AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

Union Calendar No. 605

106th Congress, 2d Session – – – – – – – – – – – – – House Report 106–1043

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES

of the

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

FOR THE

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

JANUARY 2, 2001.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

89–006 WASHINGTON : 2001

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB STUMP, Arizona
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN R. KASICH, Ohio
HERBERT H. BATEMAN,[1] Virginia
JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
STEVE BUYER, Indiana
TILLIE K. FOWLER, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JAMES TALENT, Missouri
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD "BUCK" MCKEON, California
J.C. WATTS, JR., Oklahoma
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
WALTER B. JONES, JR., North Carolina
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
BOB RILEY, Alabama
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
MARY BONO, California
JOSEPH PITTS, Pennsylvania
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
STEVEN KUYKENDALL, California
DONALD SHERWOOD, Pennsylvania
HEATHER WILSON,[2] New Mexico

IKE SKELTON, Missouri
NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
OWEN PICKETT, Virginia
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTIN T. MEEHAN, Massachusetts
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam
PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
TOM ALLEN, Maine
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JAMES H. MALONEY, Connecticut
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, GEORGIA
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
MIKE THOMPSON, California
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut

ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*
ASHLEY GODWIN, *Legislative Operations Clerk*

---

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.
[2] Ms. Wilson was elected to the Committee October 3, 2000.

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 2, 2001.

Hon. JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. TRANDAHL: Pursuant to House Rule XI 1.(d), there is transmitted herewith the report of activities of the Committee on Armed Services for the 106th Congress.

Sincerely,

FLOYD D. SPENCE, *Chairman.*

CONTENTS

	Page
Powers and Duties, Committee on Armed Services—106th Congress	1
Background	1
Constitutional Powers and Duties	2
House Rules on Jurisdiction	3
Investigative Authority and Legislative Oversight	3
Committee Rules	4
Rules Governing Procedure	4
Composition of the Committee on Armed Services—106th Congress	13
Subcommittees of the Committee on Armed Services—106th Congress	14
Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee	14
Military Personnel Subcommittee	14
Military Procurement Subcommittee	15
Military Readiness Subcommittee	15
Military Research and Development Subcommittee	16
Full Committee Panels	17
Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation	17
Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine	17
Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization	18
Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism	18
Committee Staff	19
Committee Meetings	21
Legislative Actions	21
Legislation Enacted Into Law	21
Public Law 106–38 (H.R. 4)	21
Public Law 106–65 (S. 1059)	21
Public Law 106–120 (H.R. 1555)	24
Public Law 106–195 (H.J. Res. 86)	25
Public Law 106–227 (H.J. Res. 101)	25
Public Law 106–398 (H.R. 4205)	25
Public Law 106–419 (S. 1402)	28
Public Law 106–446 (H.R. 5314)	28
Legislation Reported But Not Enacted	29
H.Res. 534	29
H.R. 850	29
H.R. 3383	29
H.R. 3906	30
H.R. 4446	30
H.R. 4737	31
Oversight Activities	33
Summary of Oversight Plan	33
Actions and Recommendations	33
Additional Oversight Activities	38
Other Activities of the Full Committee	47
Budget Activity	47
Full Committee Hearings	47
Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation	55
Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine	55
Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization	56
Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism	57

Page

Other Activities of Subcommittees 59
Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee 59
Military Personnel Subcommittee 60
Military Procurement Subcommittee 60
Military Readiness Subcommittee 61
Military Research and Development Subcommittee 62
Publications 65
Committee Prints of Laws Relating to National Defense 65
Committee Prints 65
Published Proceedings 65
House Reports 69
Public Laws 71
Press Releases 73

Union Calendar No. 605

106TH CONGRESS, 2d Session | HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES | REPORT 106–1043

REPORT OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

JANUARY 2, 2001.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

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

R E P O R T

ON

POWERS AND DUTIES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—106TH 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 legislation 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. 101, approved by the House on March 23, 1999, provided funds for oversight responsibilities to be conducted in the 106th 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(g) 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 20, 1999, and adopted the following rules governing procedure and rules for investigative hearings conducted by subcommittees.

(H.A.S.C. No. 106–1)

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 (hereafter 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 Tuesday at 10:00 a.m., and at such other times as may be fixed by the chairman of the Committee (hereafter 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 Tuesday 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 and the other subcommittee chairmen with a view toward avoiding simultaneous scheduling of committee and subcommittee meetings or hearings wherever possible.

RULE 4. SUBCOMMITTEES

The Committee shall be organized to consist of five standing subcommittees with the following jurisdictions:

Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities: military construction; real estate acquisitions and disposals; housing and support; base closure; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel: military forces and authorized strengths; integration of active and reserve components; military personnel policy; compensation and other benefits; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Procurement: the annual authorization for procurement of military weapon systems and components thereof, including full scale development and systems transition; military application of nuclear energy; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Readiness: the annual authorization for operation and maintenance; the readiness and preparedness requirements of the defense establishment; and related legislative oversight.

Subcommittee on Military Research and Development: the annual authorization for military research and development and related legislative oversight.

RULE 5. COMMITTEE PANELS

(a) The Chairman may designate a panel of the Committee drawn from 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 OF LEGISLATION AND SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

(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 hearing 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 3 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 ranking minority member of the Committee or of any 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 and promptly entered into the committee scheduling service of the House Information Resources.

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 closed to the public 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 less 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 close, the vote must be by record vote and in open session, there being a majority of the Committee or subcommittee present.

(b) Whenever it is asserted that the evidence or testimony at a hearing or meeting may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, and 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 closed session, if by a majority vote of those present, there being in attendance no less 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 less than two members of the Committee or subcommittee, may also vote to close the hearing or meeting for the sole purpose 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) which have been closed under the provisions of rule 9(a) above for national security purposes for the taking of testimony: *Provided,* That such staff member's attendance at such hearings is subject to the approval of the Committee or subcommittee as dictated by national security requirements at the time: *Provided further,* That this paragraph addresses hearings only and not briefings or meetings held under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this rule; and Provided further, That the attainment of any security clearances involved is the responsibility of individual members.

(d) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(2) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, no Member 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 by the same procedures designated in this rule for closing hearings to the public: *Provided, however,* That the Committee or the subcommittee may by the same procedure vote to close up to 5 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; and

(3) Authorizing the issuance of subpoenas.

(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 5 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 5 minutes to address the Committee or subcommittee on behalf of an amendment which the member has offered to any pending bill or resolution. The 5 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 will be recognized by the Chairman or subcommittee chairman, as appropriate, in order of seniority. Those members arriving subsequently will 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 the majority.

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

RULE 12. SUBPOENA AUTHORITY

(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 is 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 documents as it deems necessary. The Chairman of the Committee, or any member designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witness.

(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.

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 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 a quorum of the Committee or subcommittee, as appropriate.

(b) The Committee and each subcommittee shall require each witness who is to appear before it to file with the Committee in ad-

vance 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 they have been 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 5 minutes to interrogate each witness until such time as each member has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness; 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 which 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 may be had 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 may 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 in-

tention to file supplemental, minority, additional or dissenting views, that member shall be entitled to not less than 2 calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays) 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 of the House of Representatives who has requested the opportunity to review such material.

RULE 22. COMMITTEE STAFFING

The staffing of the Committee and the standing subcommittees 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. INVESTIGATIVE 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—106TH CONGRESS

Pursuant to H. Res. 6, election of majority members, and H. Res. 7, election of minority members (both adopted January 16, 1999), the following members served on the Committee on Armed Services in the 106th Congress:

FLOYD D. SPENCE, South Carolina, *Chairman*

BOB STUMP, Arizona, *Vice Chairman*
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOHN R. KASICH, Ohio
HERBERT H. BATEMAN, Virginia [1]
JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah
CURT WELDON, Pennsylvania
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
STEVE BUYER, Indiana
TILLIE K. FOWLER, Florida
JOHN M. MCHUGH, New York
JAMES M. TALENT, Missouri
TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, California
J.C. WATTS, JR., Oklahoma
MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
JOHN N. HOSTETTLER, Indiana
SAXBY CHAMBLISS, Georgia
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
JOE SCARBOROUGH, Florida
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
LINDSEY GRAHAM, South Carolina
JIM RYUN, Kansas
BOB RILEY, Alabama
JIM GIBBONS, Nevada
MARY BONO, California
JOSEPH R. PITTS, Pennsylvania
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL, California
DON SHERWOOD, California
HEATHER WILSON, New Mexico [2]

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, Ranking Member
NORMAN SISISKY, Virginia
JOHN M. SPRATT, JR., South Carolina
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
OWEN PICKETT, Virginia
LANE EVANS, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
MARTIN T. MEEHAN, Massachusetts
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam
PATRICK J. KENNEDY, Rhode Island
ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH, Illinois
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas
THOMAS H. ALLEN, Maine
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas
JIM TURNER, Texas
ADAM SMITH, Washington
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
JAMES H. MALONEY, Connecticut
MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ, Texas
CYNTHIA A. MCKINNEY, Georgia
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
BARON P. HILL, Indiana
MIKE THOMPSON, California
JOHN B. LARSON, Connecticut

---

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.
[2] Ms. Wilson was elected to the committee on October 3, 2000, pursuant to H. Res. 608.

SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES 106TH CONGRESS

The following subcommittees were established at the organizational meeting of the Committee on Armed Services on January 20, 1999:

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Military construction; real estate acquisitions and disposals; housing and support; base closure; and related legislative oversight.

Mr. HEFLEY, *Chairman*

Mrs. FOWLER
Mr. MCHUGH
Mr. MCKEON
Mr. HOSTETTLER
Mr. HILLEARY, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. SCARBOROUGH
Mr. STUMP
Mr. SAXTON
Mr. BUYER

Mr. TAYLOR, Ranking Member
Mr. ORTIZ
Mr. ABERCROMBIE
Mr. UNDERWOOD
Mr. REYES
Mr. SNYDER
Mr. BRADY
Mr. THOMPSON

MILITARY PERSONNEL

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4—Military forces and authorized strengths; integration of active and reserve components; military personnel policy; compensation and other benefits; and related legislative oversight.

Mr. BUYER, *Chairman*

Mr. BARTLETT
Mr. WATTS
Mr. THORNBERRY
Mr. GRAHAM, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. RYUN
Mrs. BONO
Mr. PITTS
Mr. HAYES
Mr. KUYKENDALL

Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ranking Member
Mr. MEEHAN
Mr. KENNEDY
Ms. SANCHEZ
Ms. MCKINNEY
Ms. TAUSCHER
Mr. THOMPSON
Mr. LARSON

MILITARY PROCUREMENT

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4–Annual authorization for procurement of military weapon systems and components thereof, including full-scale development and systems transition; military application of nuclear energy; and related legislative oversight.

Mr. HUNTER, *Chairman*

Mr. SPENCE
Mr. STUMP
Mr. HANSEN
Mr. SAXTON
Mr. TALENT
Mr. EVERETT
Mr. WATTS
Mr. THORNBERRY, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. GRAHAM
Mr. RYUN
Mr. GIBBONS
Mrs. BONO
Mr. PITTS
Mr. HAYES

Mr. SISISKY, Ranking Member
Mr. SKELTON
Mr. SPRATT
Mr. EVANS
Mr. BLAGOJEVICH
Mr. ALLEN
Mr. TURNER
Mr. SMITH
Mr. MALONEY
Mr. McINTYRE
Ms. McKINNEY
Ms. TAUSCHER
Mr. BRADY

MILITARY READINESS

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4–Annual authorization for operation and maintenance; the readiness and preparedness requirements of the defense establishment; and related legislative oversight.

Mr. BATEMAN, *Chairman* [1]

Mr. CHAMBLISS
Mr. JONES, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. RILEY
Mr. HUNTER
Mr. HANSEN
Mr. WELDON
Mrs. FOWLER
Mr. TALENT
Mr. EVERETT
Mr. GIBBONS
Mr. SHERWOOD

Mr. ORTIZ, Ranking Member
Mr. SISISKY
Mr. SPRATT
Mr. PICKETT
Mr. UNDERWOOD
Mr. BLAGOJEVICH
Mr. SMITH
Mr. MALONEY
Mr. McINTYRE
Mr. RODRIGUEZ

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Jurisdiction pursuant to Committee Rule 4–Annual authorization for military research and development and related legislative oversight.

Mr. WELDON, *Chairman*

Mr. BARTLETT
Mr. KUYKENDALL
Mr. SHERWOOD
Mr. KASICH
Mr. BATEMAN [1]
Mr. HEFLEY
Mr. MCHUGH
Mr. MCKEON
Mr. HOSTETTLER, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. CHAMBLISS
Mr. HILLEARY
Mr. SCARBOROUGH
Mr. JONES
Mr. RILEY

Mr. PICKETT, Ranking Member
Mr. TAYLOR
Mr. MEEHAN
Mr. KENNEDY
Mr. REYES
Mr. ALLEN
Mr. SNYDER
Mr. TURNER
Ms. SANCHEZ
Mr. RODRIGUEZ
Mr. ANDREWS
Mr. HILL
Mr. LARSON

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.

FULL COMMITTEE PANELS

The following full committee panels were appointed as follows:

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION

FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Purpose—Oversight responsibility for all aspects of non-appropriated fund activities, including appropriated funding in support of those activities, within the Department of Defense, including commissaries, exchanges, clubs and related activities.

Mr. MCHUGH, *Chairman*

Mr. STUMP
Mr. BATEMAN[1]
Mr. BARTLETT
Mr. WATTS
Mr. CHAMBLISS
Mr. SCARBOROUGH
Mr. JONES
Mr. RILEY, *Vice Chairman*
Mr. HAYES

Mr. MEEHAN, Ranking Member
Mr. SISISKY
Mr. ORTIZ
Mr. PICKETT
Mr. UNDERWOOD
Mr. REYES
Mr. ANDREWS
(vacancy)

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

FEBRUARY 5, 1999

Purpose—Oversight responsibility for all issues, including funding, related to the national security aspects of the Merchant Marine.

Mr. BATEMAN, *Chairman*[2]

Mr. HUNTER
Mr. WELDON
Mr. SAXTON
Mr. SCARBOROUGH
Mr. JONES
Mr. KUYKENDALL, *Vice Chairman*

Mr. UNDERWOOD, Ranking Member
Mr. TAYLOR
Mr. ABERCROMBIE
Mr. ALLEN
Mr. MALONEY

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.
[2] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REORGANIZATION

OCTOBER 8, 1999

Purpose—Oversight responsibility for the implementation of the Department of Energy reorganization provisions contained in title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

Mr. THORNBERRY, *Chairman*

Mr. HUNTER
Mr. GRAHAM
Mr. GIBBONS
Mr. RYUN
Mr. SPENCE, Ex Officio

Ms. TAUSCHER, Ranking Member
Mr. SISISKY
Mr. SPRATT
Mr. SKELTON, Ex Officio

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON TERRORISM

March 2, 2000

Purpose—Oversight responsibility for assessing the nature of the terrorist threat facing U.S. armed forces and national security interests, including the threat of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction.

Mr. SAXTON, *Chairman*

Mr. HUNTER
Mr. WELDON
Mr. BATEMAN [1]
Mr. BARTLETT
Mr. CHAMBLISS
Mr. GIBBONS
Mr. HAYES
Mr. PITTS
Mr. SPENCE, Ex Officio
(vacancy)

Mr. SNYDER, Ranking Member
Mr. TAYLOR
Mr. MALONEY
Mr. McINTYRE
Mr. ANDREWS
Mr. HILL
Mr. REYES
Mr. SKELTON, Ex Officio

[1] Mr. Bateman died September 11, 2000.

