

Union Calendar No. 435

109th Congress, 2d Session - - - - - House Report 109-731

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
FOR THE
ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS



DECEMBER 15, 2006.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

59-006

WASHINGTON : 2006

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

DUNCAN HUNTER, California, *Chairman*

CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
JOE SCHWARZ, Michigan
CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVE ISRAEL, New York
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
TIM RYAN, Ohio
MARK UDALL, Colorado
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
CYNTHIA McKINNEY, Georgia
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma

ROBERT L. SIMMONS, *Staff Director*
HOLLY GRANING, *Director of Legislative Operations*

¹ Mr. McKeon took a leave of absence from the committee effective June 29, 2006.

² Mr. Bilbray was elected to the committee on June 29, 2006.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, December 15, 2006.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: Pursuant to House Rule XI 1(d), there is transmitted herewith the report of activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 109th Congress.

Sincerely,

DUNCAN HUNTER, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

	Page
Powers and Duties, Committee on Armed Services—109th Congress	1
Background	1
Constitutional Powers and Duties	2
House Rules on Jurisdiction	3
Investigative Authority and Legislative Oversight	4
Committee Rules	4
Rules Governing Procedure	4
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services—109th Congress	13
Subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services—109th Congress	14
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces	14
Subcommittee on Readiness	15
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities	15
Subcommittee on Military Personnel	16
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces	16
Subcommittee on Projection Forces	16
Committee Staff	17
Committee Meetings	19
Legislative Actions	19
Legislation Enacted Into Law	19
Public Law 109–100 (S. 37)	19
Public Law 109–104 (H.R. 4326)	19
Public Law 109–142 (H.J. Res. 38)	20
Public Law 109–159 (S. 1988)	20
Public Law 109–163 (H.R. 1815)	20
Public Law 109–164 (H.R. 972)	23
Public Law 109–272 (H.R. 5683)	23
Public Law 109–364 (H.R. 5122)	24
Public Law 109–366 (S. 3930)	26
Legislation Reported but Not Enacted	27
H. Res. 417	27
H. J. Res. 65	27
H. Res. 645	28
H. Res. 685	28
H.R. 6054	29
Oversight Activities	31
Summary of Oversight Plan	31
Actions and Recommendations	31
Additional Oversight Activities	56
Other Activities of the Full Committee	77
Budget Activity	77
Full Committee Hearings	82
Other Activities of the Subcommittees	93
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces	93
Subcommittee on Readiness	94
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities	95
Subcommittee on Military Personnel	97
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces	97
Subcommittee on Projection Forces	98
Publications	101
Published Proceedings	101
House Reports	110
Public Laws	111
Press Releases	113

Union Calendar No. 435

109TH CONGRESS }
2d Session } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
109-731

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 109TH CONGRESS

DECEMBER 15, 2006.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

R E P O R T

ON

POWERS AND DUTIES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES— 109TH CONGRESS

BACKGROUND

The House Committee on Armed Services, a standing committee of Congress, was established on January 2, 1947, as a part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 812), by merging the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. The Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs were established in 1882. In 1885, jurisdiction over military and naval appropriations was taken from the Committee on Appropriations and given to the Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs, respectively. This practice continued until July 1, 1920, when jurisdiction over all appropriations was again placed in the Committee on Appropriations.

In the 93rd Congress, following a study by the House Select Committee on Committees, the House passed H. Res. 988, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, to be effective January 3, 1975. As a result of those amendments, the jurisdictional areas of the Committee on Armed Services remained essentially unchanged.

However, oversight functions were amended to require each standing committee to review and study on a continuing basis all laws, programs, and government activities dealing with or involving international arms control and disarmament and the education of military dependents in school.

The rules changes adopted by the House (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1977, placed new responsibilities in the field of atomic energy in the Committee on Armed Services. Those responsibilities involved the national security aspects of atomic energy previously within the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Public Law 95-110, effective September 20, 1977, abolished the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

With the adoption of H. Res. 658 on July 14, 1977, which established the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Service over intelligence matters was diminished.

That resolution gave the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence oversight responsibilities for intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs of the U.S. Government. Specifically, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence has exclusive legislative jurisdiction regarding the Central Intelligence Agency and the director of Central Intelligence, including authorizations. Also, legislative jurisdiction over all intelligence and intelligence-related activities and programs was vested in the permanent select committee except that other committees with a jurisdictional interest may request consideration of any such matters. Accordingly, as a matter of practice, the Committee on Armed Services shared jurisdiction over the authorization process involving intelligence-related activities.

The committee continues to have shared jurisdiction over military intelligence activities as set forth in rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

With the adoption of House rules (H. Res. 5) on January 4, 1995, the Committee on National Security was established as the successor committee to the Committee on Armed Services, and was granted additional legislative and oversight authority over merchant marine academies, national security aspects of merchant marine policy and programs, and interoceanic canals. Rules for the 104th Congress also codified the existing jurisdiction of the committee over tactical intelligence matters and the intelligence related activities of the Department of Defense.

On January 6, 1999, the House adopted H. Res. 5, rules for the 106th Congress, in which the Committee on National Security was redesignated as the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS AND DUTIES

The powers and duties of Congress in relation to national defense matters stem from Article I, section 8, of the Constitution, which provides, among other things, that the Congress shall have power to:

- Raise and support armies;
- Provide and maintain a navy;
- Make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
- Provide for calling forth the militia;

Provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States;

Exercise exclusive legislation . . . over all places purchased . . . for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings; and

Make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers.

HOUSE RULES ON JURISDICTION

Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives established the jurisdiction and related functions for each standing committee. Under that rule, all bills, resolutions, and other matters relating to subjects within the jurisdiction of any standing shall be referred to such committee. The jurisdiction of the House Committee on Armed Services, pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule X is as follows:

(1) Ammunition depots; forts; arsenals; Army, Navy, and Air Force reservations and establishments.

(2) Common defense generally.

(3) Conservation, development, and use of naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.

(4) The Department of Defense generally, including the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force generally.

(5) Interoceanic canals generally, including measures relating to the maintenance, operation, and administration of interoceanic canals.

(6) Merchant Marine Academy, and State Maritime Academies.

(7) Military applications of nuclear energy.

(8) Tactical intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the Department of the Defense.

(9) National security aspects of merchant marine, including financial assistance for the construction and operation of vessels, maintenance of the U.S. shipbuilding and ship repair industrial base, cabotage, cargo preference and merchant marine officers and seamen as these matters relate to the national security.

(10) Pay, promotion, retirement, and other benefits and privileges of members of the armed forces.

(11) Scientific research and development in support of the armed services.

(12) Selective service.

(13) Size and composition of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

(14) Soldiers' and sailors' homes.

(15) Strategic and critical materials necessary for the common defense.

In addition to its legislative jurisdiction and general oversight function, the Committee on Armed Services has special oversight functions with respect to international arms control and disarmament and military dependents' education.

INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY AND LEGISLATIVE OVERSIGHT

H. Res. 988 of the 93rd Congress, the Committee Reform Amendments of 1974, amended clause 1(b) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, to provide general authority for each committee to investigate matters within its jurisdiction. That amendment established a permanent investigative authority and relieved the committee of the former requirement of obtaining a renewal of the investigative authority by a House resolution at the beginning of each Congress. H. Res. 988 also amended rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives by requiring, as previously indicated, that standing committees are to conduct legislative oversight in the area of their respective jurisdiction, and by establishing specific oversight functions for the Committee on Armed Services.

H. Res. 224, approved by the House on April 27, 2005, provided funds for, among other things, committee oversight responsibilities to be conducted in the 109th Congress, pursuant to clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives (relating to general oversight responsibilities), clause 3(h) of rule X (relating to special oversight functions), and clause 1(b) of rule XI (relating to investigations and studies).

COMMITTEE RULES

The Committee held its organizational meeting on January 25, 2005, and adopted the following rules governing procedure and rules for investigative hearings conducted by subcommittees.
(H.A.S.C. No. 109-1)

RULES GOVERNING PROCEDURE

RULE 1. APPLICATION OF HOUSE RULES

The Rules of the House of Representatives are the rules of the Committee on Armed Services (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Committee”) and its subcommittees so far as applicable.

RULE 2. FULL COMMITTEE MEETING DATE

(a) The Committee shall meet every Wednesday at 10:00 a.m., and at such other times as may be fixed by the chairman of the Committee (hereinafter referred to in these rules as the “Chairman”), or by written request of members of the Committee pursuant to clause 2(c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) A Wednesday meeting of the Committee may be dispensed with by the Chairman, but such action may be reversed by a written request of a majority of the members of the Committee.

RULE 3. SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DATES

Each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and report to the Committee on all matters referred to it. Insofar as possible, meetings of the Committee and its subcommittees shall not conflict. A subcommittee chairman shall set meeting dates after consultation with the Chairman, the other subcommittee chairmen, and the ranking minority member of the sub-

committee with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEES

Pursuant to the authority granted by Section 3(b), relating to Separate Orders, of H. Res. 5 as adopted by the House of Representatives on January 4, 2005, the Committee shall be organized to consist of six standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces: All Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic weapons and lift programs, special operations and information technology accounts). In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs, National Guard and Army and Air Force reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Subcommittee on Readiness: Military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities: Department of Defense counter proliferation and counter terrorism programs and initiatives. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Special Operations Forces, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, information technology and programs, force protection policy and oversight, and related intelligence support.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: Military personnel policy, reserve component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces: Strategic Forces (except deep strike systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense and Department of Energy national security programs (except non-proliferation programs).

Subcommittee on Projection Forces: Navy and Marine Corps programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, and strategic lift programs.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS

(a) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee consisting of members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that fall within the jurisdiction of more than one subcommittee and to report to the Committee.

(b) No panel so appointed shall continue in existence for more than six months. A panel so appointed may, upon the expiration of six months, be reappointed by the Chairman.

(c) No panel so appointed shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE 6. REFERENCE AND CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

(a) The Chairman shall refer legislation and other matters to the appropriate subcommittee or to the full Committee.

(b) Legislation shall be taken up for a hearing or markup only when called by the Chairman of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate, or by a majority of those present and voting.

(c) The Chairman, with approval of a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee, shall have authority to discharge a subcommittee from consideration of any measure or matter referred thereto and have such measure or matter considered by the Committee.

(d) Reports and recommendations of a subcommittee may not be considered by the Committee until after the intervention of three calendar days from the time the report is approved by the subcommittee and available to the members of the Committee, except that this rule may be waived by a majority vote of a quorum of the Committee.

RULE 7. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee or subcommittee hearing at least one week before the commencement of the hearing. However, if the Chairman of the Committee or of any subcommittee or panel, with the concurrence of the respective ranking minority member of the Committee, subcommittee or panel, determines that there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee, subcommittee or panel so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, such chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date. Any announcement made under this rule shall be promptly published in the Daily Digest, promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources, and promptly posted to the internet web page maintained by the Committee.

RULE 8. BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MEETINGS

Clause 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

RULE 9. MEETINGS AND HEARINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

(a) Each hearing and meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be open to the public except when the Committee or subcommittee, in open session and with a majority being present, determines by record vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing or meeting on that day shall be in executive session because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. Notwithstanding the requirements of the preceding sentence, a majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may vote to close a hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether testimony or evidence to be received would endanger the national security,

would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. If the decision is to proceed in executive session, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted by a member of the committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, notwithstanding the requirements of (a) and the provisions of clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, such evidence or testimony shall be presented in executive session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, the Committee or subcommittee determines that such evidence may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. A majority of those present, there being in attendance no fewer than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose of discussing whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person. The Committee or subcommittee shall proceed to receive such testimony in open session only if the Committee or subcommittee, a majority being present, determines that such evidence or testimony will not tend to defame, degrade or incriminate any person.

(c) Notwithstanding the foregoing, and with the approval of the Chairman, each member of the Committee may designate by letter to the Chairman, a member of that member's personal staff with Top Secret security clearance to attend hearings of the Committee, or that member's subcommittee(s) (excluding briefings or meetings held under the provisions of committee rule 9(a)), which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony. The attendance of such a staff member at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee or subcommittee as dictated by national security requirements at that time. The attainment of any required security clearances is the responsibility of individual members of the Committee.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing of the Committee or a subcommittee, unless the House of Representatives shall by majority vote authorize the Committee or subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular article of legislation or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public.

(e) The Committee or the subcommittee may vote, by the same procedure, to meet in executive session for up to five additional consecutive days of hearings.

RULE 10. QUORUM

(a) For purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence, two members shall constitute a quorum.

(b) One-third of the members of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, with the following exceptions, in which case a majority of the Committee or subcommittee shall constitute a quorum:

- (1) Reporting a measure or recommendation;
- (2) Closing committee or subcommittee meetings and hearings to the public;
- (3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas;
- (4) Authorizing the use of executive session material; and
- (5) Voting to proceed in open session after voting to close to discuss whether evidence or testimony to be received would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) No measure or recommendation shall be reported to the House of Representatives unless a majority of the Committee is actually present.

RULE 11. THE FIVE-MINUTE RULE

(a) The time any one member may address the Committee or subcommittee on any measure or matter under consideration shall not exceed five minutes and then only when the member has been recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, except that this time limit may be exceeded by unanimous consent. Any member, upon request, shall be recognized for not to exceed five minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The five-minute limitation shall not apply to the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee or subcommittee.

(b) Members present at a hearing of the Committee or subcommittee when a hearing is originally convened shall be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently shall be recognized in order of their arrival. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the Chairman and the ranking minority member will take precedence upon their arrival. In recognizing members to question witnesses in this fashion, the Chairman shall take into consideration the ratio of the majority to minority members present and shall establish the order of recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of either party.

(c) No person other than a Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of Congress and committee staff may be seated in or behind the dais area during Committee, subcommittee, or panel hearings and meetings.

RULE 12. POWER TO SIT AND ACT; SUBPOENA POWER

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and any subcommittee are authorized (subject to subparagraph (b)(1) of this paragraph):

- (1) to sit and act at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold hearings, and
- (2) to require by subpoena, or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers and docu-

ments, including, but not limited to, those in electronic form, as it considers necessary.

(b)(1) A subpoena may be authorized and issued by the Committee, or any subcommittee with the concurrence of the full Committee Chairman, under subparagraph (a)(2) in the conduct of any investigation, or series of investigations or activities, only when authorized by a majority of the members voting, a majority of the Committee or subcommittee being present. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed only by the Chairman, or by any member designated by the Chairman.

(2) Pursuant to clause 2(m) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, compliance with any subpoena issued by the Committee or any subcommittee under subparagraph (a)(2) may be enforced only as authorized or directed by the House of Representatives.

RULE 13. WITNESS STATEMENTS

(a) Any prepared statement to be presented by a witness to the Committee or a subcommittee shall be submitted to the Committee or subcommittee at least 48 hours in advance of presentation and shall be distributed to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation. A copy of any such prepared statement shall also be submitted to the Committee in electronic form. If a prepared statement contains national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher, the statement shall be made available in the Committee rooms to all members of the Committee or subcommittee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation; however, no such statement shall be removed from the Committee offices. The requirement of this rule may be waived by a majority vote of the Committee or subcommittee, a quorum being present.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in advance of his or her appearance a written statement of the proposed testimony and to limit the oral presentation at such appearance to a brief summary of his or her argument.

RULE 14. ADMINISTERING OATHS TO WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(b) Witnesses, when sworn, shall subscribe to the following oath: "Do you solemnly swear (or affirm) that the testimony you will give before this Committee (or subcommittee) in the matters now under consideration will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?"

RULE 15. QUESTIONING OF WITNESSES

(a) When a witness is before the Committee or a subcommittee, members of the Committee or subcommittee may put questions to the witness only when recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, for that purpose.

(b) Members of the Committee or subcommittee who so desire shall have not to exceed five minutes to interrogate each witness or panel of witnesses until such time as each member has had an

opportunity to interrogate each witness or panel of witnesses; thereafter, additional rounds for questioning witnesses by members are discretionary with the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate.

(c) Questions put to witnesses before the Committee or subcommittee shall be pertinent to the measure or matter that may be before the Committee or subcommittee for consideration.

RULE 16. PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS AND MARKUPS

The transcripts of those hearings and mark-ups conducted by the Committee or a subcommittee that are decided by the Chairman to be officially published will be published in verbatim form, with the material requested for the record inserted at that place requested, or at the end of the record, as appropriate. Any requests to correct any errors, other than those in transcription, or disputed errors in transcription, will be appended to the record, and the appropriate place where the change is requested will be footnoted.

RULE 17. VOTING AND ROLLCALLS

(a) Voting on a measure or matter may be by record vote, division vote, voice vote, or unanimous consent.

(b) A record vote shall be ordered upon the request of one-fifth of those members present.

(c) No vote by any member of the Committee or a subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter shall be cast by proxy.

(d) In the event of a vote or votes, when a member is in attendance at any other committee, subcommittee, or conference committee meeting during that time, the necessary absence of that member shall be so noted in the record vote record, upon timely notification to the Chairman by that member.

RULE 18. COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any member of the Committee gives timely notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than two calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such days) in which to file such views, in writing and signed by that member, with the staff director of the Committee. All such views so filed by one or more members of the Committee shall be included within, and shall be a part of, the report filed by the Committee with respect to that measure or matter.

(b) With respect to each record vote on a motion to report any measure or matter, and on any amendment offered to the measure or matter, the total number of votes cast for and against, the names of those voting for and against, and a brief description of the question, shall be included in the committee report on the measure or matter.

RULE 19. POINTS OF ORDER

No point of order shall lie with respect to any measure reported by the Committee or any subcommittee on the ground that hearings on such measure were not conducted in accordance with the

provisions of the rules of the Committee; except that a point of order on that ground may be made by any member of the Committee or subcommittee which reported the measure if, in the Committee or subcommittee, such point of order was (a) timely made and (b) improperly overruled or not properly considered.

RULE 20. PUBLIC INSPECTION OF COMMITTEE ROLLCALLS

The result of each record vote in any meeting of the Committee shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order, or other proposition and the name of each member voting for and each member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition and the names of those members present but not voting.

RULE 21. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION

(a) Except as provided in clause 2(g) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, all national security information bearing a classification of secret or higher which has been received by the Committee or a subcommittee shall be deemed to have been received in executive session and shall be given appropriate safekeeping.

(b) The Chairman of the Committee shall, with the approval of a majority of the Committee, establish such procedures as in his judgment may be necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of any national security information received classified as secret or higher. Such procedures shall, however, ensure access to this information by any member of the Committee or any other Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee, the standing subcommittees, and any panel designated by the Chairman shall be subject to the rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 23. COMMITTEE RECORDS

The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The Chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of rule VII, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the Committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the Committee.

RULE 24. HEARING PROCEDURES

Clause 2(k) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall apply to the Committee.

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—
109TH CONGRESS

Pursuant to H. Res. 32, election of the Chairman (adopted January 6, 2005), H. Res. 48, election of majority members, (adopted January 26, 2005), H. Res. 33, election of the Ranking Member (adopted January 6, 2005), and H. Res. 49, election of minority members (adopted January 26, 2005), the following members served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 109th Congress:

DUNCAN HUNTER California, *Chairman*
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania, *Vice Chairman*
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
TERRT EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. “BUCK” McKEON, California¹
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
KEN CALVERT, California
ROB SIMMONS, Connecticut
JO ANN DAVIS, Virginia
W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
JEFF MILLER, Florida
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
JEB BRADLEY, New Hampshire
MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
JOE SCHWARZ, Michigan
CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky
BRIAN P. BILBRAY, California²
IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Ranking Member*
JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTY MEEHAN, Massachusetts
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island
STEVE ISRAEL, New York
RICK LARSEN, Washington
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
TIM RYAN, Ohio
MARK E. UDALL, Colorado
G.K. BUTTERFIELD, North Carolina
CYNTHIA McKINNEY, Georgia
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma

¹ Mr. McKeon took a leave of absence from the committee effective June 29, 2006.

² Mr. Bilbray was elected to the committee on June 29, 2006.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED
SERVICES 109TH CONGRESS

The following subcommittees were established at the committee's organizational meeting on January 25, 2005.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over all Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic weapons and lift programs, special operations and information technology accounts). In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs, National Guard and Army and Air Force reserve modernization, and ammunition programs.

Mr. WELDON, *Chairman*

Mr. McKEON ¹ <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mr. ABERCROMBIE, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. GIBBONS	Mr. SKELTON
Mr. CALVERT	Mr. SPRATT
Mr. LoBIONDO	Mr. ORTIZ
Mr. BRADLEY	Mr. EVANS
Mr. TURNER	Mr. SMITH
Mr. CONAWAY	Mr. McINTYRE
Mr. EVERETT	Mr. BRADY
Mr. BARTLETT	Mr. ISRAEL
Mr. JONES	Mr. COOPER
Mr. RYUN (KS)	Mr. MEEK
Mr. AKIN	Mr. RYAN (OH)
Mr. FORBES	Mr. BUTTERFIELD
Mr. WILSON	Mr. BOREN
Mr. SHUSTER	
Mr. BILBRAY ²	

¹ Mr. McKeon took a leave of absence from the committee effective June 29, 2006.

² Mr. Bilbray was elected to the committee on June 29, 2006.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process.

Mr. HEFLEY, *Chairman*

Mr. HOSTETTLER, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mr. ORTIZ, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. JONES	Mr. EVANS
Mr. RYUN (KS)	Mr. TAYLOR
Mr. FORBES	Mr. ABERCROMBIE
Mr. MILLER	Mr. REYES
Mr. ROGERS	Dr. SNYDER
Dr. SCHWARZ	Mr. BRADY
Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS	Ms. DAVIS (CA)
Mr. McHUGH	Mr. MARSHALL
Mr. McKEON ¹	Mr. MEEK
Mr. HAYES	Ms. BORDALLO
Mr. SIMMONS	Mr. RYAN (OH)
Mr. BRADLEY	Mr. UDALL
Mrs. MILLER	Mr. BUTTERFIELD
Mr. FRANKS	
Mr. BILBRAY ²	

¹ Mr. McKeon took a leave of absence from the committee effective June 29, 2006.

² Mr. Bilbray was elected to the committee on June 29, 2006.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over Department of Defense counter proliferation and counter terrorism programs and initiatives. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Special Operations Forces, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, information technology and programs, force protection policy and oversight and related intelligence support.

Mr. SAXTON, *Chairman*

Mr. HAYES, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mr. ABERCROMBIE, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. AKIN	Mr. SMITH
Mr. WILSON	Mr. McINTYRE
Mr. KLINE	Ms. TAUSCHER
Mr. SHUSTER	Mr. ANDREWS
Mr. DAVIS	Mr. LANGEVIN
Mr. HEFLEY	Mr. LARSEN
Mr. THORNBERRY	Mr. COOPER
Mr. GIBBONS	Mr. MARSHALL
Mr. MILLER	Ms. MCKINNEY
Mr. LoBIONDO	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over military personnel policy, reserve component integration and employment issues, military health care, military education and POW/MIA issues. In addition, the subcommittee will be responsible for Morale, Welfare and Recreation issues and programs.

Mr. McHUGH, *Chairman*

Mrs. DAVIS (VA)	Dr. SNYDER, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. KLINE	Mr. MEEHAN
Mrs. DRAKE, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Ms. SANCHEZ
Mr. CONAWAY	Mr. ANDREWS
Mr. SAXTON	Ms. DAVIS (CA)
Mr. JONES	Mr. UDALL
Mr. RYUN (KS)	Ms. MCKINNEY
Mr. HAYES	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over Strategic Forces (except deep strike systems), space programs, ballistic missile defense and Department of Energy national security programs (except nonproliferation).

Mr. EVERETT, *Chairman*

Mr. THORNBERRY, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mr. REYES, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mr. FRANKS	Mr. SPRATT
Mr. TURNER	Ms. SANCHEZ
Mr. ROGERS	Ms. TAUSCHER
Dr. SCHWARZ	Mr. LARSEN
Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS	Mr. COOPER
Mr. DAVIS	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROJECTION FORCES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Legislative jurisdiction over Navy and Marine Corps programs (except strategic weapons, space, special operations and information technology programs), deep strike bombers and related systems, and strategic lift programs.

Mr. BARTLETT, *Chairman*

Mr. SIMMONS, <i>Vice Chairman</i>	Mr. TAYLOR, <i>Ranking Member</i>
Mrs. DAVIS (VA)	Ms. TAUSCHER
Mrs. MILLER	Mr. LANGEVIN
Mrs. DRAKE	Mr. ISRAEL
Mr. WELDON	Mr. MARSHALL
Mr. SAXTON	Ms. BORDALLO
Mr. HOSTETTLER	Mr. BOREN
Mr. CALVERT	

COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 25, 2005, or by authority of the Chairman, the following persons were appointed to the staff of the committee during the 109th Congress:

ROBERT L. SIMMONS, *Staff Director*
ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director (resigned May 31, 2005)*
HUGH N. JOHNSTON, Jr., *Deputy Staff Director/Chief Counsel*
RITA D. THOMPSON, *Professional Staff Member (resigned January 4, 2005)*
BRENDA J. WRIGHT, *Professional Staff Member*
FRANK A. BARNES, *Staff Assistant*
BETTY B. GRAY, *Staff Assistant*
ERNEST B. WARRINGTON, Jr., *Staff Assistant (resigned April 1, 2005)*
DIANE W. BOWMAN, *Staff Assistant (resigned February 16, 2005)*
MICHAEL R. HIGGINS, *Professional Staff Member*
JEAN D. REED, *Professional Staff Member (resigned September 1, 2005)*
JOHN D. CHAPLA, *Professional Staff Member*
B. RYAN VAART, *Professional Staff Member*
ROBERT W. LAUTRUP, *Professional Staff Member (resigned September 1, 2005)*
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, *Professional Staff Member*
NANCY M. WARNER, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS E. HAWLEY, *Professional Staff Member*
WILLIAM H. NATTER, *Professional Staff Member*
JESSE D. TOLLESON, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*
MARY ELLEN FRASER, *Counsel (resigned January 12, 2006)*
DEBRA S. WADA, *Professional Staff Member*
HENRY J. SCHWEITER, *Counsel (resigned August 31, 2005)*
ERIN C. CONATON, *Professional Staff Member*
DOUGLAS C. ROACH, *Professional Staff Member*
ALEXIS R. LASSELLE, *Professional Staff Member*
DANLEIGH S. HALFAST, *Staff Assistant (resigned January 14, 2005)*
JUSTIN P. BERNIER, *Research Assistant (resigned January 7, 2005)*
CURTIS FLOOD, *Staff Assistant (resigned December 4, 2005)*
LINDA BURNETTE, *Printing Clerk*
HUGH BRADY, *Professional Staff Member (resigned June 15, 2005)*
HARALD STAVENAS, *Director of Legislative Affairs and Communications (resigned June 6, 2006)*
JOSEPH FENGLER, *Professional Staff Member (resigned September 30, 2006)*
WILLIAM R. MARCK, Jr., *Professional Staff Member (resigned March 1, 2005)*
UYEN T. DINH, *Counsel (resigned August 1, 2005)*
ERIC STERNER, *Professional Staff Member (resigned March 17, 2006)*
W. HOLLY GRANING, *Director, Legislative Operations*
WILLIAM C. OSTENDORFF, *Counsel*
CLAIRE E. DUNNE, *Program Analyst (resigned November 24, 2006)*
JAMES WILLIAM GODWIN, Jr., *Professional Staff Member*
LINDSAY YOUNG, *Staff Assistant (resigned September 2, 2005)*
JENNIFER E. GIGLIO, *Executive Assistant (resigned July 14, 2006)*
MARK R. LEWIS, *Professional Staff Member*
KATHERINE A. CROFT, *Staff Assistant (resigned September 8, 2006)*
E. HAYES ARENDALL, *Staff Assistant (resigned June 22, 2005)*
LOREN DEALY, *Communications Assistant*
JOSHUA T. HARTMAN, *Professional Staff Member (resigned March 6, 2006)*
HEATHER L. MESSERA, *Staff Assistant*
PAUL ARCANGELI, *Professional Staff Member*
CARRIE M. SLOAN, *Press Secretary (resigned April 30, 2005)*
JEFFERY A. GREEN, *Counsel*

