

**HEARING OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER AND EXPEDITIONARY FORCES OF THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE ( Part 13 )**

1512 words

21 January 2010

Federal News Service

FEDNWS

English

(c) 2010 Federal News Service, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

**REP. MASSA:** -- and the Zumwalts for nobody knows what we're going to do with those anyway, perhaps there's some synergy in combining those two shipbuilding programs that I would consider to be somewhat less successful.

But one last specific question as far as submarines go, we are now currently and we haven't discussed at all today surface infrastructure, in other words, bases, where we're going to put everything. Obviously, the Navy is operating under some incredible fiscal constraints and that's only going to get worse. In a perfect world, it'd be nice to park a nuclear aircraft carrier anywhere. In a non perfect world does it make sense to spend almost as much money on creating a new nuclear capable home port as it does building a nuclear capable ship?

**MR. THOMPSON:** I might be able to make the strategic case for Guam but not for Florida.

**REP. MASSA:** So you would, from your expert opinion question the allocation of significant dollar bills into "nuclearizing," for lack of a better word, all of the infrastructure necessary in Northern Florida port, and specifically in Mayport?

**MR. THOMPSON:** I wouldn't question it; it's a waste of money.

I already know the answer. It is a waste of money.

**REP. MASSA:** So that's relatively frank speaking in a building that's not used to relatively frank speaking.

**MR. THOMPSON:** (Laughs.) You know we are spending \$4 billion a day in this government that we do not have and meanwhile our share of global GDP has gone from 32 percent to 24 percent in one decade. So to spend that kind of money to get no additional gain in terms of military capability is bordering on the scandalous.

**END**