Y4
.Ap6/1
D 36/5/971/PT. 2
101
91Y4
Ap6/1
D 36/5/971/pt.2

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1971

GOVERNMENT
Storage
RECEIVED
8 1970
THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
JOHN M. SLACK, West Virginia
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, New York
FRANK E. EVANS, Colorado [2]
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Ohio
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
LOUIS C. WYMAN, New Hampshire [1]

RALPH PRESTON, JOHN GARRITY, PETER MURPHY, ROBERT FOSTER, and GARY MICHALAK, *Staff Assistants*

[1] Assigned to subcommittee Feb. 20, 1970.
[2] Temporarily assigned.

PART 2
Military Personnel

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

KSU LIBRARIES
A11900 453798

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1971

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, *Chairman*

ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
JOHN M. SLACK, West Virginia
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, New York
FRANK E. EVANS, Colorado [2]
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Ohio
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
LOUIS C. WYMAN, New Hampshire [1]

RALPH PRESTON, JOHN GARRITY, PETER MURPHY, ROBERT FOSTER, and GARY MICHALAK, *Staff Assistants*

[1] Assigned to subcommittee Feb. 20, 1970.
[2] Temporarily assigned.

PART 2
Military Personnel

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
42-563 O WASHINGTON : 1970

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

GEORGE H. MAHON, Texas, *Chairman*

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN, Ohio
JAMIE L. WHITTEN, Mississippi
GEORGE W. ANDREWS, Alabama
JOHN J. ROONEY, New York
ROBERT L. F. SIKES, Florida
OTTO E. PASSMAN, Louisiana
JOE L. EVINS, Tennessee
EDWARD P. BOLAND, Massachusetts
WILLIAM H. NATCHER, Kentucky
DANIEL J. FLOOD, Pennsylvania
TOM STEED, Oklahoma
GEORGE P. SHIPLEY, Illinois
JOHN M. SLACK, West Virginia
JOHN J. FLYNT, JR., Georgia
NEAL SMITH, Iowa
ROBERT N. GIAIMO, Connecticut
JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Washington
JOSEPH P. ADDABBO, New York
JOHN J. McFALL, California
W. R. HULL, JR., Missouri
JEFFERY COHELAN, California
EDWARD J. PATTEN, New Jersey
CLARENCE D. LONG, Maryland
JOHN O. MARSH, JR., Virginia
SIDNEY R. YATES, Illinois
BOB CASEY, Texas
DAVID PRYOR, Arkansas
FRANK E. EVANS, Colorado
DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin

FRANK T. BOW, Ohio
CHARLES R. JONAS, North Carolina
ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Michigan
JOHN J. RHODES, Arizona
WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, Ohio
ROBERT H. MICHEL, Illinois
SILVIO O. CONTE, Massachusetts
ODIN LANGEN, Minnesota
BEN REIFEL, South Dakota
GLENN R. DAVIS, Wisconsin
HOWARD W. ROBISON, New York
GARNER E. SHRIVER, Kansas
JOSEPH M. McDADE, Pennsylvania
MARK ANDREWS, North Dakota
LOUIS C. WYMAN, New Hampshire
BURT L. TALCOTT, California
CHARLOTTE T. REID, Illinois
DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR., Michigan
WENDELL WYATT, Oregon
JACK EDWARDS, Alabama
DEL CLAWSON, California

PAUL M. WILSON, *Clerk and Staff Director*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1970.

TRIBUTE TO GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

Mr. WHITTEN. This afternoon we begin consideration of the Department of Defense budget for fiscal year 1971. The beginning of hearings this year is a sad occasion for the members of this subcommittee for we must proceed without the benefit of our very able and longtime member, Glen Lipscomb. Glen Lipscomb was appointed to the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations in 1959 and has served as the ranking minority member since 1965.

I sat by Glen Lipscomb's side for many years in this committee room. His dedication and ability were of the highest order. He was of invaluable assistance to all of us.

Perhaps his own words which appear on the plaque attached to the U.S.S. *California* help to sum up what he accomplished during his tenure on this subcommittee:

> Future generations of Americans will recognize that it was Congress that had the foresight, wisdom, and courage to take this initiative to strengthen the defense of our Nation.

For he firmly believed in article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States which provides that the Congress shall have power to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy. Through Glen Lipscomb's untiring efforts much has been done to strengthen the defense of our Nation.

He was a great statesman and a great friend. We say here for the record that we shall all miss him, as I know you will.

I think it appropriate that we make this comment as we begin the first year of hearings without his presence.

Mr. RHODES. May I associate myself with the statement you have just made, and to add a bit to it?

I think most of the people in the room knew Glen. General Taylor was present at the funeral in California. I was particularly touched and pleased, as Mrs. Lipscomb was, at the feeling on the part of the members of the Armed Forces, that made itself so apparent, of appreciation for the great service Glen had rendered, for the kind of man he was, and for the kind of friend he was to the armed services. He was firmly convinced that the Nation was in danger from without, and he took as his life's work as much as one man can do to prevent any nation or group of nations from getting into a position where it or they could successfully challenge this Nation militarily.

His work on this subcommittee was the highlight of his life, and it is with a very heavy heart and a sense of great loss that we surviving members of the subcommittee will proceed to do the best we can without his help and guidance.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by you and by Mr. Rhodes, and observe further a rather personal reaction to the loss of Mr. Lipscomb because of the cause of his death.

As you all know, it was 9 years ago this Friday that I was afflicted by the same condition but by the help of God I managed to survive. When I first heard of Mr. Lipscomb's problem when he returned from the hospital, I immediately called him on the phone, feeling more or less of the same club, to encourage him because of my experience. He was pleased and happy, indeed, to have this support.

I attempted to keep in very close touch with him in the ensuing weeks after he left the hospital.

His sudden passing was not only a great loss to the committee but, because of the circumstances that I have just related, a great personal shock to me.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the fitting and well-earned remarks and tribute to our departed colleague, Glen Lipscomb.

In the short 3 years I have served on this subcommittee, I early realized the great dedication, knowledge, and ability of our departed colleague.

I know we all missed him during the presentation of the 1970 Defense appropriation on the floor of the House. I know he will be missed as we begin this year's hearings.

I sincerely hope and pray that Mrs. Lipscomb and his family will find some comfort in the knowledge that his untimely passing will be felt by many, and for many years to come. Our prayers are with him and his.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to comment on the passing of my very close personal friend and colleague, Glen Lipscomb. Of the 16 years in which I have served in the House, 14 of those years I sat by Glen's left in committee. At first we served together as members of the Government Operations Committee and later as members of the Defense Appropriation Subcommittee.

The course of our duties on this committee took Glen and me to many foreign countries. Frequently on these trips we had to travel and live under the most adverse circumstances. When we were in Russia, in the battle zones of Vietnam and in other parts of the world, Glen was always a great companion. He was always hard working and uncomplaining and through it all he always maintained his wonderful sense of humor.

He was a great friend and a great statesman. His contribution to his country were many and diverse—it is unfortunate that his early death deprived the Congress and his beloved country of the benefits of this dedicated and outstanding public servant. I know the other members of this committee join with me in saying that the country and the committee shall both miss him deeply this year and the years to come.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, as we begin consideration of the Defense appropriations budget request for fiscal year 1971, I believe we might well pause a moment to pay our respects to our late colleague, Congressman Glenard Lipscomb.

The remembered example of his tireless work and deep knowledge of the subject we are taking up will certainly serve as an inspiration to us all during the coming months. He loved his work and his country, and he joined together the love of both to make a great contribution to the defense of the United States.

The responsibility for arriving at justifiable Defense appropriation totals must proceed without his presence, but will certainly be undertaken this year with strong recollections of his memory.

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1970.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

WITNESSES

LT. GEN. W. T. KERWIN, JR., DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
MAJ. GEN. W. E. BRINKER, ASSISTANT DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
MAJ. GEN. L. B. TAYLOR, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY
MAJ. GEN. F. W. BOYE, JR., CHIEF, OFFICE OF PERSONNEL OPERATIONS
MAJ. GEN. C. M. GETTYS, DIRECTOR OF INDIVIDUAL TRAINING, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
BRIG. GEN. S. H. NEEL, JR., DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL
BRIG. GEN. F. M. DAVIS, DIRECTOR OF MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICIES, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
BRIG. GEN. F. J. KROESEN, DIRECTOR OF MANPOWER AND FORCES, OFFICE, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR FORCE DEVELOPMENT
COL. J. B. ADAMSON, DIRECTOR OF PLANS, STUDIES, AND BUDGET, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
COL. E. P. HOISINGTON, DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
COL. J. B. BARTHOLOMEES, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF PROCUREMENT AND DISTRIBUTION, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
LT. COL. J. F. BELLOCHI, SCHOOLS AND EDUCATIONAL DIVISION, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
B. M. HUTCHISON, CHIEF, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY BRANCH, BUDGET DIVISION, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
G. B. NUTT, CHIEF, CLOTHING AND SUBSISTENCE SECTION, BUDGET DIVISION, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY FY 1971

SECTION 1 - LANGUAGE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere); /~~$8,107,000,000~~/ $7,923,700,000. (10 U.S.C. 701-04, 744, 1035, 1037, 1212, 1475-80, 2389, 2421, 2634, 3687, 4561, 4562, 4741; chs. 3, 5, 7, 9, of title 37 U.S.C.; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970.)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2010-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct program:			
1. Strategic forces	92,453	91,234	78,141
2. General purpose forces	4,019,424	4,232,300	3,870,719
3. Intelligence and communications	325,628	373,931	369,649
4. Airlift and sealift	10,476	12,164	12,078
5. Guard and reserve	39,647	40,290	43,901
6. Research and development	58,657	65,709	62,902
7. Central supply and maintenance	73,404	84,658	85,510
8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities	3,460,056	3,376,436	3,012,552
9. Administration and associated activities	104,444	115,699	116,611
10. Support of other nations	225,780	277,579	271,637
Total direct program	8,409,969	8,670,000	7,923,700
Reimbursable program:	110,028	122,000	119,000
10 Total obligations	8,519,997	8,792,000	8,042,700

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2010-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Financing:			
Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11 Federal funds (-)	- 48,761	- 60,492	- 57,506
14 Non-Federal sources (-) 1/	- 61,267	- 61,508	- 61,494
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	....	....	....
Budget authority	8,409,969	8,670,000	7,923,700
Budget authority:			
40 Appropriation	8,409,969	8,107,000	7,923,700
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	....	563,000	....