COMMITTEE STAFF

By committee resolution adopted at the organizational meeting on January 20, 1999, or by authority of the Chairman, the following persons were appointed to the staff of the committee during the 106th Congress:

ANDREW K. ELLIS, *Staff Director* (resigned March 2, 2000)
ROBERT S. RANGEL, *Staff Director*
PHILIP W. GRONE, *Deputy Staff Director*
RITA D. THOMPSON, *Professional Staff Member*
BRENDA J. WRIGHT, *Professional Staff Member*
KATHLEEN A. LIPOVAC, *Professional Staff Member*
FRANK A. BARNES, *Staff Assistant*
BETTY B. GRAY, *Staff Assistant*
PEGGY COSSEBOOM, *Staff Assistant*
PETER M. STEFFES, *Professional Staff Member*
ERNEST B. WARRINGTON, Jr., *Staff Assistant*
DIANE W. BOWMAN, *Staff Assistant*
STEVEN A. THOMPSON, *Professional Staff Member*
MICHAEL R. HIGGINS, *Professional Staff Member*
JEAN D. REED, *Professional Staff Member*
GEORGE O. WITHERS, *Professional Staff Member*
DUDLEY L. TADEMY, *Professional Staff Member*
JOHN D. CHAPLA, *Professional Staff Member*
STEPHEN P. ANSLEY, *Professional Staff Member*
DOUGLAS H. NECESSARY, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned January 30, 2000)
DIONEL M. AVILES, *Professional Staff Member*
PETER V. PRY, *Professional Staff Member*
DAVID J. TRACHTENBERG, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS M. DONNELLY, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned September 10, 1999)
REBECCA J. ANFINSON, *Staff Assistant*
MAUREEN P. CRAGIN, *Director of Communications*
HEATHER L. HESCHELES, *Research Assistant* (resigned April 30, 2000)
ROGER M. SMITH, *Professional Staff Member*
B. RYAN VAART, *Professional Staff Member*
PETER J. BERRY, *Professional Staff Member*
MIEKE Y. EOYANG, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned September 1, 1999)
ROBERT W. LAUTRUP, *Professional Staff Member*
JOSEPH F. BOESSEN, *Professional Staff Member*
CHRISTIAN P. ZUR, *Professional Staff Member*
JOHN F. SULLIVAN, *Professional Staff Member*
NANCY M. WARNER, *Staff Assistant*
BRIAN R. GREEN, *Professional Staff Member*
NOAH L. SIMON, *Research Assistant*
MICHAEL A. KHATCHADURIAN, *Staff Assistant* (resigned January 30, 1999)
THOMAS E. HAWLEY, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS P. GLAKAS, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned January 30, 2000)
MICHELLE L. SPENCER, *Research Assistant* (resigned June 4, 1999)
CHRISTOPHER T. PEACE, *Professional Staff Member* (resigned March 7, 1999)
WILLIAM H. NATTER, *Professional Staff Member*
MONICA M. BARRON, *Executive Assistant to the Staff Director* (resigned March 27, 2000)
JEREMY D. WAGNER, *Staff Assistant* (resigned August 3, 1999)
SHEILA A. DEARYBURY, *Counsel* (resigned October 6, 1999)
ERICA A. STRIEBEL, *Staff Assistant* (resigned July 14, 2000)
ASHLEY D. GODWIN, *Legislative Operations Clerk*
ELIZABETH A. SHARP, *Staff Assistant*
JOHN J. POLLARD III, *Counsel*

JAMES M. LARIVIERE, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed January 19, 1999)
JESSE D. TOLLESON, Jr., *Staff Assistant* (appointed February 9, 1999)
DONNA M. MIRANDOLA, *Staff Assistant* (appointed February 10, 1999; resigned December 8, 1999)
MARY ELLEN FRASER, *Counsel* (appointed March 8, 1999)
EDWARD P. WYATT, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed March 22, 1999)
JESSICA R. TAYLOR, *Staff Assistant* (appointed November 2, 1999; resigned July 23, 2000)
DEBRA S. WADA, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed November 9, 1999)
JOHN M. BERNARDS, *Staff Assistant* (appointed December 1, 1999; resigned July 7, 2000)
LISA-MARIE WETZEL, *Staff Assistant* (appointed December 2, 1999; resigned August 21, 2000)
HENRY J. SCHWEITER, *Counsel* (appointed January 4, 2000)
J.J. GERTLER, *Professional Staff Member* (appointed February 22, 2000)
DANIEL T. HILTON, *Staff Assistant* (appointed February 28, 2000)
LAURA R. HAAS, *Executive Assistant* (appointed April 17, 2000)
LAURA C. TRUESDELL, *Staff Assistant* (appointed May 22, 2000)
CHRISTOPHER A. KIM, *Staff Assistant* (appointed July 10, 2000)
EILEEN C. HARLEY, *Intern* (appointed July 10, 2000; resigned September 15, 2000)
KATHERINE K. GORDON, *Staff Assistant* (appointed August 14, 2000)
LAURA K. HANCOCK, *Staff Assistant* (appointed November 6, 2000)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

A total of 135 meetings were held by the Committee on Armed Services, its subcommittees, and panels during the 106th Congress. The committee held 10 joint meetings. A breakdown of the meetings and briefings follows:

Full Committee	39
Subcommittees:	
Military Installations and Facilities	10
Military Personnel	17
Military Procurement	26
Military Readiness	20
Military Research and Development	19
Full Committee Panels:	
Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation	4
Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine	4
Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization	3
Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism	3

LEGISLATIVE ACTIONS

LEGISLATION ENACTED INTO LAW

PUBLIC LAW 106–38 (H.R. 4)

To declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense

H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, declares it the policy of the United States to deploy as soon as technologically possible a National Missile Defense (NMD) system capable of defending U.S. territory against limited ballistic missile attack, with funding subject to the annual authorization of appropriations and the annual appropriation of funds for NMD, and to seek continued negotiated reductions in Russian nuclear forces. This measure was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on International Relations. On February 25, 1999, the Committee on Armed Services ordered H.R. 4 reported favorably to the House. The bill passed the House on March 18, 1999, under suspension of the rules. H.R. 4 was subsequently amended by the Senate and passed on May 18, 1999, by unanimous consent. On May 20, 1999, the House agreed to the Senate amendment. H.R. 4 was signed by the President and became law on July 22, 1999.

(H. Rept. 106–39, Part I)

PUBLIC LAW 106–65 (S. 1059)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes

Public Law 106–65 authorizes funds totaling $290,851,066,000 for national defense functions for fiscal year 2000 and provides a budget authority level of $288,811,252,000.

Division A

Division A of Public Law 106–65 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2000 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of Title I authorizes $56,067,483,000 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, and limitations, authorize transfer of, or earmark funds for, specified programs for the armed forces, including the Army Multiple Launch Rocket System, the Navy F/A–18E/F Super Hornet aircraft and Arleigh Burke class destroyer programs, the Air Force F–22 aircraft program, and other matters such as the chemical stockpile destruction program.

Subtitle A of Title II authorizes $36,266,537,000 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 7 separate research and development-related matters.

Subtitles C through E of Title II address ballistic missile defense programs, long-term military capabilities, and miscellaneous reports and other matters.

Subtitle A of Title III authorizes $104,332,770,000 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and $375,044,000 for working capital funds for the armed forces and defense agencies, Armed Forces Retirement Home, and for the transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund.

Subtitles B through I of Title III address program requirements, restrictions, and limitations; environmental provisions; depot-level activities; performance of functions by private-sector sources; defense dependents education; military readiness issues; information technology issues; as well as other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2000 and authorizes appropriations of $73,723,293,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2000. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2000 are as follows:

Army, 480,000
Navy, 372,037
Marine Corps, 172,518
Air Force, 360,877

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2000 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 350,000
Army Reserve, 205,000
Naval Reserve, 90,288
Marine Corps Reserve, 39,624
Air National Guard, 106,678
Air Force Reserve, 73,708
Coast Guard Reserve, 8,000

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserve components for fiscal year 2000 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 22,430
Army Reserve, 12,804
Naval Reserve, 15,010
Marine Corps Reserve, 2,272
Air National Guard, 11,157
Air Force Reserve, 1,134

Title V sets military personnel policy, including provisions that address officer personnel policy; the reserve components; military technicians; service academies; education and training; reserve component management; decorations, awards, and commendations; recruiting matters; missing persons matters; domestic violence; and other matters such as funeral honors details for funerals of veterans.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonuses and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retired pay reform; retiree and survivor benefits; participation in Thrift Savings Plan; and related matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, including health care services; the TRICARE program; and other healthcare matters.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including amendments to general contracting authorities, procedures, and limitations, and other matters such as Mentor-Protege Program improvements.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including Department of Defense strategic planning, organization, personnel management, and other related matters such as management of the Civil Air Patrol.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; naval vessels and shipyards; civilian law enforcement and counterdrug activities; miscellaneous report requirements and repeals; information security; memorials and commemorations; and other matters.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel.

Title XII concerns matters relating to other nations including matters relating to the People's Republic of China; matters relating to the Balkans; matters relating to NATO and other Allies; and other matters such as limitations on deployments to Haiti.

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

Title XIV addresses proliferation and export controls.

Title XV addresses arms control and counterproliferation matters.

Title XVI addresses national security space matters such as the space technology guide; commercial space launch services; and the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization.

Title XVII addresses the Troops-to-Teachers Program.

Division B

Division B of Public Law 106–65 authorizes appropriations in the amount of $8,497,243,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the reserve compo-

nents, and the NATO security investment program for fiscal year 2000. In addition, Division B contains military construction program and military family housing changes; real property and facilities administration; defense base closure and realignment; miscellaneous land conveyances, and expansion of Arlington National Cemetery. Division B also addresses the Commission on the National Military Museum and military land withdrawals.

Division C

Division C of Public Law 106–65 authorizes appropriations in the amount of $12,110,322 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2000. Division C includes an authorization for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; the National Defense Stockpile; the Panama Canal Commission; and the Maritime Administration.

Title XXXII establishes the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and designates the Under Secretary for Nuclear Security of the Department of Energy as the Administrator of the NNSA.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services reported S. 1059 on May 17, 1999; H.R. 1401 was reported, amended, by the House Committee on Armed Services on May 24, 1999. S. 1059 passed the Senate, amended, on May 27, 1999, and the House, amended, on June 14, 1999, after all was struck after the enacting clause and the provisions of H.R. 1401 were inserted in lieu thereof. Conferees filed a conference report on August 6, 1999, which was agreed to in the House on September 15, 1999 and in the Senate on September 22, 1999. S. 1059 was signed by the President and became law on October 5, 1999.

(S. Rept. 106–50; H. Rept. 106–162; H. Rept. 106–301; H.A.S.C. 106–2; H.A.S.C. 106–3; H.A.S.C. 106–4; H.A.S.C. 106–5; H.A.S.C. 106–6; H.A.S.C. 106–7; H.A.S.C. 106–8; H.A.S.C. 106–9; H.A.S.C. 106–15; H.A.S.C. 106–23)

PUBLIC LAW 106–120 (H.R. 1555)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes

Public Law 106–120 authorizes appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, including Department of Defense intelligence-related activities within the jurisdiction shared by the Committee on Armed Services and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Among its provisions, Public Law 106–120 authorizes appropriations for the Intelligence Community Management Account of the Director of Central Intelligence and earmarks funds authorized for the National Drug Intelligence Center. Within the Department of Defense Intelligence Activities provisions is an amendment to the National Security Act of 1947 to authorize the Director of the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) to exempt NIMA operational files from provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, which require publication, disclosure, search, or review.

Referred additionally to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee was discharged from further consideration on May 11, 1999. H.R. 1555 passed the House by voice vote on May 13, 1999, and passed the Senate by voice vote on July 21, 1999. The bill was enacted into law on December 3, 1999, following conference between the House and Senate in which conferees were appointed from the Committee on Armed Services.

(H. Rept. 106–130, Part I; H. Rept. 106–457)

PUBLIC LAW 106–195 (H.J. RES. 86)

Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes

H.J. Res. 86 recognizes the historic significance of the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and honors the personal commitment and sacrifices of the members of the Armed Forces who served and fought in Korea to defeat the spread of communism. The joint resolution was passed by the House under suspension of the rules on March 8, 2000, and subsequently passed the Senate by unanimous consent on April 13, 2000. The measure was signed by the President and became law on May 2, 2000.

PUBLIC LAW 106–227 (H.J. RES. 101)

Recognizing the 225th birthday of the United States Army

H.J. Res. 101 expresses the appreciation of the people of the United States to the Army and the dedicated soldiers who have served in it, and honors the valor, commitment, and sacrifice that American soldiers have displayed throughout the 225-year history of the Army. The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services on June 8, 2000, and was considered and passed under suspension of the rules on June 13, 2000. H.J. Res. 101 passed the Senate by unanimous consent on June 15, 2000, and was signed by the President and became law on June 29, 2000.

PUBLIC LAW 106–398 (H.R. 4205)

To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 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 106–398, the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, authorizes funds totaling $310,681,100,000 for national defense functions for fiscal year 2001 and provides a budget authority level of $309,900,320,000.

Division A

Division A of Public Law 106–398 authorizes funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense.

Subtitle A of Title I authorizes $63,166,621,000 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 F of Title I establish additional program requirements, restrictions, and limitations, and authorize transfer of or earmark funds for specified programs for the armed forces in-

cluding reports and limitations relating to Army transformation; Navy CVNX–1 nuclear aircraft carrier and Virginia class submarine programs; Air Force report on the B–2 bomber, and other matters such as chemical demilitarization.

Subtitle A of Title II authorizes $38,936,673,000 for research, development, test and evaluation for the armed forces and the defense agencies, including amounts for basic and applied research.

Subtitle B of Title II establishes certain program requirements, restrictions, and limitations on 12 separate research and development-related matters.

Subtitles C through E of Title II address Ballistic Missile Defense, high energy laser programs, and other matters such as Air Force science and technology planning.

Subtitle A of Title III authorizes $109,750,164,000 for operation and maintenance (O&M) and $1,154,434,000 for working capital funds for the armed forces and defense agencies, including the Armed Forces Retirement Home, transfer from National Defense Stockpile Transaction Fund, and joint warfighting capabilities assessment teams.

Subtitles B through H of Title III address environmental provisions; commissaries and nonappropriated fund instrumentalities; Department of Defense industrial facilities; performance of functions by private-sector sources; defense dependents education; military readiness issues; as well as other miscellaneous matters.

Title IV provides military personnel authorizations for the active and reserve forces for fiscal year 2001 and authorizes appropriations of $75,801,666,000 for military personnel for fiscal year 2001. The end strengths for active duty personnel for fiscal year 2001 are as follows:

Army, 480,000
Navy, 372,642
Marine Corps, 172,600
Air Force, 357,000

The Selected Reserve end strengths for fiscal year 2001 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 350,526
Army Reserve, 205,300
Naval Reserve, 88,900
Marine Corps Reserve, 39,558
Air National Guard, 108,022
Air Force Reserve, 74,358
Coast Guard Reserve, 8,000

The end strengths for reserves on active duty in support of the reserve components for fiscal year 2001 are as follows:

Army National Guard, 22,974
Army Reserve, 13,106
Naval Reserve, 14,649
Marine Corps Reserve, 2,261
Air National Guard, 11,170
Air Force Reserve, 1,336

Title V sets military personnel policy, including provisions that address officer personnel policy; reserve component matters; military education and training; decorations, awards and commendations; military justice and legal assistance matters; recruiting mat-

ters; and other matters such as the National Guard Challenge Program.

Title VI addresses compensation and other personnel benefits, including pay and allowances; bonus and special and incentive pays; travel and transportation allowances; retired pay, survivor benefits and related matters.

Title VII contains military health care provisions, including health care services; senior health care; the TRICARE program; demonstration projects; joint initiatives with the Department of Veterans Affairs; and other matters such as the management of the anthrax vaccine immunization program.

Title VIII addresses acquisition policy, acquisition management and related matters, including amendments to general contracting authorities, information technology, studies and reports, and other acquisition-related matters.

Title IX contains Department of Defense organization and management provisions, including duties and functions of Department of Defense officers, Department of Defense organizations, information security, reports and other matters.

