underpayments, overpayments, duplicate payments, erroneous payments, and even fraudulent payments. And most of the time, there is no follow up effort to correct the mistakes.

These reports show that DOD has no effective capability for tracking the quantity, value, and locations of assets and inventory.

Double-entry bookkeeping is needed for that, but double-entry bookkeeping is a non-starter at the Pentagon. It doesn't exist.

In sum, Mr. President, these reports show that DOD has lost control of the money at the transaction level.

With no control at the transaction level, it is physically impossible to roll up all the numbers into a top-line financial statement that can stand up to scrutiny and, most importantly, audit.

Sloppy accounting generates billions of dollars in unreconciled mismatches between accounting, inventory, and disbursing records.

Bureaucrats at the Pentagon regularly try to close the gap with "plug" figures, but the IG is not fooled by that trick.

Billions and billions of dollars of unreconciled mismatches make it impossible to audit the books.

As a result, each year the Pentagon gets a failing grade on its annual financial statements required by law. Each year, the IG issues a "disclaimer of opinion" because the books don't balance.

This brings me back to where I started.

Senator BYRD shined a bright beam of light on this very problem at Mr. Rumsfeld's hearing.

I thank him from the bottom of my heart.

By asking a few simple questions, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has stirred up a hornets nest.

I am hoping that his interest will encourage the new leadership in the Pentagon to move in the right direction.

I hope the new leadership will help the bureaucrats find some old time religion.

What I am hoping is that we can find a way to convert this inertia into a long-term solution.

But Mr. Rumsfeld has to find the will to do it.

If the will is there, the way will be found.

When I talk about going back to basic accounting 101 stuff, I am not suggesting that DOD break out old-fashioned ledger books.

Today, bookkeeping and inventory control is done electronically, using

highly integrated computer systems. Large companies like Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. are famous for doing it with ease. Wal-Mart has a transaction-driven system. It is updated instantaneously when a transaction occurs at a cash register anywhere in the system.

Why can't the Pentagon do it?

I made an all-out effort to fix it two years ago.

With the help and support of the Budget and Armed Services Committees, I crafted what I considered to be a legislative remedy.

Those provisions are embodied in Sections 933 and 1007 of the FY2000 defense authorization act—Public Law 106-65.

I thought my legislative remedy would move the Department of Defense towards a clean audit, and that they would get an OK under the Chief Financial Officers Act from the inspector general and the General Accounting Office within 2 years. That was the point of my amendment.

Well, guess what. We are two years down the road, and the clean opinion is nowhere in sight.

And there is nothing coming down the pike or on the distant horizon that tells me that we will get there any time soon.

DOD simply does not have the tools in place to get the job done.

So I am hoping that the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from West Virginia can put their heads together and find a solution.

I am hoping we can work together to craft a more successful approach.

For starters, I have a recommendation to make to my friend from West Virginia.

In the near future, I would expect Secretary Rumsfeld to nominate a person to be his Under Secretary for financial management—the Comptroller and Chief Financial Officer.

This is his CFO.

This is the person responsible for cleaning up the books and bringing the Pentagon into compliance with the CFO Act.

I would like for us to sit down with this individual immediately after nomination—and long before confirmation.

I would like us to ask the same question that Senator BYRD asked Mr. Rumsfeld: Mr. Secretary, what do you plan to do about this?

First, I would expect this person to make a firm commitment to financial reform and to Chief Financial Officer's Act compliance. Second, I would not expect a final solution on the spot. However, prior to confirmation, I would expect this individual to provide us with a general framework and a timetable for reform. When can we expect to see a clean audit opinion? I will want the nominee to provide a satisfactory answer to that question.

I hope the Senator from West Virginia will think that is a good thing for us to ask the next CFO of DOD. As the new chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am deeply troubled by

the Pentagon's negative—I don't care—attitude towards bookkeeping. I see good bookkeeping as a constitutional responsibility of every department of Government. Taking cash out of the pockets of hard-working Americans and appropriating to an agency that fails to control it is just not acceptable. That must change.

Now, in my new position on the Finance Committee, the Senator from Iowa is responsible for legislation that authorizes the Government to reach deep into every citizen's pocket to get this money. I want to be certain that money is spent wisely, No. 1. And No. 2, I want to be sure that there is an audit trail on that money for all of us to see. That audit trail, that accounting system, that information in that accounting system on past expenditures is a very necessary basis for President Bush and Mr. Rumsfeld to make a decision of how much more the Defense Department budget should be ramped up.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his willingness to work on this issue. Trying to solve the bookkeeping problem at the Pentagon, earning a clean audit opinion, would restore accountability to bookkeeping at the Pentagon. This is a worthy cause.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE MILITARY BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will continue on with a few more comments about the national security issue, which is being highlighted this week, of course, by the President.