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are derived from sale of meals and clothing to service members (10 U.S.C. 4621).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2010-0-1-051		1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Relation of obligations to outlays:				
71	Obligations incurred, net	8,409,969	8,670,000	7,923,700
72	Obligated balance, start of year	343,187	180,227	260,227
74	Obligated balance, end of year (-)	- 180,227	- 260,227	- 295,427
77	Adjustments in expired accounts	- 112,251	....	....
90	Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	8,460,678	8,027,000	7,888,500
91.30	Outlays from military pay act supplemental	....	563,000	....

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2010-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military personnel	5,552,707	6,002,938	5,552,400
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military personnel	1,380,295	1,367,065	1,254,208
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	454,216	388,108	331,441
22.0 Transportation of things	201,987	189,440	162,247
25.0 Other services	79,136	49,446	43,738
26.0 Supplies and materials	708,604	639,763	550,738
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	656	570	509
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	21,523	20,723	18,462
43.0 Interest and dividends	10,845	11,947	9,957
Total direct obligations	8,409,969	8,670,000	7,923,700
Reimbursable obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military personnel	7,023	6,551	6,551
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military personnel	1,763	1,641	1,641
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	368	452	452
22.0 Transportation of things	15	15	15
25.0 Other services	76	81	81

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2010-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
26.0 Supplies and materials	100,719	113,180	110,180
41.0 Grants, subsidies, and contributions	64	80	80
Total reimbursable obligations	110,028	122,000	119,000
99.0 Total obligations	8,519,997	8,792,000	8,042,700

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

SECTION 2 - INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

This appropriation finances the costs of the military personnel forces of the Army. For the first time the program and financing schedule for this appropriation reflects budget activity classifications which are identical to the ten major program classifications used for management purposes throughout the Department of Defense. These same classifications are also used as the budget activity structure for the Operation and Maintenance appropriation.

The tables in Section 3 immediately following summarize the cost of Army military personnel both in terms of the personnel categories, i.e., pay and allowances of officers, enlisted, etc., and in terms of the major defense programs (budget activities) and operating programs where personnel work.

The remainder of this book, Sections 4 through 9, contains material in the same form that has been used for a number of years to present the requirements for the military personnel appropriation.

Primarily, Army military personnel are engaged in programs for operation of the Army. Except for military personnel, these costs are financed by the Operation and Maintenance appropriation. Army military personnel are also engaged in Operation of Defense Agencies; Research and Development, Army; and Research and Development, Defense Agencies. In addition, a small number of Army military personnel are assigned to other Government agencies outside Department of Defense. The costs of these personnel are financed as a part of the reimbursable program for this appropriation with reimbursements received from the Government agencies to which such personnel are assigned.

Obligations for military personnel are distributed to each of the major defense programs on the basis of average officer and enlisted rates. These rates are multiplied by the average number of officer and enlisted personnel assigned in each defense program. Obligations for permanent change of station travel and support of allies are excluded from these average rates and entered directly in the applicable defense program.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY
SECTION 3
COSTS BY PERSONNEL CATEGORIES

	FY 1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
Direct program:			
1. Pay and allowances of officers	1,803,668	1,977,789	1,872,424
2. Pay and allowances of enlisted	5,067,619	5,319,983	4,863,913
3. Pay and allowances of cadets	9,471	11,284	11,941
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	736,199	677,540	588,949
5. Permanent change of station travel	700,860	613,441	524,691
6. Other military personnel costs	92,152	69,963	61,782
Total direct program	8,409,969	8,670,000	7,923,700
Reimbursable program:			
1. Pay and allowances of officers	7,927	7,440	7,440
2. Pay and allowances of enlisted	4,857	4,760	4,760
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	96,794	109,250	106,250
5. Permanent change of station travel	50	50	50
6. Other military personnel costs	400	500	500
Total reimbursable program	110,028	122,000	119,000
Total program:			
1. Pay and allowances of officers	1,811,595	1,985,229	1,879,864
2. Pay and allowances of enlisted	5,072,476	5,324,743	4,868,673
3. Pay and allowances of cadets	9,471	11,284	11,941
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	832,993	786,790	695,199
5. Permanent change of station travel	700,910	613,491	524,741
6. Other military personnel costs	92,552	70,463	62,282
10. Total obligations	8,519,997	8,792,000	8,042,700

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY SECTION 3

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY
(End Strengths)

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
Direct program:			
1. Strategic forces:			
Officers	2,933	2,391	2,263
Enlisted	13,520	10,455	9,629
Total	16,453	12,846	11,892
2. General purpose forces:			
Officers	68,862	65,408	56,622
Enlisted	719,177	658,803	593,283
Total	788,039	724,211	649,905
3. Intelligence and communications:			
Officers	8,217	8,486	8,602
Enlisted	56,189	54,144	52,546
Total	64,406	62,630	61,148
4. Airlift and sealift:			
Officers	426	438	418
Enlisted	1,384	1,449	1,331
Total	1,810	1,887	1,749
5. Guard and reserve:			
Officers	1,645	2,072	2,018
Enlisted	3,457	3,910	3,876
Total	5,102	5,982	5,894
6. Research and development:			
Officers	2,628	2,227	2,210
Enlisted	7,591	7,270	7,260
Total	10,219	9,497	9,470

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY
(End Strengths)

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
7. Central supply and maintenance:			
Officers	3,658	3,948	3,820
Enlisted	7,868	8,091	7,546
Total	11,526	12,039	11,366
8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities:			
Officers	69,544	65,545	59,708
Enlisted	510,766	433,904	393,037
Academy cadets	2,532	3,865	4,119
Total	582,842	503,314	456,864
9. Administration and associated activities:			
Officers	7,129	7,518	7,664
Enlisted	6,735	5,051	5,395
Total	13,864	12,569	13,059
10. Support of other nations:			
Officers	6,830	6,640	6,640
Enlisted	10,243	10,983	10,983
Total	17,073	17,623	17,623
Total direct program:			
Officers	171,872	164,673	149,965
Enlisted	1,336,930	1,194,060	1,084,886
Academy cadets	2,532	3,865	4,119
Total	1,511,334	1,362,598	1,238,970

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY
(End Strengths)

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
Reimbursable program:			
Officers	495	495	495
Enlisted	117	117	117
Total	612	612	612
Total military personnel:			
Officers	172,367	165,168	150,460
Enlisted	1,337,047	1,194,177	1,085,003
Academy cadets	2,532	3,865	4,119
Total	1,511,946	1,363,210	1,239,582

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 2

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating programs: Operation of the Army	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Army	R&D Defense Agencies	Total
1 - Strategic forces	1971	78,141	-	-	-	78,141
	1970	91,234	-	-	-	91,234
	1969	92,453	-	-	-	92,453
2 - General purpose forces	1971	3,870,719	-	-	-	3,870,719
	1970	4,232,300	-	-	-	4,232,300
	1969	4,019,424	-	-	-	4,019,424
3 - Intelligence and communications	1971	332,196	37,453	-	-	369,649
	1970	340,312	33,619	-	-	373,931
	1969	296,501	29,127	-	-	325,628
4 - Airlift and sealift	1971	12,078	-	-	-	12,078
	1970	12,164	-	-	-	12,164
	1969	10,476	-	-	-	10,476
5 - Guard and reserve	1971	43,901	-	-	-	43,901
	1970	40,290	-	-	-	40,290
	1969	39,647	-	-	-	39,647
6 - Research and development	1971	-	-	60,664	2,238	62,902
	1970	-	-	63,576	2,133	65,709
	1969	-	-	57,521	1,136	58,657

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating programs: Operation of the Army	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Army	R&D Defense Agencies	Total
7 - Central supply and maintenance	1971	85,510	-	-	-	85,510
	1970	84,658	-	-	-	84,658
	1969	73,404	-	-	-	73,404
8 - Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1971	3,012,552	-	-	-	3,012,552
	1970	3,376,436	-	-	-	3,376,436
	1969	3,460,056	-	-	-	3,460,056
9 - Administration and associated activities	1971	104,447	12,164	-	-	116,611
	1970	103,457	12,242	-	-	115,699
	1969	93,812	10,632	-	-	104,444
10 - Support of other nations	1971	271,637	-	-	-	271,637
	1970	277,579	-	-	-	277,579
	1969	225,780	-	-	-	225,780
Total	1971	7,811,181	49,617	60,664	2,238	7,923,700
	1970	8,558,430	45,861	63,576	2,133	8,670,000
	1969	8,311,553	39,759	57,521	1,136	8,409,969