JEANETTE S. JAMES, *Professional Staff Member*
 CHANDLER T. LOCKHART, *Staff Assistant (resigned May 5, 2006)*
 MIRIAM E. WOLFF, *Communications Advisor (appointed January 1, 2005)*
 BRIAN R. ANDERSON, *Staff Assistant (appointed January 3, 2005)*
 RICHARD A. PAWLOSKI, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 10, 2005)*
 JORDAN REDMOND, *Intern (appointed January 11, 2005; resigned June 10, 2005)*
 TAYLOR L. CLUKEY, *Staff Assistant (appointed January 18, 2005; resigned January 11, 2006)*
 REBECCA A. ROSS, *Professional Staff Member (appointed February 1, 2005)*
 SARAH GELINAS, *Staff Assistant (appointed February 14, 2005; resigned November 10, 2006)*
 ANDREW HUNTER, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 1, 2005)*
 HEATH R. BOPE, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 14, 2005)*
 LYNN M. WILLIAMS, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 14, 2005)*
 DIANA SCHIMMEL, *Intern (appointed March 10, 2005; resigned May 6, 2005)*
 MARK EPLEY, *Counsel (appointed March 28, 2005; resigned March 3, 2006)*
 PAUL LEWIS, *Counsel (appointed March 28, 2005)*
 STEPHANIE SANOK, *Professional Staff Member (appointed April 4, 2005)*
 JENNIFER C. GUY, *Staff Assistant (appointed April 13, 2005; resigned August 4, 2006)*
 JOSHUA C. HOLLY, *Director of Communications (appointed May 2, 2005)*
 BRADY DEREMER, *Intern (appointed May 9, 2005; resigned August 5, 2005)*
 LYDIA CHAO, *Intern (appointed May 16, 2005; resigned August 5, 2005)*
 JOHN WASON, *Professional Staff Member (appointed June 6, 2005)*
 HARRY CARTLAND, *Professional Staff Member (appointed June 10, 2005)*
 REGINA BURGESS, *Research Assistant (appointed June 14, 2005)*
 KATHLEEN KELLY, *Intern (appointed June 14, 2005; resigned July 29, 2005)*
 BEN KOHR, *Staff Assistant (appointed July 25, 2005)*
 CATHERINE K. STEADMAN, *Staff Assistant (appointed August 9, 2005)*
 ROBERT W. DEGRASSE, Jr., *Professional Staff Member (appointed August 22, 2005)*
 ROGER ZAKHEIM, *Counsel (appointed August 29, 2005)*
 DIANA SCHIMMEL, *Intern (appointed August 31, 2005; resigned November 7, 2005)*
 KRISTINE ELLISON, *Staff Assistant (appointed September 7, 2005)*
 JENESS SIMLER, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 3, 2005)*
 DOUG LANE, *Professional Staff Member (appointed October 14, 2005)*
 JULIE UNMACHT, *Counsel (appointed October 31, 2005)*
 KEVIN P. COUGHLIN, *Counsel (appointed January 4, 2006)*
 ANNE SKELLY, *Professional Staff Member (appointed January 30, 2006; resigned December 4, 2006)*
 LORRY M. FENNER, *Professional Staff Member (appointed February 15, 2006)*
 NORMAN R. MORSE, *Professional Staff Member (appointed February 17, 2006; resigned June 30, 2006)*
 CHRISTINE ROUSHDY, *Staff Assistant (appointed March 1, 2006)*
 DEREK SCOTT, *Staff Assistant (appointed March 1, 2006)*
 ERYN ROBINSON, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 6, 2006)*
 ALEXANDER KUGAJEVSKY, *Professional Staff Member (appointed March 10, 2006)*
 KARI BINGEN, *Professional Staff Member (appointed April 24, 2006)*
 MARGEE MECKSTROTH, *Staff Assistant (appointed May 1, 2006)*
 JOHN KRUSE, *Professional Staff Member (appointed May 8, 2006)*
 HENRY NUZUM, *National Security Analyst (appointed May 15, 2006)*
 RYAN BURKE, *Intern (appointed June 12, 2006; resigned August 4, 2006)*
 CAROLINE TRIPP, *Intern (appointed June 12, 2006; resigned August 11, 2006)*
 KATHLEEN KELLY, *Intern (appointed July 11, 2006; resigned August 11, 2006)*
 ANDREW H. TABLER, *Staff Assistant (appointed August 9, 2006)*
 AILEEN K. ALEXANDER, *Professional Staff Member (appointed August 28, 2006)*
 JASON HAGADORN, *Staff Assistant (appointed September 11, 2006)*

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A total of 301 meetings and mark-ups were held by the Committee on Armed Services and its subcommittees during the 109th Congress. A breakdown of the meetings follows:

Full Committee	152
Subcommittees:	
Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces	27
Subcommittee on Readiness	14
Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities ...	38
Subcommittee on Military Personnel	23
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces	23
Subcommittee on Projection Forces	24

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW

PUBLIC LAW 109–100 (S. 37)

To extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for two years.

Public Law 109–100 extends by two years the breast cancer research special postage stamp. After passing the Senate by unanimous consent on September 27, 2005, S. 37 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on September 28, 2005. The bill was considered by unanimous consent on October 27, 2005, and passed by the House. On November 11, 2005, the President signed S. 37 into law.

PUBLIC LAW 109–104 (H.R. 4326)

To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. Carl Vinson (CVN–70).

Public Law 109–104 authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the nuclear refueling and complex overhaul of the U.S.S. Carl Vinson (CVN–70). The bill makes fiscal year 2006 funds available for commencement of work on the contract authorized during fiscal year 2006 but only for obligations in an amount not to exceed \$89,000,000. The bill allows that additional amounts may be obligated for such work for fiscal year 2006 only to the extent to which authority is expressly provided by law, and funds are appropriated by law, for such obligations after the date of enactment of this Act.

On November 15, 2005, H.R. 4326 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. The measure was considered under suspension of the rules and passed the House on November 16, 2005 by voice vote. The Senate passed the measure without amendment by Unanimous Consent on November 18, 2005. On November 19, 2005, H.R. 4326 was signed by the President and became law.

PUBLIC LAW 109–142 (H.J. RES. 38)

Recognizing Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy.

Public Law 109–142 recognizes and honors Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States Navy. The measure commends Commodore Barry and honors his efforts and accomplishments in raising the United States Navy. H.J. Res. 38 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services on March 17, 2005. On December 14, 2005, the joint resolution passed the House under suspension of the rules. The measure was passed in the Senate without amendment and with a preamble on December 16, 2005. The measure was signed by the President and became law on December 22, 2005.

PUBLIC LAW 109–159 (S. 1988)

To authorize the transfer of items in the War Reserves Stockpile for Allies, Korea.

Public Law 109–159 authorizes the President to transfer to the Republic of Korea, any munitions, equipment, and/or materiel in the War Reserves Stockpile for Allies, Korea. After passing the Senate without amendment by unanimous consent on November 9, 2005, S. 1988 was referred to the Committee on International Relations and Armed Services on November 14, 2005. The bill was considered under suspension of the rules and passed the House on December 18, 2005. On December 30, 2005, the President signed S. 1988.

PUBLIC LAW 109–163 (H.R. 1815)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Public Law 109–163, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006, authorizes funds totaling \$435,970,473,000 for national defense functions for fiscal year 2006 and provides a budget authority level of \$441,536,600,000.

Division A

Division A of Public Law 109–163 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2006 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of title I authorizes \$76,914,011,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and other procurement for the armed forces, defense agencies, and reserve components of the armed forces.

Subtitles B through E of title I establish additional program requirements, restrictions, limitations, transfers of, or funds for specified programs for the armed forces, including: multiyear procurement authority for the C–17 aircraft and utility helicopters, the shipbuilding modernization initiative, the prohibition on the retirement of KC–135 and the F–117 aircraft; and restructuring the advanced SEAL delivery system.

Subtitle A of title II authorizes \$70,199,859,000 for research, development, test and evaluation for the armed forces and the de-

fense agencies, including amounts for basic research and development-related matters.

Subtitle B of title II establishes certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on six separate research and development-related matters, including: Future Combat Systems, requirements for the heavy lift rotorcraft, limitations on the VXX presidential helicopter and requirements for the development of the Joint Tactical Radio System.

Subtitles C and D of title II address ballistic missile defense programs and miscellaneous matters, including high-performance defense manufacturing technology research and development.

Subtitle A of title III authorizes \$125,715,202,000 for operation and maintenance, \$22,429,849,000 for other programs, and \$3,129,057,000 for working capital funds for the armed forces and defense agencies.

Subtitles B through H of title III address environmental provisions, workplace and depot issues, extensions of program authorities, outsourcing, studies and reports relating to military readiness, the Utah Test and Training Range, and other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2004 and authorizes appropriations of \$108,942,746,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2006. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2006 are as follows:

Army, 512,400
Navy, 352,700
Marine Corps, 179,000
Air Force, 357,400

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2006 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 350,000
Army Reserve, 205,000
Naval Reserve, 73,100
Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600
Air National Guard, 106,800
Air Force Reserve, 74,000
Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserve components for fiscal year 2006 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 27,396
Army Reserve, 15,270
Naval Reserve, 13,392
Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261
Air National Guard, 13,123
Air Force Reserve, 2,290

Title V sets military personnel policy, including provisions that address officer personnel policy; the reserve component management; education and training, including, DOD schools, ROTC, and the Naval postgraduate school; general service requirements; military justice and legal assistance matters; issues relating to casualties; defense dependents education; consumer protection; and other matters.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retiree and survivor benefits; commissary and nonappropriated fund instrumentality benefits; and other matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, such as enhanced benefits for reservists; TRICARE program improvements; programs concerning mental health issues; reports; and other matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including amendments to general contracting authorities, and matters relating to the United States defense industrial base.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including space activities; chemical demilitarization; and intelligence-related matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; naval vessels and shipyards; counter-drug activities; homeland security; reports; military mail; and other matters.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel matters, including the Veteran's preferences, and other federal government civilian personnel matters.

Title XII concerns matters relating to foreign nations, including: assistance and training; nonproliferation and countries of concern; related reports; and other issues.

Title XIII addresses Cooperative Threat Reduction with states of the Former Soviet Union.

Title XIV addresses matters relating to detainees.

Title XV includes authorization for increased cost due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Division B

Division B of Public Law 109–163 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$12,166,611,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the reserve components, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2006. In addition, Division B contains military construction and family housing program changes; property and facilities administration; provisions concerning base closure and realignment land conveyances, and other matters.

Division C

Division C of Public Law 109–163 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$16,554,857,000 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2006. Division C also includes authorization for and/or addresses the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; National Defense Stockpile; Naval Petroleum Reserves; and the Maritime Administration.

The Committee on Armed Services reported H.R. 1815, as amended, to the House on May 20, 2005. The measure passed the House, as amended, on May 25, 2005. The Senate passed by unanimous consent H.R. 1815, as amended, on November 15, 2005, subsequent to striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of a similar measure, S. 1042. The con-

ference report was agreed to in the House on December 18, 2005, and in the Senate on December 21, 2005. H.R. 1815 was signed by the President and became law on January 6, 2006.

(H. Rept. 109–89; S. Rept. 109–69; H. Rept. 109–360; H.A.S.C. 109–2; H.A.S.C. 109–3; H.A.S.C. 109–4; H.A.S.C. 109–5; H.A.S.C. 109–6; H.A.S.C. 109–7; H.A.S.C. 109–8; H.A.S.C. 109–9; H.A.S.C. 109–10; H.A.S.C. 109–11; H.A.S.C. 109–13; H.A.S.C. 109–14; H.A.S.C. 109–15; H.A.S.C. 109–16; H.A.S.C. 109–17; H.A.S.C. 109–18; H.A.S.C. 109–19; H.A.S.C. 109–20; H.A.S.C. 109–21; H.A.S.C. 109–22; H.A.S.C. 109–23; H.A.S.C. 109–24; H.A.S.C. 109–25; H.A.S.C. 109–26; H.A.S.C. 109–27)

PUBLIC LAW 109–164 (H.R. 972)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

Public Law 109–164, the Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2005, which authorized appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to combat international trafficking in persons and domestic trafficking in persons. The measure is meant to assist in the prevention of trafficking in conjunction with post-conflict and humanitarian emergency assistance, protection of victims of trafficking in person, and enhancing prosecutions of trafficking in persons offenses especially when they are employed by or accompanying the Federal Government outside the United States.

H.R. 972 was introduced and referred to the Committee on International Relations, as well as the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce on February 17, 2005. On December 14, 2005, the bill, as amended, passed the House under suspension of the rules. The Senate passed the measure on December 22, 2005 by unanimous consent without amendment. It was signed by the President and became law on January 10, 2006.

PUBLIC LAW 109–272 (H.R. 5683)

To preserve the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, by providing for the immediate acquisition of the memorial by the United States.

Public Law 109–272, to preserve the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, for the immediate acquisition of the memorial by the United States. The measure vests title and possession of the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial, a national memorial honoring American veterans of all wars, including the War on Terrorism, in the United States.

On June 26, 2006, H.R. 5683 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Resources, as well as the Committee on Armed Services. On July 19, 2006, the House passed H.R. 5683 under suspension of the rules. The Senate passed the measure on August 1, 2006 by unanimous consent without amendment. On August 14, 2006, H.R. 5683 was signed by the President and became law.

PUBLIC LAW 109–364 (H.R. 5122)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.

Public Law 109–364, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, authorizes funds totaling \$455,383,431,000 for national defense functions for fiscal year 2006 and provides a budget authority level of \$462,760,229,000.

Division A

Division A of Public Law 109–364 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2007 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of title I authorizes \$84,153,588,000 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, weapons and tracked combat vehicles, ammunition, and other procurement for the armed forces, defense agencies, and reserve components of the armed forces.

Subtitles B through E of title I establish additional program requirements, restrictions, limitations, transfers of, or funds for specified programs for the armed forces, including: acquisition strategy for tactical wheeled vehicles; multiyear procurement authority for the MH–60R helicopter, the V–22 aircraft, and the F–22A fighter aircraft; sense of Congress on the size of the attack submarine force; modernization of the intercontinental ballistic missile; description of the bomber force structure and strategic airlift force structure.

Subtitle A of title II authorizes \$73,607,976,000 for research, development, test and evaluation for the armed forces and the defense agencies, including amounts for basic research and development-related matters.

Subtitle B of title II establishes certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on six separate research and development-related matters, including: Future Combat Systems, acquisition and cost estimate for the joint strike fighter propulsion system.

Subtitles C and D of title II address ballistic missile defense programs and miscellaneous matters, including limitation on funds for space-based interceptor.

Subtitle A of title III authorizes \$129,018,149,000 for operation and maintenance, \$23,847,112,000 for other programs, and \$2,436,430,000 for working capital funds for the armed forces and defense agencies.

Subtitles B through F of title III address environmental provisions; program requirements, restrictions, and limitations; workplace and depot issues; studies and reports relating to military readiness; and other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2004 and authorizes appropriations of \$110,098,628,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2007. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2007 are as follows:

Army, 512,400
Navy, 340,700
Marine Corps, 180,000
Air Force, 334,200

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2007 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 350,000
 Army Reserve, 205,000
 Naval Reserve, 73,100
 Marine Corps Reserve, 39,600
 Air National Guard, 106,800
 Air Force Reserve, 74,000
 Coast Guard Reserve, 10,000

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserve components for fiscal year 2006 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 27,396
 Army Reserve, 15,270
 Naval Reserve, 13,392
 Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261
 Air National Guard, 13,123
 Air Force Reserve, 2,290

Title V sets military personnel policy, including provisions that address officer personnel policy, including officer promotion policy and joint officer management requirements; the reserve component management; education and training, including service academies, JROTC, and scholarships and financial assistance programs; general service authorities; military justice matters; decorations and awards; issues relating to casualties; impact aid and defense dependents education; the armed forces retirement home; reports; and other matters.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retired pay and survivor benefits; commissary and nonappropriated fund instrumentality benefits; and other matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, such as TRICARE program improvements; selected studies and reports; planning, programming and management of military health care; and other matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including: issues relating to Major Defense Acquisition Programs; amendments to general contracting authorities, procedures, and limitations; and matters relating to the United States defense industrial base.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including space activities; chemical demilitarization; and intelligence-related matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; policy relating to vessels and shipyards; counter-drug activities; force structure and defense policy matters; reports; general authorities and limitations of the availability and use of funds; matters involving detainees; and additional issues.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel matters.

Title XII concerns matters relating to foreign nations, including: assistance and training; nonproliferation and countries of concern.

Title XIII addresses Cooperative Threat Reduction with states of the Former Soviet Union.

Title XIV addresses matters relating to defense against terrorism and other related security matters.

Title XV includes authorization for increased cost due to Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom.

Division B

Division B of Public Law 109–364 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$17,098,423,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the reserve components, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2007.

In addition, Division B contains military construction and family housing program changes; property and facilities administration; provisions concerning base closure and realignment; land conveyances; energy security; and other matters.

Division C

Division C of Public Law 109–364 authorizes appropriations in the amount of \$15,840,330,000 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2007. Division C also includes authorization for and/or addresses the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; National Defense Stockpile; Naval Petroleum Reserves; and the Maritime Administration.

The Committee on Armed Services reported H.R. 5122, as amended, to the House on May 5, 2006. The measure passed the House, as amended, on May 11, 2006. The Senate passed by unanimous consent H.R. 5122, as amended, on June 22, 2006, subsequent to striking all after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of a similar measure, S. 2766. The conference report was agreed to in the House on September 29, 2006, and in the Senate on September 30, 2006. H.R. 5122 was signed by the President and became law on October 17, 2006.

(H. Rept. 109–452; S. Rept. 109–254; H. Rept. 109–702; H.A.S.C. 109–48; H.A.S.C. 109–53; H.A.S.C. 109–54; H.A.S.C. 109–57; H.A.S.C. 109–60; H.A.S.C. 109–62; H.A.S.C. 109–68; H.A.S.C. 109–69; H.A.S.C. 109–72; H.A.S.C. 109–73; H.A.S.C. 109–74; H.A.S.C. 109–76; H.A.S.C. 109–95; H.A.S.C. 109–99; H.A.S.C. 109–101; H.A.S.C. 109–102)

PUBLIC LAW 109–366 (S. 3930)

To authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purpose.

Public Law 109–366, the Military Commissions Act of 2006, was enacted by Congress in response to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 548 U.S. ___, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (June 29, 2006). The measure provides for congressional authorization of military commissions to try alien unlawful enemy combatants for war crimes committed before, on or after September 11, 2001. In addition, the measure eliminates Federal court jurisdiction over pending and future habeas and civil suits by enemy combatants detained at Guantanamo Bay and in other U.S. facilities and limits judicial review by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals to find judgments of military commissions on matters of law. After being introduced in the Senate on September 22, 2006, and laid before the

Senate by unanimous consent on September 27, 2006, S. 3930 passed the Senate with an amendment on September 28, 2006. A House bill pertaining to the same subject matter, H.R. 6054 was introduced on September 12, 2006; it was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations. On September 13, 2006, the Committee on Armed Services met to consider H.R. 6054 and ordered the bill to be reported, as amended. On September 25, 2006, another bill pertaining to the same subject matter, H.R. 6166 was introduced in the House and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations. H.R. 6166 passed the House on September 27, 2006. On September 29, 2006, the House passed S. 3930, a similar measure to H.R. 6166, without amendment. On October 17, 2006, the President signed S. 3930 into law.

(H. Rept. 109-664, Part I)

LEGISLATION REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

H. RES. 417

Directing Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the Secretary of Defense relating to the disclosure of the identity and employment of Ms. Valerie Plame.

H. Res. 417 was a resolution of inquiry designed to request specific factual information from the President of the United States or the head of one of the executive departments. The Rules of the House of Representatives provide for a committee to report on a qualifying resolution of inquiry within 14 legislative days or a privileged motion to discharge the committee is in order. H. Res. 417 would have directed the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of the resolution all documents, including telephone and electronic mail records, logs and calendars, personnel records, and records of internal discussions in the possession of the Secretary of Defense relating to the disclosure of the identity of Ms. Valerie Plame as an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency during the period beginning on May 6, 2003, and ending on July 31, 2003.

H. Res. 417 was introduced and referred to Committee on Armed Services on July 29, 2005. On September 20, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session and ordered the resolution of inquiry to be reported adversely. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 109-234)

H.J. RES. 65

Disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

H.J. Res. 65 is a joint resolution which states that Congress disapproves the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission as submitted by the President on September 15, 2005. H.J. Res. 65 was introduced on September 20, 2005 and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On Sep-

tember 29, 2005, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session and ordered the joint resolution to be reported adversely. The measure failed in the House on October 27, 2005. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 109–243)

H. RES. 645

Requesting the President and directing Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism within the United States.

H. Res. 645 was a resolution of inquiry designed to request specific factual information from the President of the United States or the head of one of the executive departments. The Rules of the House of Representatives provide for a committee to report on a qualifying resolution of inquiry within 14 legislative days or a privileged motion to discharge the committee is in order. H. Res. 645 would have requested the President and directed the Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, all documents, including telephone and electronic mail records, logs, calendars, minutes, and memos, in the possession of the President relating to the scope of the activities undertaken by the Department of Defense, the Counterintelligence Field Activity, or any related agency with regard to Threat and Local Observation Notice reports; and the legal authority upon which surveillance by the National Security Agency or the Department of Defense of persons inside the United States and the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants is based.

H. Res. 645 was introduced on December 22, 2005 and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On March 1, 2006 the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session and ordered the resolution of inquiry to be reported adversely. No further action was taken.

H. RES. 685

Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq.

H. Res. 685 was a resolution of inquiry designed to request specific factual information from the President of the United States or the head of one of the executive departments. The Rules of the House of Representatives provide for a committee to report on a qualifying resolution of inquiry within 14 legislative days or a privileged motion to discharge the committee is in order. H. Res. 685 would have requested the President and directed the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense to provide to the House of Representatives, not later than 14 days after the date of adoption of this resolution, all documents in the possession of the President, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Defense, respectively, re-

lating to any entity (including the Rendon Group and the Lincoln Group) with which the United States has entered into a contract for public relations purposes concerning Iraq insofar as such documents relate to such contract.

H. Res. 685 was introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services on February 15, 2006. The Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session to consider the measure and ordered the resolution to be reported adversely on March 16, 2006. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 109–397)

H.R. 6054

To amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6054, the Military Commissions Act of 2006, was a bill to provide for congressional authorization of military commissions to try alien unlawful enemy combatants for war crimes, and other offenses committed before, on or after September 11, 2001. H.R. 6054 was introduced on September 12, 2006, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as well as, the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations. On September 13, 2006, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session and ordered the bill reported, as amended. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 109–664, Part I)

OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

The oversight responsibilities of the Committee on Armed Services were conducted primarily within the context of the committee's consideration of the annual defense authorization bills, which cover the breadth of the operations of the Department of Defense (DOD) and a significant portion of the operating budget of the Department of Energy. The annual national defense budget of approximately \$462.8 billion involves millions of military and civilian personnel, thousands of facilities, and hundreds of agencies, departments, and military commands located throughout the world.

SUMMARY OF OVERSIGHT PLAN

In response to the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on the United States and the ongoing U.S. military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the committee conducted extensive oversight activities during the 109th Congress, paying particular attention to the conduct of the global war on terrorism and force protection of military personnel, installations, and equipment. The committee regularly received briefings on national security threats and conducted a series of hearings and briefings on the status of U.S. forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, including the significant threat posed by Improvised Explosive Devices (IEDs). In addition, prior to consideration of the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 defense budgets, the committee conducted oversight hearings with the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the individual service secretaries and chiefs of staff, combatant commanders, other officials of the Department of Defense and the military departments, officials of the Central Intelligence Agency, and other defense-related intelligence agencies, and the Secretary of Energy, the Director of the National Nuclear Security Administration, and other officials of the Department of Energy. The committee also received testimony from outside experts in academia, industry, associations, and those in private life on these matters.

While the majority of the committee's oversight was planned to support the annual defense authorization bill, the committee also conducted oversight activities as demanded by critical current events.

ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following specific areas and subjects were designated for special attention during the 109th Congress:

NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY AND OTHER DEFENSE POLICY ISSUES

During the 109th Congress, the committee took particular interest in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and other strategic documents of the Department of Defense. The committee's in-

terest included a focus on DOD transformation efforts to improve U.S. military capabilities to address 21st Century security challenges. Throughout both sessions of Congress, the committee received numerous presentations and briefings from representatives of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the joint staff, the services, and the combatant commands.

On June 15, 2006, the committee received a top secret briefing from the Department on its national defense strategy, national military strategy, and its process for conducting the 2005 QDR. On September 14, 2005, the committee conducted an open hearing and received testimony from former DOD officials and outside experts on the goals and principles of the QDR. The witnesses included the Honorable Dov S. Zakheim; Ms. Michele Flournoy, Center for Strategic and International Studies; Dr. Daniel Goure, Lexington Institute; and Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich, Jr., Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Following the release of the QDR on February 6, 2006, the committee turned its attention to the DOD plan to implement the QDR's strategic direction. On March 14, 2006, the committee conducted a hearing and received testimony on the QDR's key findings and implementation roadmaps. Members heard from a panel comprised of the Honorable Gordon England, Deputy Secretary of Defense and Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., United States Navy, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. Following that panel, the committee heard testimony from outside experts, including Mr. Thomas Donnelly, Resident Fellow, American Enterprise Institute; Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich, Jr., Executive Director, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; and Mr. Lawrence J. Korb, Senior Fellow, Center for American Progress. These two panels offered different perspectives on the overall QDR process, key findings, and the DOD implementation plan.

Following these oversight efforts, the committee concluded that the 2006 QDR was "resource constrained," which affected DOD assessment of threats and the capabilities required to meet them; contradictory in its conclusions about force structure; and at odds regarding some programmatic decisions. As a result, in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the committee amended section 118 of title 10, United States Code. This amendment required that the analysis and recommendations in the DOD QDR are not to be constrained by the budget request; the identification of specific capabilities to achieve strategic and warfighting objectives; an independent assessment of the QDR; and a more comprehensive risk assessment from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The committee also included a provision in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit quarterly reports on the implementation of recommendations described in the 2006 QDR.

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

Since September 11, 2001, the Department of Defense (DOD) has conducted continuous military operations against those who might threaten the security of the United States or its allies. While the United States and allied forces have successfully weakened al-

Qaeda's senior leadership by capturing or killing many al-Qaeda leaders, like the U.S. military operation which killed Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the terrorist organization has morphed into an affiliated network of terrorist cells that is diffuse and decentralized. The al-Qaeda-affiliated network operates in cells of varying size and organization in Iraq, Afghanistan, Europe, Africa, Asia, and South America. In the Middle East, Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) place new demands on the armed forces and require new strategies that alter standard operating procedures, training, doctrine, and traditional concepts of operations. Moreover, as the enemy adapts their tactics and techniques to exploit those areas where U.S. capabilities might not be as strong, the United States requires increased cooperation between and among federal departments and agencies to fill those gaps.

Committee delegations visited the U.S. Central Command area of operations to assess progress in OIF and OEF, as well as other regions where U.S. forces are engaged in the global war on terrorism (GWOT). In addition to oversight activities reviewing ongoing military operations in OEF and OIF, the committee conducted numerous hearings and classified briefings on our military strategy for the global war on terrorism. In November 2005, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a classified briefing with representatives from the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the joint staff on DOD roles, missions, and capabilities in counterterrorism. On February 8, 2006, following the release of the National Military Strategic Plan for the global war on terrorism, administration officials, representatives from the joint staff, and U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) briefed the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities on the new strategic plan. The briefing clarified how the military had refined its plan to meet its top priorities for defeating al-Qaeda and affiliated movements; how the GWOT operational planning process works; and identified those tasked with the execution of command and control of counterterrorism operations.

The committee's review of newly published plans for the GWOT reinforced the conclusion that winning the global war on terrorism requires improved interagency coordination, greater synchronization within the Department, and increased capability to carry out irregular warfare missions, such as training and equipping security forces in countries where terrorist organizations operate or in countries that have large ungoverned spaces. The Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities and the full committee held hearings in March and April 2006, on improving interagency coordination. In both hearings, administration officials, general officers, and outside experts all testified that interagency coordination needs to be improved and that the U.S. Government is insufficiently applying all elements of national power in the GWOT. A number of witnesses advised the committee to monitor and oversee the work of the National Counterterrorism Center (NCTC) and the implementation of the NCTC's National Implementation Plan for the global war on terrorism, which provides operational direction to all government agencies, including the De-

partment, on the execution of a synchronized, national effort in the GWOT.

With respect to improving intra-agency execution of the GWOT strategy, on June 29, 2006, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities held a hearing that looked at how USSOCOM is executing its role as the lead combatant command for planning, synchronizing, and executing global operations against terrorist networks. This hearing, and subsequent classified briefings, reviewed the DOD Global Campaign Plan for the global war on terrorism, which was completed in 2005. In light of the military strategic plan's emphasis on unconventional warfare operations in the global war on terrorism, as well as the 2006 QDR's irregular warfare roadmap, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities held a hearing on September 27, 2006, on steps the Department is taking to increase and improve the military's irregular warfare capability.