Title X addresses general provisions relating to financial matters; naval vessels and shipyards; counter-drug activities; counterterrorism and domestic preparedness; strategic forces; miscellaneous report requirements and repeals; government information security reform; security matters; and other matters such as the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry.

Title XI addresses Department of Defense civilian personnel.

Title XII addresses matters relating to other nations including matters relating to arms control; matters relating to the Balkans; NATO and United States Forces in Europe; and other matters such as the adjustment of composite theoretical performance levels of high-performance computers.

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

Title XIV establishes the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack.

Title XV concerns matters relating to Navy activities on the Island of Vieques, Puerto Rico.

Title XVI addresses GI Bill educational assistance and Department of Veterans Affairs duty to assist.

Title XVII concerns assistance to firefighters.

Title XVIII contains provisions that address impact aid.

Division B

Division B of Public Law 106–398 authorizes appropriations in the amount of $8,821,172,000 for military construction and military family housing in support of the active forces, the reserve components, and the NATO security investment program. In addition, Division B contains miscellaneous and general provisions that concern military construction program and military family housing changes; real property and facilities administration; defense base closure and realignment; land conveyances; and other matters.

Division C

Division C of Public Law 106–398 authorizes appropriations in the amount of $13,050,370 for Department of Energy national security programs for fiscal year 2001. Division C includes authorization for the National Nuclear Security Administration; Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board; National Defense Stockpile; Naval Petroleum Reserves; Maritime Administration; and Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program.

The Committee on Armed Services reported H.R. 4205, amended, to the House on May 12, 2000. The measure passed the House, amended, on May 18, 2000 and passed the Senate in lieu of S. 2549, as amended, on July 13, 2000. The House agreed to a conference report on October 11, 2000, and the Senate on October 12, 2000, both by recorded vote. H.R. 4205 was signed by the President and became law on October 30, 2000.

(H. Rept. 106–616; S. Rept. 106–292; H. Rept. 106–945; H.A.S.C. 106–37; H.A.S.C. 106–38; H.A.S.C. 106–39; H.A.S.C. 106–40; H.A.S.C. 106–41; H.A.S.C. 106–42; H.A.S.C. 106–43; H.A.S.C. 106–45; H.A.S.C. 106–49; H.A.S.C. 106–50)

PUBLIC LAW 106—419 (S. 1402)

An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase amounts of educational assistance for veterans under the Montgomery GI Bill and to enhance programs providing educational benefits under that title, and for other purposes

S. 1402, the Veterans and Dependents Millennium Education Act, increases, as of October 1, 2002, the rates of veterans' basic educational assistance under the Montgomery GI Bill. S. 1402 was referred to the House Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on July 27, 1999. The measure passed the House, amended, under suspension of the rules on May 23, 1999, and passed the Senate, with amendment, by unanimous consent on October 12, 2000. The House concurred in the Senate amendment and passed the bill on October 17, 2000. S. 1402 was signed by the President and became law on November 1, 2000.

(S. Rept. 106–114)

PUBLIC LAW 106—446 (H.R. 5314)

To require the immediate termination of the Department of Defense practice of euthanizing military working dogs at the end of their useful working life and to facilitate the adoption of retired military working dogs by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these dogs, and other persons capable of caring for these dogs

H.R. 5314 requires the Secretary of Defense to make a military working dog available for adoption by law enforcement agencies, former handlers, and other persons capable of humanely caring for such dogs at the end of such dog's useful working life or when the dog is otherwise excess to the needs of the Department of Defense. The bill also holds harmless the United States from any damages or injury caused by a dog after such transfer.

H.R. 5314 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and passed the House on October 10, 2000 under suspension of the rules. Amended and agreed to in the Senate by unanimous consent, the House agreed to the Senate amendment under suspension of

the rules. H.R. 5314 was signed by the President and became law on November 6, 2000.

LEGISLATION REPORTED BUT NOT ENACTED

H. RES. 534

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate that security policy and security procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration remain inadequate, that the individuals responsible for such policy and procedures must be held accountable for their performance, and that immediate action must be taken to correct security deficiencies

H. Res. 534 expresses the sense of the House that certain security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate continued inadequacy of nuclear weapons security policy and procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration and its facilities and that the individuals responsible for the implementation, oversight, and management of nuclear weapons security policy and procedures within the Administration and its facilities must be held accountable for their performance. The resolution also stresses that the Administrator for Nuclear Security must take immediate action to improve safeguard procedures for classified nuclear weapons information and correct all identified nuclear weapons security deficiencies within the Administration.

H. Res. 534 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be reported favorably on July 12, 2000. The resolution was agreed to in the House under suspension of the Rules on July 17, 2000. No further action was taken on the resolution.

(H. Rept. 106–730)

H.R. 850

To amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption

H.R. 850, the Security and Freedom through Encryption (SAFE) Act of 1999, would have recognized the potential threat to national security posed by relaxed export controls and provided measures to ensure that the federal government retains the ability to review encryption exports. At the same time the resolution would have provided sufficient flexibility to permit the government policy to stay current with the rapid pace of technological advances in this area.

H.R. 850 was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the Committees on Judiciary, International Relations, Commerce and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 850 was reported, amended, to the House by the Committee on Armed Services on July 23, 1999. It was placed on the union calendar on July 23, 1999. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 106–117, Parts I–V; H.A.S.C. No. 106–16)

H.R. 3383

To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to remove separate treatment or exemption for nuclear safety violations by nonprofit institutions

H.R. 3383 would have amended the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 pertaining to civil monetary penalties for violations of nuclear safe-

ty regulations to repeal the directive to the Secretary of Energy to determine by rule whether nonprofit educational institutions should receive automatic remission of any such penalties and the exemption from such penalties granted to designated research institutions. The bill would have also limited the maximum civil penalty that may be imposed upon certain tax-exempt nonprofit contractors, subcontractors, or suppliers to the amount of any discretionary fee paid to them under the contract under which such violation occurs.

On June 23, 2000, H.R. 3383 was referred additionally to the Committee on Armed Services after the bill was reported, as amended, by the Committee on Commerce on May 17, 2000. The Committee on Armed Services held a mark-up session on June 28, 2000 and reported the bill, as reported by the Committee on Commerce, on July 21, 2000. H.R. 3383 was placed on the Union Calendar and no further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 106–695, Parts I–II)

H.R. 3906

To ensure that the Department of Energy has appropriate mechanisms to independently assess the effectiveness of its policy and site performance in the areas of safeguards and security and cyber security

H.R. 3906, the National Nuclear Security Administration Security Oversight Improvement Act of 2000, would have amended the National Nuclear Security Administration Act (Public Law 106–65) to direct the Administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) to establish an Office of Independent Security Oversight headed by a Director appointed by the Administrator and solely under the Administrator's supervision. The Office of Independent Security Oversight would have been responsible for the independent evaluation of the effectiveness of safeguards and security policies and procedures of the NNSA.

H.R. 3906 was referred to the Committees on Armed Services, Commerce, and Science. H.R. 3906 was reported, as amended, from the Committee on Commerce on June 23, 2000. The Committee on Science was discharged from further consideration of the bill that same day. On June 28, 2000, the Committee on Armed Services held a markup session to consider H.R. 3906. The committee adopted an amendment in the nature of a substitute by a voice vote and the bill, as amended, was ordered reported favorably to the House. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 106–696, Parts I–II)

H.R. 4446

To ensure that the Secretary of Energy may continue to exercise certain authorities under the Price-Anderson Act through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety, and Health

H.R. 4446, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services, would have required the Secretary of Energy to exercise the authorities to assess penalties on Department of Energy (DOE) contractors who violate DOE nuclear safety rules and regulations at the National Security Laboratories of the Department of Energy in a manner consistent with the establishment of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) authorized by title 32 of the

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). H.R. 4446 would have authorized the Secretary to delegate the exercise of these authorities, as they pertain to the NNSA, to the Administrator for Nuclear Security only and prohibit delegation of these authorities, as they pertain to the NNSA, to the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health.

On June 23, 2000, H.R. 4446 was referred additionally to the Committee on Armed Services after being reported by the Committee on Commerce. On July 21, 2000, the Committee on Armed Services reported the measure, as amended, to the House. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 106–694, Parts I–II)

H.R. 4737

To require an inventory of documents and devices containing Restricted Data at the national security laboratories of the Department of Energy, to improve security procedures for access to the vaults containing Restricted Data at those laboratories, and for other purposes

H.R. 4737 would have enhanced security controls over the handling of classified nuclear weapons information at the national security laboratories of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) of the Department of Energy. The bill would have required the Administrator for Nuclear Security to conduct an inventory of each document or device containing classified nuclear weapons information and to assess the use of polygraphic examinations as a prerequisite to access to such information. H.R. 4737 would also have specified the procedures required to gain access to document storage vaults at the national security laboratories and would have established minimum standards for electronic locks for use in the safeguarding of classified nuclear weapons information.

H.R. 4737 was introduced on June 23, 2000, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services. On June 28, 2000, the Committee held a markup session to consider H.R. 4737 and an amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted by a voice vote. The bill was ordered reported, as amended, favorably to the House by a voice vote. No further action was taken.

(H. Rept. 106–1035, 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 annual defense authorization bills, which cover the breadth of the operations of the Department of Defense as well as two-thirds of the annual budget of the Department of Energy. The Department of Defense's nearly $300 billion annual budget involves millions of military and civilian personnel, thousands of facilities, and hundreds of agencies, departments, and commands located around the world.

SUMMARY OF OVERSIGHT PLAN

The committee continued its oversight and assessment of threats to U.S. national security and interests and the preparedness of America's armed forces to address them. To aid in this effort, the committee received classified and unclassified briefings on the international threat environment throughout the 106th Congress. In consideration of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense budget requests, the committee conducted oversight hearings with the Secretary of Defense, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, service Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff, regional Commanders-in-Chief, and officials of the Department of Defense, military departments, Central Intelligence Agency, defense-related intelligence agencies, and Department of Energy. The committee also received the views and perspectives of outside experts in academia, industry, and associations on national security 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 106th Congress:

QUALITY OF LIFE

The committee continued to address critical issues and programs affecting the quality of life for military personnel and their families. In particular, the committee investigated the following: conditions of facilities where service personnel and their families live and work, including the investment strategy of the Department of Defense for maintaining adequate facilities; cost, accessibility, and quality of peacetime military health care, including the adequacy and relevance of military health care facilities construction to the health care objectives of the Department of Defense; research and health care issues related to the care of veterans of the Persian

Gulf War; policies, procedures and systems of the Department of Defense and the military departments related to sexual misconduct; family support programs, including child care and dependent education; quality and adequacy of the military family housing supply; quality and adequacy of barracks, bachelor enlisted quarters, and dormitories; implementation of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (section 2801 of Public Law 104–106, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996); and backlogs in the repair and maintenance of military housing.

The committee also gave special attention to the oversight of Morale, Welfare and Recreation programs including the operation of military exchanges and commissaries and the welfare of non-appropriated fund construction programs and other non-appropriated fund instrumentalities. These efforts resulted in a number of initiatives contained in the National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (Public Laws 106–65 and 106–398, respectively) to protect commissary funds used for modernization and replacement of facilities and to expand the types of merchandise sold at military exchanges and commissaries.

FORCE READINESS

The committee continued its assessment of the readiness of U.S. armed forces and the adequacy of the Administration's defense spending priorities to sustain readiness and modernization of U.S. military forces. Since 1995, the committee's ongoing investigations into the status of military readiness have revealed contradictions between official reports and the reality confronting military personnel on a day-to-day basis in the field. During the 106th Congress, the committee continued its annual series of hearings to receive the views of operational unit commanders and senior non-commissioned officers on military readiness. Their testimony confirmed concerns that the readiness of U.S. military forces is in decline, and provided the committee with vital information about how best to slow the erosion of military readiness. Accordingly, the committee targeted additional funds at critical accounts for training, recruiting, base operations, spare parts, and real property maintenance in the annual Defense authorization bills.

In addition, the committee focused on: the effectiveness of congressionally-revised methods of measuring the readiness of military units; assessing the amount of training required to maintain a high state of readiness and whether training requirements are being properly funded; the impact of the high pace of deployments on service personnel and their families; current policies supporting officer and enlisted recruiting, accessions, training, promotions, separations, and retirements; the value of pay, compensation, and other benefits of military service; military recruitment and retention programs; and the condition of wartime medical readiness.

MILITARY MODERNIZATION

In late 1995, then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General John Shalikashvili, advised the Secretary of Defense that $60 billion would be required annually by fiscal year 1998 to recapitalize the United States military. More than four years after this pronouncement, and three years after its subsequent endorsement by

the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review, the fiscal year 2001 procurement budget request finally reached this level. As a result of this delay, the military service chiefs testified during the 106th Congress that many of their modernization needs have gone unmet. To address the most pressing of these unfunded requirements, the committee increased the President's military procurement budget requests by more than $20 billion over the past six years, including $5 billion added by the 106th Congress through the annual defense authorization process.

Also during the 106th Congress, the committee continued its assessment of the modernization requirements of the Department of Defense through several broad-based hearings on procurement and research and development programs, as well as a number of more focused hearings in the following areas: the adequacy of the submarine modernization plans of the Navy; the status of the National Missile Defense program; critical infrastructure protection and information assurance; shipbuilding requirements; assessing the threat posed by the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons to U.S. forces; and the performance of U.S. military equipment in the Balkan conflicts.

NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY AND FORCE STRUCTURE

The committee paid particular attention to the following: the strategic and tactical assumptions supporting the national military strategy of the United States; the role of contingency operations in the execution of the national military strategy and the force structure required to sustain such operations; the technological, doctrinal, and other factors affecting the long-term transformation of the conduct of military operations; initiatives to enhance national guard and reserve forces and the integration of active and reserve components; the military requirements of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and military combatant commands; and the roles and missions of the armed services and their implications on modernization requirements and the development of major weapons systems.

BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE

The committee placed the highest priority on ensuring that U.S. ballistic missile defense programs, including national missile defense and theater missile defense programs, were well-funded and managed, and directed toward the ultimate goal of protecting the American people and U.S. troops abroad from ballistic missile attacks. Throughout the 106th Congress, the committee conducted oversight of missile defense research and development efforts, plans for deployment of national missile defenses and advanced theater missile defenses, and the rapid evolution of theater and long-range ballistic missile threats. Noting significant funding shortfalls, the committee approved substantial increases to the President's requests for theater and national missile defense programs including an additional $352 million for fiscal year 2000 and $358.6 million for fiscal year 2001.

The committee also took actions to ensure that ballistic missile defense architectures and programs are well coordinated. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law

106–65) and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) moved program management for the Space Based Infrared System-Low program (a sensor system critical to missile defense systems) from the Air Force to the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO). Furthermore, Public Law 106–398 provided the director of BMDO a significant management role in the Airborne Laser program and required a plan to address intermediate range missile threats.

Also during the 106th Congress, the committee reinvigorated high-energy laser research relevant to missile defense and other military applications. Public Law 106–65 mandated that the Department of Defense develop a high-energy laser master plan and Public Law 106–398 required the Department to implement the plan and established incentives for the military departments to fund high-energy laser research and development more adequately.

BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT (BRAC)

The committee continued to review the costs and savings associated with base realignment and closure actions taken in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995, the impact of base realignment and closure actions on affected local communities and military readiness, and the management of the base realignment and closure process by the military services.

MILITARY APPLICATIONS OF NUCLEAR ENERGY

The committee conducted oversight in relation to the following: the safety, security, and effectiveness of the nuclear weapons stockpile; the continued ability of nuclear weapons complex to sustain the nuclear weapons stockpile; the Accelerated Strategic Computing Initiative; tritium requirements and production technology; the ability to sustain a skilled nuclear weapons workforce; future requirements for plutonium pit production; and the use of Department of Energy skills and assets to reinforce ballistic missile defense efforts.