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIRICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating programs				Total	Officer	Enlisted
		Operation of the Army	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Army	R&D Defense Agencies			
1 - Strategic forces	1971	11,892	-	-	-	11,892	2,263	9,629
	1970	12,846	-	-	-	12,846	2,391	10,455
	1969	16,453	-	-	-	16,453	2,933	13,520
2 - General purpose forces	1971	649,905	-	-	-	649,905	56,622	593,283
	1970	724,211	-	-	-	724,211	65,408	658,803
	1969	788,039	-	-	-	788,039	68,862	719,177
3 - Intelligence and communications	1971	56,073	5,075	-	-	61,148	8,602	52,546
	1970	57,526	5,104	-	-	62,630	8,486	54,144
	1969	60,292	4,114	-	-	64,406	8,217	56,189
4 - Airlift and sealift	1971	1,749	-	-	-	1,749	418	1,331
	1970	1,887	-	-	-	1,887	438	1,449
	1969	1,810	-	-	-	1,810	426	1,384
5 - Guard and reserve	1971	5,894	-	-	-	5,894	2,018	3,876
	1970	5,982	-	-	-	5,982	2,072	3,910
	1969	5,102	-	-	-	5,102	1,645	3,457
6 - Research and development	1971	-	-	9,211	259	9,470	2,210	7,260
	1970	-	-	9,239	258	9,497	2,227	7,270
	1969	-	-	9,976	243	10,219	2,628	7,591

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating programs: Operation of the Army	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Army	R&D Defense Agencies	Total	Officer	Enlisted
7 - Central supply and maintenance	1971	11,366	-	-	-	11,366	3,820	7,546
	1970	12,039	-	-	-	12,039	3,948	8,091
	1969	11,526	-	-	-	11,526	3,658	7,868
8 - Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1971	456,864	-	-	-	456,864*	59,708	397,156
	1970	503,314	-	-	-	503,314*	65,545	437,769
	1969	582,842	-	-	-	582,842*	69,544	513,298
9 - Administration and associated activities	1971	11,880	1,179	-	-	13,059	7,664	5,395
	1970	11,375	1,194	-	-	12,569	7,518	5,051
	1969	12,609	1,255	-	-	13,864	7,129	6,735
10 - Support of other nations	1971	17,623	-	-	-	17,623	6,640	10,983
	1970	17,623	-	-	-	17,623	6,640	10,983
	1969	17,073	-	-	-	17,073	6,830	10,243
Total Direct Program	1971	1,223,246*	6,254	9,211	259	1,238,970*	149,965	1,089,005
	1970	1,346,803*	6,298	9,239	258	1,362,598*	164,673	1,197,925
	1969	1,495,746*	5,369	9,976	243	1,511,334*	171,872	1,339,462

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES FOR FY 1971

APPROPRIATION: MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(End strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating programs: Operation of the Army	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Army	R&D Defense Agencies	Total	Officer	Enlisted
Reimbursable Program	1971	-	-	-	-	612	495	117
	1970	-	-	-	-	612	495	117
	1969	-	-	-	-	612	495	117
Total Program	1971	-	-	-	-	1,239,582*	150,460	1,089,122*
	1970	-	-	-	-	1,363,210*	165,168	1,198,042*
	1969	-	-	-	-	1,511,946*	172,367	1,339,579*

* Includes U.S. Military Academy Cadets as follows:

1971	4,119
1970	3,865
1969	2,532

Average Strength (Man-Years) by Type of Personnel

	Actual FY 1969	Estimate FY 1970	Estimate FY 1971
Officer (Male)	141,467	137,164	129,708
Officers (Women's Army Corps - WAC)	909	987	990
Nurses	4,783	4,791	4,993
Army Medical Specialist Corps	635	617	590
Total - Commissioned Officers	147,794	143,559	136,281
Warrant Officers (Male)	21,786	23,465	20,574
Warrant Officers (WAC)	12	16	12
Total - Warrant Officers	21,798	23,481	20,586
Total - Officer Personnel	169,592	167,040	156,867
Enlisted (Male)	1,326,033	1,260,248	1,103,537
Enlisted (WAC)	10,900	12,400	12,400
Total - Enlisted Personnel	1,336,933	1,272,648	1,115,937
Sub-total	1,506,525	1,439,688	1,272,804
Cadets, United States Military Academy	3,406	3,683	3,883
GRAND TOTAL	1,509,931	1,443,371	1,276,687

Strengths, Gains, and Losses, by Identity

	Male & WAC Officers	NAMS	Warrant Officers	Enlisted Personnel	Cadets USMA	Total
A. Actual FY 1969						
Begin	140,500	5,400	20,200	1,401,800	2,400	1,570,300
Gains	30,400	1,200	6,000	574,100	1,200	612,900
Losses	27,600	1,200	2,500	638,900	1,100	671,300
End	143,300	5,400	23,700	1,337,000	2,500	1,511,900
Average	142,400	5,400	21,800	1,336,900	3,400	1,509,900
B. Estimate FY 1970						
Begin	143,300	5,400	23,700	1,337,000	2,500	1,511,900
Gains	30,800	1,800	5,300	519,100	1,400	558,400
Losses	36,200	1,600	7,300	661,900	100	707,100
End	137,900	5,600	21,700	1,194,200	3,800	1,363,200
Average	138,200	5,400	23,400	1,272,600	3,700	1,443,300
C. Estimate FY 1971						
Begin	137,900	5,600	21,700	1,194,200	3,800	1,363,200
Gains	26,300	1,700	1,900	484,400	1,400	515,700
Losses	39,100	1,900	3,600	593,600	1,100	639,300
End	125,100	5,400	20,000	1,085,000	4,100	1,239,600
Average	130,700	5,600	20,600	1,115,900	3,900	1,276,700

Grade Structure, Beginning, End and Man-Year Strengths by Identity

	30 June 1969	30 June 1970	30 June 1971	Man-Years FY 1970	Man-Years FY 1971
Commissioned Officers					
General of the Army	1	1	1	1	1
General	18	18	18	17	18
Lt. General	43	44	44	44	44
Major General	196	189	189	191	189
Brig. General	249	250	250	248	250
Colonel	6,482	6,375	6,116	6,328	6,246
Lt. Colonel	16,781	16,674	15,619	16,615	16,147
Major	25,178	24,388	23,022	24,760	23,706
Captain	38,767	39,154	39,104	40,594	39,129
1st Lieutenant	33,222	30,117	21,166	25,488	22,210
2nd Lieutenant	27,677	26,221	24,917	29,273	28,341
Sub-total	148,614	143,431	130,446	143,559	136,281
Warrant Officers					
CWO W-4	1,779	1,760	1,760	1,754	1,760
CWO W-3	3,303	3,254	3,254	3,280	3,254
CWO W-2	11,890	11,314	12,890	11,889	12,034
WO W-1	6,781	5,409	2,110	6,558	3,538
Sub-total	23,753	21,737	20,014	23,481	20,586
Total Officer Personnel	172,367	165,168	150,460	167,040	156,867
Enlisted Personnel					
E-9	5,557	5,245	4,914	5,311	5,336
E-8	18,252	18,251	17,054	17,923	17,899
E-7	59,655	64,728	60,269	60,551	61,401
E-6	108,696	108,747	101,157	107,496	103,692
E-5	214,151	213,661	197,538	207,471	204,612
E-4	365,467	358,657	328,678	354,417	339,465
E-3	198,392	163,784	131,189	191,370	128,341
E-2	123,345	124,200	109,000	148,177	120,950
E-1	243,532	136,904	135,204	179,932	134,241
Total Enlisted Personnel	1,337,047	1,194,177	1,085,003	1,272,648	1,115,937
TOTAL	1,509,414	1,359,345	1,235,463	1,439,688	1,272,804
Cadets, United States Military Academy	2,532	3,865	4,119	3,683	3,883
GRAND TOTAL	1,511,946	1,363,210	1,239,582	1,443,371	1,276,687

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Proceeding now to the business of the day, we usually begin the hearings with the appearance of the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, followed by the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff of the various services. However, this year, due to various scheduling problems, we will begin with the military personnel appropriation for the Army, and then next week commence our regular schedule with the appearance of Secretary Resor and General Westmoreland.

We will now take up military personnel, and begin our hearings with the Department of the Army.

For this appropriation, the Army is requesting $7,923,700,000.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1970 for military personnel, Army, is $8,107,000,000. We note that, in addition, you will be asking for a supplemental appropriation of $563 million to cover Pay Act costs. If the Congress were to approve the full amount of the supplemental, then the total appropriation for 1970 would be $8,670,000,000. Therefore, your request actually reflects a decrease of $746.3 million below the 1970 level.

We are pleased to have with us this afternoon Lieutenant General Kerwin, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, and Brigadier General Neel, the Deputy Surgeon General of the United States Army.

We welcome you, gentlemen, and all of your supporting witnesses.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

General Kerwin, this is your first appearance before the committee in your present position. Therefore, we will at this point in the record insert your biographical sketch.