As a result of these oversight activities, the committee recommended the statutory adoption of several provisions designed to oversee and enhance implementation of U.S. strategy in the global war on terrorism. These provisions, contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) required the Secretary of Defense to issue quarterly reports on the war strategy in Iraq, to report on the findings of the assessment process relating to the global war on terrorism, and authorized enhancements to the regional combating terrorism fellowship program. In the conference report (H. Rept. 109-702) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the committee directed the Secretary to submit a report that clarifies the roles and responsibility of the commander of USSOCOM in his capacity as the supported combatant commander in the GWOT.

Committee hearings and briefings on the need for improved interagency coordination in the global war on terrorism contributed to a provision in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which required a presidential report on building interagency capacity and enhancing integration of civilian capabilities of the executive branch with capabilities of the armed forces. Similarly, in the conference report (H. Rept. 109-702) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the committee directed the Secretary to provide a report on how the Department is improving and strengthening internal Department of Defense mechanisms for global war on terrorism interagency coordination at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels. Finally, the committee's emphasis on increasing our capability to operationalize the global war on terrorism strategy, particularly increasing the military's irregular warfare capability, contributed to a provision in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), which required the Secretary to report on the implementation of the 2006 QDR recommendations.

IRAQ

The committee closely observed the Iraqi political events in 2005 and 2006, which established an inclusive constitutional process for Iraq. In January 2005, Iraq held elections as scheduled to select a 275-seat Transitional National Assembly, with a 58 percent voter turnout. In April 2005, interim Prime Minister Ayad Allawi stepped down after the Assembly selected Ibrahim al-Jaafari as the permanent prime minister. By August 2005, the Iraqi Constitutional Committee completed its final draft of the constitution to replace the Transitional Administrative Law. In October, more than 63 percent of eligible Iraqis voted in the referendum with the constitution passing by a 79 percent majority. Parliamentary elections were held in December 2005, with the final results certified in January 2006. There was close to 80 percent voter turnout and minimal violence surrounding the election. Iraqi leaders formed a broad, unity government in April 2006, with significant Sunni representation and Nouri al-Maliki as prime minister.

While the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) continued to grow in numbers and capability in 2006, violence escalated, notably in Baghdad, after the February 2006, bombing of the Askariya mosque. The death of terrorist Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in June 2006, was a major success for coalition forces and the government of Iraq. Also in June, the Director of National Intelligence, John Negroponte, released unclassified key points from a National Ground Intelligence Center report on the recovery of chemical munitions in Iraq. In November 2006, an Iraqi court, independent of the political process, convicted Saddam Hussein for murdering his own people and sentenced him to death.

To exercise proper oversight, the committee conducted briefings and hearings with representatives from the Department of Defense (DOD) and policy community. In January 2005, the committee received a top secret briefing on operations and intelligence in support of Iraq, tsunami relief, and activities in Afghanistan; and a secret briefing on the efforts to train Iraqi security forces and on the then-upcoming Iraqi elections. The committee met on February 2, 2005, to receive a secret briefing on the Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom force protection initiatives and on March 8, 2005, to receive a secret briefing from General George W. Casey, Jr., United States Army, Commander, Multi-National Forces, Iraq. The committee met again on March 17, 2005, to receive testimony on current operations and the political transition in Iraq from witnesses, including Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich, Executive Director, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments; Dr. Steven Metz, Chairman, Regional Strategy, and Planning, Research Professor of National Security Affairs, United States Army War College Strategic Studies Institute; and the Honorable Walter B. Slocombe, Former Undersecretary of Defense for Policy and former Senior Advisor for Defense and Security Sector Affairs to the Coalition Provisional Authority for Iraq.

On April 6, 2005, the committee received testimony on Iraq's past, present, and future from General Wesley Clark, United States Army (Ret.), Former Combatant Commander, European Command and the Honorable Richard Perle, Former Assistant Sec-

retary of Defense for International Security Policy. In June 2005, committee members attended a session to review the most recent reports from the International Committee of the Red Cross related to the Iraq theater of operations detention facilities and received a top secret brief from joint staff officials on metrics, trends, and the Iraqi security forces; a briefing from General Barry McCaffrey, United States Army (Ret.) on his experiences and observation in Iraq; and a closed briefing with DOD officials on Iraqi Security Forces. The committee also received testimony on June 23, 2005, on the Progress of the Iraqi Security Forces from witnesses, including the Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense; General Richard B. Myers, United States Air Force, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; General John Abizaid, United States Army, Commander, Central Command; and General George W. Casey, Jr., United States Army, Commander, Multi-National Forces—Iraq. On July 21, 2005, the committee received a secret brief on the DOD work in developing and tracking metrics for OIF.

On September 29, 2005, the committee held an open hearing and closed briefing on operations in Iraq. The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, refuted the notion that commanders on the ground had been reluctant to request an increase in troop strength, stating that the needs of the commanders on the ground for force levels would be met. Al-Qaeda and its associated extremists, according to General John Abizaid, United States Army, Commander, U.S. Central Command, were the main threat to peace and stability in the region. General George W. Casey, Jr., United States Army, Commander, Multi-National Forces, Iraq, warned that the United States should expect a protracted conflict in Iraq.

On June 29, 2006, the director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lieutenant General Michael D. Maples, United States Army, testified in an open session on the revelations concerning weapons of mass destruction found in Iraq. He stated that the munitions in question—containing mustard and Sarin nerve agent—qualified as chemical weapons and would be capable of causing mass casualties under certain circumstances. Mr. Frank J. Gaffney, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Center for Security Policy, started off a second panel of civilian witnesses by stressing that these chemical weapons were precisely the weapons of mass destruction that Saddam Hussein had been required by the United Nations Security Council to destroy. In his written testimony for the panel, Mr. Terence Taylor, Director of the International Council for Life Sciences and former commissioner to the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) on Iraq, underscored the dangers posed by insurgents obtaining and using these weapons. David Kay, weapons inspector and the first director of the Central Intelligence Agency's Iraq Survey Group, expressed disagreement about the lethality of the munitions. Immediately following that open hearing, the committee attended a highly classified briefing from intelligence officials on the contents of the report.

On November 15, 2006, the committee held an open hearing to assess the ongoing military operations in Iraq. General John Abizaid, United States Army, Commander, U.S. Central Command, addressed the level of sectarian violence, noting its concentration in the vicinity of Baghdad, and the need for meaningful national

reconciliation to quell it. He stated that Iraq could still be stabilized and supported managing force levels without specific time-tables for withdrawal. Ambassador David Satterfield, Senior Advisor on Iraq to the Secretary of State, stressed that Iraqis do not want to see their country torn apart. He advised that the dissolution of Iraq into separate political entities would come at a price in human suffering that the United States would not be willing to bear.

Attaching importance to the acceleration of transitioning responsibility for security and stability to the Iraqi Security Forces, the committee responded with an emergency authorization of \$1.7 billion in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). This additional authorization for the Iraq Security Forces Fund Program will enhance the ability of the commander, Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq, to provide equipment, supplies, services, training, facility and infrastructure repair, renovation, and construction for the Iraqi Security Forces.

The committee recognized the good will of the Iraqi people that accrued from the humanitarian support for Iraqi children in urgent need of medical care. Therefore, it recommended a provision adopted in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) that authorized \$1.0 million and expressed a sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense continue to provide space-available transportation on military aircraft from Baghdad to Amman, Jordan for Iraqi children.

Finally, in expressing appreciation for the actions that resulted in the death of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, the Committee on Armed Services joined with the Senate Committee on Armed Services in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) to commend the U.S. armed forces, the intelligence community, other Federal agencies and coalition partners. The provision also contained a sense of Congress that exhorted Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki to end ethnic and sectarian violence.

DETAINEE POLICY AND MILITARY COMMISSIONS

On May 11, 2005, the U.S. Southern Command announced that General John Craddock, commander, U.S. Southern Command, had directed an inquiry into allegations of mishandling of the Koran at the U.S. detention facility at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The inquiry was prompted by allegations in the media in May 2005 that U.S. personnel at Guantanamo had flushed a Koran down a toilet. Additional media allegations of torture, harsh interrogations techniques, and improper medical treatment involving detainees continued to focus public attention on detainee affairs and the committee continued its intensive oversight into detainee policy begun in the 108th Congress. Because the detainee treatment issue involved sensitive matters associated with criminal investigations and prosecutions and into classified matters associated with intelligence collection techniques, much of the committee's oversight of detainee matters was conducted in classified forums. Thus, in addition to the four public hearings specifically on detainee treatment and one posture hearing devoted in part to detainee matters, the committee

conducted eight member briefings (including several opportunities for members to review reports by the International Committee of the Red Cross) and fourteen staff briefings related to detainee affairs. Additionally, many committee members and several staff made separate trips to review detainee operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The committee also received documents detailing the results of three investigations by the Department of Defense regarding alleged detainee mistreatment. Finally, the committee received 108,000 pages of documents from the Department of Defense related to Freedom of Information Act requests regarding detainee matters. The conferees for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), consisting of 26 members of the committee and 23 members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, added a Title to that measure regarding detainee treatment and the committee reported out one bill concerning detainee matters.

The first statutory provision, the “Detainee Treatment Act of 2005” (Title XIV of Public Law 109–163) originated in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006. The Senate amendment contained three provisions (secs. 1074, 1075, and 1092) relating to detainees. The first provision (sec. 1074) provided for uniform standards for the interrogation of persons under the detention of the Department of Defense. The second provision (sec. 1075) prohibited cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment of persons under the custody or control of the U.S. Government. The third provision (section 1092) provided procedures for the legal review of detainees held by the Department of Defense at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. The House bill contained no similar provisions. The House receded with an amendment that would establish a new title of the bill, Title XIV, addressing matters relating to detainees. Section 1401 designated the title as the “Detainee Treatment Act of 2005.” Section 1402 contained the text of Senate section 1074 without change. Section 1403 contained the text of Senate section 1075 without change. Section 1404 was a new provision providing for an affirmative defense in any civil action or criminal prosecution against an officer, employee, member of the armed forces, or other agent of the U.S. Government, arising out of that person’s engaging in specific operation practices involving detention or interrogation of aliens who the President or his designees determined to be engaged in or associated with international terrorist activity. Section 1405 amended Sec. 1092 of the Senate amendment and addressed the procedures for legal review of detainees held by the Department of Defense. Section 1406 was a new provision requiring the Department of Defense to train Iraqi military forces regarding the international obligations and laws applicable to the humane detention of detainee, including protections afforded under the Geneva Conventions and the Convention Against Torture and providing for Arabic translation and distribution of the Army Field Manual on Intelligence Interrogation to Iraqi security forces. The conference report for H.R. 1815 was agreed to without amendment by the House of Representatives on December 19, 2005 by a reported vote of 374–41. The Senate agreed to the Conference report by Voice Vote on December 21, 2005. The President signed H.R. 1815 on January 6,

2006 and it became Public Law 109–163. Similar legislation was passed as Title X of Public Law 109–148, signed by the President on December 30, 2005.¹

The second statutory provision, the “Military Commissions Act of 2006” (“MCA”) was enacted by Congress in response to the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hamdan v. Rumsfeld*, 548 U.S. ___, 126 S. Ct. 2749 (June 29, 2006). In a 5–3 decision, the court held that military commissions set up by the Bush Administration to try detainees at Guantanamo Bay were illegal under both the Uniform Code of Military Justice and common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. The Court also found that Section 1005 of the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–148, December 30, 2005) did not deprive the Court of jurisdiction to hear the case. The Court ruled absent clear congressional intent, there would be a presumption against retroactive application of the statute and also found that because the provision excluding the Court of jurisdiction lacked explicit language regarding pending cases contained in two other jurisdictional provisions, a negative inference could be drawn because of the exclusion of the language. After the *Hamdan* decision the committee held three oversight hearings into military commissions and related matters and on September 12, 2006 Mr. Hunter introduced H.R. 6054, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and to the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations. On September 13, 2006, the Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session and ordered the bill to be reported, as amended. On September 25, 2006, Mr. Hunter introduced a similar measure, H.R. 6166, which was the result of a compromise between the Administration, the Senate and House Republican. On September 27, 2006, H.R. 6166 was considered and passed by the House, 253–168, without amendment. On September 28, 2006, the Senate considered and passed S. 3930, an identical measure to H.R. 6166, by a recorded vote of 65–34. On September 29, 2006, the House considered S. 3930 and passed it without amendment by a vote of 250–170. On October 17, 2006, the President signed S. 3930 into law. As adopted, sections 2 and 3 of the MCA provide congressional authorization for military commissions to try alien unlawful enemy combatants for war crimes and other offenses committed before, on or after September 11, 2001. Section 3 also establishes procedures for the use of classified evidence, hearsay and statements allegedly obtained by coercive methods. Section 5 of the MCA clarifies that the Geneva Conventions are not an enforceable source of rights in any habeas corpus or other civil action or proceeding by an individual in U.S. courts. Section 6 of the MCA amends the War Crimes Act (18 USC–2441) to criminalize grave breaches of common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and provides that the amended War Crimes Act fully satisfies U.S. treaty obligations under common Article 3. Section 6 of the MCA also provides that the President may promulgate standards

¹Public Law 109–148, the Department of Defense Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 contained an earlier draft of the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 than adopted by Congress in Public Law 109–163. Public Law 109–148 contained a minor punctuation difference between Section 1005(b) and Section 1405(b) of Public Law 109–168. Sections 1006(a)(1) (required policies in general); Section 1006(b)(91) (provide portions of Field Manual) and Section 1006(b)(2) (distribution of Field Manual) of Public Law 109–148 did not include modifications later written into Sections 1406(a)(1), 1406(b)(1) and 1406(b)(2) of Public Law 109–163.

for violations of treaty obligations which are not grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions. Sections 7 and 10 of the MCA eliminates Federal court jurisdiction over pending and future habeas and civil suits by enemy combatants detained at Guantanamo Bay and in other U.S. facilities and limits judicial review by the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals to find judgments of military commissions on matters of law. These cases will be under the exclusive jurisdiction of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Finally, Sections 8–10 of the MCA amend the Detainee Treatment Act of 2005 to conform with military commissions established under the Military Commissions Act.

INTELLIGENCE

The committee worked closely with the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense of Defense from the prior Joint Military Intelligence Program/Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities Program to the new Military Intelligence Program. The committee held a number of classified intelligence briefings dealing with both the global war on terrorism (GWOT) and matters of strategic intelligence. On February 8, 2006, the committee received briefings by the Department of Defense on the gathering of counterterrorism intelligence within the United States (the Threat and Local Observation Notice program) and by the Department of Justice on the legal basis for the National Security Agency's electronic surveillance program. On March 1, 2006, the committee held a mark-up of a resolution of inquiry (H. Res. 645) on these two issues.

On February 15, 2006, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities and Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a joint hearing on a Special Operations Command project conducted in the 1999–2000 timeframe. This project, known as “Able Danger,” involved the use of data-mining tools to perform “linkage analysis” to map out certain features of the al-Qaeda network. There had been certain allegations made that prior to the September 11th terrorist attacks certain elements of the Department of Defense knew the identity of one or more of the September 11th hijackers. Testimony at the hearing was focused on the value of the “Able Danger” data-mining intelligence program and what information was known prior to September 11, 2001. The joint subcommittee hearing concluded that the intelligence community did not know the identity or intended actions of the hijackers prior to the attacks and that nothing known in the “Able Danger” project could have prevented the tragedy.

SPACE PROGRAMS

The committee remained focused on the policies and programs associated with the protection of national security space assets and the development of space-based effects in military operations. Committee members regularly received briefings on threats to our space assets and space security issues. A hearing on space and U.S. national power provided a greater understanding of the importance of space to national security and the economy, bringing together perspectives from the combatant commands, civil agencies, industry,

and academia. The committee's recognition of the expanding role of space in military operations and increasing threats led to a requirement in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) for the Department of Defense (DOD) to develop a space situational awareness strategy and conduct a space control mission review and assessment for ensuring freedom to operate domestic space assets.

In addition, particular attention was given to efforts that increase the responsiveness of space capabilities to meet the evolving needs of the warfighter. The committee has been at the forefront of encouraging the Department to develop low-cost, rapid reaction, operationally responsive space (ORS) satellite and launch capabilities that can provide prompt, focused space support to warfighters in their theaters of operations and more rapidly fill the void that exists between space science, technology efforts, and operational space requirements development. In an effort to focus ORS activities to better support military users, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) established an operationally responsive space program office.

With a number of military space programs behind schedule and over cost, the committee continued its strong oversight of Department space acquisitions. The committee continued tracking the performance of several high profile space programs including Space Radar, Transformational Satellite Communications System, Space-Based Infrared System High, and National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, and tasked the Government Accountability Office to examine several of these programs and the cost estimating processes employed by the Department. A hearing was conducted on national security space acquisitions with government and industry officials to discuss acquisition problems and provide a forum for potential solutions. Committee delegations visited the United States Strategic Command and several military installations to gain insight into warfighter needs and the integration of space in military operations, as well as service laboratories and industry sites to assess technology development in tactical satellites, responsive launch vehicles, and progress on major space acquisition programs.

MISSILE DEFENSE PROGRAMS

In addition to the annual Missile Defense Agency budget hearings, the committee held several briefings on the status of the development, operational testing, and fielding of specific elements of the ballistic missile defense system to include Ground-based Midcourse Defense, Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense, Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, Airborne Laser, and the Kinetic Energy Interceptor. The committee received several briefings on the Missile Defense Agency's (MDA) corrective actions in the aftermath of two unsuccessful tests of the Ground-Based Midcourse Defense system. The committee explored various options for accelerating the development of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System, specifically how to increase the production rate of SM-3 Block IA interceptors. The committee also met with the services and the MDA to review plans to transition individual ballistic missile defense elements from the MDA to the services.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The committee examined a wide range of issues related to DOD management and guidance during the 109th Congress. As a result of the legislation enacted, the Department will be able to respond more effectively and flexibly to the needs of the country. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), the committee standardized policies regarding gifts to regional centers for security studies. The committee continued to refine policies related to regional centers for security studies in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). New language to streamline center management allowed for personnel to conduct research and facilitated the exchange of ideas among United States and foreign military personnel, civilian government personnel, and non-governmental personnel. In addition, during the second session the committee authorized the creation of a tenth Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) billet, in order to develop a balanced set of portfolios among ASDs that would allow for more effective interaction with both commanders of the unified combatant commands and other Federal departments and agencies.

MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

In addition to the annual budget hearings for the Atomic Energy Defense Activities programs, the committee received several briefings on topics relating to the nuclear weapons complex, including the Reliable Replacement Warhead, nuclear weapons complex transformation, the nuclear weapons stockpile stewardship program, consolidation of nuclear materials, the Department of Energy's Design Basis Threat, nuclear weapons complex physical security, and cyber-security practices. Additionally, committee delegations visited the national security laboratories and several industrial sites to gain further insight into the nuclear weapons complex activities, management, operations, and challenges. Recognizing the need for transformation, the committee established objectives and directed the Department of Energy to develop a plan for the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364).

The committee established key objectives for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-363). In the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), the committee further directed the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of the methodology used by the national security laboratories for the certification of the nuclear weapons stockpile. This study was directed in order to reduce the likelihood that the Reliable Replacement Warhead will require a resumption of underground nuclear weapons testing.

The committee conducted oversight of the management of defense nuclear waste. The committee received briefings to address problems associated with the Waste Treatment Plant construction project at Hanford, Washington, and radioactive tank waste processing and disposition at the Savannah River Site in South Caro-

lina. The committee conducted oversight of the implementation of Waste Incidental to Reprocessing legislation and recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences study on nuclear waste, which was required by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375).

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND THREAT REDUCTION

The committee examined execution of Department of Energy nuclear non-proliferation programs, paying close attention to unobligated account balances in those non-proliferation programs involving the Russian Federation. The committee convened a hearing on July 26, 2006, to examine the United States and Russian plutonium disposition strategy, as well as the future of the United States Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Facility construction project.

The committee conducted oversight of the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), the committee authorized a permanent waiver on restrictions for use of CTR funds in the states of the former Soviet Union. Additionally, the committee modified authorities to allow for the use of CTR funds outside of the former Soviet Union. The committee authorized a study on the proliferation of biological weapons by the National Academy of Sciences in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS AND EXPORT CONTROLS

During the first session of the 109th Congress, the committee took particular interest in the potential transfer of European advanced technologies to China in an effort to enhance its military modernization program. On April 14, 2005, the committee conducted a joint hearing with the Committee on International Relations and received testimony on arms exports to the People's Republic of China by member states of the European Union. The committee heard testimony from the Honorable R. Nicholas Burns, Under Secretary for Political Affairs, Department of State; the Honorable Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs, Department of Defense; and the Honorable Peter Lichtenbaum, Acting Undersecretary for Industry and Security, Department of Commerce.

In both the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee was careful to ensure consistently that all training and equipment provided to allies and coalition partners remains subject to existing export control laws. For example, section 1207 of (Public Law 109–364) requires that any transfer of learning content and information technology is subject to the Arms Control Act and any other export control regime under law relating to the transfer of military technology for foreign nations.

HOMELAND DEFENSE AND SUPPORT TO CIVIL AUTHORITIES

During the 109th Congress, the committee conducted substantial oversight over the DOD homeland defense and support to civil au-

thorities missions. These activities included a committee delegation visit to U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM), and a March 15, 2005, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities hearing on how the Department, particularly NORTHCOM, is setting and implementing homeland defense policy, and how it is improving its coordination with Department of Homeland Security. As a result of this oversight, the committee included a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) that required the Secretary of Defense to report on the use of DOD aerial reconnaissance assets to support border security missions. During the second session, the committee focused its attention on the military’s role in securing our borders. The committee held a hearing on the border security mission of the National Guard and held two field hearings on the security of our northern and southern borders.

In response to Hurricane Katrina and to assess the lessons learned from the federal response, a committee delegation visited Mississippi and Louisiana to view the disaster zone, the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities held a hearing that evaluated DOD roles and responsibilities during catastrophic disasters, and committee staff supported the Select Bipartisan Committee to Investigate the Preparation for and Response to Hurricane Katrina. As a result of the committee’s findings, in its review of the federal response to Hurricane Katrina, the committee included a number of provisions in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364).

The committee included a provision in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) that authorized the National Guard’s weapons of mass destruction civil support teams to respond within the United States to intentional or unintentional releases of nuclear, biological, radiological, toxic, or poisonous chemical materials, or to natural or manmade disasters that could result in the catastrophic loss of life or property. In addition, the committee included a provision directing the Secretary of Defense to maintain a database of emergency response capabilities, which would include the types of emergency response capabilities that each State’s National Guard may provide in response to a domestic disaster and the types of capabilities the Department may provide in support of the National Response Plan’s emergency support functions. The committee authorized the Secretary of Defense to consult with the Secretary of Homeland Security and state governments in the development of Department of Defense concept plans for providing support to civil authorities.

In the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee included a Katrina-inspired provision that amended chapter 15 of the title 10, United States Code, the so called “Insurrection Act”, to authorize the President to use the armed forces to restore public order and enforce the laws of the United States, until state authorities are capable of maintaining order, in the event of a natural disaster, terrorist attack or incident, epidemic, or other serious public health emergency to such an extent that the constituted authorities of the

state are incapable of maintaining public order and the violence impedes the execution of the laws of the United States.

ACQUISITION ISSUES

ACQUISITION POLICY

The oversight of ever increasing costs of providing goods and services to the warfighter was of particular importance to the Committee on Armed Services during the 109th Congress. In that vein, the committee held numerous briefings and hearings related to acquisition policy and acquisition reform. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), the committee took aggressive steps to reform the defense acquisition process. Notably, the committee passed legislation requiring certification of numerous precautionary steps before major defense acquisition programs may proceed to the system development and demonstration phase. In addition, the committee required a determination by the Secretary of Defense and notification to Congress before procurement of major weapons systems, as commercial items, is allowed. Furthermore, the committee enacted a major change in the procurement system by modifying the parameters of the long-standing “Nunn-McCurdy” reporting requirements for programs that exceed certain cost thresholds. By enacting stricter reporting mechanisms, the committee ensured greater transparency and accountability related to the purchase of major defense acquisition programs. The committee’s legislative efforts also resulted in a wide-arching mandate that the Department of Defense (DOD) create a management structure for the procurement of contract services, as well as a total reorganization of the Board of Contract Appeals. Finally, in fiscal year 2006, the committee mandated that the Department’s review and report on DOD efforts to identify contract fraud, waste and abuse.

On November 2, 2005, the full committee held a hearing on the future of acquisition reform. Witnesses included: the Honorable Kenneth J. Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; the Honorable Claude M. Bolton, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology); the Honorable John J. Young, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research, Development and Acquisition; and Lieutenant General Donald J. Hoffman, United States Air Force, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition. On November 9, 2005, the full committee met in a follow-on hearing to discuss issues related to the Defense Logistics Agency’s Prime Vendor Program. Witnesses included: the Honorable Kenneth J. Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and Vice Admiral Keith W. Lippert, United States Navy, Director, Defense Logistics Agency.

In the second session of the 109th Congress, the committee continued its aggressive push to reform DOD’s acquisition system. By requiring, through legislation, a requirements management certification-training program, the committee hopes to drive down acquisition costs by forcing the Department to ensure better control over “requirements creep” in its major weapons procurements.

The committee also acted on several recommendations of various acquisition reform study groups by passing legislation allowing for a pilot program on time-certain development in acquisition of major weapon systems, the establishment of a panel on contracting integrity, and a formally required determination of contract type for development programs. In addition, the committee noted several areas of concern and required the Department to address issues related to the use of lead system integrators and a report and regulations on excessive pass-through charges. In reaction to the committee's observation of contracting in support of the global war on terrorism, a requirement now exists for the Department to capture the "lessons learned" of these operations through formal joint policies on requirements definition, contingency program management, and contingency contracting. Finally, the committee signaled its concern regarding the outsourcing of critical acquisition functions to private industry, which raises serious concerns over potential organizational conflicts of interest. In response, the committee passed legislation in the annual defense bill requiring government performance of critical acquisition functions, such as program management, cost estimation, and systems engineering, within five years.

To address the issues surrounding the need for significant acquisition reform, the committee held two full committee hearings devoted to the issue. The first hearing, on March 29, 2006, addressed numerous acquisition reform studies conducted by the Department, academia, and the private sector. Witnesses included: Mr. Pierre Chao, Senior Fellow and Director of Defense Industrial Initiatives, International Security Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies; the Honorable Robert J. Hermann, Task Force Co-Chair, Defense Science Board Summer Study on Transformation; Lieutenant General Ronald T. Kadish, United States Air Force (Ret.), Chairman, Defense Acquisition Performance Assessment Panel; and Mr. Terry R. Little, Acquisition Advisor to the Director, Missile Defense Agency. The second hearing, on April 5, 2006, addressed the approach by the Department in addressing the recommendations of the various acquisition reform studies. Witnesses included: the Honorable David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; the Honorable Kenneth Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics; Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, United States Navy, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Mr. David Patterson, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT OF WEAPONS PROGRAMS

Major weapons system development and acquisition programs continued to experience cost growth and schedule delays over the past several years. The committee assessed the need for legislative action by examining causes of these problems including: proceeding with development with immature technology, requirements growth, late determination of requirements, poor cost estimating, improper funding profiles, labor, and material cost increases, poor program execution, and program instability.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) included the following legislation to address

acquisition-related cost, schedule, and performance issues with programs: Virginia-Class submarine program (section 121); LHA replacement amphibious assault ship program (section 122); cost limitation for next generation destroyer program (section 123); Littoral Combat Ship program (section 124); limitation on initiation of new unmanned aerial vehicle systems (section 142); annual Comptroller General report on the Future Combat Systems program (section 211); single set of requirements for Army and Marine Corps heavy lift rotorcraft program (section 217); limitation on systems development and demonstration of Personnel Recovery Vehicle (section 219); limitation on VXX helicopter program (section 220); report on capabilities and costs of operational boost/ascent phase missile defense systems (section 231); requirement for certification before major defense acquisition program may proceed to milestone B (section 801); and report on lead systems integrators in the acquisition of major systems (section 805).