The committee gave special emphasis to oversight of the National Ignition Facility project because of significant schedule delays and cost growth. The committee also addressed serious organizational issues and management and security deficiencies at the Department of Energy and sought to ensure that the operations and practices of the Department of Energy are compliant with Title 32 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), which established a semi-autonomous organization to manage the nuclear weapons complex. The committee also took steps to ensure better planning and fiscal discipline within the nuclear weapons activities of the Department of Energy.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Despite significant progress in recent years to force organizational and management reforms on the Department of Defense through workforce reductions, common-sense business practice reforms, and pilot programs to test new business concepts, waste and inefficiency remain part of the Department's business culture. Wasteful practices at the Department must be eliminated, and sav-

ings must be redirected to meet important priorities such as critical shortfalls in modernization and readiness accounts. As such, the committee continued to pursue efforts to decrease the costs associated with the defense service support infrastructure and to encourage the Department of Defense to comply with established downsizing and streamlining goals. The committee also continued to monitor the implementation of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996, and other recent reforms of the federal acquisition system. In addition, the committee evaluated and implemented proposals to further reform the military procurement process to achieve greater efficiencies and economies.

TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS AND EXPORT CONTROLS

The committee continued its examination of the current U.S. export control regime and its effectiveness in preventing the transfer of sensitive military-related technologies to potential adversaries. In particular, the committee focused on the following: the impact of U.S. policy regarding the export of sophisticated encryption products on U.S. national security; implementation of requirements related to the export of high performance computers (so-called "supercomputers") contained in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85); the results and impact of the licensing jurisdiction changes related to the export of U.S. satellites mandated by the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261); and assessing the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns With the People's Republic of China with a view toward developing appropriate legislative remedies to prevent the unauthorized or dangerous transfer of military-related U.S. technology to China.

INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL BASE

The committee assessed the following: current budget and policy priorities of the Department of Defense on the maintenance of the defense industrial and technology base; the ramifications of mergers and acquisitions in the defense industry on the development of future weapons systems; dual-use technology programs; the current defense laboratory system; and the role of defense funding for university research in the maintenance of the technology base.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

The committee paid particular attention to the following: current federal, state, and local environmental compliance, remediation, and restoration requirements imposed on the Department of Defense, the military services, and the Department of Energy; current and planned funding requirements for environmental programs of the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy, including the cost effectiveness of such programs; and the diversion of military training and operations and maintenance funds to meet unfunded environmental requirements and the impact of such diversions on training and readiness.

ADDITIONAL OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

THE GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT

The committee paid close attention to mandates placed on executive departments and agencies by the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–62). In so doing, the committee closely observed Department of Defense, military departments, and Department of Energy efforts to comply with Public Law 103–62 to include the use of performance-based budgeting techniques and five-year strategic planning documents.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION

During the 105th Congress, the committee discovered worrisome trends in efforts to recruit and retain critical military personnel. In fact, the Army, Navy, and Air Force all missed recruiting goals for fiscal year 1999, and several of the reserve components missed fiscal year 1999 recruiting goals by sizeable margins. These figures caused great concern within the committee, resulting in persistent congressional efforts to continually reassess the condition of the services' recruiting and retention efforts by conducting hearings both in Washington, D.C., and at military facilities around the country.

Fortunately, substantial and sustained congressional support for recruiting and retention efforts by the committee, including more than $500 million in additional funding from fiscal year 1998 through fiscal year 2001, began to have results, as all of the services reported significant improvements in recruiting efforts during fiscal year 2000. Likewise, congressional efforts to retain key military personnel through increased pay and improved benefits also resulted in improved retention rates. Though each of the services continue to struggle to meet retention goals, reports at the end of calendar year 2000 indicate an increasing number of critical personnel are choosing to remain in the force. To a large extent, these successes may be attributed to additional funding for recruiting and retention efforts combined with compensation and retirement reforms enacted in the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense authorization bills.

MILITARY RETIREMENT AND COMPENSATION

The committee examined a wide range of compensation issues during the 106th Congress. During hearings with military personnel, family members, association representatives, and defense officials, the committee pursued concerns about military pay levels, the role of special and incentive pays, and the adequacy of pay during deployments. This review resulted in legislation in the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense authorization bills to increase basic, special, and incentive pays, reform pay tables, and reduce out-of-pocket housing costs for military personnel. In addition, the committee closed the gap between military and civilian pay levels by requiring that future military pay increases exceed the rate of inflation by one-half percent.

During the 105th Congress, the committee heard evidence that the reduction in military retirement benefits enacted in 1986 was

hampering the ability of the services to recruit and retain quality personnel. Testimony received during the 106th Congress further supported this position, and led the committee to enact a comprehensive reform of the military retirement system in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65). In addition, the committee recognized the value of 401(k)-type retirement savings plans to recruiting and retention efforts, and authorized military participation in the Federal Thrift Savings Plan through the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense authorization bills.

MILITARY HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

In several hearings held during the second session of the 106th Congress, service members and their families testified that the existing health care benefit for military personnel was insufficient and an eroding benefit. Accordingly, the committee took numerous actions to ensure that military members, retirees, and their families have access to quality health care, and to improve the military heath care system. Through the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398), the committee restructured the military health care program and provided permanent lifetime TRICARE eligibility to Medicare-eligible military retirees and their family members beginning in fiscal year 2002. In addition, the committee expanded the mail order and network retail pharmacy programs of the Department of Defense to ensure that all Medicare-eligible military retirees and family members have access to reduced-cost prescription drugs. To ensure that the costs of the expanded senior retiree health care benefit does not compete for funding with other critical defense priorities within the Department of Defense budget, the committee reformed the financing process for the Defense Health Program. This reform established an accrual funding mechanism, similar to that used for military retired pay benefits, to pay for senior retiree health care.

The committee also took steps to eliminate inequities in health care costs for military personnel, protect retirees from excessive medical expenses by reducing the maximum annual out-of-pocket medical expense level for retired TRICARE beneficiaries, and provide additional funds to implement good business practices and technologies that have the potential to improve the military health care system.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY MANAGEMENT, COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY, AND ORGANIZATION

At the beginning of the 106th Congress, the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China (known as the "Cox Committee") released a bipartisan report entitled *U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China.* The report revealed that the People's Republic of China (PRC) has obtained classified information on all of the United States most advanced thermonuclear warheads. Drawing on the findings of that select committee, the committee conducted hearings concerning the compromised nuclear weapon design information, and the information security and physical security measures implemented by the

Department of Energy to prevent future compromise of nuclear weapons information.

In June 1999, the committee received testimony from Warren Rudman, chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board (PFIAB), on an inquiry the Board undertook on security problems at the DOE weapons laboratories and the adequacy of the measures undertaken by the Department of Energy to address them. The PFIAB found a 25-year history of reports, studies, and inquiries identifying chronic management, security, and counterintelligence problems at the weapons labs, and attempted but aborted reforms. The Board reported that the Department of Energy and the weapons laboratories suffer from a lack of mission focus, unclear lines of authority, and a deeply rooted culture of low regard for security issues and concluded that the Department is a dysfunctional bureaucracy that has proven incapable of reforming itself. The PFIAB recommended reorganization of the nuclear weapons functions of the Department of Energy by establishing either a new independent agency or a new semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy to manage those functions.

The reports of the Cox Committee and the PFIAB, reinforced by hearings of the committee, led to the reorganization of these functions within the Department of Energy and significant security and counterintelligence legislation. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) created a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy with responsibility for all nuclear weapons, naval nuclear propulsion, and nonproliferation work. The legislation:

(1) established a new position of Administrator for Nuclear Security who, while serving under the direction, control, and authority of the Secretary of Energy, may establish NNSA-unique policy;

(2) established DOE Offices of Intelligence and Counterintelligence and NNSA Offices of Defense Nuclear Security and Defense Nuclear Counterintelligence;

(3) established clear lines of authority for both NNSA personnel and NNSA contractor personnel and personnel policies to reshape the NNSA workforce; and

(4) required that the NNSA forward a budget and a future year nuclear security plan that provides more fiscal discipline and better congressional oversight.

In April 1999, and later in November 1999, the committee held hearings on alleged espionage activities at the Los Alamos National Laboratory that may have contributed to the loss of design information for the W–88 and other U.S. nuclear warheads to the PRC. One of these hearings centered on the initial failure of the Department of Energy to inform the committee about this extremely significant counterintelligence loss. The other hearing was focused on why the Department of Energy and the Los Alamos Laboratory allowed continued access to classified nuclear weapon information by the main suspect in this espionage case.

In June 2000, the Department of Energy informed the committee that two removable computer hard drives containing highly classified nuclear weapons information were missing from the Los Alamos national laboratory. The committee held a hearing to examine

the content of the hard drives and the management problems that led to their initial loss.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD THE BALKANS REGION

On March 24, 1999, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) undertook military action against Yugoslavia, beginning a three-month air war against Yugoslavia's integrated air defense system and command and control systems. The committee held hearings and received classified intelligence and operations briefings on various aspects of the air campaign and the option to use ground troops for the mission. The committee prepared a series of reports outlining and analyzing U.S. policy toward Bosnia and the Balkans and a number of Congressional fact-finding delegations traveled to the region to focus on Kosovo operations and associated diplomatic, military, and humanitarian relief issues. In an effort to gain a comprehensive understanding of U.S. policy toward Bosnia and to ensure oversight of U.S. military deployments to the Balkans, the committee received testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, various defense officials, and numerous distinguished retired officers and analysts.

BALLISTIC MISSILE THREAT

Over the past six years, the committee has become increasingly concerned by the vulnerability of the United States to ballistic missile attack. In addition to the 1998 findings of the bipartisan and independent Commission to Assess the Ballistic Missile Threat to the United States, the spread of ballistic missile technology without the prior knowledge of U.S. intelligence organizations has raised serious questions about the ability of the intelligence community to foresee the emergence of ballistic missile threats. Furthermore, the Administration has displayed a disinclination to move forward with the rapid development of technologies to defend against such threats. The committee's concern about the threat of ballistic missile attack led the committee to increase funding for ballistic missile defense programs beyond amounts requested by the President and to pass the National Missile Defense Act of 1999 (Public Law 106–38) making it the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.

INVESTIGATION INTO MILITARY ABSENTEE BALLOTS

In the wake of allegations raised during the November 2000 election that both the Department of Defense and state election boards mishandled the ballots of overseas military personnel, the committee undertook an initial review of the absentee balloting process, the Federal Voter Assistance Program, and the Department of Defense mail system. The committee also called upon the General Accounting Office to examine overseas absentee ballots that had been rejected by county election officials and to assess the Federal Voter Assistance Program administered by the Department of Defense to better understand the problems and the solutions that may be available to the Congress. The committee aggressively investigated complaints about groups of service members serving at sea or assigned to remote locations that had been denied their voting

rights due to problems with the voting process or mail systems. Furthermore, the committee contacted service members whose overseas absentee ballots were rejected by election officials in Florida to determine how the overseas voting process can be improved. The committee expects to continue oversight of the matter during the 107th Congress.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD IRAQ

During the 106th Congress, the committee continued to exercise its oversight role with respect to military deployments in the Persian Gulf region, especially the continued enforcement of the "no-fly zones" over northern and southern Iraq. During 1999 and 2000, the committee held a number of hearings to explore U.S. policy toward Iraq and the prospects for re-establishing a weapons inspections regime to prevent Iraq from acquiring additional weapons of mass destruction. In particular, on March 10, 1999, and March 11, 1999, the committee held separate hearings on U.S. policy toward Iraq and U.S. activities in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, the committee received testimony from the Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Central Command on March 15, 2000, in connection with the annual defense budget request, regarding the situation in Iraq and the continuing U.S. military activity in the region. Finally, in both the fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 Defense authorization bills, the committee extended the Department of Defense's authority to support the re-establishment of a United Nations weapons inspection regime in Iraq by providing expertise, equipment, and materiel in support of the UN-mandated weapons inspection mission.

INVESTIGATION INTO THE TERRORIST ATTACK ON THE U.S.S. COLE

On October 12, 2000, a small boat exploded along the port side of the U.S.S. *Cole* (DDG–67) during a brief refueling stop in the port of Aden, Yemen. The blast resulted in a 40 by 45 foot hole in the side of the ship, killing 17 sailors and wounding some three-dozen more. In the aftermath of the attack, the committee initiated oversight of the incident and received a classified briefing from Department of Defense officials on the initial reports surrounding the attack. Subsequently, the committee met in both open and closed sessions to receive testimony on the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole.* The committee also initiated an investigation of the incident. As part of this investigation, the committee reviewed general and specific force protection issues with the staff of the Commander-in-Chief, Atlantic Fleet, the Commander-in-Chief, Central Command, the U.S. Naval Forces Central Command, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Defense Energy Support Activity. The committee intends to publish its findings on the attack early in the 107th Congress.

ENCRYPTION CONTROL POLICY

Information warfare has become a critical element of U.S. military strategy—the United States must be able to protect its own communications from interception while exploiting the weaknesses in the information systems and communications of its potential ad-

versaries. However, the explosive growth of the internet and electronic commerce in recent years has increased concerns about information security as a growing number of individuals and businesses now have access to the information superhighway and the ability to transmit volumes of personal and proprietary data from one user to another nearly instantaneously. As technology advances, the risk that the secure transmission of information may be compromised by computer "hackers" increases, resulting in calls for improved encryption capabilities.

During the first session of the 106th Congress, H.R. 850, the "Security and Freedom Through Encryption (SAFE) Act" was introduced and sequentially referred to the House Committee on Armed Services. The committee was concerned that this legislation, similar to legislation introduced during the 105th Congress, would liberalize U.S. encryption policy by allowing commercially-available encryption software—along with any computers containing such software (including supercomputers)—to be exported without a government-issued export license. Furthermore, the committee believed that this legislation would nullify the supercomputer provisions of National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85). As such, the committee took testimony from the Deputy Director of the National Security Agency Barbara McNamara and Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre on the national security implications of H.R. 850 on July 1, 1999. Based in part on such testimony, the committee amended H.R. 850 to preserve encryption software export controls by a committee vote of 47–6.

RESERVE COMPONENTS

The Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) marked the third consecutive year that the grades limits were increased for reserve members authorized to serve on active duty or on full-time national guard duty for administration of the reserves or the national guard, also known as active guard reserve (AGR) members. The role of AGRs was expanded by section 555 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65), resulting in a need for new career progression opportunities. Accordingly, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 includes a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to study the grade structure requirements of the AGR force and provide a comprehensive plan to manage AGR controlled grades not later than March 31, 2001.

The committee also considered a number of reforms to improve the welfare of reservists and enhance compensation programs. The committee included several initiatives in Public Law 106–398, including authority:

(1) for reservists to travel on military aircraft on a space available basis when traveling to inactive duty training;

(2) to exempt reserve officers from consideration for promotion with active duty officers when serving on active duty for less than three years;

(3) for reserve officers to obtain military legal assistance following separation from active duty;

(4) for reservists to be paid the full amount based on grade for a training period when they participate in details providing military honors at funerals of veterans;

(5) for reservists not on active duty to receive special duty assignment pay; and

(6) for an increase in the number of reserve retirement points that may be earned in a year from 75 to 90.

In addition, the committee continued oversight of the management by the Department of Defense of its full-time support force. Although the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998 (Public Law 105–85) required the Department of Defense to submit a plan to eliminate non-dual status military technicians, the Department did not comply with the law. As such, the committee included several provisions in Public Law 106–65 to strengthen the military technician program. These provisions included legislation to provide for mandatory civil service retirement for certain non-dual status military technicians and to reduce the number of non-dual status military technicians in the Army and Air Force Reserve to no more than 175 by October 1, 2007. The committee also provided for early civil service retirement for reserve and national guard military technicians hired after February 10, 1996, in recognition that these dual status military technicians must retain dual status or forfeit their jobs. Additionally, the committee recognized the unique nature of some national guard military technician positions and provided authority for the national guard to retain no more than 1,950 non-dual status military technicians.