(The sketch follows:)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF LT. GEN. WALTER T. KERWIN, JR., DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL

Walter T. Kerwin, Jr. was born in West Chester, Pa., June 14, 1917. He graduated from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point with a bachelor of science degree in 1939, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of field artillery. His first assignment was at Fort Lewis, Wash., with the 9th Field Artillery Regiment of the 3d Infantry Division.

General Kerwin served with the 3d Infantry Division from 1939 until 1944 in the capacities of battery executive, battery commander, division naval gunfire support, naval liaison officer and division artillery intelligence and operations officer. Beginning in October 1942 his wartime overseas duty included Africa, Sicily, Italy, and France. Wounded in December 1944 at Mutzig, France, he was evacuated to the United States in March 1945.

In June 1945 he was assigned to the Operations Division of the War Department General staff as a theater operations group staff officer. In August 1947, General Kerwin was selected for attendance at the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, Kans. Upon graduation, he remained as an instructor in the intelligence school and was later assigned as chief of the college instructor training.

In July 1951, General Kerwin departed for Turkey for duty with the Joint United States Military Mission for Aid to Turkey (JUSMMAT). Here he served as Director of Instruction at the Turkish Artillery School at Polotli, Turkey, and as Assistant J–3 of the Joint Staff in Ankara.

In January 1953 he was selected to attend the Joint Operations Course at the Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va. Upon graduation, he was assigned to Joint Task Forces SEVEN (nuclear testing) with station at the Los Alamos

Scientific Laboratory, Los Alamos, N. Mex. Here he served as the plans and operations officer for the scientific task group and participated in weapons development in the laboratory and in operations Redwing and Castle at the Pacific Islands of Eniwetok and Bikini. This assignment also included several nuclear test operations at the Nevada Proving Ground.

In August 1956 he was selected for attendance at the U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa., and graduated in June 1957. Following the war college he assumed command of the 56th Artillery Group, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, N.C., until August 1959, when he departed for the National War College, Washington, D.C.

Following graduation in June 1960 General Kerwin moved to the Army General Staff as Deputy Director, Special Weapons, Office of Chief Research and Development, Department of the Army.

Upon his promotion to brigadier general in July 1961 he was assigned as Artillery Commander, 3d Armored Division in Germany.

In May 1963 he moved to the SHAPE Staff in Paris, France, as Chief, Nuclear Activities Branch, Operations Division. He was promoted to Major General in June 1964. On 18 March 1965 he was assigned as Commanding General of the 3d Armored Division in Germany.

General Kerwin's assignment after returning to the United States in October 1966 was Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations, Department of the Army.

In May 1967 General Kerwin reported to Vietnam and was assigned as Chief of Staff, U.S. Military Assistance Command. He served in this position until August 1968, when he was appointed Commanding General, II Field Force, Vietnam.

General Kerwin arrived in Washington, D.C., to assume duties as Director for Civil Disturbance Planning and Operations in May 1969. On August 1, 1969, he became the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

General Statement

Mr. Whitten. General, I believe you have a prepared statement. You may proceed with that in such manner as you wish, either in full detail or by highlighting your statement.

General Kerwin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to present to you the requirements for the fiscal year 1971 Army, military personnel appropriation and the highlights of our manpower program. Since General Connor's appearance before you last year, our manpower program has undergone substantial revision. I will review some of these changes as well as comment on their impact on the Army's personnel programs.

In today's environment and in view of recent reductions in the size of the Army, my primary concern is that the Army must be composed of men meeting the highest reasonable mental, physical, and moral standards. These men must be led by broadly educated, competent officers of the highest integrity. They must serve in an atmosphere of strong but enlightened discipline.

A quality Army is essential, because our future Army commitments will demand the maximum in technical know-how and in leadership and managerial abilities.

The manpower program for fiscal year 1970 provides for an end strength of 1,363,000. This represents a reduction of 146,000 from the program presented in the fiscal year 1970 President's budget. This reduction is primarily associated with announced strength reductions in Vietnam.

Before presenting our fiscal year 1971 program, I would like to mention that this year, for the first time, we have displayed our manpower

program and budget estimate in terms of the 10 major defense program classifications. The detailed justification of our budget, however, continues to be shown in the same format presented in previous years.

FISCAL YEAR 1971 MANPOWER PROGRAM

The manpower program planned for fiscal year 1971 provides an Army end strength of 1,239,000. This includes 150,000 officers, 1,084,900 enlisted men, and 4,100 cadets. It represents a reduction of 123,600 from the fiscal year 1970 end strength which is the beginning point for the fiscal year 1971 budget. The decrease in end strength during fiscal year 1971 includes a reduction of 14,700 officers and 109,200 enlisted men. The number of U.S. Military Academy cadets, however, will increase from 3,800 in fiscal year 1970 to 4,100 in fiscal year 1971 in accordance with Public Law 88–276.

The planned reduction in enlisted strength during fiscal year 1971 will occur from normal attrition and reduced procurement. Should temporary overstrengths occur during the year, they will be reduced by liberalizing our present early release policies. The reduction in officer strength will result primarily from normal attrition and reduced procurement. In addition, some form of early release of obligated volunteer officers may be necessary to reach planned end strengths.

The officer-to-enlisted ratio is increasing and is projected to continue to increase during the next 3 to 5 years. This increase is the result of the addition of aviation units which have a high officer content, and increased sophistication of equipment. This results in a greater demand for skilled, technically qualified officer personnel. The increased officer-to-enlisted ratio is just now showing up in our projected end strength. Until recently, officer requirements exceeded our procurement capability. Now, however, our capability has improved and officer strength more nearly approaches requirements.

PROCUREMENT

The total number of untrained accessions required to support the planned force is 338,000 compared with 373,600 in fiscal year 1970. Within the total number for fiscal year 1971, 156,000 will be obtained through voluntary enlistments with the remaining 182,000 obtained through the Selective Service System.

With the advent of the draft lottery and the shift to a "youngest first" order of call, we expect a decline in the number of men entering the Army with civilian acquired skills. To offset this decline, we are expanding our enlistment program for accepting personnel with critical skills into the enlisted ranks at a higher entry grade. Currently, men and women qualified in one of 16 medical skills are appointed to grade E4 or E5 upon completion of basic and orientation training. By March, 14 critical construction skills will be added to the program, with others to follow.

We plan to take full advantage of the civilian trend toward post-high school education. Two-year college level vocational schools offer a valuable source of technically trained personnel needed immediately to fill critical requirements. In addition to offering selected graduates of vocational schools an advance grade after completion of basic and orientation training, we are developing a program that will

allow vocational school graduates to enter directly into high skill level training. These individuals include clinical specialists, x-ray and dental assistants, electricians, plumbers, and crane operators. We will continue to offer a choice of apprentice level technical training as an incentive for the unskilled to enlist in the Army.

We are also concentrating on developing our career force into a highly motivated, proficient group of professionals. The role of the careerist is vital to the effectiveness of a first term force composed of younger, less educated men.

To do this, we must give the careerist the incentive to remain in spite of frequent moves and family separations which are part of Army life. We are beginning those actions which can be accomplished immediately for a minimum cost. We are revitalizing our in-service reenlistment program and through a series of management and policy changes are reversing the downward trend in reenlistments. For example, former service members were required to reenlist within 90 days in order to retain the grade they held at the time of separation. This was lengthened to 30 months in the belief that former servicemen needed longer exposure to civilian life before making a reenlistment decision. The success of this action is reflected in the increase in the number of reenlistments from civilian life for the first 5 months of fiscal year 1970 as opposed to fiscal year 1968 and fiscal year 1969. In fiscal year 1968 an average of 312 men reenlisted each month after a break in service of over 90 days. In fiscal year 1969 an average of 366 men per month reentered the Army. For the first 5 months of fiscal year 1970, however, an average of 765 men per month have reentered the Army from civilian life.

Another action which is helping to reverse the downward trend is a numerical reenlistment objective to replace a rather complex system of obtaining a percentage of the number of eligibles. Commanders are sighting on the target of 1 percent of their assigned strength per month with considerable success. An example of the success of the 1 percent numerical objective is the increase in the overall rate within the U.S. Continental Army Command. For the period July through November 1968, the CONARC reenlistment rate was 16.1 percent. In early 1969 they changed to the 1 percent objective system. For the period July through November 1969, the rate increased to 27.8 percent. This meant 3,485 more reenlistments with 17,000 fewer people authorized. U.S. Army, Europe, and the U.S. Army Air Defense Command have experienced similar success since converting to the 1 percent objective.

SUSTAINMENT

Sustainment of forces in short-tour areas continues to be one of our most challenging problems. By sustainment I mean meeting our short-tour replacement requirements with individuals in the proper grade and skill while maintaining a 1-year policy for short-tour areas.

Our goal is to keep an individual 25 months in the sustaining base prior to returning him to a short-tour area. This goal has not been achieved in all cases. During fiscal year 1969 approximately 16,000 individuals were involuntarily returned to Vietnam. Of these, some 9,000 had less than 25 months in the sustaining base.

During the first half of fiscal year 1970 over 8,000 individuals were involuntarily returned to Vietnam. Fiscal year 1969 also saw the re-

turn of certain individuals for a third involuntary tour. In spite of troop reductions in Vietnam, additional personnel will be required to serve a third involuntary tour in that area during fiscal year 1970.