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–163) included the following legislation to address acquisition-related cost, schedule, and performance issues with programs: funding profile for the Modular Force Initiative of the Army (section 113); Bridge to Future Networks Program (section 114); Comptroller General report on the contract for the Future Combat Systems program (section 115); CVN–21 class aircraft carrier procurement (section 121); adherence to cost estimates for CVN–21 class of aircraft carriers (section 122); modification of limitation on total cost procurement of CVN–77 aircraft carrier (section 123); construction of the first two vessels of the DDG–1000 Next Generation Destroyer program (section 124); adherence to Navy cost estimates for LHA Replacement Amphibious Assault Ship program (section 125); cost limitation for the San Antonio (LPD–17) class amphibious ship program (section 126); procurement of Joint Primary Aircraft Training System aircraft after fiscal year 2006 (section 138); acquisition of, and independent cost analyses for, the Joint Strike Fighter propulsion system (section 211); independent estimate of the costs of the Future Combat Systems program (section 216); limitation on use of funds for the space-based interceptor (section 222); study and report on revisions to the Selected Acquisition Report requirements (section 803); additional certification requirements for major defense acquisition programs before proceeding to Milestone B (section 805); original baseline estimate for major defense acquisition programs (section 806); and linking of award and incentive fees to acquisition outcomes (section 814).

MILITARY MODERNIZATION

Throughout the 109th Congress, particular attention was given to the following: a continuing examination of military equipment modernization with respect to military capability; Army modularity; tactical aviation; shipbuilding requirements; unmanned aerial vehicles; missile defense; and development of joint-service transformation programs.

The National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2006 included the following legislation to address issues related to military modernization: Virginia-Class submarine program (section 121); LHA replacement amphibious assault ship program (section 122);

Cost limitation for next generation destroyer program (section 123); Littoral Combat Ship Program (section 124); Authorization of Two Additional Arleigh Burke Class Destroyers (section 125); Limitation on initiation of new unmanned aerial vehicle systems (section 142); Annual Comptroller General report on Future Combat Systems program (section 211); Single set of requirements for Army and Marine Corps heavy lift rotorcraft program (section 217); Limitation on systems development and demonstration of Personnel Recovery Vehicle (section 219); Limitation on VXX helicopter program (section 220); Report on capabilities and costs of operational boost/ascent phase missile defense systems (section 231); Requirement for certification before major defense acquisition program may proceed to milestone B (section 801); and Report on lead systems integrators in the acquisition of major systems (section 805).

The National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2007 included the following legislation to address issues related to military modernization: Funding profile for the Modular Force Initiative of the Army (section 113); Bridge to Future Networks Program (section 114); Comptroller General report on the contract for the Future Combat Systems program (section 115); CVN-21 class aircraft carrier procurement (section 121); Adherence to cost estimates for CVN-21 class of aircraft carriers (section 122); Modification of limitation on total cost procurement of CVN-77 aircraft carrier (section 123); Construction of first two vessels under the DDG-1000 Next Generation Destroyer program (section 124); Adherence to navy cost estimates for LHA Replacement amphibious assault ship program (section 125); Cost limitation for San Antonio (LPD-17) class amphibious ship program (section 126); Procurement of Joint Primary Aircraft Training System aircraft after fiscal year 2006 (section 138); Acquisition of, and independent cost analyses for, the Joint Strike Fighter propulsion system (section 211); Independent estimate of costs of the Future Combat Systems Program (section 216); Limitation on use of funds for space-based interceptor (section 222); and Additional certification requirements for major defense acquisition programs before proceeding to Milestone B (section 805).

MILITARY READINESS

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT (BRAC)

On May 13, 2005, the President submitted base closure and realignment recommendations to the BRAC Commission. Over the next 4 months, the committee reviewed the process used by the Department of Defense to reach recommendation decisions, evaluated the recommendations for consistency with the BRAC legal requirements, and ensured that the Department complied with procedural requirements associated with the BRAC statute.

On September 8, 2005, the commission submitted amended base realignment and closure recommendations to the President. On September 15, 2005, the President approved the commission's list of closures and realignments, triggering a 45 "legislative day" clock upon expiration of which the recommendations would become final, unless a resolution of disapproval was enacted.

On September 29, 2005, the committee considered and reported adversely, H.J. Res. 65, a joint resolution disapproving the recommendations of the BRAC commission. On October 27, 2005, the House of Representatives did not agree to the resolution by an 85–324 vote, with one member voting present. In the absence of an enacted joint resolution of disapproval, the BRAC recommendations became final on November 9, 2005.

Throughout the 109th Congress, the committee reviewed the costs and savings associated with base realignment and closure actions, as well as anticipated budgets for BRAC implementation. Through hearings and briefings, the committee uncovered significant shortfalls in planned BRAC funding levels and resolved to authorize funding to fully support executable expenses for BRAC during fiscal years 2006 and 2007.

In addition, the committee reviewed the impact of BRAC on affected local communities, military readiness, and the management of the BRAC process by the military services. These efforts resulted in a number of modifications to statutes governing BRAC, including increased requirements for information on the status of closure, realignment, and reuse activities in annual reports; improved authority for the Department to assist communities adversely affected by mission realignments; termination of authority for construction of projects at bases approved for closure; and additional requirements to encourage interaction between the Department and local communities affected by increases in military populations resulting from BRAC.

FORCE READINESS AND ADEQUACY

END STRENGTH

The committee sustained its initiatives from the previous Congress to increase the size of both the active Army and active Marine Corps, despite proposals in the budget requests to maintain the authorized end strengths for those services at fiscal year 2004 levels. As a result, the 109th Congress, in the National Defense Authorization Acts for fiscal years 2006 and 2007, adopted committee recommendations for increases in active Army end strength from 502,400 to 512,400 (or more than 6 percent above the 2004 levels), and for increases in active Marine Corps end strength from 178,000 to 180,000 (or 2.9 percent above the 2004 levels). Also enacted were the committee's recommendations for continued growth in the Army's end strength to 532,400 and the Marine Corps end strength to 184,000 by fiscal year 2009.

During the second session of the 109th Congress, committee concerns arose over Army plans for fiscal year 2007 to reduce Army National Guard end strength to 332,900, which was more than 17,000 below the 2006 authorization. Although a revised budget request eventually restored the Army National Guard end strength authorization to 350,000—the same as authorized in fiscal year 2006—the committee acted to provide the additional funding to sustain the increased end strength in the revised budget request. As a result, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) provided an additional \$500.0 million to Army National Guard military personnel, oper-

ations and maintenance, and defense health accounts and \$318.0 million for procurement.

MOBILIZATION AND SUSTAINMENT OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Increased reliance on the reserve components to perform a broader range of missions required the committee to consider revisions to the statutory authorities governing the scope of activities that could be performed by full-time support personnel, such as military technicians (dual status) and active guard and reserve (AGR) personnel. In general, such personnel had been limited to missions involved in organizing, administering, recruiting, training or instructing only the reserve components. As a result, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) expanded that authority to permit AGRs and military technicians to support operational missions assigned to the reserve components and to instruct or train active-duty members of the armed forces, foreign military forces and Department of Defense civilian employees and contractors, as long as that training was conducted in the United States.

During the second session of the 109th Congress, committee members testified before the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, which had been established by the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375), providing recommendations and perspectives with regard to the future roles and missions, pay, benefits, support and sustainment of the reserve components. To ensure that the commission had sufficient time to complete its important work, the committee supported an extension of the commission’s reporting deadline to January 31, 2008. This extension was enacted in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). That Public Law also expanded the scope of the commission’s work by requiring an assessment be provided to the Congress not later than March 1, 2007, of matters directly related to the Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and the role of the Bureau.

HEALTH CARE AND MEDICAL READINESS OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

Continuing the commitment to the medical readiness for members of the reserve components, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) enhanced the TRICARE benefits for reservists and their family members. In the first session, the 109th Congress extended eligibility for TRICARE Standard benefits to family members under the TRICARE Reserve Select program for six months following the death of a covered service member. In addition, all members of the Selected Reserve who committed to continued service in the Selected Reserves and their families became eligible for TRICARE Standard when not on active duty, with cost shares ranging from 28 percent to 85 percent. The second session of the 109th Congress standardized the cost share at 28 percent for all members of the Selected Reserve and their families who enrolled in TRICARE Standard.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION

The committee continued to monitor recruiting and retention trends closely throughout the 109th Congress to ensure that programs remained effective in response to the low private sector unemployment rate, the increasing college attendance rate by America's youth, and the growing awareness of the hardships and risks of war. The committee worked to anticipate aspects of the wide array of active duty and reserve recruiting and retention programs that require improvement and to develop legislative solutions. To that end, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) included legislation that:

- (1) Increased the maximum active duty enlistment bonus from \$60,000 to \$90,000 and reenlistment bonus from \$20,000 to \$40,000.
- (2) Authorized a new bonus to encourage members to transfer between services and set the maximum amount at \$10,000.
- (3) Increased the reserve enlistment bonus from \$10,000 to \$20,000.
- (4) Made reservists eligible for a critical skill retention bonus of up to \$100,000 over a career.
- (5) Increased medical education loan repayment authority from \$22,000 to \$60,000.
- (6) Increased the stipend under the Health Professions Scholarship Program from \$579 a month to a maximum of \$30,000 a year.
- (7) Increased the maximum grant under the Health Professions Scholarship Program from \$15,000 to \$45,000.
- (8) Increased the reserve critical health skill special pay from \$10,000 to \$25,000.
- (9) Increased the accession bonus for dentists from \$30,000 to \$200,000.
- (10) Established a \$400,000 accession bonus for critical physician and dentist skills.
- (11) Authorized a \$50,000 bonus to encourage retired members and separated members to return to active duty to fill shortage manpower requirements in units with high-demand, low-density missions.
- (12) Increased the maximum amount of the nuclear career accession bonus from \$20,000 to \$30,000.
- (13) Increased the Army bonus for referral of recruits from \$1,000 to \$2,000 and expands the eligible population to retirees and civilian employees.
- (14) Established an \$8,000 bonus for enlistments to enter a commissioning program.

MILITARY COMPENSATION

The committee continued to closely monitor compensation programs during the 109th Congress to ensure an adequate quality of life for service members and their families and to ensure that pay and benefits met the needs of the wartime military and kept pace with private sector standards. The committee's active oversight of

these issues resulted in legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) that authorized a 3.1 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2006 and a 2.2 percent raise in basic pay during fiscal year 2007. Public Law 109–364 also included additional targeted pay raises for warrant officers and mid-grade and senior enlisted personnel. The combination of the basic pay raise and the targeted pay raise resulted in an average pay increase during fiscal year 2007 of 2.7 percent. The two military pay raises in the 109th Congress were both one-half of one percent above the Employment Cost Index (ECI) and extended to eight the number of consecutive years where Congress authorized pay raises above the ECI level. As a result of the pay raises in fiscal year 2006 and 2007, the gap between military and private sector pay during the 109th Congress was reduced from 5.0 percent to 4.0 percent, well below the peak pay gap of 13.5 percent in fiscal year 1999. With the addition of the fiscal year 2007 pay raise, average pay levels have increased 41 percent over the last 8 years.

In addition, the committee saw the need to increase benefits for deployed service members, to include mobilized reserve component members serving at locations inside the United States and overseas. As a result, legislation enacted during the 109th Congress: increased the maximum hardship duty pay from \$300 to \$750 per month; authorized income replacement of up to \$3,000 per month for reservists who experienced reduced income while serving extended or frequent tours on active duty; set the reserve component rates for basic allowance for housing (BAH) at active duty levels when reservists are mobilized for over 30 days, thereby eliminating the discriminatory Type II BAH for reserve members; and authorized an allowance to pay the premiums for the full cost of Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance premiums for service members serving in the Iraq or Afghanistan combat zone.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

During the 109th Congress the committee spent considerable time assessing the adequacy of mental health services available to service members and their families. In particular, the committee focused on the continuum of mental health services provided throughout the deployment cycle. The committee staff continued to visit military installations to gather information from returning service members and their families regarding the availability and adequacy of mental health programs. These visits led to a Subcommittee on Military Personnel hearing on mental health in July 2005, and several legislative initiatives in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364). As a result, Congress required the Secretary of Defense to establish a task force to examine mental health issues in the armed forces and to develop a long-term plan for improving mental health services provided to service members and their families. In addition, legislative provisions authorized pilot projects that focused on early diagnosis and treatment of post traumatic stress

disorder (PTSD) and required the use of internet-based tools to assist family members to identify early signs of PTSD.

In the second session of the 109th Congress, the committee recognized the increased incidence of traumatic brain injury in service members returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. Of particular concern are injuries suffered as a result of blasts that may not be accompanied by obvious head trauma and thus may never be diagnosed. The committee took action in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) to ensure deployment medical screening included screening for traumatic brain injury and directed a longitudinal study on the long term physical and mental effects of traumatic brain injury incurred by service members. The purpose of the study was to identify the health care needs, the availability of long-term health care and the effects of a traumatic brain injured service member on family members.

MILITARY AND MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE

Throughout the 109th Congress, the committee exercised vigorous oversight on the military health system. The committee focused substantial attention on the cost of military health care to the Department of Defense (DOD) and to military beneficiaries and to the long term viability of the military health system. For several years the committee was aware of the rising cost of providing health care to military beneficiaries and the potential negative impact of health care costs on other critical readiness programs. The committee closely examined DOD's proposal to sustain the military health care benefit and contain costs by shifting costs to military beneficiaries, particularly military retirees. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) included several legislative initiatives to control the cost of the military health system while ensuring the future of the military health benefit. For example, Congress established a task force to conduct a comprehensive assessment on the future of military health care and provide the Department with recommendations for improving and sustaining the military health system; required the Comptroller General to study the pharmacy benefits program and to audit DOD's health care costs and cost saving measures; and imposed temporary prohibitions on cost increases in the retail pharmacy program and TRICARE fees. In addition, committee action led to the enactment of a demonstration project on coverage of over-the-counter drugs under the pharmacy benefits program and a feasibility study of using Medicare Advantage managed care methods for TRICARE-Medicare dual eligible beneficiaries.

The committee continued to focus attention on the availability of health care providers under TRICARE and access to care for military beneficiaries. Responding to concerns raised by health care providers over the administrative requirements of the TRICARE program, Congress adopted legislation to standardize claims processing under the TRICARE and Medicare programs.

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE MILITARY

In the 109th Congress, the committee took an active role in reviewing how the military justice system treated sexual assaults and in preventing sexual assaults in the armed forces. Specifically with regard to the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), the committee devoted much effort to examining the recommendations from the Joint Service Committee on Military Justice for amending the Code to improve the ability of the military justice system to address sexual assault offenses and conform more closely to other Federal laws. As a result of this review, Congress adopted legislation amending the UCMJ, including: establishing stalking as a separate offense; providing a series of graded offenses relating to rape, sexual assault and other sexual misconduct based on aggravating factors; and extending the statute of limitations for murder and child abuse. The Congress further clarified that under the UCMJ the offense of rape has an unlimited statute of limitations.

The committee remained vigilant in ensuring that the efforts to prevent sexual assault and sexual harassment in the military continued as a Department of Defense priority. The committee became aware that the majority of the cadets and midshipmen at the military service academies considered the annual requirement for gathering information on sexual assault and sexual harassment to be burdensome, an attitude that threatened the quality and reliability of the survey data. To address these concerns the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) changed the frequency of the service academy sexual assault survey from an annual requirement to one in which surveys would be conducted in odd numbered years. In any year that a survey is not required, the secretary of the military service will provide focus groups to gather information regarding sexual assault and sexual harassment issues at the academy.

MILITARY RESALE AND MORALE, WELFARE, AND RECREATION (MWR)
PROGRAMS

The committee acted throughout the 109th Congress to improve the effectiveness and quality of military exchanges and commissaries and MWR programs and to protect these critical programs for future generations of service members. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) included a number of legislative initiatives to address the many concerns that had been brought to the attention of the committee. The legislation that the 109th Congress adopted included initiatives that:

- (1) Protected commissaries from contracting out competitions under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 until December 31, 2008.
- (2) Mandated the use of appropriated dollars to support second destination transportation costs for shipping exchange products to overseas stores.
- (3) Allocated \$7.0 million to Armed Forces Recreation Centers to reimburse for costs of facilities used to support the Rest and Recuperation Leave Program.

(4) Clarified that the revenue for products that are sold in commissaries as special exceptions to the standard surcharge of five percent shall be applied to the surcharge fund as if the products were uniform surcharge products.

(5) Protected the right for exchanges, commissaries, and MWR activities to provide support services in enhanced use leases of government property.

(6) Required the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study to determine the cost effectiveness of non-appropriated fund activities purchasing commercial insurance to protect financial interests in facilities.

SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL BASE

Perhaps one of the most overlooked and underappreciated components of our national defense is the criticality of ensuring a strong industrial and technological base. Beyond simply providing American workers jobs and economic opportunity, the role of the industrial and technological base is a vital component of our national security. In its efforts to strengthen the industrial base, the committee enacted significant reforms related to section 2533a of title 10, United States Code, commonly known as the Berry Amendment. In the first session of the 109th Congress, the committee included in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364), requirements for training of the defense acquisition workforce on the requirements of the Berry Amendment. In addition, a change was made to the Berry amendment to clarify domestic source requirements relating to clothing materials and components.

On July 13, 2005, the full committee addressed the issue of the national security implications of the possible merger of the China National Offshore Oil Corporation with Unocal Corporation. Witnesses included: R. James Woolsey, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Honorable C. Richard D'Amato, Chairman, U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Frank J. Gaffney, Jr., President and CEO, Center for Security Policy, and Jerry Taylor, Director of Natural Resources Studies, CATO Institute.

In the second session of the 109th Congress, the committee took even stronger action to strengthen the industrial base by enacting major reform of the Berry amendment through the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). By dividing the Berry amendment into two separate sections of the United States Code, sections 2533a and 2533b, the committee created a distinction between the requirements for protection of domestic sources of different types of materials. In section 2533b of title 10, United States Code, the committee created a separate section to signify the strategic and national security significance of ensuring a reliable supply of specialty metals. By requiring the Department of Defense to create a robust and workable waiver process, to include transparency and compliance plans, the committee sought to capitalize on market forces to strengthen our industrial base. The committee hopes that the market will recog-

nize the opportunities presented by awareness of Berry waivers to stimulate new producers to meet the growing, and transparent, needs of the Department.

To ensure that the Department continues to recognize the strategic significance of domestic protection for certain materials, the committee created a Strategic Materials Protection Board, within the Department of Defense, which will meet on a bi-annual basis. The purpose of the board is to leverage the assets of the Executive Branch to conduct a periodic analysis of those items whose domestic availability is critical to national security. The committee is hopeful that those analyses will result in thoughtful recommendations for the inclusion or exclusion of certain materials from future domestic preference legislation.

ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

The Committee on Armed Services addressed the following areas and subjects in addition to those designated for special attention during the 109th Congress:

GLOBAL FORCE POSTURE

During the 109th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of Department of Defense (DOD) efforts to realign its forces around the world. Over the last two years, the committee conducted several hearings and received briefings on those efforts. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), the committee included a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to develop criteria, as part of the Global Force Posture Review, for assessing the costs and benefits of deploying to particular overseas locations and for establishing new overseas facilities. The committee also included a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to notify the committee within 30 days after the United States entered into an agreement with a foreign country to support the deployment of elements of the U.S. armed forces in that country.

During the second session of the 109th Congress, the committee received an update on DOD force realignment plans and used the hearing to assess whether the Department is prepared to address the many resulting requirements of those realignment plans. On June 20, 2006, the committee heard testimony from the Honorable Ryan Henry, Principal Under Secretary of Defense for Policy; the Honorable Philip W. Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment; and Rear Admiral William D. Sullivan, Vice Director for Strategic Plans and Policy, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

INTERAGENCY REFORM

During the 109th Congress, the committee noted that the United States faces a more diverse set of national security challenges than those faced during the Cold War and that the major national security institutions designed for the Cold War lack adequate capacity to address the security challenges of the 21st Century. The committee recognized that the executive branch and Congress must continue to strengthen Federal institutions to ensure that inter-

agency structure, policies, and processes support integrated planning and unified action in response to current and future national security challenges. On April 4, 2006, the committee conducted a hearing and received testimony on both existing deficiencies in interagency collaboration and the executive branch's efforts to improve interagency coordination for current conflicts and beyond. The witnesses included the Honorable Thomas W. O'Connell, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Department of Defense; Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, United States Navy, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ambassador Henry A. Crumpton, Coordinator for Counterterrorism, Department of State; and Vice Admiral John Scott Redd, United States Navy (Retired), Director, National Counterterrorism Center.

In an effort to improve the effective employment of all instruments of U.S. national power, the committee included legislation on interagency reform in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). This provision requires the President to submit a report to Congress on building interagency capacity and enhancing the integration of civilian and military capabilities to achieve U.S. national security goals and objectives. This report should also include recommendations for specific legislative proposals to improve interagency coordination to be considered in the future. In addition, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) included a provision requiring the Secretary of Defense to submit a report to the committee on interagency counter-drug implementation plans for Afghanistan and 10 other countries in South and Central Asia.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

During the 109th Congress, the committee spent considerable time examining the practices of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) in terms of how it reviews the national security implications of foreign acquisitions of, or mergers with, U.S. companies. On July 13, 2005, the committee conducted a hearing on the national security implications of the possible merger of the China Offshore National Oil Corporation with Unocal Corporation, where witness testimony advocated a more rigorous and transparent national security-minded CFIUS process. Similarly in response to CFIUS' approval of Dubai Ports World's acquisition of Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, the committee held a hearing on March 2, 2006, on the national security implications of the deal and the CFIUS process, and on November 14, 2006, the committee held a closed briefing on the Lucent Technologies-Alcatel merger. Both activities included witness testimony which advocated legislative reform of CFIUS.

In addition to these committee activities, committee staff investigated the national security implications of other pending CFIUS cases, such as the Toshiba Westinghouse acquisition and Dubai International Capital's acquisition of Doncasters Group Limited. The committee also participated in the drafting of the National Security Foreign Investment Reform and Strengthened Transparency Act of 2006, which the House of Representatives approved by a

vote of 424–0 on July 26, 2006. The Senate has not taken action on the National Security Foreign Investment Reform and Strengthened Transparency Act, but if codified, the legislation would improve how CFIUS monitors and enforces mitigation agreements in CFIUS-approved deals, and would increase Congressional oversight of the CFIUS process. Finally, in the conference report (H. Rept. 109–702) accompanying the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), the committee directed the Secretary of Defense to report on how the Department of Defense evaluates national security implications of mergers, acquisitions, or takeovers subject to CFIUS review.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

During the second session of the 109th Congress, the committee received testimony on building the capacity of foreign military forces to address the broader authority that allows the Department of Defense to work with the Department of State to enable foreign militaries to carry out such missions as combating terrorism and stability operations. On April 7, 2006, the committee heard testimony from Ambassador Eric S. Edelman, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Dr. John Hillen, Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs, Department of State; and General James L. Jones, United States Marine Corps, Commander, U.S. European Command.

The committee came to several conclusions from its observations of allies and coalition partners, who are participating in the global war on terrorism and in security, stabilization, transition, and reconstruction operations around the world. In particular, the committee determined that commanders on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan need access to funds to use in local rehabilitation projects. As a result, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorized the use of \$500.0 million annually in fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007 funds for the Commander’s Emergency Response Program and a similar program to assist the people of Afghanistan.

Additionally, the committee improved authorities regarding the transfer of defense articles and to provide defense services to the military and security forces of Iraq and Afghanistan. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorized the President to transfer \$500.0 million in defense articles and related services during fiscal year 2006 to the military and security forces of Iraq and Afghanistan to support efforts to restore and maintain peace and security in those countries.

The committee also took action to support coalition forces in Iraq and Afghanistan through the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). This legislation provided temporary authority for the Secretary of Defense to use Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreements to lend certain significant military equipment to the military forces of foreign nations that are participating in combined operations with U.S. armed forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. Limited to fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and to specific categories of “significant military equipment” on the U.S. munitions list, this authority allows the

United States to help its allies and coalition partners to better protect their forces against weapons, such as IEDs, in theater.

Committee members also showed support for the goal of enabling foreign militaries to carry out counterterrorism and stability missions so that U.S. troops can focus their energies in other arenas. In the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163), the committee established a pilot program within the Department of Defense to allow the Administration to establish a successful track record for the Department, in coordination with the Department of State, to take on this type of limited, focused mission and to allow the Administration to address the larger issue of how the Department of State administers the nation’s traditional foreign assistance programs. This authority, known as “section 1206 authority,” allowed the President to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct or support such a program, using up to \$200.0 million annually. This provision required the Secretary of Defense to work with the Secretary of State to formulate and implement such programs and provide a notification to specified congressional committees before initiating any activities under this authority. It further required a report from the President on the strengths and weaknesses of current laws governing and relating to the provision of this type of foreign assistance; recommended changes, if any, to those laws; any organizational and procedural changes that should be made in the Department of Defense and the Department of State to improve their ability to conduct such programs; and the resources and funding mechanisms required to assure adequate funding for such programs. Originally, this authority would have expired on September 30, 2007, but the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) extended “section 1206 authority” until September 30, 2008. This legislation also modified the authority by providing it directly to the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, and allowing the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$300.0 million annually.

The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) also expanded the Combatant Commander Initiative Fund, allowing geographic combatant commanders to provide urgent and unanticipated humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance, particularly to countries in which the United States is engaged in contingency operations. Moreover, this legislation authorized the Secretary of Defense to use up to \$100.0 million to provide logistic support, supplies, and services to allied forces that are participating in operations alongside U.S. forces and an additional \$5.0 million to improve interoperability of logistical support systems of allied forces.

Finally, the committee recognized the importance of Department of Defense support for the Department of State’s effort to provide reconstruction, security, and stabilization assistance to foreign countries. To help the two Departments to work together in addressing the stability and reconstruction needs of foreign nations, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorized the Secretary of Defense to provide services to, and transfer defense articles and funds to, the Secretary of State toward that end. The authority, which expires on

September 30, 2007, limits the aggregate value of such services, articles, and funds to \$100.0 million annually.

COMMITTEE DEFENSE REVIEW

During the 109th Congress, the committee conducted a defense review to complement the 2006 QDR. During the summer of 2005, a bipartisan group of members developed a three-phase format to address the future national security environment. First, members established a threat panel to identify and categorize the many threats found around the world. Second, members created six gap panels to address the categories of threats, evaluating whether the current and future U.S. military would have the capabilities and capacity to protect U.S. national security. Finally, senior members of the committee formed an integration panel to examine the gap panels' evaluation and create an integrated product reflective of future threats and U.S. military capabilities. Each panel functioned on a strictly bipartisan basis, equally halving membership and alternating control of the chairmanship from meeting to meeting.

Fifty-five of the 62 members of the committee participated in the CDR process. The threat panel held numerous hearings and briefings, as well as an on-site briefing at the Central Intelligence Agency. The gap panels (Regional Powers, Regional Conflicts, Asymmetric and Unconventional Threats, Current and Emerging Nuclear Powers, Terrorism and Radical Islam, and Non-Traditional Missions and Catastrophic Disasters) met for a total of 10 hearings and 24 briefings. The integration panel met three times and edited multiple CDR drafts. The final CDR was released in December 2006.

While the final CDR is a bipartisan creation, it is not a unanimous document. Rather, it is a product endorsed by those committee members who reviewed the final product and chose to participate as signatories.

WOUNDED, DISABLED AND DECEASED SERVICE MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

The committee devoted substantial attention during the 109th Congress to the emerging needs of active duty and reserve wounded and disabled service members and their families. The committee investigated a wide range of problems involving transitional compensation, medical treatment, evaluation and rating of disabilities, retention of members with disabilities on active duty, and post separation programs to assist members and families as they transition to civilian life. As the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109-364) included a number of legislative initiatives to address the many concerns that had been brought to the attention of the committee. For example, a new payment of \$430 per month was authorized to ensure that hospitalized combat wounded service members did not suffer a reduction in income after departing the combat zone. Legislation revamped the military services' physical evaluation boards to ensure that members receive consistent, fair, and timely judgments delivered by efficient, well-trained personnel who are prepared to reach out to service members with information and insight into the disability process. The

Congress also clarified that assistive technology provided to severely injured members would be provided on a permanent basis and that the service member would be authorized to retain such equipment after separation. In addition, the Congress required the Department of Defense to ensure that the military departments used uniform procedures and standards for assisting severely wounded and injured members of the armed forces. To augment the programs operated by each of the military services in support severely injured and wounded service members and their families, legislation authorized a Military Severely Injured Center and required that a central data base be established to track support provided by the center to severely wounded and injured service members. Furthermore, Congress authorized service members on active duty with disabilities to participate in the Paralympic Games.