ANTHRAX VACCINE IMMUNIZATION PROGRAM

The committee continued oversight of the Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP), amid concerns over the inability of the sole manufacturer of the vaccine to achieve Food and Drug Administration approval for production of vaccine in its rebuilt manufacturing facility. The committee conducted two oversight hearings in Washington, D.C. and included the AVIP program in discussion with soldiers and sailors during focus group sessions at several military installations. In addition, the committee conducted two oversight inspections at Bioport, the DOD contractor for producing the vaccine, and reviewed in detail the Food and Drug Administration's plans for inspection and final approval of Bioport's rebuilt manufacturing facility. Based on these efforts, the committee remained concerned that the Department of Defense has not adequately addressed service members' concerns about the potency and purity of the vaccine. To address these concerns, the committee included requirements in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to establish uniform guidelines to be applied by each of the four services when determining vaccination exemption policies and several reporting requirements to facilitate the committee future oversight of the AVIP program.

MERCHANT MARINE AND PANAMA CANAL

The committee paid particular attention to the following: examination of programs to maintain the U.S. flag merchant fleet and

its role in strategic and sustainment sealift; the condition of the National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF) and its ability to meet surge requirements; and the scrapping of obsolete vessels under the control of the Maritime Administration. The committee also continued its oversight of the Panama Canal Commission until the transfer of the canal to the government of Panama in December 1999.

CHEMICAL STOCKPILE DESTRUCTION PROGRAM

The committee continued its oversight of the Department of Defense program for destruction of the U.S. stockpile of lethal chemical agents and munitions in such a manner as to ensure the maximum protection of the general public, the personnel involved in the program, and the environment.

Reflecting long-term concern over the growing cost of the program, the committee initiated legislation in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) that resulted in direction to the Secretary of Defense to assess measures for reducing the cost of the program and ensuring its completion in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Chemical Weapons Convention. Additionally, to provide flexibility in the future use of chemical stockpile destruction facilities, Public Law 106–65 provided that non-stockpile chemical agents, munitions, or related materials could be destroyed in chemical stockpile destruction facilities, on the basis of a site-specific agreement between the Department and the governor of the state in which the destruction facility is located. The legislation also provided that chemical stockpile destruction facilities will be disposed of in accordance with such agreements following completion of the chemical stockpile destruction program.

The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) continued support for the program and included provisions to restrict the chemical stockpile destruction technologies which may be considered for use at Pueblo Chemical Depot, Colorado, limit destruction of non-stockpile chemical warfare material at the Anniston Chemical Stockpile Disposal Facility, Alabama, and direct a report by the Secretary of Defense on the need for federal economic assistance for communities that have been impacted by chemical weapons stockpile storage sites and their associated chemical agent and munitions destruction activities. During an oversight hearing prior to enactment of Public Law 106–398, the committee noted progress in the destruction of the chemical agents and munitions stockpiles on Johnston Atoll in the Pacific and Tooele Chemical Depot, Utah, and at other chemical stockpile disposal sites; the lessons learned and corrective actions being taken in response release of a small amount of agent from the destruction facility at Tooele; the status of the chemical stockpile emergency preparedness program; and concerns, including the potential economic impact of the program, raised by local communities.

REVIEW OF RADIO FREQUENCY SPECTRUM REALLOCATION

Several reports by the Department of Defense highlight the historical importance of military access to the radio frequency spec-

trum. Furthermore, in testimony before a joint hearing of the Subcommittees on Military Procurement and Military Research and Development on February 23, 1999, Department of Defense witnesses indicated that the planned reallocation of portions of the frequency spectrum that were reserved for military purposes could significantly degrade the capabilities of many major weapons systems and cost the Department hundreds of millions of dollars, and recommended a review of national radio frequency spectrum policy. Accordingly, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) limited the surrender of those portions of the frequency spectrum assigned primarily for use by the Department and directed the return of eight megahertz of previously reallocated spectrum to the Department of Defense. Public Law 106–65 also directed an interagency review of progress in implementation of national spectrum planning, reallocation of federal spectrum to non-federal use, and implications of such reallocation to the affected federal executive agencies.

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF THE FULL COMMITTEE

BUDGET ACTIVITY

On March 2, 1999, the committee forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal year 2000 to the Committee on the Budget. The committee noted that budget request fell approximately $17 billion short of the requirements identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for fiscal year 2000, and the committee again expressed concern over the Administration's underestimation of defense outlays in the President's Budget. The committee noted that should the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget fail to provide sufficient defense outlays to reconcile the Administration's underestimation, severe reductions in defense spending would be necessary. The committee did not recommend specific National Defense (function 050) authorization levels for budget authority and outlays, but instead sought sufficient discretionary and mandatory resources to address critical recruiting and retention needs, such as retirement and pay reforms.

On February 25, 2000, the committee forwarded its views and estimates regarding the budget for National Defense (function 050) for fiscal year 2001 to the Committee on the Budget. The committee expressed its concern about the potential for a difference between the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office in the estimation of defense outlays in the President's Budget. The committee's views and estimates were provided before the Congressional Budget Office had completed its independent estimate of the President's Budget so the committee did not recommend specific National Defense (function 050) authorization levels for budget authority and outlays. The committee noted that the budget request fell approximately $16.0 billion short of the requirements identified by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for fiscal year 2001 and that this estimate was over $5 billion higher than the preceding year's estimate of the shortfall for fiscal year 2001. Although the committee did not recommend specific National Defense (function 050) authorization levels for the reason noted above, it did seek additional discretionary and mandatory resources to address critical unfunded requirements, military participation in the Thrift Savings Program, and military health care reform.

FULL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

During the 106th Congress, the Committee on Armed Services held numerous hearings in accordance with its legislative and oversight roles. An examination of existing and emerging threats to the United States and its global national security interests provided the thematic overlay for the committee's consideration of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense budget requests. Other full committee hearings focused on U.S. national security strategy; the deployment

and employment of U.S. military forces abroad in the Balkans, including on peacekeeping missions in Bosnia and Kosovo and in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization military air campaign against Yugoslavia (Operation Allied Force); U.S. policy in the Persian Gulf; nuclear security at Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories and DOE reorganization; encryption, high-performance computers and export controls; national missile defense; relations with the People's Republic of China; the situation in Colombia; and the bombing of the U.S.S. Cole.

(H.A.S.C. 106–1; H.A.S.C. 106–2; H.A.S.C. 106–10; H.A.S.C. 106–12; H.A.S.C. 106–13; H.A.S.C. 106–14; H.A.S.C. 106–16; H.A.S.C. 106–17; H.A.S.C. 106–20; H.A.S.C. 106–33; H.A.S.C. 106–34; H.A.S.C. 106–35; H.A.S.C. 37; H.A.S.C. 106–44; H.A.S.C. 106–46; H.A.S.C. 106–47; H.A.S.C. 106–53; H.A.S.C. 106–54; H.A.S.C. 106–60; H.A.S.C. 106–61; H.A.S.C. 106–65)

POSTURE HEARINGS

In exercising its oversight obligations, the committee sought and received testimony early in each session of the 106th Congress from Administration officials with respect to the Administration's overall national security policy, plans, and programs, and the budget proposals requested to implement them. As part of its review of these issues, the committee requested and received posture statements from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the uniformed service chiefs, and the service Secretaries.

In the first session, during deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (H.R. 1401), the committee received testimony from Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Henry H. Shelton, and Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Chief Financial Officer) William J. Lynn, III on February 2, 1999. Subsequently, the committee received testimony from the uniformed service chiefs; Gen. Dennis J. Reimer, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. Jay L. Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Charles C. Krulak, Commandant of the Marine Corps; and Gen. Ralph E. Eberhart, Vice-Chief of Staff of the Air Force, on February 24, 1999. The committee received testimony from the service secretaries; Louis Caldera, Secretary of the Army; Richard Danzig, Secretary of the Navy; and F. Whitten Peters, Acting Secretary of the Air Force, on March 25, 1999.

In addition, the committee heard from regional commanders-in-chief. On March 3, 1999, the committee met to receive testimony from Adm. Dennis C. Blair, USN, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM); and Gen. John Tilelli, USA, Commander in Chief, U.S. Forces Korea (USFK). On March 11, 1999, the committee received testimony from Gen. Anthony C. Zinni, USMC, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM); and on March 17, 1999, the committee heard from Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA, Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command (EUCOM).

During the second session, the committee began its deliberations on the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (H.R. 4205) with an initial posture hearing on February 9, 2000, receiving testimony from Secretary Cohen and Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs of Staff General Shelton. This was followed on February 10, 2000, with testimony from the uniformed service chiefs; Gen. Eric K. Shinseki, Chief of Staff of the Army; Adm. Jay L. Johnson, Chief of Naval Operations; Gen. Michael E. Ryan, Chief of Staff of the Air Force; and Gen. James L. Jones, Commandant of the Marine Corps. Subsequently, the committee received testimony from regional commanders-in-chief. On February 17, 2000, the committee heard from Gen. Wesley K. Clark, USA, Commander in Chief, EUCOM; and on March 15, 2000 from Gen. Anthony C. Zinni, USMC, Commander in Chief, CENTCOM; Adm. Dennis C. Blair, USN, Commander in Chief, PACOM; and Gen. Thomas A. Schwartz, USA, Commander in Chief, USFK. On March 22, 2000, the committee heard from the service secretaries; Louis Caldera, Secretary of the Army; Richard Danzig, Secretary of the Navy; and F. Whitten Peters, Secretary of the Air Force.

(H.A.S.C. 106–2, H.A.S.C. 106–37)

THREATS TO U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

During the 106th Congress, the committee's review of the Administration's defense budget proposals was framed by an assessment and evaluation of the threats to U.S. national security. On February 3, 1999, the committee received testimony in closed session from the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet, and the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Lt. Gen. Patrick M. Hughes. On February 4, 1999, the committee heard from Mr. John Gannon, Chairman, National Intelligence Council; Mr. Robert Walpole, National Intelligence Officer for Strategic & Nuclear Programs; Mr. Ben Bonk, National Intelligence Officer for Near East & South Asia; Mr. Barry Lowenkron, National Intelligence Officer for Europe; and Ms. Mary Tighe, National Intelligence Officer for East Asia. The information received provided important context for the committee's consideration of the Administration's fiscal year 2000 defense budget request. This approach was repeated during the committee's consideration of the fiscal year 2001 budget request, as General John A. Gordon, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence and Admiral Thomas R. Wilson, Director, Defense Intelligence Agency, appeared before the committee on February 16, 2000 to discuss worldwide threats to the United States and U.S. global interests. The committee also received a classified briefing from the Joint Staff on global hot spots and threats to U.S. interests on September 29, 1999.

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

The committee continued its examination of U.S. national security strategy and the national military strategy during the 106th Congress with a view toward judging the appropriateness of U.S. strategy and the adequacy of defense resources being applied to execute it.

On October 5, 1999, the committee took testimony from members of the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century, established by Congress to provide an independent assessment of the national security challenges facing the United States in the next quarter century. The commission's "Phase One" report outlining its view of anticipated challenges provided the backdrop

for the committee's hearing. In addition, the committee began the second session of the 106th Congress by holding a hearing on the relationship between U.S. military strategy and defense resources. On February 8, 2000, the committee took testimony from former Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger and analysts from the Center for Strategic and International Studies with respect to the Administration's defense budget requests and the need for significantly increased resources for defense. Secretary Schlesinger's testimony that the United States faces a coming "train wreck" in defense and that the United States "simply cannot continue to play the global leadership role envisioned by the current national security strategy without a substantial increase in defense spending" formed the basis for the committee's efforts during the second session of the 106th Congress to increase the defense budget topline and to ensure that the military services received the resources necessary to successfully carry out their missions at the lowest possible level of risk.

(H.A.S.C. 106–20; H.A.S.C. 106–46)

U.S. POLICY IN THE BALKANS

During the 106th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of U.S. policy in the Balkans, focusing on both the peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Kosovo, and the allied military operation against Yugoslavia (Operation Allied Force). The committee held numerous hearings and received classified intelligence and operations briefings on the situation on the ground with respect to ongoing peacekeeping operations in the region and the conduct of the 78-day NATO air campaign led by the United States. In particular, the committee focused its attention on the continuing rotation of U.S. military forces to Bosnia as part of the multinational Stabilization Force (SFOR) and the impact of such troop rotations on the overall readiness of the armed forces to execute the requirements of the national military strategy. The committee's examination of U.S. Balkans policy exposed continuing strains in the ability of the armed forces to meet their warfighting requirements as a result of the extended peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. Moreover, the committee's review of Operation Allied Force reignited debate over the issues of NATO burdensharing, military and technological interoperability and standardization among NATO members, the political constraints on conducting alliance warfare, and the post-Cold War mission of the alliance. In the wake of the termination of the air campaign and the removal by Serbia of its military forces from Kosovo, the committee reviewed the Administration's plan for U.S. participation in the multinational Kosovo Force (KFOR) peacekeeping operation and the additional strains the Kosovo deployment imposed on the warfighting readiness of U.S. forces. The committee also hosted a series of classified briefings for all Members of the House of Representatives on the Kosovo deployment.

As part of its effort to provide comprehensive oversight of U.S. military deployments to the Balkans region, the committee received testimony from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense officials, the intelligence

community, former military officials, and non-governmental experts.

(H.A.S.C. 106–2; H.A.S.C. 106–12; H.A.S.C. 106–13; H.A.S.C. 106–37)

U.S. POLICY IN THE PERSIAN GULF

During the 106th Congress, the committee continued to exercise its oversight role with respect to U.S. military deployments in the Persian Gulf region. In particular, the committee focused its oversight efforts on the continuing deployment of U.S. forces in the region as part of the mission to contain Iraq from acquiring weapons of mass destruction and to prevent it from posing a military threat to its neighbors, including Kuwait. The committee reviewed U.S. policy with respect to the "no-fly zones" over Iraq and the ability of U.S. forces to continue to enforce the Operation Southern Watch mission at minimal risk, receiving a series of operational and intelligence briefings on the situation. In addition, the committee held hearings on March 10, 1999 and March 11, 1999 with Department of Defense and former government officials, and outside experts, to explore U.S. policy toward Iraq. On March 15, 2000, the committee took testimony from the Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command, on the situation within the Central Command area of responsibility and, in particular, ongoing military operations with respect to Iraq.

Although the Persian Gulf War ended nearly a decade ago, the continuing deployment of U.S. military forces in the region in support of Operation Southern Watch poses additional strains on the personnel and equipment involved in the enforcement operation. Moreover, the risk to U.S. forces has increased as Iraq has become more defiant, challenging the air exclusion zones and allied aircraft patrolling them. In addition, the UN-sanctioned weapons inspection regime established after the Persian Gulf War was thwarted by Iraq when it expelled weapons inspectors in October 1998. Although no weapons inspections have occurred in Iraq since then, the committee has continued to support Department of Defense efforts to provide support to a reconstituted weapons inspection regime in short order. Accordingly, in both the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense authorization bills, the committee extended the authority of the Secretary of Defense to provide UN weapons inspectors in Iraq with expertise, equipment, and materiel in support of the UN-mandated weapons inspection mission.

(H.A.S.C. 106–2; H.A.S.C. 106–10; H.A.S.C. 106–37)

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NUCLEAR SECURITY

In the wake of serious concerns over lax security at the nuclear weapons laboratories of the Department of Energy and the loss of U.S. nuclear secrets by the People's Republic of China, the committee initiated a series of efforts to improve security and management procedures of the Department of Energy. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) included provisions that would establish a semi-autonomous National Nuclear Security Administration with clearer lines of authority and responsibility, and provided for improvements to the counterintelligence procedures of the Department of Energy. In addi-

tion, the committee included provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398) to further improve the management and operations of the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons laboratories and to ensure that U.S. nuclear secrets are effectively safeguarded.