With each reduction in the total force in Vietnam, the number of replacements required is reduced proportionally; however, as units are deleted from force structure our assets are likewise proportionally reduced. Until the ratio of assets to short tour requirements improves significantly, the problem of sustainment will remain with us.

OFFICER PROMOTION AND RETENTION

Temporary promotion of officers to major and lieutenant colonel will be substantially reduced in fiscal year 1971 from the fiscal year 1969–70 experience figures. Promotions to colonel will remain near previous levels. The promotion point to captain will be gradually extended from the current time in grade requirement of 1 year which will result in a corresponding slowdown in promotions to that grade.

This reduction in promotions is necessitated by the current requirement to maintain the Officer Grade Limitation Act (OGLA) field grade limitations as the authorized strength of the Army is decreased. Medical doctor strengths are excluded from OGLA; however, the number of Medical Corps promotions will decrease as the strength of the Medical Corps is reduced.

Promotion to major and lieutenant colonel in terms of time in grade and time in service, however, will compare favorably with promotion to these grades prior to the Vietnam buildup. Every effort will be made to maintain meaningful promotion flow, consistent with strength authorizations.

The Army is endeavoring to retain those junior officers who have displayed a high potential for military service. In order to meet this objective, the following actions are being taken:

First, a program for enlisting the support and assistance of senior commanders is being emphasized. Information concerning the retention problem and to assist in implementing local command retention programs has been provided to all senior Army commanders.

Second, a personalized program of correspondence with individuals and visits by career management personnel to schools has been effective in obtaining extended service commitments from many officers who were undecided on a military career. In 1969, these visits resulted in over 30 percent of officer basic course graduates converting their category to a longer service agreement.

Third, educational opportunities for junior officers—to include graduate and undergraduate programs—have been increased. The officer undergraduate degree program which began in February 1969, is designed to provide the junior officer with up to 2 full years of civil schooling for the completion of baccalaureate degree requirements.

The frequent movement of personnel required to meet Vietnam and other worldwide commitments, has a continuing impact on retention rates. In human terms, as well as budgetary considerations, frequent moves and family separations are of vital consideration. Paramount within our operational areas of emphasis, is a continuing effort to reduce personnel turbulence while achieving equity in hardship area assignments.

The shortage of professional nurses which the United States has experienced over the past several years gives little indication of being alleviated. U.S. Army Recruiting Command is having difficulty in meeting its objectives of obtaining a sufficient number of professional nurses for the Army Nurse Corps. The Department of the Army subsidy programs for nursing students now account for over 78 percent of the total yearly accessions to the Army Nurse Corps.

The retention of physicians continues to be a critical problem and is a matter of prime concern to the Army. The basic problem is that current and foreseeable opportunities in civilian medical practice places the Army in a noncompetitive situation. The continuation pay program has helped by narrowing the gap but as long as a competitive imbalance exists, it will not be possible to attribute specific results to this program. Of continuing concern to our medical personnel are housing, stability of tours, and professional career development.

A Special Assistant to the Surgeon General for Medical Corps Affairs has been appointed to assure that all actions to improve retention within our capabilities are accomplished and to identify potential areas where new legislation may be warranted.

ENLISTED PROMOTION AND RETENTION

The promotion system for enlisted personnel is receiving an ever-increasing amount of attention at Department of the Army. The program of centralized promotions at Department of the Army to the grades of E–8 and E–9 which were begun in early 1969 continues in effect and has been well-received in the field. We are currently studying the extension of this system to grade E–7. Significant improvements in the decentralized system for promotion to E–4 through E–7 have also been made. The advent of the standardized promotion scoring forms on an Armywide basis increased the visibility of the system for the individual soldier. These forms have very recently undergone their first major revision and now provide the system with an even greater degree of selectivity and equity.

A more liberal policy for the promotion of hospitalized, missing, and captured personnel has recently been instituted. Accelerated promotion opportunity for soldiers in Vietnam, the skill development base, and in other highly competitive areas such as the drill sergeant program has been provided. As I previously mentioned, higher entry grades upon enlistment have also been authorized for individuals possessing certain critically needed skills.

The most recent innovation in enlisted career planning is the establishment of career management fields. Enlisted military occupational specialties have been organized into 39 such fields. This enables the enlisted man to obtain an early idea of his long range opportunities. Furthermore, it provides both the soldier and the personnel manager an opportunity to plan the enlisted man's career.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the budget request to support our manpower program is $7 billion, 923.7 million, a decrease of $746.3 million from our fiscal year 1970 estimate. These funds will support an average military personnel strength of 1,276,700.

Sir, this concludes my statement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General, for your statement.

EARLY RELEASE PROGRAM

I note several things of interest to the committee.

First, you mention "some form of early release of obligated volunteer officers may be necessary to reach planned end strengths."

Early release of officers would seem to compound your retention problems, would it not?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir; it could compound the retention problem. On the other hand, in order to meet the end strengths, we have to take a look not only at total officer strengths but also at field grade strengths because these are limited by the Officer Grade Limitation Act.

DIRECT PROCUREMENT PROGRAM

Mr. WHITTEN. It is one of the necessary evils.

You also state that you are expanding the enlistment program for accepting personnel with critical skills into the enlisted ranks at a higher entry grade.

Would you please provide a statement for the record explaining what skills are involved, what type of preservice training is required, and how an individual would apply for the program?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir; I can address it briefly.

We have certain medical skills in which we are accepting personnel who will be promoted to either E–4 or E–5 upon completion of training. We are extending this program at the present time to certain construction skills. I will provide details for the record, Mr. Chairman.

(The information follows:)

The objective of the direct procurement program for civilian acquired skills is to allow men and women, qualified in all respects, to step from civilian life into a job for which the Army has a critical requirement. For example, the medical skills enlistment option, established in September 1969, offers direct award of one of 16 medical specialties such as X-ray technician, dental assistant, and medical laboratory assistant. Special criteria have been developed for each of these specialties based on education and experience required to determine eligibility for enlistment. Eligible applicants are enlisted in grade E–1 and attend basic combat training. Appointment to grade E–4 or E–5 is made upon completion of at least 4 weeks of medical corpsman training. The particular grade to which appointed is dependent upon the complexity of the specialty. Fourteen critical construction skills such as construction surveyor, construction draftsman, and plumber are being added to this program in March 1970. All Army recruiters are available to advise prospective applicants concerning this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Has any consideration been given to a similar type program for officers?

General KERWIN. Sir, I would like to ask General Boye to tell you what we are doing.

General BOYE. I am General Boye, Chief of Personnel Operations.

The medical and technical fields, of course, you are familiar with. I do not know of any program for other broad skills where we are considering bringing people in at a higher grade than normal.

Mr. WHITTEN. General Kerwin's statement mentioned other areas of training programs and vocational 2-year college courses. At this

stage you feel your own training will probably pay better dividends than to have a mixed program and try to start off with someone from civilian life in the higher grade. Is that approximately the way you look at it?

General BOYE. Mr. Chairman, I agree.

I would make one additional statement. We do receive a considerable number of officers with civilian-acquired skills that come in through ROTC and in some cases through OCS. When young men have achieved education and experience before they come in, obviously we make every effort to utilize the skills that they bring with them.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mr. WHITTEN. Following that up, you mentioned the graduate schooling input for fiscal year 1970 is programed at approximately 1,096 officers. How does the Army determine which officers require a graduate degree?

General DAVIS. The basic system for determining that requirement lies in our Army Educational Requirements Board which reviews each year the previous validated requirements, acts on any identified requirements for new validations, and then formulates recommendations to strengthen and improve our overall management of the Army Civil School program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you.

There are various service schools that require approximately 1 year to complete, such as the Army War College and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Is a graduate degree awarded as a result of completing these courses?

General KERWIN. No, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is there any other notice taken other than that?

General KERWIN. No, sir; no notice is taken.

Mr. RHODES. It was my understanding that the Command and General Staff School does award a degree.

General KERWIN. No, sir.

Mr. RHODES. Maybe I am confused. There was an accreditation program.

General KERWIN. It is a proposal at the present time, but it has not yet been approved.

Mr. RHODES. It has been proposed for a long time?

General KERWIN. Yes. It has been under consideration for quite some time, but as yet it is not in effect.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you.

Mr. WHITTEN. The present status is that it is under consideration?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Since there is apparently some misunderstanding as to the present status, I would like for you to give us the pros and cons and the possibility of getting this action, for the record.

(The information follows:)

The U.S. Army Command and General Staff College has conducted a graduate program in military arts and science since 1963. The program was accredited by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools at the outset but this accreditation was subsequently withdrawn. The renewal of accreditation is contingent upon specific congressional approval of degree-granting au-

thority at the Command and General Staff College. This legislative proposal was submitted to the 90th Congress and passed the House (H.R. 15231) on May 6, 1968. The bill was not reported out of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the 90th Congress. It was resubmitted to the 91st Congress on January 3, 1969. Senator Dole, for himself and Senator Goldwater, introduced a bill (S. 3148) on November 18, 1969, to authorize the Commandant of the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College to award the degree of master of military art and science. This proposal was referred to the Committee on Armed Services where hearings are presently under consideration. The future of this program depends entirely on the passage of enabling legislation.

Mr. RHODES. With further regard to graduate schools, if an officer completes a graduate course and obtains a graduate degree is his service requirement extended?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. His service requirement is extended usually a 2-year extension for each year that is given to him or allowed to him.