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVING FAMILY MEMBERS

During the examination of benefits for wounded and disabled service members, the committee recognized that a greater level of benefit was required to fully meet the needs of surviving family members of those service members who die while on active duty. Accordingly, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) authorized an increase in the death gratuity payment from just over \$12,000 to \$100,000 for the survivors of all active duty deaths. The legislative remedy also authorized survivors of all military deaths after October 7, 2001 to receive a retroactive payment of both the increased \$100,000 death gratuity and a \$150,000 payment to recognize the increase in Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) coverage from \$250,000 to \$400,000. As a result of the increase in death gratuity and SGLI, the up-front cash payments to survivors of service members who die on active duty were increased to over \$500,000. Additionally, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) increased from 180 to 365 days the period that surviving families may remain in housing or receive military housing allowances.

RESPECTFUL TRANSPORTATION AND PRESERVATION OF REMAINS

In the 109th Congress the committee took a number of steps to ensure that the remains of military personnel who die during combat operations or who die of non-combat related injuries in the theater of combat are handled with dignity and respect. The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) required the remains of military personnel be moved by dedicated military or military contracted aircraft from Dover Air Force Base, Delaware, to the military airfield nearest to the service member's place of interment or to a location designated by the next of kin. It also required that proper military honors be rendered by military personnel at the destination airfield.

The Act also required each military department to provide pre-deployment training of health care professionals in the preservation of remains. In addition, the Act required a comprehensive review of the mortuary affairs process focused on the capabilities and standards employed in combat theaters that could preserve the re-

mains of deceased personnel and expedite the return of remains to the United States in a non-decomposed state.

PROTECTIONS FOR SERVICE MEMBERS AGAINST PREDATORY LENDERS

The committee expressed strong concerns about predatory lending practices and the hidden costs that many service members and their dependents face. Accordingly, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) provided the additional safeguards for service members and their dependents who are extended credit. These safeguards include:

(1) Unambiguous coverage to any service member on active duty regardless of deployment status;

(2) Extension of “predatory lender” coverage to the service member’s dependents;

(3) Giving the Secretary of Defense direct control and oversight over the program;

(4) Prohibiting creditors from charging service members an annual interest percentage rate for loans that is higher than that charged the legal residents of the state, and capping the annual percentage rate at 36 percent, including fees;

(5) Expanding the definition of interest to include all costs associated with the credit, including credit insurance, premiums, or any ancillary product sold with any extension of credit;

(6) Prohibiting creditors from extending credit if the borrower’s legal rights are waived, the creditor demands unreasonable notice from the borrower, arbitration is required in case of dispute, a creditor uses a check or other means of access to borrower’s financial account as security for the obligation, the creditor requires an allotment as a condition of the extension of credit, or if the borrower is prohibited from prepaying loan or charged a fee for repaying;

(7) Prohibiting rollovers, and

(8) Requiring that the Secretary with other regulatory agencies, establish the implementing regulations of this provision.

MILITARY CHAPLAINS

The committee became concerned about Air Force and Navy policies governing the conduct of military chaplains, especially policies that regulated the manner and form in which chaplains might pray. As a result the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for 2007 (Public Law 109–364) directed that the Secretary of the Air Force rescind the policy and revised interim guidelines concerning the exercise of religion in the Air Force issued on February 9, 2006, and reinstate the policy that was set forth in Air Force Policy Directive 52–1, dated 1 July, 1999. The Act also directed that the Secretary of the Navy rescind Secretary of the Navy Instruction 1730.7C, dated February 21, 2006, titled “Religious Ministry within the Department of the Navy” and directed that the Secretary of the Navy reinstate the policy that was set forth in Secretary of the Navy Instruction 1730.7B, dated October 12, 2000.

FORCE PROTECTION

The committee selected force protection for special oversight, focusing on areas having a direct impact on the safety of our military personnel engaged in operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The objective of committee activity was to expedite the promulgation of policies and the fielding of technology and equipment that would prevent or reduce combat casualties. The committee was also concerned by inflated claims with respect to the capabilities of certain products, some of which were targeted at the families of military personnel serving overseas, and the committee viewed exposure of inferior capabilities as equally important.

This special oversight was conducted within the formal committee structure under the jurisdiction of the full committee, and supplemented by dedicated staffing with specialized expertise. In addition to the methods of past congresses, the committee engaged in more in-depth oversight activities, including: visits to contractor and government production sites and assembly lines, and assessment of manufacturing processes and schedules; active oversight of various aspects of testing, including developmental testing, field testing and source selection testing; and identification and referral to the Department of Defense (DOD) of sources and vendors with capability and capacity to meet critical deployment timelines. Focus areas included the following: body and vehicle armor capabilities and quantities; counter improvised explosive device (IED) technologies, especially electronic countermeasures to radio control initiated devices; tactical persistent surveillance in support of ground operations, particularly prevention of IED emplacement; and technologies to counter indirect fires.

RAPID ACQUISITION AUTHORITY

The committee has long been concerned by the length of time required by the Department to acquire even comparatively simple technologies and equipment to meet warfighting needs. The recent conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, and particularly the evolution of the IED as a weapon of strategic influence, have illustrated the ability of an adaptive enemy to work to advantage inside a normal defense acquisition cycle. To ensure the prompt fielding of critical warfighting capabilities, the committee recommended, and Congress approved, section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375) granting to the Secretary of Defense a rapid acquisition authority. This authority specifically allows the Secretary to waive all federal acquisition regulations to eliminate capability deficiencies that have resulted in combat fatalities.

ADD-ON ARMOR

Immediately after the fall of Saddam Hussein's regime, the committee recognized the dire need to armor tactical vehicles used in convoys and combat patrols. Insurgents were using small arms, rocket propelled grenades, and improvised explosive devices IEDs to attack U.S. forces in unarmored tactical wheeled vehicles.

The committee visited Aberdeen Proving Ground to review testing of potential vehicle add-on armor solutions and assisted with

the establishment of a direct mechanism for receiving armor coupons from the commercial sector for immediate testing. After reviewing the Army's original production schedule, which called for completion of 7,000 high mobility multi-purpose wheeled vehicle (HMMWV) add-on armor kits by December, 2004, the committee determined that a best production effort could reach that objective no later than April 30, 2004. The committee sent a formal memo to the Army noting that arsenals, depots, industry, and steel mills were not operating at maximum capacity. Committee and Army teams visited U.S. steel mills and reached an agreement with management and union officials to voluntarily set aside commercial work and dedicate 100% capacity to vehicle add-on armor plate production. Through on-site visits using a hands-on approach, the committee was active in the resolution of other problems affecting the delivery schedule.

The original Army installation plan required the cycling of vehicles from Iraq into Kuwait for add-on armor kit installation. The committee determined that U.S. production would outpace installation capability in Kuwait, and issued a memo to the Army's Tank-Automotive and Armaments Command suggesting that 11 sites be opened in Iraq to install HMMWV and tactical truck add-on armor kits. The Army adopted the committee's recommendation, greatly enhancing kit installation capacity.

Ultimately, as a direct result of committee efforts, the Army completed 6,670 HMMWV add-on armor kits one week late to the committee's best production effort schedule, but eight months ahead of the original Army schedule.

In February 2005, the committee met with senior DOD staff and Marine Corps officials to discuss a potential interim solution for underbody add-on armor kits to mitigate an intensifying stacked mine threat to Marines engaged in combat operations in Iraq. In April the committee learned that the Marine Corps was proceeding down a path for underbody armor protection that would take considerable time to deploy. The committee located readily available excess 3/8th inch armor panels at an Army Materiel Command depot in Kuwait, recommending their use in an in-theater fabricated interim solution to the HMMWV underbody protection requirement.

Largely as a result of committee leadership, Congress authorized and appropriated over \$3.0 billion for vehicle add-on armor between fiscal years 2004 and 2007.

GUN TRUCK

At the encouragement of the committee, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency teamed to produce a relatively low-cost, up-armor kit to convert 5-ton tactical trucks to "gun trucks" for use as convoy security vehicles and for other defensive missions. The larger cargo capacity of the 5-ton trucks allows for heavier armor and therefore better protection than is possible with lighter vehicles. There are currently 112 of these gun trucks in Iraq and Afghanistan serving multiple missions and protecting U.S. forces.

STRYKER STEEL

During a time when troops in Iraq were using mild steel and even plywood to armor their tactical trucks, the committee located a supply of military specification armor steel plate left over from Stryker production stored at a steel mill. At the committee's insistence, the armor plate was procured, and half of the armor plates were shipped to the Marine Corps to be converted into an armor shield for gunner's turrets and the other half were delivered to the Army to be converted into armored box kits for protecting soldiers transported by 5-ton trucks.

GUNNER PROTECTION KITS

Early versions of gunner's armor shields were made entirely from opaque armor and did not provide adequate protection from IED attack. The committee strongly encouraged both the Marine Corps and the Army to develop improved Gunner's Protection Kits (GPK) which incorporated transparent armor. The transparent armor allows gunners to maintain situational awareness while protected from IED and small arms attack. The Marines are currently fielding a GPK called Marine Corps transparent armor gun shield and the Army is about to start producing an upgraded GPK. Both systems incorporate several panels of transparent armor.

FRAG KIT PRODUCTION

Both the Army and the Marine Corps have recognized the need to further upgrade factory up-armored HMMWVs (UAH) to a threshold level of protection, and have developed add-on armor kits ("frag kits") for this purpose. However, the schedule for producing and installing these upgrade kits was not acceptable and the committee strongly encouraged the two departments to accelerate production of objective kits, and to continue to produce interim armor kits to provide added protection until objective kits could be installed.

As a result of committee efforts, 1,300 additional UAH interim door kits were produced. In addition, the schedule for fielding of the Marine Corps's objective door kits was accelerated from February 2007, to December 2006. The schedule for fielding the Army's M1151 objective door kits was accelerated from July 2007, to April 2007. And the schedule for fielding the Army's M1114 objective door kits was accelerated from June 2007, to March 2007. The committee continues to work with both departments to further accelerate production.

REDEFINITION OF ARMOR PROTECTION LEVELS

The efforts to quickly armor tactical vehicles resulted in three basic methods of installing armor, including: armor integrated into the vehicle on the assembly line; armor added as a DOD-approved kit specifically designed for a particular vehicle; and armor added in the field. These three methods of armor installation were designated Levels I, II, and III, respectively. Although these levels only refer to the method of armor installation, they are generally viewed as defining level of crew protection with I being the greatest and III being the least. After careful review of all the tactical vehi-

cles and their true armor protection level, the committee found that the levels as currently defined do not necessarily indicate a level of protection.

The committee has strongly advocated the development of new definitions for armor protection level and has provided suggestions on how this might be done. The Joint Staff is working on these new definitions and expects to complete them by early 2007. The committee continues to encourage the Joint Staff to move faster so that commanders and their troops understand the true level of protection offered by myriad armor configurations present in the force.

VEHICLE USE POLICY

In conjunction with committee efforts on redefinition of armor protection levels, the committee has strongly encouraged the Secretary of Defense to promulgate policies restricting tactical vehicles to use on secure military operating bases unless those vehicles meet a threshold level of armor protection. The committee remains concerned that there are many thinly armored vehicles in theater, and that these should either be upgraded to the threshold level or not be used outside of secure bases. The Department is considering the implementation of such a policy in early 2007.

BODY ARMOR

Under intense committee scrutiny, by April 2004, initial shortfalls in body armor were resolved and all DOD civilians and military personnel in Iraq had been issued interceptor body armor and small arms protective inserts (SAPI). The committee continued its intensive oversight of personal armor programs throughout the 109th Congress, advocating in 2005 for replacement of SAPI with an enhanced version capable of defeating more challenging ballistic threats, and in 2006 for accelerated production of enhanced side SAPI plates to protect vulnerable torso areas.

In the area of head protection, a Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing was followed by the Marine Corps' adoption of the padded combat helmet suspension system already in use by the Army, which provides ballistic protection equivalent to the legacy sling suspension system and better blunt trauma survivability.

NEW BODY ARMOR TECHNOLOGIES

The committee maintains strong interest in new developments that could lead to significant improvements in body armor. The committee closely followed and encouraged Army testing of alternative flexible body armor systems. Although the Army determined that alternatives do not meet current body armor requirements, they appear to offer some advantages for specialty use. The committee also followed vendor development and encouraged Army testing of mosaic tile body armor. The initial test results have been favorable and this technology may offer the next advancement in personnel armor.

MANNED SURVEILLANCE AIRCRAFT

During a January 2004, congressional delegation to Iraq, the committee observed the need for persistent surveillance of roads and other locations where IED attacks against U.S. forces occur frequently. From that time to present the committee has promoted a “take back the roads” campaign which encourages the Department to provide tactical persistent surveillance platforms coupled with quick reaction forces to neutralize IED emplacements. In early 2006, the Army responded to this call from the committee by establishing Task Force ODIN, which comprises a specialized Army aviation battalion equipped with airborne reconnaissance multi-sensor (ARMS) manned surveillance aircraft and Warrior Alpha unmanned aerial vehicles for tactical use in countering the IED threat. The Army is also sending medium altitude reconnaissance and surveillance system (MARSS) manned aircraft to theater in advance of the ARMS aircraft to provide an interim capability. Though well intended, the schedule for deploying both MARSS and ARMS has slipped significantly. To fill the gap left by these delays, the committee has since July, 2006, advocated the redeployment of two Airborne Reconnaissance Low (ARL) aircraft from U.S. Southern Command, where they were seeing little use, to U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), where they could be used to patrol the roads in Iraq. One of the ARL aircraft has been redeployed.

The committee has further planned for the time when the primary responsibility for security in Iraq falls to the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) and understands that the ISF will need some airborne surveillance capability for that mission. Many of the surveillance platforms that the committee has promoted for use in Iraq can be left behind for the ISF, and the committee has investigated contractor support for this activity, conveying the results to the Army.

Although not included in the budget request, the committee provided \$100.0 million in title XV of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) to support tactical persistent surveillance programs.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM

The committee ascertained during briefings and Congressional delegation oversight visits to Iraq that the joint surveillance target attack radar system (JSTARS) platform was not optimally employed when used as a communications relay platform, a role other aircraft are equipped to perform. The committee believed this adversely impacted the ability of the combined forces air component commander to wholly support Army and Marine Corps ground component commanders’ requests for ground moving target indicator capability using this platform. The committee was further troubled that no formal process existed to analyze or assess JSTARS post-mission intelligence data. Lastly, the committee became aware that a JSTARS mission-crew shortfall existed, and that without fully manning 24 combat coded mission-crews, JSTARS was unable to perform at surge-rate operational tempos for extended periods of time.

The committee strongly urged the CENTCOM combatant commander to reassess the prioritization of missions assigned to the

JSTARS platform, and directed the Secretary of the Air Force to implement formal procedures to analyze JSTARS post-mission intelligence data to more effectively support the warfighter at all levels. The committee authorized an increase of 85 active guard and reserve (AGR) positions for the Air National Guard, and encouraged the Secretary of the Air Force to program the required funding in the Air Force Future Years Defense Program to convert the remaining 107 part-time positions to AGR positions.

AEROSTATS

Based on the success of the persistent threat detection system (PTDS) at the Baghdad International Airport, the committee has encouraged the deployment of additional aerostat systems with upgraded equipment to help reduce the “sensor-to-shooter” time after detection of a threat. At present, there are six new PTDS systems being produced for deployment to both Iraq and Afghanistan.

GROUND SURVEILLANCE

In addition to air surveillance platforms, the committee promoted the use of ground-based overt and covert camera surveillance systems of the types used with great success in high-crime areas of large U.S. cities. As a direct result of committee encouragement, a system was deployed in Baghdad by the Army and has proven very useful in thwarting insurgent activities. The Marine Corps selected another portable remote surveillance system called the Tactical Concealed Video System and have procured at least five of these systems for deployment at the end of 2006.

ELECTRONIC COUNTERMEASURES

Radio-control initiated IEDs (RCIED) have emerged as the most lethal threat to coalition forces deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan, currently accounting for more than half of all combat deaths. Although extensive effort had gone into protecting military personnel in vehicles by the spring of 2005, far less had been accomplished to protect dismounted troops. In early 2005, the committee identified a lightweight dismounted Counter RCIED Electronic Warfare (CREW) technology capable of suppressing threats commonly encountered in urban areas. Largely due to intensive committee oversight, this CREW system, designated Warlock Blue, was designed, tested and manufactured, with production deliveries to the Department commencing 33 days after initial contract award in June 2005. The 8000th production unit was shipped in August 2005, only 70 days after contract award and 6 months ahead of the Department's original delivery schedule. This uncharacteristic production and deployment timeline was enabled in part by the first use of the rapid acquisition authority granted to the Secretary under section 811 of the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108-375), and in part by direct participation of the committee in identifying vendors with prototyping and production capacity sufficient to meet an accelerated schedule.

Recognizing that deficiencies still existed, in August 2005, the committee initiated efforts to ensure the fielding of more capable

dismounted CREW technologies to combat the evolving threat. Again largely due to intensive committee oversight, in April 2006, the Navy initiated a Quick Reaction—Dismounted (QRD) acquisition effort under the rapid acquisition authority. In September 2006, the Navy announced a CREW QRD source selection decision, awarding a base contract for an initial quantity of 1400 Guardian dismounted systems, with delivery to complete by early February 2007. Guardian will provide a “backpackable” capability to suppress all known RCIEDs.

Concurrent with the CREW QRD acquisition effort, the committee pressed for further evolution of vehicle mounted CREW systems to correct capability deficiencies in currently deployed systems. In June 2006, the Navy initiated the CREW 2.1 acquisition effort. Source selection testing completed in December 2006, and production contract award is scheduled for January 2007.

Although not included in the budget request, the committee provided \$109.7 million in title XV of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) for acquisition and deployment of dismounted and mounted CREW systems. Section 1403 of the Act further requires that the Secretary take such steps as are necessary to ensure that, by the end of fiscal year 2007, CREW systems protect all U.S. military wheeled vehicles operating outside of secure military bases.

JIEDDO REPORTING

The committee has exercised extensive oversight of the Joint IED Defeat Organization (JIEDDO) and its institutional predecessor, the Joint IED Defeat Task Force. The JIEDDO was formally established as a permanent organization by the Deputy Secretary of Defense in January 2006, to lead and coordinate all DOD efforts to defeat improvised explosive devices as weapons of strategic influence. The committee has strongly supported the IED defeat effort, but grew concerned about its ability to oversee the execution of funds entrusted to JIEDDO. The committee understood the need for flexibility, security, and expeditious action to counter the rapidly evolving IED threat. However, at almost \$3.6 billion for fiscal year 2006, JIEDDO funding was completely “off-budget” with none of the justification materials normally available to Congress for a program of such size and importance. The committee was also aware of other Department efforts to defeat the IED threat. Consequently, the committee included section 1402 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364), which established a quarterly reporting requirement on the status of the threat and efforts undertaken to defeat it.

COUNTER-ROCKETS, ARTILLERY AND MORTARS

The committee’s strong commitment to the adaptation, further development, and testing of certain air defense artillery technologies to combat rocket and mortar fire led to deployment of an operational capability to defeat these threats for the first time in history.

SPECIAL STUDIES

The committee engaged in other special studies and oversight activities that crossed formal subcommittee jurisdiction.

UNIT READINESS STUDY

From February 2005 through the end of the 109th Congress, the committee conducted an extensive study on unit readiness in relation to Operation Iraqi Freedom. Designed to provide insight into the readiness challenges facing Army and Marine Corps units and personnel, this ongoing study focuses on pre-deployment activities such as training, logistics planning, and family preparations. Over several months, committee staff periodically embedded with one Army battalion and one Marine Corps battalion as they prepared for deployment to Iraq. Close observation revealed the development of individual and collective skills throughout the training process, as well as improved preparedness in areas such as medical, family, and logistical readiness. During the units' deployments, staff continued to monitor their status via correspondence, classified data, media accounts, and a staff delegation to Iraq. With the battalions' recent redeployment to the United States, the staff continues to receive information on the units' operational experiences and "lessons learned."

RETURNING UNITS STUDY

In March 2006, the committee commenced a systematic study of Army and Marine Corps units (active, reserve, and Guard) returning from Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The intent of this study is to collect information regarding units' deployment and operational experiences through multiple, standard interviews of enlisted personnel and officers from battalions that have recently returned from theater. This study is ongoing, and no conclusions or reports have been formulated.

IN LIEU OF FORCES

The need for additional military personnel to support ground force troop rotations has led to the deployment in significant numbers of Air Force and Navy "in lieu of" forces. The committee spent considerable time examining the training and use of these airmen and sailors to provide temporary augmentation in nontraditional combat environments around the globe. This oversight is ongoing.

OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM AND OPERATION ENDURING FREEDOM
OVERSIGHT TEAM EFFORT

At the beginning of the 109th Congress, the chairman temporarily reorganized the committee staff into "oversight teams" and directed an extensive evaluation of key issue areas pertinent to combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The oversight teams identified issue areas having the potential for prompt benefit from committee review and involvement. The issue areas were: vehicle armor protection, IED jammers, tactical surveillance, ammunition, tactical weapons availability, counter-rocket/mortar, contractor operations on the battlefield, care for wounded and injured, post sepa-

ration support for wounded and injured service members and their family members and survivors, training of Iraqi security forces, active and reserve components' ability to sustain rotation requirements, configurations of units deploying, resetting the force, and the Joint Rapid Action Cell. Oversight teams were encouraged to "get out in the field" and "walk the lines". The activities of these teams, which included actions such as site visits of production facilities, interviews with service members, and reviews of DOD regulations and military doctrine, led to a number of actions during the 109th Congress. In many cases, the efforts of these oversight teams raised awareness in the Department and defense industry of many pressing war-related issues, instigated internal DOD review of the Department's policies or programs, spawned new committee oversight activities on related matters, or influenced committee legislative action throughout fiscal years 2006 and 2007. Examples of some of the teams' activities follow.

The oversight team charged with investigating vehicle armor protection continued from the 108th Congress the committee's aggressive oversight activities of the Department's add-on armor program for tactical wheeled vehicles. To evaluate if maximum effort and productivity were achieved in providing add-on armor kit solutions to OIF and OEF, the team engaged in activities that included, but were not limited to: multiple oversight delegations to the prime contractor for the UAH; the primary arsenals and depots responsible for fabricating light tactical vehicle add-on armor solutions; the prime contractors producing add-on armor solutions for medium and heavy tactical wheeled vehicles; the Aberdeen Proving Grounds to observe test and evaluation procedures of add-on armor solutions as well as discuss and analyze lessons learned regarding the performance of existing add-on armor solutions in OIF and OEF; and the primary U.S. steel mill that produced the majority of armor plates. The team received weekly and monthly armor summaries from the Army and Marine Corps and maintained direct links to U.S. industry and the U.S. steel industry in helping to provide better visibility into current and future add-on armor requirements. Activities also resulted in several hearings that addressed vehicle add-on armor concerns for medium and heavy tactical vehicles as well as underbody armor protection for Marine Corps light tactical vehicles. The activities of this team also helped the committee to adequately address funding requirements for armor solutions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (109-364). During the 109th Congress, the committee provided an additional \$1.47 billion for add-on armor solutions. Also, the committee noted the importance of a long term, sustained armoring strategy that would utilize an "A Kit"/"B Kit" construct allowing for maximum protection and flexibility in combat and non-combat situations.

The ammunition oversight team was created with the primary mission of better understanding conventional ammunition requirements, production rates and sustainability of production for current usage levels and determine best course of actions for meeting new requirements for small and medium caliber ammunition. The overall approach was review of inventory requirements, war reserves,

consumption rates, production rates, and abilities to deliver critical war related materials in quantity, quality, and in the time frame required by the warfighter. The team traveled to the Lake City Army Ammunition Plant, the Radford Army Ammunition Plant, and the Holston Army Ammunition Plant to meet with officials and observe and determine current capabilities of these plants and requirements for production base upgrades. Meetings and conference calls were also conducted by the team with other experts and suppliers within the ammunition community including such organizations as the Office of Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), the Joint Munitions Command, the Joint Staff, the Army, the Marine Corps, Munitions Industrial Base Task Force, and industry. The activities of the team followed up on previous committee actions taken during the 108th Congress such as a June 2004 hearing that addressed whether or not a shortage in small-caliber ammunition existed for OIF and OEF. The team provided information to the committee that determined no such shortage had prevented military personnel from being able to conduct their mission. The team continues to work with the Army to help create better methodology for tracking current conventional ammunition inventory. The services now provide to the committee annually an inventory matrix that denotes previous year expenditures and current year requirements. The committee during the 109th Congress authorized an additional \$245.6 million over the President's budget requests for ammunition industrial base upgrades and small-caliber ammunition production.

The tactical weapon shortfall oversight team was created with the primary mission to better understand current usage and OIF and OEF theater requirements for crew served weapons as well as primary and secondary small arms. The team specifically analyzed the current inventoried stock of M2 .50 caliber crew served weapons. M2s were no longer in production but were being used extensively and to great effect in OIF and OEF. Operational needs statements (ONS) continued to be generated in theater. As such, the team traveled to the Anniston Army Depot, the depot responsible for all small arms and crew served weapon refurbishment activity for the U.S. military, including the M2, in order to ascertain whether or not a shortage existed for small arms and crew served weapons. The team walked the production lines at Anniston Army depot and observed the M2 .50 caliber refurbishment program. The team found that Anniston Army Depot and the prime contractor had substantial capability to increase production and address any M2 requirements as well as determined that all in theater validated requirements were being fulfilled expediently. In addition to field travel the team met with officials representing the Program Executive Office—Soldier, the organization responsible for small arms acquisition and program management in the Army, officials from the Marine Corps, and industry in order to better understand current and future small arms acquisition strategy and capability. Activities led to even greater scrutiny of the Army's Objective Individual Combat Weapon, Increment One program; the program originally planned to replace all primary small arms for the Army such as the M4 carbine and M16 rifle. The committee during the 109th Congress provided \$538.4 million for small arms and modi-

fications, in particular, providing \$20.0 million for quick change barrel kits for the M2, a critical aspect to the .50 caliber refurbishment program. The team continues to monitor new efforts such as the M240 medium machine gun conversion program.

The team assembled to evaluate DOD policy for contractors operating on the battlefield examined issues such as force protection for civilian contractors, contractors' use of personal weapons, the role of private security companies, and the impact of these civilians on combatant commanders' operations. Through more than 35 briefings with DOD agencies and subordinate activities, private companies, and trade groups responsible for aspects of contractor operations, the team gathered a multitude of information, enabling the committee to call for clarification and expansion of DOD guidance for contractors. The committee introduced legislation in fiscal year 2006 that would have taken steps to clarify and regulate the growing sector of contractors that are present during military operations.

A team assembled to understand the configuration of units deploying in OIF 04–06, how this configuration differs from OIF II and how these units compare to the new modular brigade configuration. Particular attention was paid to the Army's ongoing transformation to modularity while executing ongoing combat operations. The team examined the tables of organization and equipment for both a theoretical and actual deploying modular brigade. The team received briefings on the subject from the Joint Staff and Army G–3.

The Joint Rapid Action Cell team assembled to understand the implementation of "rapid acquisition authority," as created in the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–314) and modified in the Ronald W. Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 (Public Law 108–375). The team was concerned that after 18 months of authority, the Department of Defense had only used the rapid acquisition authority twice. The JRAC is a new organization within the Department designed to increase the velocity of the acquisition system in meeting urgent requirements from the combatant commander. The team received briefings from various DOD officials including the Director of the Joint Rapid Acquisition Cell and the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy.

The committee pursued two closely aligned oversight projects involving the care and support provided to wounded and injured military personnel and their families (1) during their active duty service and (2) during their transition from active duty into their post separation lives. The later project also examined the programs designed to support the surviving family members of those who die in the theater of operations.

The two teams began their examination of the issues with over 40 formal meetings in the months just preceding and following the inauguration of the 109th Congress and remained actively engaged throughout the 109th Congress. The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on the care of injured and wounded service members early in the 109th Congress. The oversight process involved extensive travel to Department of Defense and other governmental activities, in-office research, and informational briefings

from the Department, other governmental agencies, and private sector organizations. The teams examined the following issues:

(1) Adequacy of medical treatment and support with special attention paid to mental health services.

(2) Effectiveness and efficiency of the medical holdover system.

(3) Identification and resolution of problems encountered by wounded and injured members and their families with particular attention paid to reservists.

(4) Effectiveness of new programs operated by the military services to assist severely disabled service members and their families.

(5) Fairness and effectiveness of physical disability evaluation system.

(6) Effectiveness and efficiency of Department of Defense, Department of Veterans Affairs, and Department of Labor programs intended to provide a seamless transition for wounded and injured service members and families and survivors of deceased members.

(7) Scope and nature of the services and resources available to wounded and injured service members and families and survivors of deceased members from the Department of Defense, other governmental agencies, and the private sector and the ability of the Department of Defense to integrate and coordinate access to those services and resources.

