



**HOUSE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM AND  
UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS  
JIM SAXTON, NEW JERSEY  
CHAIRMAN**

**PRESS RELEASE**

---

For Immediate Release:  
July 21, 2005

Contact: Josh Holly (HASC), 202-225-2539 or  
Greg Keeley (SAXTON), 202-225-4765

**OPENING STATEMENT OF JIM SAXTON**

***Joint Hearing on Counter-Terrorism Technology Transfer***

**Washington, D.C.** – The Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities meets this afternoon in joint session with our colleagues from the Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Science, and Technology to review the process by which the Department of Defense shares counter terror technology with the Department of Homeland Security. This is first of what I expect will be many joint ventures with our friends on the Homeland Security Committee. It is no surprise that the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security share similar joint interests across a range of areas, and we hope to foster and encourage even greater cooperation than already exists between these two vitally important executive branch departments.

Nothing we do in Congress is more important than national security. DOD and DHS are the lead federal agencies in assuring the safety and security of the American public and must work together in a seamless fashion as they work to deter and defeat terrorism.

Our concern today is technology transfer of tools useful in combating terrorism, a broader topic than one may think. DOD has been working on force protection and installation protection mechanisms for as long as we’ve had military installations, and continues to seek improvements. Not everything done by DOD is directly applicable to DHS and first responder needs, but much clearly is. We understand that much has been done on a largely informal basis to share good ideas between the departments. While that is encouraging news, I believe it would be better to have a more rigorous, formal process in place. We don’t want to create unnecessary bureaucracy, but we need to be assured that the good ideas developed by each is made available—and most importantly, seriously considered—by the other. Such a process will likely require some incentives to be effective. We would be interested in any ideas our witnesses may have in that regard.

###

<http://armedservices.house.gov/>