Mr. WHITTEN. In connection with the information I requested earlier, you might spell out for the record the different schools and also wherein these schools differ from each other with respect to courses, time spent, and so forth.

(The information follows:)

Army officers generally attend four levels of professional military schooling. All officers, except OCS graduates, attend a basic course immediately after commissioning. Basic courses are of short duration, usually 9 weeks, and they prepare the new officer for company-grade duties in his branch. Between the third and eighth year of service, all career officers are programed to attend advanced course, 6 to 9 months in length. These advanced courses prepare the junior officer for subsequent assignments, primarily at battalion and brigade level. The next period of service—from 8 to 16 years—is categorized as the intermediate professional development phase. During this period, approximately 50 percent of our career officers attend a command and staff college course. Included are the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College (USACGSC), the Armed Forces Staff College (AFSC), the command and staff colleges of the Navy and Air Force, as well as several foreign schools. All of these colleges have courses approximately 10 months in length except the Armed Forces Staff College which is 5½ months in duration. The curriculum at USACGSC is designed to prepare graduates for duty as commanders and principal staff officers at division through Army group level, including the supporting logistical elements. Other service staff colleges emphasize command and staff procedures at equivalent levels in their parent service. AFSC is oriented primarily on command and staff duties in joint and combined commands. Completion of these courses does not result in award of a graduate degree, but the Naval and Air Command and Staff Colleges have graduate degree programs in cooperation with civilian universities. George Washington University has cooperative degree programs at the Naval War College, the National War College, and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces. Auburn University offers a graduate degree in business administration concurrent with attendance at the Air University. Army students at these colleges are participating in these degree programs. The highest level of military schooling is provided for a very small group (300 per year) of officers selected to attend a senior service college (SSC). Selection for SSC takes place between the 15th and 23d year of service. In the category of SSC are the Army War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), the National War College, the Naval Warfare Course, the Air War College, the Inter-American Defense College, and three foreign schools. Each of these SSC prepares graduates for the highest levels of command, staff, and management positions. The curricula are oriented towards national power, international relations, and national strategy. However, each SSC has a different emphasis generally related to the name of the particular school. All the courses are approximately 10 months in duration. None of the SSC awards a degree upon completion of the course, but several offer graduate degree programs in cooperation with civilian universities as out-

lined above. The Army War College is in the process of coordinating with civilian universities for the establishment of a cooperative degree program to commence school year 1970.

RECRUITMENT OF ARMY NURSES

Mr. WHITTEN. Reference is made to the fact that the "Army Recruiting Command is having difficulty in meeting its objectives of obtaining a sufficient number of professional nurses for the Army Nurse Corps." Do you have any plans underway to attempt to improve this situation?

General NEEL. Mr. Chairman, we have several plans afoot. We are running into competition with the civilian side of the house, as usual. The salaries are a little better on the civilian side. We used to have an advantage but no longer. We have certain military requirements that our nurses meet; for instance, they must come on for 2 years, whereas a civilian hospital can hire a nurse for a shorter period of time. Further, we do not take women in with children under 18. When we hire a civilian nurse we don't ask how many children they have, we are so glad to hire one.

We are looking into these areas to decide how far we can go to be competitive. We are looking at the types of nurses, we are trying to raise the standards, the qualifications of the military nurses just as the rest of our Officer Corps. Now, I am speaking of the baccalaureate nurses rather than diploma. We want to make sure that we are not purifying ourselves into a problem, that maybe we could take some of these lesser academically trained in order to meet our requirement. We are exploring all areas but this is our greatest problem at the present time.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can fully appreciate that. I think just about anybody who lives today realizes we are having trouble in civilian as well as military areas trying to find trained nurses. In addition, there are prob'ems finding people who are willing to work when the hours are not always regular. It is good to know that you are exploring all these various means. Having been to a number of military hospitals, I know you have to turn to your hospital corpsmen—I don't mean to do the nurse's work—but you have to lean on other sources of manpower to do many of the essential tasks in and around your hospitals.

General NEEL. That is true. We utilize the enlisted people to the maximum.

PAY OF ARMY NURSES

Mr. SLACK. What is the difference in salary between civilian and military nurses?

General NEEL. I don't know that gap. I will have to provide that. I know it is not as big as the doctor gap. It is with these other nonpecuniary things which I just cited that we are concerned. We used to have enough of a salary advantage so that we could be strict on the military requirements. Now we are losing our salary advantage because of the civilian improvement. So we are having to look at all of these other aspects.

(The information follows:)

Based on available information, the starting pay of civilian and military registered nurses for fairly comparable positions are as follows:

Position	Civilian [1]	Military [2]	Difference
Staff nurse	$6,900	$6,108	$792

[1] The American Nurses' Association has made several limited studies, most recently in January 1969. At that time it was estimated that the average starting salary for a registered nurse in a staff position in hospitals within the scope of the study (at least 200 beds) was $6,900, or about $133 a week. (1969 Facts About Nursing, ANA, New York, N.Y., p. 124.)
[2] The military salary is the average of 1st and 2d lieutenant with under 2 years' service for base pay, subsistence, and quarters allowance, adjusted back to the pay rate effective in January 1969.

Civilian salaries vary according to the shift worked, clinical specialty in which trained, and other special qualifications. Thus, although an Army lieutenant receives the same salary whether working nights on a pediatric ward or days on a surgical ward, extra pay for work on late shifts and premium pay for overtime, weekends, and special assignments are a significant factor in the compensation of the civilian nurse.

Civilian salaries are computed on a 40-hour week. Military personnel are not limited to a set number of hours per week. The workload is met without additional staff augmentation, or overtime pay.

Mr. SLACK. Thank you.

RECRUITING AND RETAINING PHYSICIANS

Mr. WHITTEN. You mentioned earlier the number of physicians. What is being done with regard to, first, obtaining physicians and, then, what steps are you taking where it may be necessary to try to retain them? What is the picture as far as retention of physicians or obtaining physicians?

General NEEL. The continuation pay program which has been in effect for 2 years now, 2 program years, has helped narrow the gap between the civilian and military salaries to some extent. The accelerated promotion program, when they removed us from the Officers Grade Limitation Act, has helped quite a bit, because they can obtain the higher grades. We are continuing to examine these programs because of the rules that we have now within the Department for implementation. For instance, on continuation pay you have to have 8 years in the Army before it applies. Sixty-five percent of our doctors on duty are 2-year-obligated volunteers. So the continuation pay program means little to them. They are going to get out, so except for the long-range-thinking individual the accelerated promotion does not apply.

Many of our problems are the same as General Kerwin alluded to for the Army in general, the turbulence, the frequent moves, housing problems, the fringe benefits, all that. Our problem is that the opportunities available on the outside are so great that these factors which apply to all of our military personnel seem to have a greater impact on the medical officers than on some of the others because of this attraction for the civilian side.

As to what we are doing about it, General Heaton shortly before his retirement appointed a special assistant for Medical Corps affairs. This assistant now monitors all of the interests of the physicians, these interests are centrally considered by one general officer instead of being spread pretty well all through the system. We have gone to a

personal relationship with the doctors we are trying to retain. They now feel like they have someone in Washington who is looking after them exclusively, and as individuals. We are trying to improve our training programs. We are trying within our budgetary constraints to authorize travel to meetings so that they can keep up their professional status. You get behind in a hurry these days.

They like to go to these meetings.

RECRUITING AND RETAINING DENTISTS

Mr. WHITTEN. How does this apply to a dentist? Does it apply to any degree in the same way?

General NEEL. The difference is in degree. Dentists are not getting out to the same extent as the Medical Corps officers. I am talking now about the O–5's and O–6's, the lieutenant colonels and colonels; those dentists are staying with us. That is why we have not implemented the continuation pay for them.

SALARY OF SURGEONS

Mr. RHODES. General, I have heard that certain types of surgeons can get salaries of up to $70,000 per year just about as soon as they pass the Board in their specialty. Is that about right?

General NEEL. That could be, but that would be the exception. We think it is more like $37,000, $40,000 right after training.

Mr. RHODES. That is still pretty tough competition.

General NEEL. And that is right after training.

Mr. RHODES. Have you ever considered, as an incentive to doctors and other professional people, asking the Congress to approve some special treatment with respect to income tax? For instance, the doctors in civilian life are very tax-conscious. This we all know. Special tax advantages might be very worthwhile as an incentive. I am not sure that my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee would go for it, but if they would it might be helpful.

General KERWIN. We have not considered such a program, but we will look into its feasibility.

Mr. WHITTEN. I think all these points are appreciated by Members of the committee. Several times in connection with these hearings we may ask questions where we either—from talking or listening to you—have a pretty good idea about a particular problem, but we think it well for the record to show these problems. Many folks look to the hearings, in order to see what the military is saying.

GI DEAFNESS

The staff and members of the committee from time to time read articles in magazines which have a bearing on the military. Now, I have personally learned through the years that many writers like to make what they write sensational. You never know how much weight to give a particular article or a particular writer. To some you ought not give any weight, and to some, you take those to heart, depending on the individual. Now, there have been one or two articles that I think should be discussed here. One article states "More than half the 500,000 GI's who undergo combat training each year suffer enough

hearing loss so that they could be barred from combat." The article goes on to state that the Veterans' Administration is paying 60,000 veterans about $3.3 million per month in pensions for hearing impairments. What efforts are the Army making to, (1) determine in the first place what the facts are? I am sure you have some problem in this area, some degree of problem. Now, what efforts are being made to protect hearing impairment not only for the value of the serviceman himself while he is in service but to alleviate future problems in connection with disabilities?