The two oversight projects resulted in the following legislation being enacted during the 109th Congress:

(1) The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) included the following provisions:

a. Authority for members to participate in the Paralympic Games.

b. Assessment and standardization of policy and procedures involved in providing assistance to survivors of casualties.

c. Assessment and standardization of policy and procedures involved in providing assistance to severely wounded service members.

d. Requirement for members to designate persons to direct the disposition of remains should they become a casualty.

e. Prohibition against charging the cost of meals to hospitalized wounded and injured members.

f. Increase in the length of time that surviving family members may remain in government housing or receive housing allowances.

g. Transitional pay for hospitalized wounded and injured members.

h. Increase in the length of time provided to surviving family members to make a final home of selection.

i. Authority to provide travel and transportation allowances to families visiting hospitalized members.

j. Increase in death gratuity provided to survivors of members who die on active duty.

(2) The John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364) included the following provisions:

- a. Authority for members to retain assistive technology and devices after separation from active duty.
- b. Enhanced guidelines for the proper transportation of remains to burial sites.
- c. Standards and guidelines for the establishment of a severely injured center by the Secretary of Defense.
- d. Comprehensive review of DOD mortuary affairs procedures.
- e. Requirement to deploy personnel trained in techniques to better preserve remains under combat conditions.
- f. Reform of Physical Evaluation Board policy and procedures to improve fairness and efficiency.
- g. Inclusion of military members in the policy to provide continued housing allowances at increased rates to spouses of members who die while serving on active duty.
- h. Inclusion of military members in the policy to provide travel and transportation allowances to family members visiting wounded and injured service members.
- i. Correction of effective date to retroactively provide certain Survivor Benefit Plan annuities to all surviving family members of members who died on active duty during the global war on terrorism.

In addition to the above legislative initiatives, the committee devoted considerable effort to oversight of the support provided wounded and injured service members and their families at Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda. The effort focused not only on the overall functioning of the patient support systems, but also in resolving the specific problems related to housing, pay, benefits, and care arising for military personnel and their families.

As of the end of the 109th Congress, committee staff has conducted seventy nine visits to Walter Reed Army Medical Center and more than sixty visits to the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda interviewing an average of five severely injured or wounded service members each visit and many of their visiting family members. This effort prompted more than twenty case inquiries concerning pay, accommodations, and patient support systems. Significant effort was also devoted to making direct contact with severely injured service members following their hospitalization to assist in their transition to civilian life including guidance and support toward career, education and financial recovery.

Formal staff visits to three of the four Veterans Administration Poly-trauma Centers (Minneapolis, Minnesota; Tampa, Florida; and Richmond, Virginia), together with individual case inquiries from the remaining facility at Palo Alto, California, prompted committee interest in the establishment of Fisher House facilities near the California and Virginia centers. These facilities are currently in the development process. The extended care of military traumatic brain and spinal cord patients at the Poly-trauma Centers is facilitated by participation of family members in their therapy.

Committee staff coordinated closely with the Department of Labor to establish on-site employment specialists at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center and the National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda. These specialists will be readily available for preliminary consultations with wounded service members and their spouses concerning employment plans and objectives. This effort included collecting and tracking skills and interest data, resume preparation, and research into career opportunities at or near their homes.

On December 5, 2006, the House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 1070, a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that Members of the House should actively engage with employers and the American public at large to encourage the hiring of members and former members of the armed forces who were wounded in service and are facing a transition to civilian life. The resolution was sponsored by Chairman Duncan Hunter and included a provision to eliminate any perception of inappropriate conduct by Members of the House when they contact private sector and government employers to provide job search and hiring assistance to wounded service members.

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

BUDGET ACTIVITY

On March 3, 2003, the committee forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal year 2006 to the Committee on the Budget. The Committee noted that our security and defense environment is rapidly changing and in flux. The daily headlines out of Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran or North Korea reflect the unpredictable security climate we faced. At the same time, our armed forces were experiencing the most severe challenges and demands that have been placed on them in decades. Our military—a critical component of our national security structure—was undergoing sweeping and fundamental change while simultaneously carrying most of the free world's burden in the global war on terrorism. Unfortunately, despite a concerted effort to improve modernization and investment funding, our forces today rely on heavily-used and rapidly aging equipment. Continued operations in Iraq and Afghanistan require our critical warfighting systems to be used at significantly higher rates (for some by a factor of 5 to 10 times) than expected under peacetime conditions. Critical equipment is aging quickly. For example: our bomber fleet, which has been so successful in recent operations, is on average 29 years old; our Marine helicopters and ground combat vehicles are on average 24.7 and 15.2 years old, respectively; and our Army helicopters and ground combat vehicles are on average 18.5 and 14.3 years old. All of these weapons systems are either at or past their projected half-life. Clearly, our defense capability will erode if we continue to rely on aged equipment. Against this backdrop, the President submitted a defense budget request of \$419.3 billion for Fiscal Year 2006, an increase of \$19.2 billion over the budget authority appropriated for Fiscal Year 2005. However, the Committee noted that even with this proposed increase, defense spending would amount to a far lower percentage of the nation's gross domestic product (GDP) than it did 20 years ago—a projected 4.3 percent in 2005 compared to 6.0 percent in 1985. While the annual defense budget should not be solely determined by an arbitrary percentage of GDP, it does serve as a useful measure of the relative means available to the nation to properly fund the national defense function. Thus, for a nation at war, the committee believes that defense spending remains relatively low. Between Fiscal Years 2000 and 2005, equipment modernization funding has increased by an average of 7.2 percent annually. However, the President's budget request proposes to increase modernization accounts by less than one-half of one percent relative to Fiscal Year 2005. Further, the Fiscal Year 2006 Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP) reduces modernization funding between Fiscal Year 2006 and 2009 by \$12.9 billion. Therefore, the committee proposed that additional funding be

provided over this period in order to sustain the needed pace of modernization of our military forces. It is also important to note the President's budget request proposed to continue the practice of deferring funding for significant elements of the base defense program until future supplemental appropriations requests. As expected, and in keeping with historical practice, the budget request did not include the costs of conducting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Committee was also concerned, however, that the proposed budget provided no funding for additional Congressionally mandated military personnel end strength increases, Army transformation, force protection initiatives and other critical activities. Thus, the combination of this strategy of deferred program funding and the expected costs resulting from continued operations in the global war on terrorism required the Committee to insist that the Budget Resolution contain a contingency fund mechanism that would allow the defense authorization and appropriations process to pursue an appropriate level of "bridge" funding for the initial quarters of Fiscal Year 2006. Finally, the Administration included in the Fiscal Year 2005 supplemental request a proposal to increase the benefits afforded to the survivors of military members. The proposal had three components. First, it provided an increase in the death gratuity from \$12,420 to \$100,000 for deaths incurred in designated combat zones. Second, it provided an increase in the maximum amount of Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) from \$250,000 to \$400,000 for service members. Third, it provided \$238,000 in retroactive payments to surviving family members of combat deaths occurring on or after October 7, 2001. The Committee requested the necessary discretionary and mandatory spending increases in the military personnel accounts to provide increases in the death gratuity and SGLI payments for military deaths.

On March 3, 2006, the Committee forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal year 2007 to the Committee on the Budget. By way of background, during the fall of 2005, the committee initiated a comprehensive study of the Department of Defense's ability to secure our national defense over the next 25 years. The "Committee Defense Review" (CDR) brought together members of the committee to receive testimony from experts in the government, academia and the private sector. This independent review, conducted in parallel with the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review, addressed the threats facing the United States and gaps in our current capabilities. Given the environment our nation is in today, the Committee noted that it had serious concerns that the base budget for Fiscal Year 2007 was inadequate to support non-deployed programs not directly involved in the day-to-day operations of the global war on terrorism. In conjunction with the CDR initiative, and based on our hearings and briefings from the Department of Defense and Department of Energy, the budget request presented Congress with the following challenges:

- (1) \$10.0 billion short for the minimum requirements for training and maintenance;
- (2) \$5.0 billion needed to avoid delays in procuring necessary weapon systems;

(3) \$25.0 billion to fund the initial reset requirements of our deployed equipment;

(4) \$4.6 billion for military end strength and TRICARE requirements;

(5) \$45.0 million in mandatory authority for shortfalls in death gratuity benefits;

(6) \$600.0 million in mandatory authority for new overseas housing; and

(7) \$500.0 million in mandatory authority to extend the maximum lease term permitted for family housing in foreign nations.

The Committee did not make these observations lightly. Against the current President's budget request, three observations needed to be made about the proposed Fiscal Year 2007 budget request: (1) there is virtually no growth in the defense budget from Fiscal Year 2006, (2) defense spending is low compared to the 1980s, and (3) Congressionally mandated savings and personnel spending over the past five years are eroding our training and investment account. The President submitted a budget request for national defense budget function (050) of \$513.0 billion for Fiscal Year 2007.

The discretionary budget request for the Department of Defense includes two distinct elements. First, \$439.3 billion for military forces not deployed in the global war on terrorism. This funding baseline request represented an increase of \$28.5 billion over the budget authority appropriated to the Department of Defense last year for non-global war on terrorism accounts. To the casual observer this 7 percent increase would seem to be a robust boost to our national defense capabilities. Unfortunately, this growth can be attributed to three things:

(1) \$11.4 billion covers annual inflation and pay raises;

(2) \$3.0 billion finances increased fuel costs; and

(3) \$4.1 billion funds Base Realignment and Closure initiatives.

Of the remaining \$10.0 billion increase for traditional military programs and procurement, close to one-half supported the implementation of the Army modularity program this fiscal year. Aside from Army modularity, the remaining critical investment, personnel, training and maintenance accounts only experienced a \$5.0 billion increase—which translates into 1.2 percent growth over Fiscal Year 2006. For the first time this year, the President requested \$50.0 billion for estimated future emergency spending for the global war on terrorism. This is a significant step in fiscal responsibility. Until now, the global war on terrorism was funded outside the traditional budget. Therefore, it was not included in the formal calculation of the federal government's annual liabilities. By including the \$50.0 billion in the budget request, this represents an important step towards accurately budgeting for our nation's defense. It is important to note that even with funding of \$513.0 billion, defense spending amounts to a far lower percentage of the nation's gross domestic product (GDP) than it did twenty years ago—projected 4.0 percent in 2007 compared to 6 percent in 1985. While the annual defense budget should not be solely determined by an arbitrary percentage of GDP, it does serve as a useful measure of the relative means available to the nation to properly fund the national

defense function. Another comparison that perhaps is a better metric is the percentage of discretionary budget authority spent on Department of Defense (function 051) in relation to the total federal discretionary budget request. In 1985, the Department of Defense discretionary budget authority was 62.9 percent of the total federal discretionary budget. In 1986, that amount grew to 64.4 percent. In contrast, this year's Department of Defense discretionary budget authority is only 53 percent of the total discretionary budget. Thus, for a nation at war, the funding for our national defense remains relatively low. To return spending on our nation's defense to 6 percent of GDP, the amount required would translate to \$734.0 billion for Fiscal Year 2007. Similarly, if we were to fund the Department of Defense at 62.9 percent of the \$923 billion federal discretionary budget authority requested for Fiscal Year 2007, the total discretionary budget request for function 050 would be \$580.6 billion. The Committee further noted that while the Department faced rising health care costs, fuel costs and inflation, as well as congressionally imposed budget caps, the most severe budget challenges were found in the operation and maintenance accounts. Currently, all the services are funded well below the levels required to conduct the minimal training necessary to maintain adequate military readiness. For example, the shortfalls in Fiscal Year 2007 budget request were as follows:

(1) Navy funds only 36 steaming days a quarter versus required 51 steaming days per quarter;

(2) Army funds 615 tank miles a year versus combined arms training strategy requirement of 899 miles;

(3) Army funds 11.6 helicopter flying hours per month versus 14.5 hours helicopter flying hours per month;

(4) Marine Corps funds 88 percent of the combat ready days—equipment and training requirement; and

(5) Air Force funds 98 percent of the flying hour training requirement while mission capable rates are scheduled to fall to 75 percent for the first time since 1998.

(6) In the Fiscal Year 2006 FYDP, the services anticipated receiving \$154.7 billion for operation and maintenance programs in Fiscal Year 2007. Instead, this year's request is \$152.0 billion—a \$2.7 billion reduction. Combined with the \$4.0 billion in price growth due to inflation and the \$3.0 billion in price growth due to rising fuel costs, the budget request would actually reduce critical training and maintenance programs by close to \$10.0 billion. With respect to procurement and despite a concerted effort to improve modernization and investment funding, the budget request deferred critical weapon systems by pushing procurement quantities over the next 5 years—increasing cost and delaying acquisition.

On the procurement side of the ledger, the services were scheduled in the 2006 FYDP, to receive \$91.6 billion for procurement programs in Fiscal Year 2007. Instead, this year's request was \$84.2 billion for those accounts—a \$7.4 billion reduction. While some of these funds were transferred to Research, Development, Test and Evaluation accounts, the procurement accounts experienced a \$5.0 billion reduction from last year.

Finally, the Army and Marine Corps estimated that a large percentage of equipment currently operating in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom will be unserviceable at the conclusion of these campaigns. The Army and Marine Corps are confronted with the challenging task of “resetting” their forces, restoring heavily used operating equipment to combat readiness and replacing worn out equipment. The initial cost estimates for Army and Marine Corps equipment reset are close to \$50.0 billion. Given the rising costs of current and future modernization programs and the ongoing global war on terrorism, the Committee believes that the Army and Marine Corps’ ability to properly resource equipment reset is in jeopardy. The sheer size of the unfunded reset bill is starting to impact future force development. Last year the Army testified that with the funding projected in the FYDP they could field between 77 to 82 Brigade Combat Teams. Yet, in less than one year, the Army plan has been modified develop only 70 Brigade Combat Teams in order to fit within the proposed budget this year.

The Committee has a responsibility to consider funding the reset of our critical warfighting capability. Equipment reset is critical to maintaining warfighting capability. Accordingly, we believe the services have an immediate requirement of \$25.0 billion for equipment reset. The budget request contained legislative proposals designed to contain the cost of military health care by substantially increasing the out-of-pocket costs for military retirees under age 65 and their families. Those proposals would also increase the pharmacy co-payments for all beneficiaries—active duty members, retirees, Medicare-eligibles and their families. In anticipation of enactment of this legislation, the budget request reduces the Defense Health Program by \$735.0 million—the amount of savings estimated by the Department that results from increased beneficiary cost shares. The committee believed that these proposals depend too exclusively on increasing cost shares and believes that no action should be taken in Fiscal Year 2007 until a full review of additional cost control options is completed. Circumventing Congressional oversight by quickly implementing fundamental changes to a highly viable medical benefit is not keeping the promise to the sailors, soldiers, airmen and Marines that serve our country. The Committee was concerned that the proposed budget did not provide funding for the additional 34,000 military personnel end strength congressionally mandated for the active components of the Army and Marine Corps. The budget request also funded Army National Guard end strength at 332,900, which was 17,100 below what was authorized in Fiscal Year 2006. The Committee had estimated the cost to fully fund the end strength for Fiscal Year 2007 was \$3.9 billion.

The President included a proposal to permit the sale of the remaining government-owned industrial commodities in the National Defense Stockpile that were not needed for national defense requirements. Furthermore, the proposal requested the receipts from these additional sales be deposited in the Treasury for deficit reduction. The savings identified in this proposal are \$1.0 million in Fiscal Year 2007 and \$299.0 million between Fiscal Year 2007 and Fiscal Year 2011. However, against the \$299.0 million in savings, the committee has identified three mandatory proposals totaling

more than \$1.1 billion that need immediate attention in Fiscal Year 2007.

First, the committee had identified the need for an amendment to the death gratuity provision in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) to ensure that 300 surviving families of members who died while on active duty after October 7, 2001, receive a retroactive \$150,000 payment. The payment was intended to compensate surviving families of both combat and non combat deaths for the increase in Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance (SGLI) that went into effect on September 1, 2005.

The death gratuity amendment would revise the effective date of section 664 to cover the benefit population from May 5, 2005 through August 31, 2005. The amendment would incur a one-time \$45.0 million mandatory spending cost. Accordingly, the committee requested \$45.0 million in mandatory spending to include the legislative authority to address this unintended lack of coverage in the death gratuity benefits.

Finally, the committee requested that an additional \$600.0 million be allocated in mandatory spending be allocated from Fiscal Year 2007 through Fiscal Year 2015 to accelerate rebasing plans and the acquisition of safe, secure housing for U.S. military personnel and their families stationed in the Republic of Korea. The Department is currently implementing a global integrated presence and basing strategy to ensure our military forces stationed overseas are adequately postured to meet emerging threats to our national security. In order to provide for the most efficient use of military resources, the committee wanted to provide the Department with legislative authorities which resulted in this mandatory increase to the obligation authority in the Fiscal Year 2007 budget.

FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

During the 109th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services held numerous hearings in accordance with its legislative and oversight roles. These hearings focused on areas including the budget of the Department of Defense (DOD) and the posture of the armed services, the global war on terrorism, detainee policy, the creation of military commissions to try those accused of illegal acts in the war on terrorism, force protection initiatives, national security concerns, acquisition reform, U.S. border security, and Department of Defense management and strategy. A full account of these hearings is below.

(H.A.S.C. 109-1; H.A.S.C. 109-2; H.A.S.C. 109-3; H.A.S.C. 109-4; H.A.S.C. 109-5; H.A.S.C. 109-6; H.A.S.C. 109-7; H.A.S.C. 109-31; H.A.S.C. 109-32; H.A.S.C. 109-33; H.A.S.C. 109-35; H.A.S.C. 109-36; H.A.S.C. 109-37; H.A.S.C. 109-38; H.A.S.C. 109-39; H.A.S.C. 109-48; H.A.S.C. 109-53; H.A.S.C. 109-57; H.A.S.C. 109-60; H.A.S.C. 109-63; H.A.S.C. 109-69; H.A.S.C. 109-79; H.A.S.C. 109-80; H.A.S.C. 109-81; H.A.S.C. 109-82; H.A.S.C. 109-87; H.A.S.C. 109-88; H.A.S.C. 109-92; H.A.S.C. 109-93; H.A.S.C. 109-95; H.A.S.C. 109-96; H.A.S.C. 109-97; H.A.S.C. 109-98; H.A.S.C. 109-99; H.A.S.C. 109-100; H.A.S.C. 109-101; H.A.S.C. 109-102; H.A.S.C. 109-103; H.A.S.C. 109-104; H.A.S.C. 109-105; H.A.S.C. 109-106; H.A.S.C. 109-107; H.A.S.C. 109-108; H.A.S.C. 109-109;

H.A.S.C. 109-110; H.A.S.C. 109-111; H.A.S.C. 109-112; H.A.S.C. 109-113; H.A.S.C. 109-114; H.A.S.C. 109-115; H.A.S.C. 109-116; H.A.S.C. 109-117; H.A.S.C. 109-118; H.A.S.C. 109-119; H.A.S.C. 109-120)

POSTURE AND BUDGET

During the 109th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services held multiple hearings on the posture, financial requirements, and status of the U.S. armed forces as they continue to fight the global war on terrorism to protect and defend the United States, her people, her interests, and her friends and allies around the world. These hearings, combined with the committee's responsibility for assembling the annual defense authorization bill, are the primary means by which it leads Congress in the latter's discharge of its Constitutional duties.

On February 9 and March 10, 2005, the committee convened a hearing with Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard B. Myers, USAF, to review the budget request for funding and authorities during fiscal year 2006. In addition to this hearing, the committee sought and received testimony from each of the services and several unified combatant commanders. On February 9, 2005, Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army; and the Chief of Staff of the Army, Peter J. Schoomaker, appeared before the committee to discuss their service's portion of the fiscal year 2006 budget request. They were followed on February 17th by Gordon England, Secretary of the Navy; Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Vernon E. Clark; and Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Michael W. Hagee, who testified on the budget as it related to the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps. The following month, Pete Teets, Acting Secretary of the Air Force; and Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General John P. Jumper, appeared before the committee to testify on the United States Air Force's portion of the fiscal year 2006 budget request.

In addition to the uniformed services, which are primarily responsible for training and equipping their respective forces, commanders of the unified combatant commands, who are in the chain of command, appeared before the committee to discuss the security situation in their respective areas of responsibility. These included General John Abizaid, USA, Commander of U.S. Central Command; and General Bryan D. Brown, USA, Commander of U.S. Special Operations Command on March 2, 2005. They were followed one week later by General James L. Jones, USMC, Commander of U.S. European Command; Admiral William J. Fallon, USN, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command; and General Bantz J. Craddock, USA, Commander of U.S. Southern Command on March 9, 2005.

During the second session of the 109th Congress in 2006, the committee continued its tradition of conducting intensive hearings in preparation of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2007. On February 8, 2006, the committee received testimony from Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense; General Peter Pace, USMC, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and General Peter J. Schoomaker, Chief of Staff of the Army, to review the

budget request for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 2007. On February 15, 2006, Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army; and General Peter J. Schoomaker, Chief of Staff of the Army, testified on the Army's portion of the fiscal year 2007 budget request. The committee continued its hearings on the budget request by inviting the senior leaders of the Department of the Air Force to appear before it on March 1, 2006, when Michael T. Wynne, Secretary of the Air Force, testified before the committee with General T. Michael Moseley, Chief of Staff of the Air Force. The committee concluded its uniformed service posture hearings that same day with a separate hearing when Donald C. Winter, Secretary of the Navy, testified before the committee with Admiral Michael G. Mullen, Chief of Naval Operations, and General Michael W. Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

After completing its hearings with the leadership of the uniformed services, the committee turned its attention to the combatant commands. On March 2, 2006, General Norton A. Schwartz, USAF, Commander of U.S. Transportation Command, testified before the committee along with General Duncan J. McNabb, USAF, Commander of Air Mobility Command, Vice Admiral David L. Brewer III, USN, Commander of Military Sealift Command, and Major General Charles W. Fletcher, USA, Commander of Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command. They were followed by geographic unified combatant commanders when on March 8, 2006, General James L. Jones, USMC, Commander of U.S. European Command testified before the committee. Admiral William J. Fallon, USN, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, and General B.B. Bell, USA, Commander of United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, U.S. Forces Korea, testified before the committee on March 9, 2006. General John Abizaid, USA, Commander of U.S. Central Command, testified before the committee on March 15, 2006. In the last posture hearing of the 109th Congress, on March 16, 2006, General Bantz J. Craddock, USA, Commander of U.S. Southern Command, testified before the committee.

(H.A.S.C. 109-2; H.A.S.C. 109-3; H.A.S.C. 109-4; H.A.S.C. 109-5; H.A.S.C. 109-6; H.A.S.C. 109-7; H.A.S.C. 109-48; H.A.S.C. 109-53; H.A.S.C. 109-57; H.A.S.C. 109-60; H.A.S.C. 109-69; H.A.S.C. 109-95; H.A.S.C. 109-99; H.A.S.C. 109-101; H.A.S.C. 109-102)

GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM

The committee continued its work from the 108th Congress with intensive oversight of the global war on terrorism. While much of this oversight is necessarily classified, the committee is committed to publicly reviewing the developments associated with the activities and deployments of the U.S. armed forces. On June 22, 2005, the committee received testimony on operations and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan from Peter Rodman, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Lieutenant General Walter Sharp, USA, Director of Strategic Plans and Policy, Joint Staff, and Nancy Powell, Assistant Secretary of State for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs. Oversight of operations in Afghanistan continued in the second session on June 28, 2006, when the committee received testimony on the status of security and stability from Karen Tandy, Administrator of the Drug

Enforcement Agency, Mary Beth Long, Principal Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Lieutenant General Karl Eikenberry, USA, Commanding General of Combined Forces Command—Afghanistan, and James Kunder, Assistant Administrator for Asia and the Near East for the U.S. Agency for International Development. Both of the hearings highlighted the committee's concern over the growing poppy cultivation problem in Afghanistan. On June 29, 2005, the committee met to review detainee operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba. Brigadier General Jay Hood, USA, Commander of Joint Task Force Guantanamo, Commander Cary Ostergaard, USN, Detainee Hospital Commander, and Command Sergeant Major Anthony Mendez, USA, Joint Detention Group testified.

(H.A.S.C. 109–38; H.A.S.C. 109–114; H.A.S.C. 109–37)

IRAQ

The committee continued to spend large amounts of time on the war in Iraq as members sought to ensure that U.S. military forces had every thing necessary to assist in Iraq's eventual successful transition to a fully functioning stable and autonomous state. On March 17, 2005, Dr. Andrew Krepinevich, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, Dr. Steven Metz, Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College, and Walter B. Slocombe, former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and Senior Adviser for Defense and Security Sector Affairs to the Coalition Provisional Authority met with the committee to discuss current operations and the political transition in Iraq. On April 4, 2005, General Wesley K. Clark, USA (Ret.), former Commander of U.S. European Command, and Richard Perle, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy, testified before the committee on Iraq's past, present, and future. Soon after these outside experts testified, senior Department of Defense leaders including Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, General Richard B. Myers, USAF, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General John Abizaid, USA, Commander of U.S. Central Command, and General George W. Casey, Jr., USA, Commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq, appeared before the committee on June 23, 2005, to examine the progress of the Iraqi Security Forces. On September 29, 2005, the committee met to receive an update on operations in Iraq from Donald H. Rumsfeld, Secretary of Defense, General Richard B. Myers, USAF, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General John Abizaid, USA, Commander of U.S. Central Command, and General George W. Casey, Jr., USA, Commander of Multi-National Forces—Iraq. The committee met on November 3, 2005, to recognize and discuss the contributions of servicemembers with testimony from a representative panel of a few of America's finest: Brigadier John F. Kelly, USMC, Legislative Assistant to the Commandant, Colonel Robert Abrams, USA, Chief of Staff, 1st Cavalry Division, and Command Sergeant Major Neil Citola, USA, Command Sergeant Major, III Corps.

In the second session of the 109th Congress on June 29, 2006, the committee met to review reports of weapons of mass destruction findings in Iraq with Lieutenant General Michael D. Maples, USA, Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Mr. Frank Gaffney,

President of the Center for Security Policy, Dr. David Kay, former Director of the Iraq Survey Group, and Dr. Terence Taylor, Former Commissioner, U.N. Special Commission on Iraq. On November 15, 2006, the committee received testimony on the current situation and military operations in Iraq from Ambassador David M. Satterfield, Senior Adviser to the Secretary of State and Coordinator for Iraq, and General John Abizaid, USA, Commander of U.S. Central Command. For the last full committee hearing of the 109th Congress, on December 7, 2006, the committee received testimony from Lieutenant General James J. Lovelace, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Major General Carter F. Ham, USA, Commanding General of the 1st Infantry Division, and Major General George F. Flynn, USMC, Commanding General of Training and Education Command, on military transition teams in Iraq.

(H.A.S.C. 109-31; H.A.S.C. 109-32; H.A.S.C. 109-33; H.A.S.C. 109-87; H.A.S.C. 109-93; H.A.S.C. 109-115; H.A.S.C. 109-92; H.A.S.C. 109-97)

FORCE PROTECTION

All members of the committee are dedicated to making certain that every servicemember who enters a theater of combat operations has the necessary force protection equipment to give them the best opportunity to come home safe. In light of this commitment, the members met on May 5, 2005, to discuss the status of tactical wheeled vehicle armoring initiatives and improvised explosive device jammer initiatives in Operation Iraqi Freedom with Dr. Steven J. deTeresa, Engineer, Laurence Livermore National Laboratory, Brigadier General Joseph L. Votel, USA, Director, Joint IED Defeat Task Force, Brigadier General Jeffrey A. Sorenson, USA, Deputy for Acquisition and Systems Management, Department of the Army, Brigadier General William D. Catto, USMC, Commanding General of the Marine Corps System Command, Lieutenant General James N. Mattis, USMC, Commanding General of the Marine Corps Combat Development Command, and Lieutenant Colonel Paul J. Kennedy, USMC, former battalion commander, 2nd Battalion, 4th Marine Regiment, 1st Marine Division. On June 21, 2005, the committee met to review Marine Corps force protection with General William L. Nyland, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Brigadier General William D. Catto, Commanding General of the Marine Corps System Command. The committee invited Hon. Francis J. Harvey, Secretary of the Army, and General Richard Cody, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, to testify on the Army's M1114 up-armor high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicle distribution strategy on October 20, 2005.