We have talked about the most obvious issue dealing with the military; that is, having to do something for personnel. Without that, we can't have a military. We can't have defense. Furthermore, it is very unfair. We ask people in the military to serve the country, and they do that willingly. We have a responsibility to ensure that they are reasonably reimbursed and their living conditions are kept as high as possible.

Obviously, the military budget is one of considerable concern. It is the largest item in discretionary spending. We have discretionary spending of about \$630 billion. Nearly half of that, \$300 billion, is defense. It is very large. On the other hand, when we ask our country to defend against threats around the world—and this is not necessarily a peaceful world at this time—then we have to expect that it will be costly. We are faced with, of course—at least in the notion of many—what has been a period somewhat of neglect over the

last 8 years where the military has not had the highest priority, has not had as high a level of support as many believe it should have.

Last year the uniformed Service Chiefs testified to a requirement of between \$48 and \$58 billion per year in additional funding above the 5-year projected budget. That is the impression, that is the notion from the military leadership of the amount of dollars that are essential. One of the things that makes that even more obvious in terms of needs is that while the military has not been supported as highly and as strongly as it might be, this administration that just passed has deployed more troops overseas than at any previous time during the same length of time. In the past decade, our active duty manpower has been reduced by about a third, active Army divisions have been cut by almost 50 percent. Not all that is bad, of course.

As the Senator from Iowa indicated, there are changes that need to be made. Certainly the economic accounting, the management of the economics in the military could stand some strengthening. I am sure that is the case. We ought to expect that kind of expenditure of taxpayer dollars. However, we do find ourselves in a state where we do need to change things. The lack of spare parts for aging systems has forced the military to take parts off of other vehicles and other airplanes and cannibalize other kinds of things. It is so widespread that personnel in the Air Force apparently spent 178,000 man-hours over 2 years removing parts from bombers and fighters and transports, some of those kinds of things that certainly do not bode well for the kind of military we, indeed, want to have.

Obviously, there are needs for change. Often bureaucracies—and frankly, the military has its share of bureaucracies—find it difficult to make change: We have always done it that way so we are going to continue to do it that way. Certainly that can't be the case with the military, as things have changed substantially.

I heard testimony this week before one of the committees that indicated there could be a good deal more cooperation and unification among the branches of the military to make it more economic. That is probably true.

One of the items that is being considered is the national missile defense. There is a great deal of interest in that. It is not a new idea. It has been around for about 20 years. It certainly has merit. If we thought we could develop some kind of an overall network of defense mechanisms, that would be a wonderful thing to do. On the other hand, there is substantial question about what the costs would be. I think there is substantial question even about the technology. It has not yet been developed.

I favor moving toward a national missile defense. I don't think we are ready to sacrifice some of the other

things that we do because we are talking about doing a national missile defense.

First of all, as I mentioned, it is very expensive. We don't really know the cost. I have been to Space Command in Colorado Springs, CO. They indicated that even though they are enthusiastic about it and doing experiments, we haven't reached the technological level where it would work. I think there is a legitimate role for the missile defense soon. However, I think we are going to run into, No. 1, the cost; and No. 2, technology; and, No. 3, certainly we are going to have difficulties dealing with some other countries in terms of the agreements that we have.

I think we need to understand that, at least from what we know about it now, it is going to be a relatively limited defense system, probably based on the islands of Alaska. It will be designed to deal with rogue states that have very limited capacity but certainly have the scary capacity to put a missile in the United States, even though certainly that would not win a conflict for them. But it would do a great deal of damage to us.

I think the Space Command is working on the kind of system that would be there in case something came from a couple of the countries that are likely to be out of control in doing these kinds of things. They would be limited to defending against a limited number of reentry vehicles. They would not be able to deal with the whole issue of a major missile attack, of course.

I guess what I am saying is that we now have a nuclear capacity of our own, probably the strongest in the world. We have had it for a good long time. We deal in three areas, of course, land-based missiles, ship-to-ground missiles, and ground-to-air missiles. They constitute a very important part of our defense in terms of a deterrent. I think it is very necessary to continue to do that.

The President has talked about reducing the number of nuclear weapons. I think that makes sense. We are in the process of doing that now. We are in the process of removing some of our missiles under START I, and we are moving toward the restrictions that will be there in START II, in terms of the land-based missiles we have had over time, of course, the peacekeepers that have been multiple warhead missiles. These are being changed and replaced by the Minuteman III missiles, which would be a single warhead. We can do a good deal of reduction through this ongoing arrangement. There needs, in my view, however, to be the time START II or even START III was agreed to with the Russians, a minimum of 500 missiles that we would have, which brings us down to that 2,000 missiles that we talked about—the warheads we talked about in START I and II. We could do that. There is some talk about the idea of a hair trigger alert. There was something on TV last weekend, taken from the