In addition, the committee held a series of hearings on the security procedures at DOE laboratories. On June 24, 1999, the committee took testimony from the Chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board on the Board's investigation into the security situation at DOE laboratories and its recommendations for improving DOE security and counterintelligence procedures. On July 14, 1999, the committee took testimony from Victor H. Reis, Assistant Secretary of Energy for Defense Programs, on reorganization plans for the Department of Energy. On March 2, 2000, the committee took testimony from Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson regarding implementation of DOE reorganization and the reforms contained in Title 32 of Public Law 106–65. Additionally, on June 14, 2000, the committee took testimony from DOE officials on security failures at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

On June 28, 2000, the committee marked up several pieces of legislation related to DOE safety and security, including: H. Res. 534, a resolution expressing the sense of the House on the security situation involving missing computer hard drives at Los Alamos National Laboratory; H.R. 3906, a bill to codify the authority of the Secretary of Energy to conduct independent assessments of safeguards and security at all DOE facilities, including facilities of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA); H.R. 4446, a bill to permit the Secretary of Energy to assess civil penalties resulting from Price-Anderson Act violations against NNSA contractors through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety and Health; H.R. 3383, a bill to eliminate the existing statutory exemption for certain NNSA and DOE contractors from Price-Anderson Act civil penalties; and H.R. 4737, a bill to make a number of improvements in the classified material handling procedures of the national security laboratories.

(H.A.S.C. 106–17; H.A.S.C. 106–47; H.A.S.C. 106–54)

ENCRYPTION, EXPORT CONTROLS, AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS

During the 106th Congress, the committee continued its oversight of the Administration's policy regarding the export of sophisticated dual-use technologies. Controls on the export of these technologies to countries of concern have been progressively loosened in recent years as rapid technological advances have increased the ability of other countries to acquire militarily useful technologies through commercial means.

The committee sought a better understanding of the Administration's rationale for loosening controls over the export of sophisticated U.S. technologies in light of concerns that certain technologies had been diverted to inappropriate end-users or end-uses. In particular, the committee continued to assess the Administration's decision to progressively relax restrictions on the export of high-performance computers to countries of proliferation concern. In accordance with the mechanism for relaxing such controls established by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year

1998 (Public Law 105–85) and subsequent amendments, the committee focused its oversight effort on assessing each Administration-proposed adjustment to the notification threshold established by law. On October 28, 1999, the committee held a hearing to receive testimony from the U.S. General Accounting Office, government and former government officials, and industry and outside experts on U.S. policy regarding high-performance computer exports.

In addition, the committee assessed the impact of changes to U.S. policy regarding the export of sophisticated encryption products. On July 1, 1999, the committee held a hearing to receive testimony from John J. Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Barbara A. McNamara, Deputy Director of the National Security Agency, with respect to H.R. 850, the Security and Freedom Through Encryption (SAFE) Act, a bill to relax export restrictions on encryption products. The committee continued its examination of the impact of H.R. 850 on U.S. national security with a hearing on July 13, 1999, taking testimony from Attorney General Janet Reno, Federal Bureau of Investigation Director Louis J. Freeh, Department of Commerce officials and industry representatives. In light of the testimony received and the committee's assessment of the risks to U.S. national security posed by the global spread of sophisticated encryption technology, the committee significantly amended H.R. 850 in a mark-up session on July 21, 1999.

(H.A.S.C. 106–16; H.A.S.C. 106–35)

NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

The committee continued its oversight of U.S. national missile defense (NMD) policy and programs during the 106th Congress, holding hearings and marking up legislation in an effort to assess the Administration's NMD plans and architecture and to accelerate the eventual deployment of a national missile defense system designed to protect Americans against the growing threat of ballistic missile attack. The committee's actions were fueled by a growing recognition of the seriousness of the ballistic missile threat to the United States and the acknowledgement of the Secretary of Defense William Cohen, that ballistic missiles will soon pose a danger to both U.S, forces overseas and to Americans domestically.

On February 25, 1999, the committee marked up H.R. 4, the National Missile Defense Act of 1999, which declared it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense as soon as is technologically possible. H.R. 4 subsequently passed both Houses of Congress and was signed into law by the President (Public Law 106–38) on July 22, 1999.

On October 13, 1999, the committee received testimony from Department of Defense and Department of State officials on Administration plans for national missile defense. The committee also heard from former government and outside experts regarding the arms control implications of the Administration's NMD program and constraints placed on the deployment of a national missile defense by the 1972 U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. On June 28, 2000, the committee took testimony from Department of Defense officials on the current status of the NMD program and possible alternative NMD deployment architectures.

(H.A.S.C. 106–33; H.A.S.C. 106–60)

RELATIONS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

During the 106th Congress, the committee began a systematic, in-depth examination of U.S. relations with the People's Republic of China and, in particular, the threat posed by the growing military capabilities of the People's Liberation Army to the United States and U.S. interests.

On March 3, 1999, as part of the series of posture hearings on the Administration's defense budget request, the committee took testimony from Adm. Dennis C. Blair, Commander-in-Chief of U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM), regarding the situation in PACOM's area of responsibility and with particular emphasis on China. On March 15, 2000, Adm. Blair again testified on this topic in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, PACOM.

During the second session, the committee intensified its look at China's military strategy, policies, and programs. On June 21, 2000, the committee held a hearing to focus on China's overall strategic intentions and goals, receiving testimony from Department of Defense, former military, and outside experts. On July 19, 2000, the committee took testimony from independent analysts on China's military modernization programs and capabilities and the threat posed to the United States and U.S. interests in the region, including the security of Taiwan.

(H.A.S.C. 106–2; H.A.S.C. 106–37; H.A.S.C. 106–53; H.A.S.C. 106–61)

THE SITUATION IN COLOMBIA

In light of growing concerns over the situation in Colombia and Administration plans to increase the level of U.S. military support to Colombia's counter-drug effort, the committee received a briefing in closed session on October 6, 1999, from officials of the intelligence community, Department of Defense, and Department of State. The briefing provided the committee with a detailed understanding of the drug trafficking threat in Colombia and associated threats in the region. In addition, the committee held an open hearing on March 23, 2000, to examine U.S. policy toward Colombia, receiving testimony from Department of Defense and Department of State officials.

THE BOMBING OF THE U.S.S. "COLE"

The bombing of the U.S.S. *Cole* in Aden, Yemen on October 12, 2000, again focused the committee's attention on the threat of international terrorism directed against American forces, citizens, and interests. Subsequent to the bombing, the committee received a series of classified briefings from Department of Defense officials on the situation. On October 25, 2000, the committee held an open hearing with Department of Defense and Department of State officials, followed by a closed executive session. On October 18, 2000, the House unanimously approved a resolution discharged from the committee, H. Res. 631, honoring the members of the crew of the guided missile destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* who were killed or wounded in the terrorist bombing attack on that vessel in Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000, expressing the sympathies of the House of Representatives to the families of those crew members, commending

the ship's crew for their heroic damage control efforts, and condemning the bombing of that ship.

(H.A.S.C. 106–65)

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION

The Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation was appointed for the 106th Congress on February 5, 1999.

The panel conducted two oversight hearings during the 106th Congress. The panel's review of the fiscal year 2000 budget request for morale, welfare and recreation (MWR) programs was conducted on March 10, 1999, while the review of the fiscal year 2001 budget request was conducted on March 15, 2000. The panel continued its oversight of the military services' MWR programs and operations of the Defense Commissary Agency (DeCA) and the military exchanges. Issues examined included the adequacy of appropriated fund support to MWR programs; the importance of the military resale system as a non pay benefit; and efforts to improve the efficiency of the operation of the commissaries, exchanges, and MWR activities.

This active oversight resulted in a number of initiatives contained in National Defense Authorization Acts for Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001 (Public Laws 106–65 and 106–398). These included requiring that surcharge trust funds generated by commissary patron purchases be used solely for the construction and renovation of commissary stores; directing the Department of Defense to consider establishing combined exchange and commissary stores at closed bases; encouraging service secretaries to increase funding for MWR activities; directing a review of the impact of slot machine use on military personnel; and preventing the Department of Defense from tampering with long established nonappropriated fund employee retirement programs. Other panel initiatives included expanding of types of merchandise that military exchanges may sell; examining DeCA's plans to sell scanner data; and reviewing military exchange use of consultant services. The panel also continued its annual review of the commissary surcharge and nonappropriated fund construction program.

(H.A.S.C. 106–8; H.A.S.C. 106–43)

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON THE MERCHANT MARINE

The Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine was appointed for the 106th Congress on February 5, 1999.

On March 16, 1999, the panel held a hearing to receive testimony on the budget request for fiscal year 2000 for the Panama Canal Commission and legislative proposals to facilitate the orderly transfer of the canal to the government of Panama in December 1999. Representatives from the Panama Canal Commission testified on these matters. The panel's recommendations were adopted by the committee on May 19, 1999 by voice vote, and were subsequently included, with amendments, in title XXXV of Division C of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

During the March 16, 1999, hearing, the panel also received testimony on the budget request for the Maritime Administration for

fiscal year 2000 and legislative proposals. The panel's recommendations were adopted by the committee on May 19, 1999, by voice vote, and were subsequently included, with amendments, in title XXXIV of Division C of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65).

The panel's oversight responsibilities for the Panama Canal Commission ended with the transfer of the canal to the government of Panama in December 1999. On February 29, 2000, the panel held a hearing to receive testimony on the budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Maritime Administration and legislative proposals to facilitate its national defense mission. On May 10, 2000, the panel's recommendations on authorization levels and legislative provisions affecting the Maritime Administration were adopted by voice vote, and were subsequently included with amendments in provisions of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398).

(H.A.S.C. 106–9, H.A.S.C. 106–49)

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY REORGANIZATION

The Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization was appointed on October 8, 1999, to oversee the implementation of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Act (Public Law 106–65). Public Law 106–65 established a semi-autonomous agency within the Department of Energy to manage the Department's nuclear weapons, nuclear nonproliferation, and naval reactor activities.

The panel sought to determine whether DOE establishment of the NNSA complied with the requirements of the NNSA Act and to encourage more complete compliance when the Department's actions were found wanting. The Secretary of Energy strongly opposed some of the provisions of the NNSA Act, and argued that the Act did not provide him enough authority to manage the Administration. The President's decision in October 1999 to assign the roles and functions of the NNSA Administrator to the Secretary indefinitely and to assign other Department of Energy personnel to serve concurrently in the Administration (a practice known as "dual-hatting") reflected this opposition. The panel solicited an analysis of these actions by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS concluded in a report submitted to the panel November 1, 1999, that the President was legally required to forward a nomination for Administrator in a timely fashion, and that dual-hatting "is plainly contrary to the letter and intent of the law."

On March 2, 2000, the panel held a hearing with witnesses from CRS, the General Accounting Office, and Center for Strategic and International Studies. On March 16, 2000, the panel took testimony concerning the implementation of Public Law 106–65 from the Deputy Secretary of Energy and the Director of the Office of Management and Administration of the Department of Energy.

In early June 2000, DOE informed the committee of a new security breach at Los Alamos National Laboratory, New Mexico. This breach led to hearings regarding the management of the nuclear weapons complex and implementation of Public Law 106–65 by the Secretary of Energy. While the special oversight panel has no legis-

lative authority, the panel supported full committee efforts to craft an effective ban on dual-hatting, and other provisions to provide a fixed term of office for the first Administrator of the NNSA and restrict the ability of the Secretary to reorganize NNSA. These provisions were adopted in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398).

On July 11, 2000, the panel held a hearing with the new Administrator of the NNSA. He indicated in his testimony that he planned to eliminate dual-hatting, streamline NNSA management, and put into place more effective planning, programming and budgeting procedures.

On October 13, 2000, the panel issued a report assessing progress toward establishment of the NNSA in the year since enactment of Public Law 106–65. The report concluded that progress toward full implementation of the law was inhibited by obstacles erected by DOE leadership, but that confirmation of the Administrator of the NNSA and the removal of some of the obstacles established the conditions under which progress could be made.

(H.A.S.C. 106–48; H.A.S.C. 106–58)

SPECIAL OVERSIGHT PANEL ON TERRORISM

The Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism was appointed for the 106th Congress on March 2, 2000. The panel was charged with responsibility for conducting oversight on the nature of the terrorist threat facing the U.S. national security interests and the armed forces, including the threat of terrorism using weapons of mass destruction. During the year, the panel focused its activities on gaining a greater understanding of unconventional terrorist threats, including biological, nuclear, and cyberterrorism threats. In addition, the panel sought to explore the regional underpinnings of terrorism and the threats posed to U.S. interests in various regions of the world.

The panel conducted three closed briefings and three open hearings during the 106th Congress. After an initial organizational meeting on March 16, 2000, the panel held a closed briefing on terrorist threats to the United States on May 23, 2000. Additional closed briefings took place on June 20, 2000, and July 11, 2000, with testimony taken from the U.S. intelligence community on regional terrorist threats to U.S. interests. The panel also convened in closed session on October 18, 2000, to take testimony from the intelligence community regarding the terrorist attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* in Yemen. The panel's three open hearings were held on May 23, 2000, June 29, 2000, and July 13, 2000, concerning biological, nuclear, and cyberterrorism threats, and threats to U.S. interests in Latin America and the Middle East, respectively.

(H.A.S.C. 106–52; H.A.S.C. 106–56; H.A.S.C. 106–59)

OTHER ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEES

MILITARY INSTALLATIONS AND FACILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities held several hearings in support of its consideration of the fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 budget request for the military construction, military family housing, and other related programs of the Department of Defense and the military services. In addition to its consideration of the annual budget request, the subcommittee considered and reported legislation in each session of the 106th Congress, which was included in division B of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106–65) and division B of the National Defense Authorization for Fiscal Year 2001 (Public Law 106–398). In both instances, the legislation included alterations to the management of the military construction program and the military family housing program, modifications of the defense base closure and realignment process, and provisions affecting the conveyance, exchange, transfer of jurisdiction, or modification to existing statutory authority on the disposition of real property. The subcommittee reported legislation to reauthorize the Sikes Act. In its consideration of that legislation, the subcommittee took testimony from senior officials of the Department of Defense and senior officials and active and reserve component officers of the Department of Defense, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, the Department of the Air Force, the General Accounting Office, and members of Congress.

The subcommittee met on March 9, 1999, and March 16, 2000, to conduct oversight hearings on the implementation by the Department of Defense and the military departments of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative (subchapter IV, chapter 169 of title 10, United States Code). In its hearing of March 16, 2000, the subcommittee also considered, as a matter of oversight, the implementation by the Department of Defense and military departments of the utilities infrastructure privatization and asset management practices. In both stances, the subcommittee took testimony from senior officials of the Department of Defense and the military services.

The subcommittee met on March 16, 1999, to conduct an oversight hearing to assess the military construction component of the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) and the adequacy of the FYDP in addressing future facilities recapitalization and modernization requirements. The subcommittee took testimony from a senior official of the Department of Defense and senior officers of the military services and Admiral Jack E. Buffington (retired), Department of Civil Engineering, University of Arkansas.

The subcommittee met on March 16, 1999, to conduct an oversight hearing on the use of economic development conveyances in the reuse of former military installations and proposals to improve the base reuse process. The subcommittee took testimony from senior officials from the Department of Defense, the General Accounting Office, Mr. Michael Houlemard, Executive Officer, Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Mr. Jeffery Simon, Board President, National Association of Installation Developers, Honorable Gene Stedham, Mayor of the City of Anniston, Alabama, Mr. Chris Waddle, Past President, Anniston/Calhoun County Council of Unified Leadership and members of Congress.

(H.A.S.C. 106–7; H.A.S.C. 106–42)

MILITARY PERSONNEL SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a series of hearings to review the manpower portion of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 defense budget requests and to conduct oversight: February 22, 1999, understanding the retention issues; February 25, 1999, pay and retirement reform issues; March 4, 1999, pilot retention—issues and possible solutions; March 10, 1999, pharmacy redesign and TRICARE claims processing; March 17, 1999, report of the Congressional Commission on Military Training and Gender-Related Issues; March 18, 1999, recruiting issues; September 30, 1999; Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP); November 4, 1999, report of the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century; February 25, 2000, February 28, 2000 and March 15, 2000, removing the barriers to TRICARE; March 8, 2000 and March 17, 2000, sustaining the all volunteer force and reserve component issues; July 13, 2000, Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP); November 28, 2000, proposals to transform the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). Staff briefings held: February 5, 1999, domestic violence in the military service; February 26, 1999, military child development system; and September 16, 1999, Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP).