(H.A.S.C. 109-79; H.A.S.C. 109-80; H.A.S.C. 109-88)

MILITARY COMMISSIONS

To prosecute expeditiously those individuals who have wreaked terror on the United States, the committee devoted a large segment of its second session to enacting law governing military commissions. On July 12, 2006, the committee summoned Mr. Steven J. Bradbury, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Daniel J. Dell'Orto, Principal Deputy General Counsel for the Department of Defense, Honorable Theodore Olson, former Solicitor General of the

United States, and Rear Admiral John Hutson, USN (Ret.), former Judge Advocate General to testify on the standards of military commissions and tribunals. Two weeks later the committee met again on July 26, 2006, to hear from Honorable Patricia M. Wald, former Chief Judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, Judge Gerald Gahima, former Judge for the War Crimes Chamber of the Court of Bosnia Herzegovina and former Deputy Chief Justice and Attorney General for Rwanda, Mr. Michael P. Scharf, Professor of Law and Director of the Frederick K. Cox International Law Center at Case Western Reserve University, and Ms. Jennifer Elsea, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division, Congressional Research Service on the same topic. On September 7, 2006, the committee met again to discuss the standards of military commissions and tribunals with Mr. Steven Bradbury, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Major General Scott C. Black, The Judge Advocate General of the Army, Rear Admiral Bruce E. MacDonald, The Judge Advocate General of the Navy, Major General Charles J. Dunlap, Jr., Deputy Judge Advocate General of the Air Force, Brigadier General James C. Walker, Staff Judge Advocate to the Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, and Colonel Ronald Reed, USAF, Legal Counsel to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

(H.A.S.C. 109-116; H.A.S.C. 109-117; H.A.S.C. 109-120)

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

CHINA

As part of its larger responsibility to oversee matters related to national security, the committee hosted a joint hearing with the House Committee on International Relations on April 14, 2005, to discuss arms exports to the People's Republic of China by member states of the European Union. Honorable R. Nicholas Burns, Under Secretary for Political Affairs at the Department of State, Honorable Peter W. Rodman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs for the Department of Defense, and Mr. Peter Lichtenbaum, Acting Under Secretary for Industry and Security for the Department of Commerce testified on the importance maintaining the embargo for U.S. national security.

On July 27, 2005, the committee met to receive testimony on Chinese military power from Honorable Franklin Kramer, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Dr. Richard D. Fisher, Vice President of the International Assessment and Strategy Center, and Mr. John J. Tkacik, Jr., Senior Fellow at the Heritage Foundation. In the second session, the committee met on June 22, 2006, to discuss the military power of the People's Republic of China with Honorable Peter W. Rodman, Assistant Secretary for International Security Affairs for the Department of Defense, Mr. Mark Cozad, China Forces Senior Intelligence Officer for the Defense Intelligence Agency, and COL Robert Carr, USA, Assistant Director of Intelligence for the Joint Staff.

(H.A.S.C. 109-35; H.A.S.C. 109-36; H.A.S.C. 109-112)

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

The process of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS) came under increasing scrutiny in the

109th Congress, as the committee sought to ensure important national security matters were given due consideration in the voluntary CFIUS process. On July 13, 2005, the committee met to investigate the national security implications of the possible merger of the China National Offshore Oil Corporation with Unocal Corporation. The four witnesses were Honorable R. James Woolsey, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Honorable C. Richard D'Amato, Chairman of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Mr. Frank J. Gaffney, President of the Center for Security Policy, and Mr. Jerry Taylor, Director of Natural Resource Studies for the Cato Institute. On March 2, 2006, the committee met to receive testimony on the national security implications of the Dubai Ports World deal to take over management of U.S. ports from Mr. Frank J. Gaffney, President of the Center for Security Policy, Dr. James Carafano, Senior Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security for the Heritage Foundation, Mr. Stephen Flynn, Senior Fellow for the Council on Foreign Relations, Mr. Edward H. Bilkey, Chief Operating Officer for Dubai Ports World, Mr. George Dalton, General Counsel for Dubai Ports World, Mr. Michael Moore, Senior Vice President for Commercial Dubai Ports World, Mr. Robert Scavone, Executive Vice President for Security for the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, Ambassador Eric S. Edelman, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy for the Department of Defense, Mr. Stewart Baker, Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning, and International Affairs for the Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Clay Lowery, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs for the Department of Treasury, Mr. Alan Misenheimer, Director of the Office of Arabian Peninsula and Iran Affairs for the Department of State, and Rear Admiral Thomas Gilmour, USCG, Assistant Commandant for Marine Safety, Security, and Environmental Protection.

(H.A.S.C. 109–81; H.A.S.C. 109–100)

IRAN

The committee continued to investigate the efforts of Iran to develop nuclear capabilities. On February 1, 2006, the committee received testimony on options in countering a nuclear Iran from Mr. Michael Eisenstadt of the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Dr. George Perkovich of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Dr. Ilan Berman of the American Foreign Policy Council. On June 8, 2006, the committee met to assess the geopolitical dynamics and U.S. policy options in relation to Iran with testimony from Dr. Patrick Clawson, Deputy Director of Research for the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, and Dr. Ray Takeyh, Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies, Council on Foreign Relations.

(H.A.S.C. 109–98; H.A.S.C. 109–109)

ACQUISITION REFORM

Recognizing the importance of a smoothly functioning, efficient acquisition process to the members of the armed services, the committee remained extremely interested in all aspects of acquisition reform. On November 2, 2005, the committee met to receive a general overview of all acquisition reform efforts from Honorable Ken-

neth J. Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Honorable Claude M. Bolton, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Honorable John J. Young, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, and Lieutenant General Donald J. Hoffman, USAF, Military Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition. One week later on November 9, 2005, the committee met to take a closer look at the Defense Logistics Agency's Prime Vendor Program with testimony from Honorable Kenneth J. Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, and Vice Admiral Keith W. Lippert, USN, Director of the Defense Logistics Agency. In the second session the committee continued to review acquisition reform and related issues with a hearing on March 29, 2006, with testimony from Mr. Pierre Chao, Senior Fellow and Director of Defense Industrial Initiatives for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Honorable Robert J. Hermann, Task Force co-chair, Defense Science Board Summer Study on Transformation, Lieutenant General Robert T. Kadish, USAF (Ret.), Chairman of the Defense Acquisition Performance Assessment Panel, and Mr. Terry R. Little, Acquisition Adviser to the Director of the Defense Missile Agency. On April 5, 2006, the committee met to discuss further reviews of major defense acquisition reforms with Honorable David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, Honorable Kenneth J. Krieg, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, USN, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Mr. David Patterson, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller.

(H.A.S.C. 109-63; H.A.S.C. 109-96; H.A.S.C. 109-104; H.A.S.C. 109-106)

BORDER SECURITY

The committee conducted several hearings over the course of the Congress on border security, including two conducted in the field. On May 24, 2006, the committee met to receive testimony on the mission of the National Guard in regards to border security from Honorable Paul McHale, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense, Major General Richard J. Rowe, USA, Director of Operations for U.S. Northern Command, Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, USA, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Mr. David Aguilar, Chief of Border Patrol for the U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency. On August 1, 2006, the committee held a field hearing at Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan, to investigate U.S. Northern border security with testimony from Brigadier General Michael Peplinski, USAF, Commander 127th Wing, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Chief Patrol Agent John Bates, Sector Chief for U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency, Captain Patrick Brennan, USCG, Commanding Officer for Sector Detroit, Mr. John Jamian, former Maritime Administrator for the Maritime Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Sheriff Dan Lane, St. Clair County Sheriff's Department, St. Clair County, Michigan, Colonel Paul Disney, USA, Director of Operations for Joint Task Force North, U.S. Northern Command, and Mr. Ghurdit Dillon, Director of Field Operations for the Detroit

Field Office, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security. On August 2, 2006, the committee moved south to receive testimony regarding U.S. Southern border security from Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, USA, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Colonel Ben Hancock, USMC, Commanding Officer for the Marine Corps Air Station, Yuma, Arizona, Deputy Chief Patrol Agent Jeffrey Calhoon, Sector Deputy Chief, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agency, Major General Antonio J. Pineda, National Commander of the U.S. Civil Air Patrol, and Ms. Vivian Juan-Saunders, Chairwoman of the Tohono O'odham Nation.

(H.A.S.C. 109–108; H.A.S.C. 109–118; H.A.S.C. 109–119)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGY

In preparation for the release of the February 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) the committee conducted a hearing on September 14, 2005, on the goals and principles of the QDR with testimony from outside experts Honorable Dov S. Zakheim, former Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, Ms. Michele Flournoy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Dr. Daniel Goure, Lexington Institute, and Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. After the QDR was released the committee met again on March 14, 2006, to discuss the document with Honorable Gordon England, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, USN, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Mr. Thomas Donnelly, American Enterprise Institute, Dr. Andrew F. Krepinevich, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and Mr. Lawrence J. Korb, Center for American Progress.

(H.A.S.C. 109–82; H.A.S.C. 109–103)

OTHER

The committee held multiple hearings throughout the 109th Congress to investigate issues at the full committee level that functioned as stand alone hearings.

On July 20, 2005, the committee met to review the Air Force's Future Total Force Plan with Lieutenant General Stephan G. Wood, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum, USA, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lieutenant General Daniel James III, USAF, Director of the Air National Guard, Lieutenant General John A. Bradley, USAF, Chief of the Air Force Reserve, Major General Roger P. Lempke, USAF, Adjutant General of Nebraska, and Major General Mason C. Whitney, USAF, Adjutant General of Colorado.

On April 4, 2006, the committee received testimony on improving interagency coordination for the global war on terrorism and beyond from Honorable Thomas W. O'Connell, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, Jr., USN, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Ambassador Henry A. Crumpton, Coordinator for Counterterrorism for the Department of State, and Vice Admiral John Scott Redd, USN (Ret.), Director of the National Counterterrorism Center.

On April 7, 2006, the committee met to investigate the appropriateness of avenues for building the capacity of foreign forces through the Department with the following witnesses: Ambassador Eric S. Edelman, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, Dr. John Hillen, Assistant Secretary for Political-Military Affairs for the Department of State, and General James L. Jones, USMC, Commander of U.S. European Command.

On June 13, 2006, the committee examined issues related to H.R. 5200, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006, with Honorable Gordon England, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Admiral Edmund P. Giambastiani, USN, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Richard Cody, USA, Vice Chief of Staff for the Army, General John D.W. Corley, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff for the Air Force, Brigadier General Stephen Koper, USAF (Ret.), President of the National Guard Association of the United States, and Major General Francis D. Vavala, USA (Ret.), Vice President of the Adjutants General Association of the United States.

On June 20, 2006, the committee received testimony on significant force realignments of the Department, including beddown, support, and other costs and requirements related to those realignments from Honorable Ryan Henry, Principal Deputy Secretary of Defense for Policy, Honorable Philip W. Grone, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Management, and Rear Admiral William D. Sullivan, Vice Director for Strategic Plans and Policy for the Joint Staff.

On June 27, 2006, the committee met to review Army and Marine Corps reset strategies for ground equipment and rotorcraft with General Peter J. Schoomaker, Chief of Staff of the Army, and General Michael W. Hagee, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

(H.A.S.C. 109-39; H.A.S.C. 109-105; H.A.S.C. 109-107; H.A.S.C. 109-110; H.A.S.C. 109-111; H.A.S.C. 109-113)

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TACTICAL AIR AND LAND FORCES

The Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces addressed all Army and Air Force acquisition programs (except strategic airlift and weapons programs, space programs, special operations and information technology programs); Navy and Marine Corps aviation programs; National Guard, Army, and Air Force reserve modernization programs; and ammunition programs by conducting 14 oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007 Department of Defense (DOD) budget requests, including: March 3, 2005, Navy and Air Force aviation acquisition programs; March 9, 2005, DOD unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) and joint unmanned combat air system investment programs; March 16, 2005, Future Combat Systems (FCS), modularity, and force protection initiatives; April 14, 2005, DOD major rotorcraft programs; March 9, 2006, DOD major rotorcraft programs; March 16, 2006, Navy and Air Force aviation acquisition programs; April 4, 2006, FCS, modularity, and force protection initiatives; April 6, 2006, UAV and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities.

In addition to its traditional oversight responsibilities regarding DOD budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearing on the following: June 29, 2005, small business technologies; October 20, 2005, aerial common sensor program; February 1, 2006, Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) ground forces vehicle and personnel protection and rotary wing safety of flight update; March 30, 2006, Army and Marine Corps reset strategies for ground equipment and rotorcraft; June 15, 2006, the use of combat helmets, vehicle armor, and body armor by ground forces in OIF and OEF; September 21, 2006, combat vehicle active protection systems. In addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings on the following: major rotorcraft programs, DOD intelligence programs, tactical aviation programs, force protection initiatives, and active protection systems.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 12, 2005, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163), and considered and reported legislation on April 26, 2006, that was included in the John W. Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). The legislation covered a range of issues, including multiyear procurement authority for F-22 aircraft, and an independent cost estimate for the Army's Future Combat Systems program. Legislation initiated by the subcommittee also increased funding for a Joint Strike Fighter alter-

nate engine, as well as increased funding for M-1 tanks, Bradley fighting vehicle upgrades, and tactical wheeled vehicles.

(H.A.S.C. No. 109-8; H.A.S.C. No. 109-9; H.A.S.C. No. 109-10; H.A.S.C. No. 109-11; H.A.S.C. No. 109-29; H.A.S.C. No. 109-46; H.A.S.C. No. 109-66; H.A.S.C. No. 109-68; H.A.S.C. No. 109-73; H.A.S.C. No. 109-74; H.A.S.C. No. 109-76; H.A.S.C. No. 109-121; H.A.S.C. No. 109-122; H.A.S.C. No. 109-126)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

The Subcommittee on Readiness reviewed the programs within the operation and maintenance accounts for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 to ensure that appropriate funds were available to maintain a high level of military readiness. Oversight activities of the subcommittee included a hearing on March 3, 2005, as well as classified briefings on February 15, 2006, and June 28, 2006, to examine the current state of military readiness and the adequacy of the fiscal year 2006 and 2007 budget requests. As a result, the subcommittee authorized \$125.7 billion in the operation and maintenance accounts in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and authorized \$129.0 billion in operation and maintenance accounts the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) to fund critical readiness needs.

In order to assess the military forces' preparedness for the global war on terrorism and the effects of this ongoing campaign on military readiness, the subcommittee performed a number of oversight activities. The subcommittee met in joint session with the Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces on February 2, 2006, to receive testimony on vehicle and personnel protection and rotary wing flight safety. During the 109th Congress, the subcommittee also evaluated programs for the repair, modernization, and replacement of equipment used in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. The subcommittee met on April 6, 2005, to hear testimony on the military services' requirements to reset and reconstitute their forces. The Subcommittees on Readiness and Tactical Air and Land Forces met in a joint session on March 30, 2006, to investigate Army and Marine Corps reset strategies for ground equipment and rotorcraft. In continuation of this effort, the full committee took up this topic in a hearing on June 27, 2006. In addition to formal subcommittee meetings to evaluate equipment reset, the subcommittee charged staff to conduct multiple meetings with service representatives and undergo several fact-finding staff delegations to military facilities in the United States and the theater of operations. As a result, the subcommittee recommended an increase of \$23.8 billion in the fiscal year 2007 supplemental bridge fund to meet all outstanding requirements for Army and Marine Corps equipment reset.

The subcommittee also reviewed the impacts of service contracting on military readiness. On April 5, 2006, the subcommittee held a hearing on the potential for the inappropriate use of operation and maintenance funds for military construction and procurement activities. As a result, the subcommittee recommended a provision in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364) that would limit the use of

service contracts for the acquisition of certain major systems. The subcommittee also received testimony on Navy transformation efforts on April 6, 2006, resulting in legislation requiring additional information prior to the expenditures of funds for the Naval Expeditionary Combat Command.

In addition, the subcommittee reviewed issues pertaining to military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure activities (BRAC) of the Department of Defense (DOD). The subcommittee held a hearing on March 15, 2005, on the fiscal year 2006 budget request for military construction, family housing, base realignment and closure activities, and facilities operations and maintenance. The subcommittee also met to receive testimony on the DOD management of historic and historic-eligible facilities on March 8, 2006.

In relation to the BRAC process, the subcommittee held a briefing on March 17, 2005, on reutilization of closed and realigned military bases. Subsequently, the full committee met on September 15, 2005, to consider H.J. Res. 65, a resolution to disapprove the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. On September 29, 2005, the committee reported the resolution adversely to the House. The resolution failed to pass the House on November 27, 2005.

On September 21, 2006, the subcommittee joined the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities in closed session for a briefing on Northern Command's (USNORTHCOM) decision to maintain the Cheyenne Mountain Operations Center in a "warm standby" status and to relocate some North American Aerospace Defense Command and USNORTHCOM military and civilian positions to Peterson Air Force Base, Colorado. The Chairman and Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Readiness subsequently requested that the Government Accountability Office investigate the relocation decision.

Finally, the Subcommittees on Readiness and Terrorism, and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on September 26, 2006, to explore alternative energy and energy efficiency programs of the Department of Defense. This hearing resulted in legislation to establish an Energy Security chapter of title 10, United States Code, to consolidate and improve energy policy authorities of the Department of Defense.

(H.A.S.C. 109-12; H.A.S.C. 109-13; H.A.S.C. 109-14; H.A.S.C. 109-46; H.A.S.C. 109-66; H.A.S.C. 109-123; H.A.S.C. 109-124; H.A.S.C. 109-125; H.A.S.C. 109-127)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the Department of Defense budget requests for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 during the 109th Congress, including: March 3, 2005, Tactical C-4 Systems: Why Does the Department of Defense Have So Many Systems Performing the Same Functionality?; March 10, 2005, Defense Science and Technology in Support of the War on Terrorism and Beyond; March 15, 2005, Department of Defense Responsibilities in Homeland Defense and Homeland Secu-

urity Missions; March 17, 2005, U.S. Special Operations Command Policy and Programs; April 6, 2005, Destruction of the U.S. Chemical Weapons Stockpile—Program Status and Issues; March 8, 2006, Special Operations Command: Transforming for the Long War; March 29, 2006, Defense Science and Technology: Investments to Shape the Evolving Terrorist Threat; April 6, 2006 Information Technology Issues and Defense Transformation.

In addition to its optional oversight responsibilities regarding the President's budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following: July 21, 2005, Counter Terrorism Technology Sharing (a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology of the Committee on Homeland Security Committee); Financing the Iraq Insurgency (a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Financial Services Committee); September 29, 2005, Understanding the Iran Threat; November 9, 2005, Military and National Guard Roles in Disaster Response; February 15, 2006, The Able Danger Program (a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services); February 16, 2006, Combating al Qaeda and the Militant Jihadist Threat; March 15, 2006, Implementing the Global War on Terror Strategy: Overcoming Interagency Problems; April 5, 2006, Implementing the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Recommendations to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction; May 25, 2006, Applying Lessons Learned from Hurricane Katrina: How the Department of Defense is Preparing for the Upcoming Hurricane Season; June 29, 2006, Assessing U.S. Special Operations Command's Missions and Roles; September 26, 2006, Alternative Energy and Energy Efficiency Programs of the Department of Defense; September 27, 2006, Irregular Warfare Roadmap.

Furthermore, in addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings on the following topics: Middle Eastern Foreign Policy, U.S. Special Operations Command, the global war on terrorism, Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, human intelligence issues, Alternative Energy Policy, and Information Ops (Winning Hearts and Minds).

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 11, 2005, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and met to consider and report legislation on April 27, 2006, that was included in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). The legislation covered a range of issues, including the following: Improved interagency coordination in prosecuting the global war on terrorism, Chemical Biological defense basic research, added funding for counterterrorism technology development, Special Operations Command unfunded requirements, Test and Evaluation policy for rapid acquisition and information technology program concerns.

(H.A.S.C. 109-15; H.A.S.C. 109-16; H.A.S.C. 109-17; H.A.S.C. 109-18; H.A.S.C. 109-19; H.A.S.C. 109-40; H.A.S.C. 109-41; H.A.S.C. 109-42; H.A.S.C. 109-43; H.A.S.C. 109-52; H.A.S.C. 109-55; H.A.S.C. 109-56; H.A.S.C. 109-59; H.A.S.C. 109-71; H.A.S.C. 109-83; H.A.S.C. 109-84; H.A.S.C. 109-85; H.A.S.C. 109-127; H.A.S.C. 109-128; H.A.S.C. 109-129)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel conducted a series of hearings to review and evaluate matters under its jurisdiction in the fiscal years 2006 and 2007 budget requests: March 16, 2005, Recruiting, Retention and Military Personnel Policy, and Benefits and Compensation Overview; April 7, 2005, Military Resale and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Overview; March 15, 2006, Military Resale and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Overview; March 29, 2006, The Defense Health Program—Department of Defense Initiatives to Control Costs; and April 6, 2006, Policy, Compensation, and Benefits Overview.

In addition to its budget request hearings, the subcommittee conducted hearings related to the following topics: February 2, 2005, Adequacy of Army Forces; March 3, 2005, Care of Injured and Wounded Service Members; June 28, 2005, The Religious Climate at the U.S. Air Force Academy; July 19, 2005, Current Status of Military Recruiting and Retention; July 26, 2005, Mental Health; October 19, 2005, Defense Health Program Overview; June 21, 2006, Trafficking in Persons; and September 27, 2006, The Montgomery G.I. Bill for Members of the Selected Reserve.

The subcommittee also conducted briefings on the following topics: March 18, 2005, Report on the Service Academy Sexual Assault and Leadership Survey; April 6, 2005, Department of Defense Briefing on Sexual Assault; April 11, 2005, the Inspector General Report on Sexual Assault; April 21, 2005, Proposed Changes to the Uniform Code of Military Justice on Rape and Sexual Assault; March 2, 2006, Combatant Commander Warfighting Requirements and the Quadrennial Defense Review Force (classified); June 14, 2006, The Viability of the Selective Service; and June 20, 2006, Veterans? Affairs Data Loss.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 11, 2005, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and met to consider and report legislation on April 26, 2006, that was included in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The legislation covered a range of issues, including the following: increased active component end strength for the Army and Marine Corps, support for the Defense Health Program, protection of service members from predatory lenders, and bonuses and incentive pay for service members.

(H.A.S.C. 109–20; H.A.S.C. 109–21; H.A.S.C. 109–44; H.A.S.C. 109–45; H.A.S.C. 109–64; H.A.S.C. 109–65; H.A.S.C. 109–70; H.A.S.C. 109–75; H.A.S.C. 109–78; H.A.S.C. 109–86; H.A.S.C. 109–89; H.A.S.C. 109–90; H.A.S.C. 109–91)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces addressed the Department of Energy's atomic energy defense activities, as well as the missile defense and space programs of the Department of Defense (DOD), by conducting hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007 budget requests, including: March 2, 2005, Department of Energy's budget request for atomic energy defense activities; March 9, 2005, the status of military space ac-

tivities; March 15, 2005, budget request for missile defense programs; March 1, 2006, Department of Energy's budget request for atomic energy defense activities; March 9, 2006, budget request for the Missile Defense Agency and ballistic missile defense programs; and on March 16, 2006, the status of military space activities.

Separate from the traditional budget oversight reviews, the subcommittee held hearings on the following: July 12, 2005, on space acquisitions; February 15, 2006, the Able Danger Program (joint with the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities); April 5, 2006, future plans for the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex infrastructure; June 21, 2006, space and U.S. national power; July 26, 2006, on plutonium disposition and the U.S. mixed oxide fuel facility.

Furthermore, in addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings on the following topics: adversarial information operations and cyber attacks as part of a threat-based defense review to complement the DOD's on-going, capabilities-based Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, Conventional Trident Modification program, Reliable Replacement Warhead program, National Security Space Threat and Space Control, and strategic implications of the QDR.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 11, 2005, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109-163) and considered and reported legislation on April 27, 2006, that was included in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109-364). The legislation covered a range of issues, including the following: the Reliable Replacement Warhead program, transformation of the nuclear weapons complex, consolidation of the counterintelligence programs of the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration, plans for the test and evaluation of the ballistic missile defense system, the policy of the United States on priorities in the development, testing and fielding of missile defense capabilities, Space Situational Awareness Strategy, and Operationally Responsive Space.

(H.A.S.C. 109-22, H.A.S.C. 109-23, H.A.S.C. 109-24, H.A.S.C. 109-34, H.A.S.C. 109-54, H.A.S.C. 109-58, H.A.S.C. 109-62, H.A.S.C. 109-71, H.A.S.C. 109-72, H.A.S.C. 109-77, H.A.S.C. 109-130)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROJECTION FORCES

The Subcommittee on Projection Forces conducted a series of hearings to review programs included in the Department of Defense (DOD) acquisition budget requests for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 during the 109th Congress, including: March 2, 2005, Navy Research and Development: Programs in Support of the War on Terrorism, Naval Transformation, and Future Naval Capabilities; March 10, 2005, The Navy's Future Fleet: Assessing the Strength of Today's Navy for Tomorrow; March 15, 2005, Navy Critical Enablers—The Department of the Navy's Program and Antisubmarine Warfare, Mine Countermeasures, Ship Self-Defense and Naval Surface Fire Support; and March 30, 2006, The Department of the Navy's Shipbuilding Acquisition Strategy.

In addition to its traditional oversight responsibilities regarding DOD budget requests, the subcommittee conducted oversight hearings on the following: June 13, 2005, The Nuclear Submarine Force—Past, Present and Future; June 29, 2005, Small Business Technologies (joint with Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces); July 19, 2005, Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2006 Plans and Programs for the DD(X) Next-Generation Multi-Mission Surface Combatant Ship (Part I) and July 20, 2005, Department of the Navy Fiscal Year 2006 Plans and Programs for the DD(X) Next-Generation Multi-Mission Surface Combatant Ship (Part II); February 28, 2006, U.S. Air Force Aerial Refueling Recapitalization Requirements; March 15, 2006, Evolving Missions of the U.S. Navy and the Role of Surface and Subsurface Combatants; March 28, 2006, The U.S. Navy's Future Submarine Force Structure; April 5, 2006, The U.S. Shipbuilding Industrial Base; April 6, 2006, Integration of Energy Efficient Propulsion Systems for Future U.S. Navy Vessels.

Furthermore, in addition to formal hearings, the subcommittee conducted briefings on the following topics: antisubmarine warfare, mine countermeasures, alternate propulsion systems, threats to U.S. naval forces, mobility capability study, conventional trident modification, aircraft carrier force structure, and alternate aircraft carrier designs.

The subcommittee considered and reported legislation on May 11, 2005, that was included in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 (Public Law 109–163) and considered and report legislation on April 27, 2006, that was included in the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 (Public Law 109–364). The legislation covered a range of issues, including the following: measures to enhance the force projection capabilities of the U.S. Navy and U.S. Air Force; steps to assess the processes, technologies, and performance incentives required to improve the efficiencies and effectiveness of naval vessel construction; and efforts to ensure that current capabilities are not permanently or prematurely retired to fund future replacement capabilities that are either undefined or unaffordable.