General KERWIN. I am not familiar with the specific details of the article to which you refer, but I am well aware of the problem.

Mr. WHITTEN. The staff will be glad to give you the article itself. I personally feel it is just as well not to have the name of the particular magazine on the record and get into a controversy on the record. However, the name of the magazine and the article itself will be made available to you by the staff.

General KERWIN. We do have a very definite program. As you know, I just came back from Vietnam. Every man who requires one is issued a set of earplugs. When you get in a helicopter you sit near the door with turbines grinding, or if you are in a fire support base, you are constantly confronted with the noise of the artillery firing. We do recognize that we have a problem. However, not being familiar with the details of the article, I would like to look into it and furnish it for the record.

(The information follows:)

ARMY HEARING CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The Army has an extensive hearing conservation program which includes not only military but civilian personnel. The fundamentals of this program are described in AR 40–5, "Preventive Medicine" and TB Med 251, "Noise and Conservation of Hearing." The Army conducts hearing protection surveys and determines the areas where hazardous noise levels occur. Weapons firing ranges are examples of such an area. Where hazardous noise levels are known to occur attempts are made to reduce or muffle the noise. If the noise levels cannot be reduced to safe levels personnel are required to wear hearing protection devices. These hearing protective devices include earplugs, ear muffs, and certain helmets such as the aircraft crewman's helmet. These hearing protective devices were all designed specifically to provide hearing protection. The earplugs and muffs currently furnished to military personnel are among the best available from American industry. Trainees are issued earplugs and the plugs are retained as personal equipment. They are convenient because of their size and their weight and they are relatively comfortable. Ear muffs are issued when they offer advantages over the earplugs or the use of earplugs is not desirable.

Army regulations require that hearing protection devices be worn in noise-hazardous areas. Army commanders are interested in preserving the hearing of the troops and whenever it is brought to their attention that the wearing of hearing protective devices is not being enforced they take immediate action to see that it is enforced. New helmets are being developed for combat vehicle crewmen which will provide protection comparable to that provided by ear muffs or earplugs. Personnel who are exposed to known hazardous noise levels receive periodic hearing evaluations to determine if there are any changes in their hearing acuity.

Army personnel are receiving audiograms upon induction and separation from this military service. Commanders may refer personnel to medical facilities for evaluation of the individual's hearing capacities any time they desire. The estimate that more than half of the 500,000 GI's who undergo combat training each year suffer enough hearing loss so that they could be barred from combat contains basic factual discrepancies, to note: The study of 281 weapons instructors at Fort Jackson, S.C., in 1962, indicated that 52 percent of the cadremen

had a hearing loss of 30 decibels or more. It is incorrect to extrapolate these data from cadremen at Fort Jackson to the young trainees with a short service period. There is no other evidence to substantiate such a large estimate.

In 1963 the otolaryngology consultant, on the basis of the Fort Jackson study, made a number of recommendation to the Surgeon General with reference to the hearing conservation program. Appropriate guidance and directives were published to implement the existing program.

With reference to the Veterans' Administration paying 60,000 veterans about $3.3 million per month in pensions for hearing impairment, it must be recognized that numerous losses to hearing are attributable to causes other than noise, that is, infection, direct trauma to the head or ear sustained in combat, and other injuries.

It is pertinent to note that these veterans cover a long timespan, several wars, and millions of people who served in the Armed Forces. One could reasonably assume that much of this hearing loss can be attributed to combat injuries in the Armed Forces dating back to pre-World War I.

Mr. WHITTEN. This same article states that you do provide these earplugs but that no effort is made at enforcement. In the stress of combat and other situations of the moment, other things seem to be more important and the individual himself seems to be a little lenient in looking after himself. Therefore, it kind of goes by the board.

General KERWIN. I can speak from personal experience, I did not wear mine most of the time even though I spent up to 6 hours a day in a helicopter. I know it does damage the hearing. This is mainly because I wanted to put on my headphones and talk to the people in the chopper. Also, when I was in fire support bases, even though I was in vicinity of the artillery, I didn't wear them because I wanted to be able to talk to the people. I am sure that many people don't wear them to the extent that they probably should. Further, in a combat situation, the young soldiers' life may well depend upon his ability to hear all that goes on around him.

Mr. WHITTEN. This is where your immediate assignment requires it, requires a keenness of hearing and that is cut down by the earplugs?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

ABUSE OF INCOME TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. WHITTEN. There have been other reports recently stating that some servicemen, mostly officers according to these charges, have been taking advantage of the law which exempts most Vietnam military pay from Federal income taxes. In other words, those engaged in actual combat, actually assigned to Vietnam, are exempted from most Federal income taxes. But the charges are made that some individuals intentionally fly over Vietnam and then sign up for the tax exemption. I have been on this committee a long time. I remember when one of the top people in the military had his boat tied up here in Washington and got sea duty pay. Now, this has been a matter that has been batted back and forth through the years.

I ask you to state for the record what is the law? Do you have any complaints along this line? What are the requirements necessary to bring yourself within the tax law? We understand that these provisions in the law were adopted or made possible by the Government with the approval of the Congress. The point I raise here is, what does the law call for and what is the experience insofar as sticking to the requirements of the law and its application?

General KERWIN. I will provide that for the record.

(The information follows:)

Title 26, United States Code, section 112 is the basis for the tax exclusion earned by military personnel while in a combat zone. Effective January 1, 1964, Executive Order 11216 designated Vietnam and its surrounding waters as a "combat zone." The tax exclusion applies to the entire pay for enlisted members or warrant officers and up to $500 per month of such pay for commissioned officers for any month combat zone exclusion applies.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have any knowledge at the moment, or is that something that will have to go into the record?

General KERWIN. I can address the problem now. As you know, an officer gets $500 per month income tax exemption for each month or part of a month that he has been in Vietnam. I don't recall anyone who has gone to Vietnam specifically to get the tax income exemption. I know at one time, about a year ago, when I was Chief of Staff of the Military Assistance Command there were people who would come out in the last few days of one month and go back home in the first few days of the next month, thereby getting a $1,000 income tax exemption. I can assure you that this is not done now. The Chief of Staff requires him to take the trip in the month unless he is required to be there more than 30 days.

Mr. WHITTEN. These questions, as I say, are so that the record may show the true facts. I have been very careful or I have tried to be careful in saying that these charges are made from time to time and those of us in our line of activity are aware that the charges are made frequently without foundation. The Army says that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are going to investigate this type of situation and see what the story is. So I presume that is correct.

Mr. RHODES. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish you would put the true facts into the record, General.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

TAX EXCLUSION BENEFIT

The Department of Defense has been aware of and alert to the possibility of abuse of this tax exclusion benefit. Standing instructions issued by the Secretary of Defense as early as September 20, 1967, severely restrict and control official visits to Southeast Asia. The Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, has issued similar instructions to all Department of Defense agencies and various commands. The following extract from a report by General Wheeler to the Secretary of Defense is pertinent:

"Analysis of the actual number of visits to the Republic of Vietnam between July 1, 1968, and May 31, 1969, including identification of those visits which overlap from one month to another, discloses no apparent abuse of the income tax exclusion privilege."

Additionally, another part of General Wheeler's report advised that an examination of current procedures and criteria for travel to Southeast Asia disclosed no requirement for additional restrictions or limitations for such travel and that the current procedures established for approving visits to the Republic of Vietnam (and Thailand) are considered adequate, and strict enforcement of these provisions will continue at all levels. Travel to Southeast Asia is limited to those visits which will make a positive contribution to the mission of the area. Each proposed visit is evaluated against the following criteria:

1. Will the visit aid the field commanders concerned or their staffs in acquiring needed resources?
2. Will the visit aid future operations?
3. Will the visit provide field commanders or higher echelons with significant information not otherwise available?

4. Can it be certified that information to be obtained from the trip cannot be obtained from the staff elements in OSD, OJCS, and the headquarters of the military departments, the defense agencies, and the unified and specified commands?

5. Can it be certified that the specific trip request cannot be combined with other proposed visits?

It is the view of the Department of Defense that the existing regulations and controls are adequate to insure that the combat zone income tax benefit accrues only to those who legitimately qualify within the letter and the intent of the law. The Department of Defense will continue to maintain a close surveillance over the operation of these controls to insure that the law is administered properly and in accordance with the intent of the Congress. To this end, the Department of Defense is willing and prepared to fully investigate any reported abuses being furnished sufficient facts to warrant a meaningful investigation.

HOSTILE FIRE PAY

Mr. WHITTEN. You might also give the full story with respect to drawing combat pay.

General KERWIN. Very well, sir.

(The information follows:)

HOSTILE FIRE PAY

Hostile fire pay is authorized under section 310, title 37, United State Code. Except in time of war declared by Congress, a member may be paid a special pay at a rate of $65 per month for any month in which he (1) was subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; (2) was on duty in an area in which he was in imminent danger of being exposed to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines and in which, during the period he was on duty in that area, other members of the uniformed services were subject to hostile fire or explosion of hostile mines; or (3) was killed, injured, or wounded by hostile fire, explosion of a hostile mine, or any other hostile action.