(H.A.S.C. 106–6; H.A.S.C. 106–22; H.A.S.C. 106–26; H.A.S.C. 106–41; H.A.S.C. 106–62; H.A.S.C. 106–66)

MILITARY PROCUREMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Military Procurement addressed the Department of Defense's (DOD) modernization shortfalls and the Department of Energy's (DOE) management and security problems by conducting numerous oversight hearings during its consideration of the fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001 budget requests, including: February 11, 1999, protection equipment and countermeasure devices; February 23, 1999 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), information superiority and information assurance; February 24, 1999, aging military equipment; March 3, 1999 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), aviation modernization plans; March 4, 1999, and March 21, 2000, DOE programs; March 9, 1999, littoral warfare protection and ship recapitalization; April 15,

1999, counterintelligence problems at DOE laboratories; June 30, 1999, performance of the B–2 bomber in the Kosovo air campaign; October 19, 1999, lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict-implications for future modernization plans; October 20, 1999 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), chemical and biological weapons threat to U.S. forces; October 20, 1999, DOE security issues; February 16, 2000 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), ballistic missile defense programs; February 29, 2000, shipbuilding programs; March 9, 2000 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), Army programs and transformation; March 14, 2000 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), Navy programs; March 16, 2000 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development), Air Force programs; June 27, 2000, attack submarine force structure modernization plans; September 21, 2000, DOD procurement requirements and funding; and September 21, 2000, chemical agents and munitions destruction program.

In addition to these oversight hearings, on June 29, 1999, the subcommittee held a joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development and with the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, Committee on Science, on space range modernization.

(H.A.S.C. 106–3; H.A.S.C. 106–11; H.A.S.C. 106–15; H.A.S.C. 106–21; H.A.S.C. 106–23; H.A.S.C. 106–24; H.A.S.C. 106–28; H.A.S.C. 106–29; H.A.S.C. 106–30; H.A.S.C. 106–36; H.A.S.C. 106–38; H.A.S.C. 106–50; H.A.S.C. 106–63; 106–64)

MILITARY READINESS SUBCOMMITTEE

During the 106th Congress, the Subcommittee on Military Readiness reviewed the operations and maintenance portion of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001 Department of Defense authorization requests and held numerous hearings within its jurisdiction. Major areas of the subcommittee's examinations included: military readiness trends and perspectives; military readiness reporting systems and procedures; defense reform initiatives; contracting out and privatization initiatives of the Department of Defense; repair depot and shipyard maintenance issues; Department of Defense acquisition workforce; operation and maintenance financial management issues; mission capability rates; spare and repair parts shortfalls; improving readiness capabilities; military training and combat training facilities issues; quarterly readiness reports; assessing the readiness of reserve forces; environmental restoration and compliance issues; Armed Forces Retirement Homes issues; a review of proposed changes and pilot programs concerning the movement of household goods of military personnel; and issues concerning the Naval Petroleum and Oil Shale Reserves and the National Defense Stockpile of strategic and critical materials. In addition, the subcommittee conducted a series of field hearings at the following locations: Norfolk Naval Station, Virginia; Naples, Italy; and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada.

The subcommittee undertook a detailed and extensive examination of issues concerning the outsourcing of information technology by the Navy and the Marine Corps to the private sector which cul-

minated in a major legislative initiative in this area. In addition, the subcommittee conducted an in-depth review of the quality of training at the military services' combat training centers which culminated in the recommendation of significant additional funding for these training centers; and a review of the issues concerning the aging civilian workforce of the Department of Defense.

In the second session of the 106th Congress, the subcommittee approved a legislative package to permit the transfer of the Naval Oil Shale Reserve numbered 2, located in Utah, to the Ute Indian Tribe which also provided for the potential cleanup of hazardous materials at a former uranium mining site at Moab, Utah.

(H.A.S.C. 106–5; H.A.S.C. 106–18; H.A.S.C. 106–19; H.A.S.C. 106–25; H.A.S.C. 106–27; H.A.S.C. 106–40; H.A.S.C. 106–45; H.A.S.C. 106–57)

MILITARY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Military Research and Development (R&D) conducted numerous oversight hearings to review programs included in the Department of Defense research and development budget requests for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 during the 106th Congress. In addition to traditional budget oversight reviews, the Subcommittee held a number of hearings, several conducted jointly with the Subcommittee on Military Procurement, to address specific areas of concern.

The subcommittee held the following hearings: Defense Information Superiority and Information Assurance—Entering the 21st Century, Ballistic Missile Defense Programs, Service Aviation Modernization Plans (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Procurement), Domestic Emergency Preparedness for Response to Threats of Terrorist Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Range modernization (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Procurement and the Committee on Science), Range Modernization (joint hearing with the Committee on Science), Electromagnetic Pulse Threats to U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure, Chemical/Biological Defense for U.S. Forces, Russian Threat Perceptions And Plans For Sabotage Against The United States, Ballistic Missile Defense Programs, Defense Wide Research & Development Programs, Information Assurance and Information Superiority: Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century, Army Programs and Transformation for Fiscal Year 2001 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Procurement), Navy and Marine Corps Modernization Programs for Fiscal Year 2001 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Procurement), Air Force Modernization Programs for Fiscal Year 2001 (joint hearing with the Subcommittee on Procurement), Oversight Hearing on the National Ocean Research Leadership Council Report, An Integrated Ocean Observing System (joint hearing with the Committee on Resources), and National Missile Defense—Reviewing the Technical Status.

The subcommittee also conducted hearings and briefings during the 106th Congress to address concerns over inadequate future year funding for the service's science and technology programs and to conclude efforts initiated during the 104th Congress to streamline the Department's ineffective Defense Airborne Reconnaissance Office and revitalize the military service unmanned aerial vehicles

programs. The subcommittee also received testimony on the Administration's program for critical infrastructure protection, information superiority for the 21st century battlefield, and the status of the defense science and technology base. The committee continues to be concerned about the serious decline in research and development funding, specifically science and technology accounts, which are critical to maintaining US superiority. Accordingly, the committee allocated an increase in funding for research, development, test, and evaluation, rather than the decrease reflected in the budget request.

(H.A.S.C. 106–4; H.A.S.C. 106–31; H.A.S.C. 106–32; H.A.S.C. 106–36; H.A.S.C. 106–39; H.A.S.C. 106–45; H.A.S.C. 106–50; H.A.S.C. 106–51; H.A.S.C. 106–55)

PUBLICATIONS

COMMITTEE PRINTS OF LAWS RELATING TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

To assist individuals in referencing statutes that are frequently under consideration by the Committee on Armed Services and the Department of Defense and others in looking for statutory guidance, the committee printed three volumes pertaining to current law in the 106th Congress:

Title 10, United States Code—Armed Forces (as amended through December 31, 1998).

Compilation of Defense-Related Federal Laws (other than title 10, United States Code) (as amended through December 31, 1998).

Laws Relating to Federal Procurement (as amended through December 31, 1999).

(Committee Prints 2, 3 and 4)

COMMITTEE PRINTS

1. Committee rules, adopted January—20, 1999.
2. Title 10, United States Code—Armed Forces (as amended through December 31, 1998). February 1999.
3. Compilation of Defense-Related Federal Laws (other than title 10, United States Code) (as amended through December 31, 1998). February 1999.
4. Laws Relating to Federal Procurement (as amended through December 31, 1999). February 2000.
5. A Ceremony Unveiling the Portrait of The Honorable Floyd D. Spence. September 25, 2000.

PUBLISHED PROCEEDINGS

H.A.S.C. 106–1—Full committee hearing on committee organization. January 20, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–2—Full Committee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. February 2, 24, March 3, 11, 17, and 25, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–3—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title I—Procurement. February 24 and March 9, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–4—Military Research and Development Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title II—Research and Development, Test, and Evaluation. February 25 and March 11, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–5—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title III—Operation and Maintenance, Volumes 1 and 2. February 24, 25, 26, March 2, 4, 8, 17, 18, and 22, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–6—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title IV—Personnel Authorizations, Title V—Military Personnel Policy, Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits, and Title VII—Health Care Provisions. February 22, 25, March 4, 10, 17, and 18, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–7—Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Division B—Military Construction Authorizations. February 25, March 2, 9, 16, and July 1, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–8—Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare, and Recreation hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. March 10, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–9—Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine hearing on the Fiscal Year 2000 Maritime Administration request and related matters and the Fiscal Year 2000 (First Quarter) Panama Canal Commission authorization request and related matters. March 16, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–10—Full Committee hearing on United States policy toward Iraq. March 10, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–11—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on protection equipment and countermeasure devices. February 11, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–12—Full Committee hearing on the United States and NATO military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. April 28, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–13—Full Committee hearing on the United States policy toward Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. April 15, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–14—Full Committee hearing on the state of United States military forces. January 20, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–15—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on the Department of Defense activities budget for Fiscal Year 2000 and related matters. March 4, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–16—Full Committee hearing on U.S. encryption policy. July 1 and 13, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–17—Full Committee hearing on Department of Energy reorganization. June 24 and July 14, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–18—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearing on the readiness of Army AH–64 Apache helicopter fleet. July 1, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–19—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearing on implications concerning the Atlantic Fleet Training Center, Vieques, Puerto Rico. September 22, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–20—Full Committee hearing on the Phase One Report of the United States Commission on National Security/21st Century. October 5, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–21—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on the recent counterintelligence problems at Department of Energy laboratories. April 15, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–22—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program. September 30, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–23—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000—H.R. 1401 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. February 23 and March 3, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–24—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on the performance of the B–2 Bomber in the Kosovo Air Campaign. June 30, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–25—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearing on spare and repair parts shortages. October 7, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–26—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on the trends in the U.S. domestic future and implications for national security—A report on the National Security Study Group, United States Commission on National Security/21st Century. November 4, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–27—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearing on operations in Kosovo: problems encountered and lessons learned and reconstruction. October 26, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–28—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on Department of Energy security issues. October 20, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–29—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict—the effect of the operation on both deployed/non-deployed forces and on future modernization plans. October 19, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–30—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on the results of Department of Energy's Inspector General inquiries into specific aspects of the espionage investigation at the Los Alamos National Laboratory. November 10, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–31—Military Research and Development Subcommittee hearing on the electromagnetic pulse threats to U.S. military and civilian infrastructure. October 7, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–32—Military Research and Development Subcommittee hearing on Russian threat perceptions and plans for sabotage against the United States. October 26, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–33—Full Committee hearing on U.S. National Missile Defense policy and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. October 13, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–34—Full Committee hearing on Military Services' posture, readiness, and budget issues. October 21, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–35—Full Committee hearing on U.S. policy regarding high-performance computer exports. October 28, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–36—Military Research and Development and Military Procurement Subcommittees, and Space and Aeronautics Subcommittee of the Committee on Science joint hearings on range modernization, Parts 1 and 2. March 24, and June 29, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–37—Full Committee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205, and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. February 9, 10, 17, March 15, 22, and 23, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–38—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title I—Procurement. February 29 and June 27, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–39—Military Research and Development Subcommittee hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation. March 1, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–40—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title III—Operation and Maintenance. February 29, March 1, and 9, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–41—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title IV—Personnel Authorizations, Title V—Military Personnel Policy, Title VI—Compensation and Other Personnel Benefits, and Title VII—Health Care Provisions. February 25, 28, March 8, 15, and 17, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–42—Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Division B—Military Construction Authorizations. March 2, 9, and 16, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–43—Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare, and Recreation hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. March 15, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–44—Full Committee hearing on Military Services' posture, readiness, and budget issues. September 27, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–45—Military Research and Development Subcommittee and Military Readiness Subcommittee joint hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—H.R. 4205 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation and Title III—Operation and Maintenance. March 8, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–46—Full Committee hearing on the adequacy of the defense budget. February 8, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–47—Full Committee hearing on the implementation of Title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000. March 2, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–48—Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization hearings on National Nuclear Security Administration. March 2 and 16, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–49—Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 Maritime Administration authorization request and related matters. February 29, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–50—Military Procurement Subcommittee and Military Research and Development Subcommittee joint hearing on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—Title I—Procurement and Title II—Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation. February 16, March 9, 14, and 16, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–51—Military Procurement Subcommittee and Military Research and Development Subcommittee joint hearing on chemical and biological defense for U.S. forces. October 20, 1999.

H.A.S.C. 106–52—Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism hearing on terrorist threats to the United States. May 23, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–53—Full Committee hearing on China's strategic intentions and goals. June 21, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–54—Full Committee hearing on security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory. June 14, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–55—Military Research and Development Subcommittee hearing on National Missile Defense: Reviewing its technical status. June 22, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–56—Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism hearing on terrorism and threats to U.S. interests in Latin America. June 29, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–57—Military Readiness Subcommittee hearing on defense logistics reengineering initiatives. June 27, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–58—Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization hearing on status of National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). July 11, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–59—Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism hearing on terrorism and threats to U.S. interests in the Middle East. July 13, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–60—Full Committee hearing on U.S. plans and policy regarding National Missile Defense. June 28, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–61—Full Committee hearing on military capabilities of the People's Republic of China. July 19, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–62—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program (AVIP). July 13, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–63—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on the status of military procurement requirements and funding. September 21, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–64—Military Procurement Subcommittee hearing on Department of Defense Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction Program. September 21, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–65—Full Committee hearing on the attack on U.S.S. *Cole.* October 25, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–66—Military Personnel Subcommittee hearing on proposals to transform the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC). November 28, 2000.

H.A.S.C. 106–67—Department of Energy budget request (defense programs) for fiscal year 2001 and related matters. March 21, 2000.

HOUSE REPORTS

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
106–39, part 1	Mar. 2, 1999	H.R. 4	To declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.
106–117, part 4	July 23, 1999	H.R. 850	To amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell Encryption and to relax export Controls on encryption.
106–162	May 24, 1999	H.R. 1401	To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes.
106–301	Aug. 6, 1999	H.R. 1401 Conf. Rept.	To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes.
106–616	May 12, 1999	H.R. 4205	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military Personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.
106–694, part 2	July 21, 1999	H.R. 4446	To ensure that the Secretary of Energy may continue to exercise Certain authorities under the Price-Anderson Act through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety, and Health.
106–695, part 2	July 21, 1999	H.R. 3383	To amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to remove separate treatment or exemption for nuclear safety violations by nonprofit institutions.
106–696, part 2	July 12, 1999	H.R. 3906	To ensure that the Department of Energy has appropriate mechanisms to independently assess the effectiveness of its policy and site performance in the areas of safeguards and security and cyber security

Report number	Date filed	Bill number	Title
106–730	July 12, 2000	H. Res. 534	Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate that security policy and security procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration remain inadequate, that the individuals responsible for such policy and procedure must be held accountable for their performance, and that immediate action must be taken to correct security deficiencies.
106–945	Oct. 6, 2000	H.R. 4205 Conf. Rept.	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military Personnel strengths for fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.
106–1035, part 1	Dec. 15, 2000	H.R. 4737	To require an inventory of documents and devices containing Restricted Data at the national security laboratories of the Department of Energy, to improve security procedures for access to the vaults containing Restricted Data at those laboratories, and for other purposes.

Public Laws

Law number	Date approved	Bill number	Title
106–38	July 22, 1999	H.R. 4	To declare it to be the policy of the United States to deploy a national missile defense.
106–65	Oct. 5, 1999	H.R. 1401 (S. 1059)	To authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, and for other purposes
106–120	Dec. 3, 1999	H.R. 1555	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2000 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.
106–195	May 2, 2000	H.J. Res. 86	Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Services during such war, and for other purposes.