(H.A.S.C. 109–25; H.A.S.C. 109–26; H.A.S.C. 109–27; H.A.S.C. 109–28; H.A.S.C. 109–29; H.A.S.C. 109–30; H.A.S.C. 109–47; H.A.S.C. 109–49; H.A.S.C. 109–50; H.A.S.C. 109–51; H.A.S.C. 109–61; H.A.S.C. 109–67)

PUBLICATIONS

PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 109-1—Full Committee hearing on Committee Organization. January 26, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-2—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Army. February 9, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-3—Full Committee hearings on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Defense. February 16 and March 10, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-4—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. February 17, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-5—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Combatant Commanders of the U.S. Central Command and U.S. Special Operations Command. March 2, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-6—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Combatant Commanders of the U.S. European Command, U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Southern Command. March 9, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-7—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. March 16, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-8—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—The Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force Aviation Acquisition Programs and Future Technology Initiatives. March 3, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-9—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Department of Defense Unmanned Aerial Vehicle and Joint Unmanned Combat Air System Investment Programs. March 9, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-10—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget

Request on Future Combat Systems, Modularity and Force Protection Initiatives. March 16, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–11—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on the Department of Defense’s Major Rotorcraft Programs. April 14, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–12—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on The Adequacy of the Fiscal Year 2006 Budget to Meet Readiness Needs. March 3, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–13—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Military Construction, Family Housing, Base Closures, and Facilities Operations and Maintenance. March 15, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–14—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Military Services’ Requirement on Reconstitution of Equipment. April 6, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–15—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Tactical C4 Systems: Why Does the DOD Have so Many Systems Performing the Same Functionality? March 3, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–16—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Defense Science and Technology Policy Programs. March 10, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–17—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Department of Defense Responsibilities in Homeland Defense and Homeland Security Missions. March 15, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–18—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—U.S. Special Operations Command Fiscal Year 2006 Budget Request. March 17, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–19—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Destruction of the U.S. Chemical Weapons Stockpile—Program Status and Issues. April 6, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–20—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Recruiting, Retention and Military Personnel Policy, and Benefits and Compensation Overview. March 16, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–21—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and

Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Military Resale and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Overview. April 7, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–22—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Energy on Atomic Energy Defense Activities. March 2, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–23—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Space Activities. March 9, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–24—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Missile Defense Programs. March 15, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–25—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Navy Research and Development: Programs in Support of the War on Terrorism, Naval Transformation, and Future Naval Capabilities. March 2, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–26—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request—The Navy's Future Fleet: Assessing the Strength of Today's Navy for Tomorrow. March 10, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–27—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearings on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Navy Critical Enablers: The Department of the Navy's Program and Budget Request for Antisubmarine Warfare, Mine Counter Measures, Ship Self-Defense, and Naval Surface Fire Support. March 15, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–28—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on The Nuclear Submarine Force—Past, Present and Future. June 13, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–29—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee joint hearing with the Projection Forces Subcommittee on Small Business Technologies. June 29, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–30—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearings on the Department of the Navy Plans and Programs for the DD(X) Next-Generation Multi-Mission Surface Combatant Ship. July 19 and 20, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–31—Full Committee hearing on Current Operations and the Political Transition in Iraq. March 17, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–32—Full Committee hearing on Iraq's Past, Present and Future. April 6, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–33—Full Committee hearing on Progress of the Iraqi Security Forces. June 23, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–34—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on Space Acquisitions. July 12, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–35—Full Committee joint hearing with the Committee on International Relations—Arms Exports to the People's

Republic of China by Member States of the European Union. April 14, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–36—Full Committee hearing on Chinese Military Power. July 27, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–37—Full Committee hearing on Detainee Operations at Guantanamo Bay. June 29, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–38—Full Committee hearing on Afghanistan: Operations and Reconstruction. June 22, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–39—Full Committee hearing on The Air Force's Future Total Force Plan. July 20, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–40—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science and Technology of the Homeland Security Committee on Counter Terrorism Technology Sharing. July 21, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–41—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee joint hearing with the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Financial Services—Financing of the Iraq Insurgency. July 28, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–42—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Understanding the Iran Threat. September 29, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–43—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Combating al Qaeda and the Militant Jihadist Threat. February 16, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–44—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on The Current Status of Military Recruiting and Retention. July 19, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–45—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on The Care of Injured and Wounded Service Members. March 3, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–46—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee joint hearing with the Readiness Subcommittee on Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom Ground Forces Vehicle and Personnel Protection and Rotary Wing Safety of Flight Update. February 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–47—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on U.S. Air Force Aerial Refueling Recapitalization Requirements. February 28, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–48—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the United States Transportation Command and Component Commands. March 2, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–49—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on Evolving Missions of the U.S. Navy and the Role of Surface and Subsurface Combatants. March 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–50—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on the Department of the Navy's Shipbuilding Acquisition Strategy. March 30, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–51—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on U.S. Navy's Future Submarine Force Structure. March 28, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–52—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Implementing the Global War on

Terrorism Strategy: Overcoming Interagency Problems. March 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-53—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force. March 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-54—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the Missile Defense Agency and Ballistic Missile Defense Programs. March 9, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-55—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Special Operations Command: Transforming for the Long War. March 8, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-56—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Defense Science and Technology: Investments to Shape the Evolving Terrorist Threat. March 29, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-57—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy. March 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-58—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on Future Plans for the Department of Energy's Nuclear Weapons Complex Infrastructure. April 5, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-59—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Information Technology Issues and Defense Transformation. April 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-60—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the U.S. Central Command. March 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-61—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on The Integration of Energy Efficient Propulsion Systems for Future U.S. Navy Vessels. April 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-62—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for the Department of Energy's Atomic Energy Defense Activities. March 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-63—Full Committee hearing on Acquisition Reform. November 2, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-64—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Mental Health. July 26, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-65—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Defense Health Program Overview. October 19, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109-66—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee joint hearing with the Readiness Subcommittee on Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies for Ground Equipment and Rotorcraft. March 30, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-67—Projection Forces Subcommittee hearing on The U.S. Shipbuilding Industrial Base. April 5, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109-68—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on the Department of the Navy and Department of the Air Force Aviation Acquisition Programs. March 16, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–69—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of the Army. February 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–70—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on The Religious Climate at the U.S. Air Force Academy. June 28, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–71—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee joint hearing with the Strategic Forces Subcommittee on The Able Danger Program. February 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–72—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request for Space Activities. March 16, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–73—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on the Department of Defense Major Rotorcraft Programs. March 9, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–74—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Future Combat Systems, Modularity, and Force Protection Initiatives. April 4, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–75—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the Adequacy of Army Forces. February 2, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–76—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) Capabilities. April 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–77—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on Space and U.S. National Power. June 21, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–78—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Policy, Compensation and Benefits Overview. April 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–79—Full Committee hearing on The Status of the Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Armoring Initiatives and Improvised Explosive Device (IED) Jammer Initiatives in Operation Iraqi Freedom. May 5, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–80—Full Committee hearing on Review of Marine Corps Force Protection. June 21, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–81—Full Committee hearing on National Security Implications of the Possible Merger of the China National Offshore Oil Corporation (Cnooc) with Unocal Corporation. July 13, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–82—Full Committee hearing on the Quadrennial Defense Review: Goals and Principles. September 14, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–83—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Military and National Guard Roles in Disaster Response. November 9, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–84—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Implementing the 2006 Quadren-

nial Defense Review (QDR) Recommendations to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). April 5, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–85—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on The Irregular Warfare Roadmap. September 27, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–86—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Military Resale and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Overview. March 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–87—Full Committee hearing on Operations in Iraq. September 29, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–88—Full Committee hearing on The Army’s M1114 Up-Armor High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (UAH) Distribution Strategy. October 20, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–89—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on The Defense Health Program—Department of Defense initiatives to Control Costs. March 29, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–90—Military Personnel Subcommittee joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on International Relations on Trafficking in Persons. June 21, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–91—Military Personnel Subcommittee joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity of the Veterans’ Affairs Committee on The Montgomery G.I. Bill for Members of the Selected Reserve. September 27, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–92—Full Committee hearing on the Current Situation and Military Operations in Iraq. November 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–93—Full Committee hearing on Your Troops: Their Story. November 3, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–94—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Examination of Criteria for Awards and Decorations. December 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–95—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the U.S. Southern Command. March 16, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–96—Full Committee hearing on the Defense Logistics Agency’s Prime Vendor Program. November 9, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–97—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Military Transition Teams in Iraq and Afghanistan. December 7, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–98—Full Committee hearing on Countering a Nuclear Iran. February 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–99—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the Department of Defense. February 8, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–100—Full Committee hearing on National Security Implications of the Dubai Ports World Deal to Take over Management of U.S. Ports. March 2, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–101—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the European Command. March 8, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–102—Full Committee hearing on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 and Oversight of Pre-

viously Authorized Programs—Budget Request from the U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea. March 9, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–103—Full Committee hearing on the Department of Defense Quadrennial Defense Review. March 14, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–104—Full Committee hearing on Issues Relating to Defense Acquisition Reform. March 29, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–105—Full Committee hearing on Improving Inter-agency Coordination for the Global War on Terrorism and Beyond. April 4, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–106—Full Committee hearing on Review of Major Defense Acquisition Reform Initiatives. April 5, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–107—Full Committee hearing on Building the Capability of Foreign Military Forces. April 7, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–108—Full Committee hearing on Border Security—Mission of the National Guard. May 24, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–109—Full Committee hearing on Iran: Assessing Geopolitical Dynamics and U.S. Policy Options. June 8, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–110—Full Committee hearing on Issues Related to H.R. 5200, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006. June 13, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–111—Full Committee hearing on Significant Force Realignment of the Department of Defense, Including Beddown, Support, and Other Costs and Requirements Related to those Realignments. June 20, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–112—Full Committee hearing on Military Power of the People's Republic of China. June 22, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–113—Full Committee hearing on Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies for Ground Equipment and Rotorcraft. June 27, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–114—Full Committee hearing on The Status of Security and Stability in Afghanistan. June 28, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–115—Full Committee hearing on Reports of Weapons of Mass Destruction Findings in Iraq. June 29, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–116—Full Committee hearing on Standards of Military Commissions and Tribunals. July 12, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–117—Full Committee hearing on Standards of Military Commissions and Tribunals. July 26, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–118—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Northern Border Security—National Security Implications and Issues for the Armed Services. August 1, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–119—Full Committee hearing on U.S. Southern Border Security—National Security Implications and Issues for the Armed Services. August 2, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–120—Full Committee hearing on Standards of Military Commissions and Tribunals. September 7, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–121—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical Intelligence of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on Aerial Common Sensor Program. October 20, 2005.

H.A.S.C. 109–122—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on an Update on the Use of Combat Helmets, Vehicle Armor and Body Armor by Ground Forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. June 15, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–123—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on the Department of Defense Management of Historic and Historic-Eligible Facilities. March 8, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–124—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on Service Contracting’s Impact on Military Readiness. April 5, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–125—Readiness Subcommittee hearing on Navy Transformation. April 6, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–126—Tactical Air and Land Forces Subcommittee hearing on Combat Vehicle Active Protection Systems. September 21, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–127—Readiness Subcommittee joint hearing with the Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee on Alternative Energy and Energy Efficiency Programs of the Department of Defense. September 26, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–128—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Applying Lessons Learned from Hurricane Katrina: How the Department of Defense is Preparing for the Upcoming Hurricane Season. May 25, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–129—Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee hearing on Assessing United States Special Operations Command’s Missions and Roles. June 29, 2006.

H.A.S.C. 109–130—Strategic Forces Subcommittee hearing on Plutonium Disposition and the U.S. Mixed Oxide Fuel Facility. July 26 2006.

HOUSE REPORTS

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
109-89	May 20, 2005	H.R. 1815	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.
109-234	Sept. 22, 2005	H. Res. 417	Directing Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives not later than 14 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution documents in the possession of the Secretary of Defense relating to the disclosure of the identity and employment of Ms. Valerie Plame.
109-243	Sept. 29, 2005	H.J. Res. 65	Disapproving the recommendations of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
109-360	Dec. 18, 2005	H.R. 1815 Conf. Rept	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.
109-384	Mar. 7, 2006	H.Res. 645	Requesting the President and directing Secretary of Defense to transmit to the House of Representatives all information in the possession of the President or the Secretary of Defense relating to the collection of intelligence information pertaining to persons inside the United States without obtaining court-ordered warrants authorizing the collection of such information and relating to the policy of the United States with respect to the gathering of counterterrorism within the United States.
109-397	Mar. 16, 2006	H.Res. 685	Requesting the President and directing the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense provide to the House of Representatives certain documents in their possession relating to any entity with which the United States has contracted for public relations purposes concerning Iraq.
109-452	May 5, 2006	H.R. 5122	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.
109-664, Part I	Sept. 15, 2006	H.R. 6054	To amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purposes.

109-702	Sept. 29, 2006	H.R. 5122 Conf. Rept	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.
---------------	----------------------	----------------------------	--

PUBLIC LAWS

Public law number	Date enacted	Bill number	Title
109-59	Dec. 30, 2005	S. 1988	To authorize the transfer of items in the War Reserves Stockpile for Allies, Korea.
109-100	Nov. 11, 2005	S. 37	A bill to extend the special postage stamp for breast cancer research for 2 years.
109-104	Nov. 19, 2005	H.R. 4326	To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract for the nuclear refueling of the U.S.S. "Carl Vinson" (CVN-70).
109-142	Dec. 22, 2005	H.J. Res. 38	Recognizing Commodore John Barry as the first flag officer of the United States.
109-163	Jan. 6, 2006	H.R. 1815	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes.
109-164	Jan. 6, 2006	H.R. 972	To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2006 and 2007 for the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.
109-272	Aug. 14, 2006	H.R. 5683	To preserve the Mt. Soledad Veterans Memorial in San Diego, California, by providing for the immediate acquisition of the memorial by the United States.
109-364	Oct. 17, 2006	H.R. 5122	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2007 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.
109-366	Oct. 17, 2006	S. 3930	A bill to authorize trial by military commission for violations of the law of war, and for other purposes.

PRESS RELEASES

FIRST SESSION

January 24, 2005—Hunter Statement on Intelligence Activities of the Department of Defense (DOD)

January 26, 2005—Hunter, Hyde, Manzullo Urge Treasury to Extend Review of IBM's Computer Sale to Chinese Firm

January 28, 2005—Hunter Statement on Awarding of Presidential Helicopter Contract

February 7, 2005—Hunter Statement on the DOD Budget Proposal

February 9, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2006 Department of the Army Budget Request

February 16, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Department of Defense's Budget Request

February 17, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Department of the Navy's Budget Request

February 23, 2005—Hunter Statement on Secretary Rumsfeld's Recent Appearance at the Committee on Armed Services and the Inaccurate Washington Post Coverage That Followed

March 2, 2005—Hunter Statement on the Passing of Former Rep. Tillie Fowler (FL)

March 15, 2005—Emergency Supplemental Wartime Appropriations Act Includes Congressman Terry Everett's Death Benefits Expansion Proposal

March 15, 2005—Cole Amendment Keeps Military Benefits on Track

March 16, 2005—Chairman Hunter Announces Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee Vice Chairmen for the 109th Congress

March 31, 2005—Hunter Statement on Silberman-Robb Commission Report on WMD Intelligence

April 6, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Progress in Iraq

May 5, 2005—Hunter Opening Statement on the Status of Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Armoring Initiatives and IED Jammer Initiatives in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF)

May 11, 2005—Committee on Armed Services Prohibits Women in Combat

May 13, 2005—Hunter Statement on Base Realignment and Closure Commission

May 19, 2005—Mark-up of H.R. 1815—the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006

May 19, 2005—Hunter Announces Changes in Committee Staff Leadership

May 25, 2005—Hunter Statement on DOD Direct Ground Combat Policy

May 25, 2005—House Approves Fiscal Year 2006 Defense Authorization Bill; Focuses on Major Procurement Overhaul, Force Protection and Personnel Benefits

June 13, 2005—Hunter Statements on Guantanamo Bay, including Menus for Detainees

June 16, 2005—Hunter Condemns Durbin Statements on Guantanamo Bay

June 21, 2005—Members of the Committee on Armed Services Issue Statements in Response to Calls to Form a Select Committee to Investigate Alleged Abuses against Terrorists Held at Guantanamo Bay

June 21, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Status of U.S. Marine Corps HMMWV Underbody Armor Kits in OIF

June 22, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Afghanistan: Operations and Reconstruction

June 23, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Progress of the Iraqi Security Forces

June 27, 2005—Congressional Delegation Inspects Guantanamo Detainee Facility

June 29, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Detainee Operations at Guantanamo

July 13, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the National Security Implications of the Possible Merger of the China National Offshore Oil Corporations (CNOOC) and the Unocal Corporation

July 13, 2005—Hunter Statement on CNOOC's Attempted Purchase of UNOCAL

July 20, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Air Force's Future Total Force

July 25, 2005—Gun Truck Armor Kits Provide Protection for U.S. Troops in Iraq

July 25, 2005—Congressional Delegation Visits With British Prime Minister Tony Blair to Express America's Condolences

July 27, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on China's Grand Strategy and Military Modernization

July 29, 2005—Hunter Appoints Three Distinguished Individuals to the Commission on National Guard and the Reserves

September 14, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Quadrennial Defense Review: Goals and Principles

September 29, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing to Review the Current Operations in Iraq

October 20, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Army's M-1114 Up-Armor HMMWV Distribution Strategy

October 27, 2005—Hunter Statement on Floor Consideration of Base Realignment and Closure Commission Recommendations

November 2, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Acquisition Reform

November 3, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Your Troops—Their Stories

November 9, 2005—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Defense Logistics Agency’s Prime Vendor Program

November 10, 2005—Everett Addresses Space and National Security Implications

November 15, 2006—Hunter Calls on American Media to Print U.S. Laws Banning Torture

November 17, 2005—Hunter Calls on Americans to “Hold Steady” in Iraq

November 22, 2005—Rep. Hayes Named to the Conference Committee on the Fiscal Year 2006 Department of Defense Authorization Act

December 15, 2005—Detainee Deal Now Resolved as Hunter Gains Protections for American Personnel; Hunter Gets Letter of Assurance from Director of National Intelligence

December 18, 2005—House and Senate Conferees Reach Agreement on H.R. 1815, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

SECOND SESSION

January 6, 2006—Congressional Delegation Visits Troops in Iraq and Afghanistan

January 20, 2006—Hunter Statement on Pete Geren’s Nomination for Undersecretary of the Army

February 1, 2006—Weldon Statement at Joint Hearing on Body and Vehicle Armor, Rotorcraft Safety

February 1, 2006—Hefley Statement at Joint Hearing on Body and Vehicle Armor, Rotorcraft Safety

February 1, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Options Available to the United States to Counter a Nuclear Iran

February 3, 2006—Hunter Statement on the DOD Quadrennial Defense Review

February 6, 2006—Hunter Statement on President Bush’s Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2007

February 8, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Posture Hearing on the DOD Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

February 15, 2006—Weldon Statement at Committee on Armed Services Posture Hearing on the Army’s Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

February 15, 2006—Hunter Statement on the Final Select Committee Report on Hurricane Katrina

February 16, 2006—Saxton Opening Statement at the Joint Hearing on the Able Danger Program

February 16, 2006—Weldon Opening Statement at the Joint Hearing on the Able Danger Program

February 16, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Hearing on Combating al-Qaeda and the Militant Jihadists

February 17, 2006—Hunter Statement on Rep. Joel Hefley’s (CO) Retirement

February 17, 2006—Hunter Statement on the Release of Additional Photographs from Abu Ghraib

February 28, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on the Aerial Refueling and Recapitalization Program

March 1, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request on the Department of Energy's Atomic Energy Defense Activities

March 1, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Posture Hearing on the Department of the Air Force's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

March 1, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Posture Hearing on the Department of the Navy's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

March 2, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the National Security Implications of Dubai Ports World's Takeover of U.S. Ports

March 2, 2006—Hunter Statement on Dubai and U.S. Ports

March 2, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Posture Hearing on the United States Transportation Command's Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request

March 6, 2006—Hunter Statement on U.S. Supreme Court Ruling Allowing Military Recruiters Access to College Campuses

March 7, 2006—Hunter Statement on Dubai Ports World's Announcement to Divest U.S. Holdings

March 8, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Special Operations Command

March 8, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. European Command

March 9, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the Missile Defense Agency and Ballistic Missile Defense Programs

March 9, 2006—Weldon Statement at Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Hearing on Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request for DOD Major Rotorcraft Programs

March 9, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea

March 14, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Department of Defense's Quadrennial Defense Review

March 15, 2006—McHugh Statement at Subcommittee on Military Personnel Hearing on the Current Status of Military Commissaries, Morale, Welfare and Recreation Activities

March 15, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on the Evolving Missions of the U.S. Navy and the Role of Surface and Subsurface Combatants

March 15, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Hearing on Over-

coming Interagency Problems in Implementing the Global War on Terror Strategy

March 15, 2006—Hunter Statement on Dubai Ports World's Release of Additional Information on Its Divestment of U.S. Holdings

March 15, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the U.S. Central Command

March 16, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request for Space Activities

March 16, 2006—Weldon Statement at Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Hearing on Fiscal Year 2007 Budget Request for Navy and Air Force Aviation Acquisition Programs

March 16, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the U.S. Southern Command

March 17, 2006—Hunter Calls on American Citizens to Emulate "Purpose and Mission" of Brave U.S. Troops on Third Anniversary of OIF

March 29, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on the Future Submarine Force Structure

March 29, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Acquisition Reform: Bringing Change to the Process

March 29, 2006—McHugh Statement at Subcommittee on Military Personnel Hearing on the Defense Health Program and Department of Defense Initiatives to Control Cost

March 29, 2006—Subcommittee on Readiness Chairman Hefley's Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Acquisition Reform: Bringing Change to the Process

March 29, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Defense Science and Technology—Investments to Shape the Evolving Terrorist Threat

March 29, 2006—Hunter Statement Honoring Casper Weinburger's Services to America

March 30, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on the Navy's Fiscal Year 2007 Shipbuilding Acquisition Strategy

March 30, 2006—Hefley Statement at Joint Hearing on Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies for Ground Equipment and Rotorcraft

March 30, 2006—Weldon Statement at Joint Hearing on Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies for Ground Equipment and Rotorcraft

March 31, 2006—Prime Vender Investigation a Win for American Taxpayers; Committee on Armed Services Members Release Results from DOD Investigation into Exorbitant Pricing

April 4, 2006—Weldon Statement at Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Posture Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Future Combat Systems, Modularity and Force Protection Initiatives

April 4, 2006—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Chairman Saxton Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Improving Interagency Coordination in the Global War on Terrorism and Beyond

April 4, 2006—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Chairman Weldon Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Improving Interagency Coordination in the Global War on Terrorism and Beyond

April 5, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on the United States Shipbuilding Industrial Base

April 5, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on Plans for Transforming the Department of Energy's Nuclear Weapons Complex

April 5, 2006—Hefley Statement at Subcommittee on Readiness Hearing on the Impact of Service Contracting on Military Readiness

April 5, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on Improving the Department of Defense's Capability to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction

April 5, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Major Defense Acquisition Reform Initiatives

April 6, 2006—Bartlett Statement at Subcommittee on Projection Forces Hearing on Efficient Propulsion Systems for Navy Vessels

April 6, 2006—Hefley Statement at Subcommittee on Readiness Hearing on the Navy's Transformation

April 6, 2006—McHugh Statement at Subcommittee on Military Personnel Hearing on Recruitment and Retention and Military Personnel Policy, Compensation and Benefits

April 6, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on Information Technology Issues and Defense Transformation

April 7, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Building the Capacity of Foreign Military Forces

April 7, 2006—New Congressionally-Mandated Reporting Requirement Highlights Dramatic Cost Increases in 36 Major Weapons Systems

April 18, 2006—Hunter expresses Strong Support for Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld

April 22, 2006—U.S. Congressional Delegation Attends Historic Meeting of Iraqi Parliament

April 28, 2006—Hunter Letter to President Bush Outlining His Grave Concerns with the Potential Merger Between French-owned Alcatel and American-Owned Lucent Technologies

May 3, 2006—Mark-up of H.R. 5122, the Fiscal Year 2007 National Defense Authorization Act

May 19, 2006—Hunter: "Don't Tar the Service of 922,000 Brave American Troops"

May 24, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the National Guard's Border Security Mission

May 25, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on the Department of Defense's Preparedness for the Upcoming Hurricane Season

June 8, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Iran: Geopolitical Dynamics and U.S. Policy Options

June 8, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Members Comment on the Death of Abu Musab al-Zarqawi

June 13, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on H.R. 5200, the National Defense Enhancement and National Guard Empowerment Act of 2006

June 15, 2006—Weldon Statement at Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Hearing on Combat Helmets, Body and Vehicle Armor in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom

June 16, 2006—Hunter Speech during House Debate on H. Res. 861, Declaring that the United States Will Prevail in the Global War on Terror

June 20, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on DOD Global Defense Posture Strategy Including Beddown, Support and Other Requirements

June 20, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on DOD Global Defense Posture Strategy

June 20, 2006—Hunter Statement: “Potential North Korea Missile Test Underscores Need for Ballistic Missile Defense System”

June 21, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on Space and U.S. National Power

June 21, 2006—Subcommittee for Strategic Forces Hearing Focuses on Protecting Space and U.S. National Power

June 21, 2006—McHugh Statement at Joint Hearing on Global Human Rights, Specifically Human Trafficking

June 21, 2006—Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Africa Joint Hearing Focuses on Global Human Rights, specifically Human Trafficking

June 22, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Military Power of the People’s Republic of China

June 26, 2006—Everett Statement at Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Hearing on Plutonium Deposition and the U.S. Mixed Oxide Facility

June 27, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Army and Marine Corps Reset Programs for Ground Equipment Utilized in OIF and OEF

June 27, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on Army and Marine Corps Reset Strategies

June 28, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on the Status of Safety and Security in Afghanistan

June 28, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Receives Update on the Status of Safety and Security in Afghanistan

June 29, 2006—Hunter to Explore all Legislative Options Available to Try Terrorists

June 29, 2006—Rep. Weldon Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on New Discovery of Weapons of Mass Destruction in Iraq

June 29, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on Reports of Weapons of Mass Destruction Findings in Iraq

June 29, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on the Missions and Responsibilities of the U.S. Special Operations Command

June 29, 2006—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Focuses on the United States Special Operations Command's Roles and Missions

July 10, 2006—Hunter Statement Clarifying House Position on Legal Immigrants Serving in the U.S. Armed Services

July 12, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Military Commissions and Tribunals

July 12, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on Possible Legislative Initiatives to Try Detainees for War Crimes

July 20, 2006—Hunter Supports President Bush on Oman Free Trade Agreement

July 25, 2006—Committee on Armed Services to Hold Field Hearing in Michigan to Address Border Security

July 26, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Military Commissions and Standards Utilized in Trying Detainees

July 26, 2006—Hunter Statement Regarding the National Foreign Investment and Strengthened Transparency Act

July 31, 2006—Committee on Armed Services to Hold Field Hearing in Arizona

August 23, 2006—Hunter Announces Increase in Funding for Combat Readiness, Equipment Reset

September 1, 2006—Subcommittee on Strategic Forces Chairman Everett Lauds Successful Missile Defense Test

September 6, 2006—Hunter Statement Regarding President Bush's Proposal for the Treatment and Prosecution of Terrorists

September 7, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Military Commissions and Standards Utilized in Trying Detainees

September 7, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on White House Legislative Initiative to Try Detainees

September 11, 2006—Hunter Unveils Military Commissions Act of 2006

September 12, 2006—Hunter Reacts to Democrat Leader's Osama bin Laden Comments

September 13, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Mark-up on H.R. 6054, the Military Commissions Act of 2006

September 13, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Votes to Create New Process to Prosecute Terrorists, Protect Troops on the Battlefield

September 21, 2006—Weldon Statement at Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces Hearing on Combat Vehicle Active Protection Systems

September 21, 2006—Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces hearing focuses on Combat Vehicle Active Protection Systems

September 26, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Hearing on En-

ergy Efficiency and Alternative Energy Programs of the Department of Defense

September 26, 2006—Joint Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities and Subcommittee on Readiness Hearing Focuses on Energy Efficiency and Alternative Energy Programs of the Department of Defense

September 26, 2006—Hunter Responds to Democrat Allegations about the Iraq War

September 26, 2006—Hunter, Sensenbrenner Introduce Military Commissions Agreement Reached Among House, Senate and Bush Administration

September 27, 2006—Saxton Statement at Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Hearing on the Department of Defense's Irregular Warfare Map

September 27, 2006—Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities Hearing Focuses on Irregular Warfare Map

September 27, 2006—Hunter Floor Statement during Debate on H.R. 6166, Military Commissions Act of 2006

September 27, 2006—McHugh Opening Statement at Joint Hearing on the Montgomery G.I. Bill for Members of the Selected Reserve

September 27, 2006—Joint Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Committee on Veterans Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity Hearing Focuses on the Montgomery G.I. Bill for Members of the Selected Reserve

September 28, 2006—Hunter, Warner Reach Deal on Annual Defense Authorization Bill

September 29, 2006—House and Senate Conferees Approve the Conference Report for the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007

October 24, 2006—Hunter: Send Iraqi Military Battalions to Baghdad

October 31, 2006—Hunter Calls on Kerry to Apologize to U.S. Troops

November 3, 2006—Hunter Corrects New York Times Regarding Special Inspector General for Iraq Provision in National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007

November 8, 2006—Hunter Comments on Secretary Rumsfeld's Resignation

November 14, 2006—Hunter Statement on Lucent Alcatel Merger

November 15, 2006—Hunter Statement at Committee on Armed Services Hearing on Current Situation and Military Operations in Iraq

November 15, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Hearing Focuses on Situation in Iraq

November 15, 2006—Hunter Statement Regarding Rep. Simmons

November 20, 2006—Hunter: Best Option is to "Go Iraqi"

December 5, 2006—House Overwhelmingly Approves Resolution to Help Wounded Servicemembers Find Employment

December 6, 2006—Hunter: "American Policy Should Flow From Our Shores With One Voice"

December 6, 2006—Subcommittee on Military Personnel Chairman McHugh Holds Hearing to Assess Criteria, Consistency and Timeliness of Valor Awards and Decoration

December 6, 2006—Chairman Hunter, Members of the House Armed Services Committee Release Comprehensive Defense Review

December 7, 2006—Committee on Armed Services Holds Hearing to Assess Military Training Teams Embedded With Iraqi Units

December 13, 2006—Hunter: “Goodyear Tire and Steelworkers Need to Step Up For America”