Law number	Date approved	Bill number	Title
106–227	June 29, 2000	H.J. Res. 101	Recognizing the 225th Birthday of the United States Army.
106–398	Oct. 30, 2000	H.R. 4205	To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities for the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.
106–419	Nov. 1, 2000	S. 1402	To amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance programs providing education benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

PRESS RELEASES

FIRST SESSION

January 7, 1999—Chairman Spence Announces Leadership of the House Armed Services Committee.

January 20, 1999—Chairman Spence's Remarks upon Organization of the Armed Services Committee.

January 20, 1999—Chairman Spence's Opening Statement at Full Committee Hearing with General Shelton and the Service Chiefs.

January 25, 1999—Chairman Spence and Ranking Member Skelton Announce Subcommittee Assignments.

February 1999—*National Security Report*—The FY2000 Defense Budget: Gambling with America's Defense.

February 1, 1999—The President's Defense Budget: Short of the Requirement and High on Risk.

February 2, 1999—Chairman Spence's Statement at Full Committee Hearing on FY 2000 Budget Hearing with Secretary Cohen and General Shelton.

February 5, 1999—Chairman Spence and Ranking Member Skelton Announce Panel Assignments.

February 18, 1999—Press Advisory: House Armed Services Subcommittee to Conduct Field Hearing in Norfolk, VA.

February 19, 1999—Press Advisory: House Armed Services Subcommittee to Conduct Field Hearing at Nellis, Air Force Base.

February 24, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Service Chiefs.

February 24, 1999—Chairman Spence Calls State of Aging and Obsolete Equipment "Irresponsible".

February 25, 1999—Service Chiefs: Ability to Execute National Military Strategy Remains "High-Risk".

February 25, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Markup of H.R. 4.

February 25, 1999—Armed Services Committee Reports Bipartisan National Missile Defense Policy Bill.

February 25, 1999—H.R. 4: A Bill Declaring it to be the Policy of the United States to Deploy a National Missile Defense.

March 2, 1999—House Armed Services Subcommittee to Assess the Readiness of U.S. Military Forces in Europe at Field Hearing at Naples, Italy.

March 3, 1999—Chairman Spence Calls for Increased Defense Spending to Address Critical Unfunded Requirements.

March 3, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Admiral Blair and General Tilelli.

March 10, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S. Policy on Iraq (Day 1 of 2).

March 11, 1999—Spence on Kosovo: "The Wrong Commitment at the Wrong Time for the Wrong Reasons".

March 11, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S. Policy on Iraq (Day 2 of 2).

March 11, 1999—Chairman Spence Appoints House Armed Services Committee Vice-Chairs.

March 16, 1999—House Armed Services Subcommittee to Conduct Field Hearing in Norfolk.

March 17, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S. Policy in the Balkans.

March 24, 1999—Floor Statement of Chairman Spence on the Resolution in Support of U.S. Troops in Operations Against Yugoslavia.

March 25, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Service Secretaries.

April 1999—*Military Readiness Review*—Kosovo and the National Military Strategy: The costs of doing more with less.

April 10, 1999—Chairman Spence Leads Delegation to Macedonia.

April 15, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Secretary Cohen and General Shelton on Kosovo.

April 28, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Outside Witnesses on Options in Kosovo.

April 28, 1999—Floor Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 1569: A Bill Prohibiting the use of DOD Funds for U.S. Ground Forces in Yugoslavia.

May 1999—*Defense Quotables*—Military Readiness: The Strain is Showing.

May 5, 1999—Spence Questions Utility of Some Cooperative Threat Reduction Projects.

May 19, 1999—House Armed Services Committee Reports H.R. 1401: FY 2000 National Defense Authorization Bill.

May 19, 1999—Chairman Spence's Statement and Summary of H.R. 1401 as Reported.

May 19, 1999—Correction to Summary of H.R. 1401.

May 19, 1999—H.R. 1401 as Reported by the House Armed Services Committee.

May 20, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 4: The National Missile Defense Act of 1999.

May 25, 1999—Spence Reaction on Release of the Cox Committee Report.

June 9, 1999—Floor Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 1401: FY 2000 National Defense Authorization Act.

June 10, 1999—House Approves Funding to Improve Military Quality of Life, Readiness and Equipment Modernization Programs.

June 24, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board on the Security Problems at the U.S. Department of Energy.

June 30, 1999—Kosovo Backgrounder.

July 1999—*Military Readiness Review*—The U.S. Air Force and Kosovo: Readiness strained to the limit.

July 1, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 850: a Bill to Amend Title 18, United States Code, to Affirm the Rights of United States Persons to Use and Sell Encryption and to Relax Export Controls on Encryption.

July 13, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 850, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to affirm the rights of United States persons to use and sell encryption and to relax export controls on encryption.

July 14, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on Department of Energy Reorganization.

July 21, 1999—Armed Services Committee Adopts Amendment to Encryption Bill Ensuring That National Security, Law Enforcement Remain Priority.

July 21, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Markup of H.R. 850.

July 21, 1999—Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute to H.R. 850 Adopted by the House Armed Services Committee.

August 1999—*National Security Report*—Communiques and Treaties are Poor Shields: Implications of the U.S.-Russian Joint Statement on the ABM and START III Treaties.

August 5, 1999—Conferees Reach Agreement on FY 2000 Defense Authorization Bill.

August 5, 1999—House, Senate Reach Agreement on Energy Department Reorganization.

September 1999—*National Security Report*—Reforming the Department of Energy: Safeguarding America's Nuclear Secrets.

September 1999—*Defense Quotables*—Department of Energy: Time for Reform.

September 15, 1999—Prepared Remarks of Chairman Floyd Spence on Conference Report.

October 5, 1999—President Endorses Congressional Actions on Defense Bill.

October 5, 1999—Spence Appoints Panel to Oversee Implementation of DOE Reorganization.

October 5, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Hart-Rudman Commission Report.

October 12, 1999—Spence to President: Signing Statement Inconsistent with Law, Will Delay Overdue DOE Management and Nuclear Security Reforms.

October 13, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S National Missile Defense Policy and the ABM Treaty.

October 19, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence on Vieques: Critical to Military Readiness.

October 20, 1999—Statement of Chairman Spence: Supercomputer Export Review Process Works.

October 20, 1999—GAO Report NSIAD–99–208—Export Controls: 1998 Legislative Mandate for High Performance Computers.

October 21, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with Military Service Chiefs.

October 28, 1999—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S. Policy on Supercomputer Exports.

November 18, 1999—Defense Accomplishments of the 104th, 105th, and 106th Congresses.

SECOND SESSION

February 2000—Department of Energy National Nuclear Security Administration Implementation Plan: An Assessment.

February 2000—*National Security Report*—The Fiscal Year 2001 Defense Budget: The Mismatch between Strategy, Resources, and Forces Continues.

February 2, 2000—Spence Announces HASC Staff Director's Departure.

February 8, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on the CSIS "Defense Train Wreck" Report.

February 9, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Budget Request.

February 10, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at the Full Committee Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Budget Request with Military Service Chiefs.

February 16, 2000—Opening Statement of Subcommittee Chairman Weldon at the Joint Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Ballistic Missile Defense Programs.

February 17, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at the Full Committee Hearing on the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense Authorization Budget Request with General Wesley Clark.

February 18, 2000—House Armed Services Committee to Conduct Field Hearing at Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana.

February 22, 2000—House Armed Services Committee to Conduct Field Hearing at Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

February 28, 2000—Spence Calls for Increased Defense Spending to Address Critical Unfunded Requirements.

February 29, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Special Oversight Panel on the Merchant Marine hearing on the FY 2001 Maritime Administration Authorization Request and Related Matters.

February 29, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Military Readiness Subcommittee Hearing on the Adequacy of the FY 2001 Budget Request to Meet Readiness Needs.

February 29, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement Subcommittee Hearing on Navy Shipbuilding Programs.

March 2000—*Military Readiness Review*—Vieques Training Facilities: Vital to U.S. military readiness.

March 1, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Military Research & Development Hearing on Defense-Wide Research and Development Programs.

March 1, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Military Readiness Subcommittee Hearing on Real Property Maintenance and Infrastructure Funding.

March 3, 2000—Chairman Spence Appoints Committee Panel to Assess Terrorist Threats.

March 3, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hefley at Military Installations & Facilities Subcommittee Hearing on the FY

2001 Budget Request for Military Construction and Military Family Housing of the Department of Defense.

March 3, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Implementation of Department of Energy Reorganization and Reforms Contained in Title XXXII of the FY 2000 National Defense Authorization Act.

March 8, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Military Readiness and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Information Superiority and Information Assurance.

March 8, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Military Readiness and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Information Superiority and Information Assurance.

March 8, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Buyer at Military Personnel Subcommittee Hearing on the All Volunteer Force and Reserve Component Overview.

March 9, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Army Programs and Transformation.

March 9, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Military Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Army Programs and Transformation.

March 9, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Military Readiness and Civil Service Subcommittees Hearing on Civilian Personnel Readiness.

March 9, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hefley at Military Installations & Facilities Subcommittee Hearing on the FY 2001 Budget Request for DOD Military Construction and Family Housing Programs.

March 14, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Navy and Marine Corps Programs.

March 15, 2000—GAO Report Raises Questions About Usage of Cooperative Threat Reduction Funds.

March 15, 2000—GAO Report—Cooperative Threat Reduction: DOD's 1997–98 Reports on Accounting for Assistance were Late and Incomplete.

March 15, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing with the Regional Commanders on the FY 2001 Budget Request.

March 15, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman McHugh at Morale, Welfare & Recreation Panel Hearing on Resale Systems and Programs.

March 15, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Buyer at Personnel Subcommittee Hearing on Removing the Barriers to TRICARE.

March 16, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hefley at Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee Hearing on Implementation of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, Utilities Infrastructure Privatization, and Asset Management Practices of the Military Departments.

March 16, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Air Force Programs.

March 16, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Military Procurement and Research & Development Subcommittees Hearing on Air Force Programs.

March 21, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement Subcommittee Hearing on the Department of Energy FY 2001 Budget Request for Defense Programs and Related Matters.

March 22, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on the FY 2001 National Defense Authorization Act.

March 23, 2000—Spence Reacts to Patriot Missile (PAC–2) Failure.

March 23, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on U.S. Policy Towards Colombia.

April 13, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman McHugh at Morale, Welfare & Recreation Panel Consideration of H.R. 4205: FY 2001 National Defense Authorization Act.

April 19, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on Release of the Commission on National Security/21st Century Phase II Report.

May 2000—*National Security Report*—China in the Ascendancy: A Growing Threat to U.S. Security?

May 2, 2000—Statement of Chairman Hefley at Military Installations and Facilities Subcommittee Markup of H.R. 4205.

May 3, 2000—GAO Report: CTR Biological Weapon Proliferation Prevention Program "Poses New Risks" to the United States.

May 3, 2000—GAO Report: Biological Weapons: Effort to Reduce Former Soviet Threat Offers Benefits, Poses New Risks.

May 4, 2000—Statement of Chairman Bateman at Military Readiness Subcommittee Markup of H.R. 4205.

May 4, 2000—Statement of Chairman Buyer at Military Personnel Subcommittee Markup of H.R. 4205.

May 4, 2000—Chart Summary of Personnel Subcommittee Mark.

May 9, 2000—Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement Subcommittee Markup of H.R. 4205.

May 9, 2000—Statement of Chairman Weldon at Military Research & Development Subcommittee Markup of H.R. 4205.

May 10, 2000—H.R. 4205: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—Summary of Committee Markup.

May 10, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence at Markup.

May 10, 2000—Statement of Chairman Hefley at Markup.

May 10, 2000—Statement of Chairman McHugh at Markup.

May 10, 2000—Statement of Chairman Bateman at Markup.

May 10, 2000—Statement of Chairman Buyer at Markup.

May 15, 2000—GAO Report on "Volatile" Balkans Raises Further Questions About U.S. Military Involvement in the Region.

May 15, 2000—GAO Report: Balkans Security—Current and Projected Factors Affecting Regional Stability.

May 17, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence at General Floor Debate on H.R. 4205.

May 17, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on Dreier Amendment at General Floor Debate on H.R. 4205.

May 18, 2000—House Approves Funding to Improve Military Quality of Life, Readiness and Equipment Modernization Programs.

May 18, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on Moakley Amendment at General Floor Debate on H.R. 4205.

May 23, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Saxton at Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism Hearing on Terrorist Threats to the United States.

May 25, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Joint Military Research & Development and Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife & Oceans (Resources Committee) Hearing on the Integrated Ocean Observing System.

June 5, 2000—Congress Appoints Members to Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization.

June 13, 2000—Statement of Chairman Floyd Spence on H.J. Res. 101: Commemorating the Army's 225th Birthday.

June 14, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Security Failures at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

June 21, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Strategic Intentions and Goals of China.

June 21, 2000—Press Advisory: Press Conference on DOD Management of Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program.

June 22, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Weldon at Research & Development Subcommittee Hearing on the Technical Status of the National Missile Defense Program.

June 27, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Bateman at Readiness Subcommittee Hearing on Defense Logistics Reengineering Initiatives.

June 27, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Procurement Subcommittee Hearing on Submarine Force Structure and Modernization.

June 28, 2000—Armed Services Committee Calls for Clear Accountability on Nuclear Weapons Security.

June 28, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Mark Up of H. Res. 534 and H.R. 3906, 4446, 3383 and 4737.

June 28, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on H. Res. 534.

June 28, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 3906.

June 28, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on H.R. 4446.

June 28, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on the National Missile Defense Program.

July 13, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Buyer at Military Personnel Hearing on DOD Management of the Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program.

July 13, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Saxton at Special Oversight Panel on Terrorism Hearing on Threats to U.S. Interests in the Middle East.

July 17, 2000—House Committed to Protecting Nuclear Weapon Secrets at the Department of Energy.

July 17, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at House Floor Consideration of H. Res. 534.

July 19, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Military Capabilities of the People's Republic of China.

August 17, 2000—GAO Report "Heightens Concerns" about Stockpile Stewardship Program and Department of Energy Management of National Ignition Facility.

August 17, 2000—GAO Report: National Ignition Facility—Management and Oversight Failures Caused Major Cost Overruns and Schedule Delays.

September 2000—*National Security Report*—National Missile Defense: Countering the Ballistic Missile Threat.

September 1, 2000—Delay of National Missile Defense System will "Increase Risk to Americans".

September 11, 2000—Chairman Spence on the Death of Representative Herb Bateman.

September 21, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement Hearing on the DOD Chemical Agents and Munitions Destruction Program.

September 21, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter at Military Procurement Hearing on the Status of Military Procurement Requirements and Funding.

September 27, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on Readiness and Service Budgets.

October 5, 2000—GAO Report: Department of Defense Fails to Cut Headquarters Staff Levels.

October 5, 2000—GAO Report: Defense Headquarters—Status of Efforts to Redefine and Reduce Headquarters Staff.

October 6, 2000—H.R. 4205: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001—Summary of Conference Agreement.

October 6, 2000—Keeping Faith with America's Veterans.

October 6, 2000—Congress Approves Compensation Plan for Nuclear Weapons Workers.

October 11, 2000—Floor Statement of Chairman Floyd Spence on the Conference Report on H.R. 4205—FY 2001 National Defense Authorization Act.

October 12, 2000—House Armed Services Committee Adopts Motion Condemning Attack on U.S.S. *Cole*.

October 13, 2000—"One Year Later, Slow Progress for DOE Reform," says Special Nuclear Security Oversight Panel.

October 13, 2000—Panel Report: Establishing the National Nuclear Security Administration: A Year of Obstacles and Opportunities.

October 18, 2000—Prepared Floor Statement of Chairman Spence-Resolution Regarding the Attack on the U.S.S. *Cole*.

October 25, 2000—Opening Statement of Chairman Spence at Full Committee Hearing on the Bombing of the U.S.S. *Cole*.

November 21, 2000—Statement of Chairman Spence on Florida Disqualified Military Absentee Ballots.

November 28, 2000—Statement of Chairman Buyer at Personnel Subcommittee Hearing on Proposals to Transform TRADOC.

○