Under implementing DOD instructions the entitlement to hostile fire pay ($65 a month) accrues upon date of entry to all members permanently assigned duty in a designated hostile fire area. Additionally, personnel who are not permanently assigned in a designated hostile fire area but who may perform assigned duties in such areas for a minimum of 6 days within 1 calendar month or 6 consecutive days beginning in one month within 1 calendar month or 6 consecutive days beginning in one month and ending in the following month are also entitled to hostile fire pay.

The following have been designated hostile fire areas:

Vietnam.—The total land area of North and South Vietnam, including inland waters, and the adjacent sea area west of a line from a point on the east coast of Vietnam at the juncture of North Vietnam and China, southeastward to 21°00′ N., 108°15′ E., then south to a point where it intersects a line 12 miles seaward from the base line from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured as shown on large scale charts of the coast of South Vietnam; then continuing on that line to 10°16′ N., 103°44′ E., thence on straight lines to 10°23′ N., 103°49′ E.; 10°26′ N., 103°54′ E.; 10°30′ N., 103°55′ E.; 10°30′ N., 104° 01′ E.; 10°28′ N., 104°06′ E.; 10°16′ N., 104°14′ E., thence northeast to that juncture of the Cambodia and Vietnam border; and the airspace thereover.

Korea.—Effective April 1, 1968, that portion of the Republic of Korea north of the Imjin River and south of the DMZ extending from the intersection of the river and the DMZ on the west (coordinates 969903), along the DMZ to a point in the vicinity of Pinil (coordinates 097095), then southeast to the north bank of the Imjin River in the vicinity of Chajip'O (coordinates 119060).

CERTIFICATION OF TAX EXCLUSION

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the Army itself give any type of certification that may be used by the individual in connection with filing for an income tax exemption or is the individual's statement all that is necessary? Is this a matter with which you are familiar, or would you prefer to put it in the record?

General KERWIN. I would prefer to put that in the record.
(The information follows:)

Upon arrival in "combat zone" area the finance and accounting officer enters on the military pay voucher for enlisted personnel and warrant officers that "no income tax will be withheld and no taxable wages will be reported for any month in which the member is assigned to a combat zone exclusion area." Officers military pay vouchers are annotated to reflect "combat zone exemption ($500)." For those personnel who penetrate the zone (by land, sea, or air) while in a duty, leave, or rest and recuperation status a copy of the temporary duty orders or a statement of the member's commanding officer and a statement by the individual furnishing inclusive dates are required prior to entry on the military pay voucher.

REDUCTION IN PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Mr. WHITTEN. General Kerwin, in your statement you mention that your budget for 1971 plans for year-end strength of 1,239,000. This is a decrease of 123,600 below your planned year-end strength for fiscal 1970 of 1,363,000. How did you determine your requirements for 1971 as opposed to 1970 and where will the reductions be applied?

In other words, is this a money limitation on you and then you, in turn, within the limits of your funding, attempt to allocate the manpower? Or is it a case of working from the other end and determining what your place in the sun requires in the way of manpower and let the totals come out where they will?

General KERWIN. Sir, this is actually the plan for the worldwide distribution of our force structure and also our strengths. The actual number to which we will reduce will depend on the enemy activity in Vietnam and also the improvement of our Vietnam forces, that is, the Vietnamese forces within Vietnam. So for budgetary purposes only, we have projected a downward movement toward the strength which is cited here.

VIETNAM TROOP WITHDRAWALS

Mr. WHITTEN. The President's budget states that very probably future reductions can be made in Vietnam. However, because of the obvious need to maintain the security of any plans of this nature, this type of information is not included in the budget. Would you please tell the committee what troop reductions are now under consideration for fiscal year 1971 in Vietnam?

Reserving the right, of course, to take out of the record such parts of that as might not be appropriate to publicize at this time.

General KERWIN. Sir, the reductions in Vietnam are going to depend upon the Presidential decisions.

PLANS FOR FUTURE WITHDRAWALS

Mr. WHITTEN. This is a question which varies a little bit from the approach that I have been following here. It was mentioned earlier that one of the problems as I see it and as many other folks see it, is that it is easy to decide to get out. However, it is difficult when the Vietnamese, both South and North, should decide that you are on your way out, it is hard to know what they might do in the way of getting together. In other words, the getting out might not be so easy under some circumstances. It may be that you yourself, being in the actual handling of personnel, that I might be asking this at the wrong

level. All of us know something about it. I presume it comes to you, to some degree. We have had war games throughout the years. In the years I have been on this committee a great deal of money has been spent each year preparing plans based on any number of contingencies. Now, while I realize it must be a Presidential decision, he can't suddenly decide, and after he so decides, then you get ready to start on Monday morning doing the job. I am asking if you have any information as to various levels for which you have been asked "What would you do if we had to bring out so many?" "How would you do this or do that?" I come back to the fact that I realize that those who are in a different type of military activity might be more appropriately included but the job of actually moving people would probably come back to you. Now, could you give us any information along that line?

General KERWIN. In this particular area we have been given the end strength as has been indicated in the budget. For budgetary purposes only we have planned a fairly constant reduction down to the end strength indicated for the end of fiscal year 1971. The timing and the specific levels will, of course, be a Presidential decision.

Mr. WHITTEN. It comes back again to this, that if perchance it cannot be decreased, but we will have to expand all of a sudden, then you will be in here with a supplemental trying to get more funds, but if we are lucky and get out at a faster rate than you projected in your budget, you will be in a position to recapture funds. Now, we know you are dealing with budgetary items here.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir; it is a budgetary consideration.

Mr. RHODES. Would it be a fair statement that your proposed reduction in end strength for fiscal 1971 is projected upon probable reductions in Vietnam? You do not expect to reduce in any other parts of the world, do you?

General KERWIN. This again will depend on Presidential decisions as to what we do worldwide. A part of this, of course, the end strength to which we reduce, does take into consideration things that could happen in other parts of the world. We have been given the end strength and we are moving gradually down to it.

TROOP STRENGTH IN VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. Following up the question of my colleague from Arizona, we of course have before us and there have been mentioned here several times the figures as to end strength. We know from other sources that there are plans and there are high hopes that we can cut the strength in Vietnam. Have you included any reductions in money based on hoped for reductions in Vietnam or is that a separate matter which is not included here? In other words, your monetary budget here, is this separate from what is hoped for or planned for in Vietnam?

General BRINKER. This budget is based specifically on a program that is phased to the end of fiscal year 1971. These strengths do require additional reductions. They included phased and assumed dates.

We do not know whether these assumptions will materialize. This is about as specific as we feel we can get because they will depend on decisions at a higher level.

Mr. WHITTEN. My questions are not intended in any way to indicate otherwise, I just want the record to show whether any proposed decrease in manpower and thereby decrease of costs in Vietnam was included or considered in connection with your request here.

General KERWIN. They are.

General BRINKER. This budget does reflect decreases in end strengths. The worldwide disposition of the Army's division forces and the military strengths to be maintained in Vietnam during fiscal year 1971 will depend upon future Presidential decisions.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would you please provide for the record the in-country strength of Army personnel located in Vietnam by month, beginning with January 1969 and projecting it through June 1971?

General BRINKER. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

COMBAT VERSUS NONCOMBAT U.S. ARMY MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH IN REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM JANUARY 1969 THROUGH JUNE 1970.

[In thousands]

Month	Combat[1]	Noncombat	Total
January 1969	———	———	364.3
February 1969	———	———	364.2
March 1969	———	———	362.4
April 1969	———	———	362.1
May 1969	———	———	359.1
June 1969	———	———	360.9
July 1969	———	———	361.7
August 1969	———	———	342.5
September 1969	———	———	343.8
October 1969	———	———	337.9
November 1969	———	———	330.6
December 1969[2]	———	———	330.3
January 1970[2]	———	———	330.9
February 1970[2]	———	———	332.2
March 1970[2]	———	———	313.5
April 1970	———	———	———
May 1970	———	———	———
June 1970	———	———	———

[1] Combat personnel include all those assigned to division, brigade and armored cavalry units as well as those assigned to units which perform direct combat support missions.

[2] Preliminary

Note: Final determinations for fiscal year 1971 will be contingent upon Presidential decisions.

SUPPORT OF GUARD AND RESERVE FORCES

Mr. WHITTEN. For the first time, the programing and financing schedule of the 1971 budget for military personnel reflects budget activity classes which are identical to the 10 major program classifications used for management purposes throughout the Department of Defense. For category No. 5, the Guard and Reserve, you are requesting $43,901,000, an increase of $3,611,000 over your 1970 estimate. Would you please tell the committee what type of effort this category represents?

General KROESEN. Program 5, National Guard and Reserve, includes the active Army manpower contribution as advisers or technicians, who provide active Army supervisory support of the Army Reserve and National Guard. We have an increase in spaces for the period 1969 through 1971 of approximately 792 in this category.

INCREASE IN CENTRAL SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. You are also showing a slight increase in the area of "Central supply and maintenance." Would you please tell the committee what type of effort this category represents?

General KROESEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You might add why the increase is requested for 1970.

General KROESEN. Program 7, "Central supply and maintenance," consists of supply and maintenance personnel not organic to any of the other programs, the general purpose forces or special mission forces. It includes the nondeployable supply depots, maintenance depots of both the industrially and nonindustrially funded agencies. Primarily, sir; this is the Army Materiel Command.

Mr. WHITTEN. In the earlier statement, my attention has been called to the fact that as we understood it, you stated the increase of $3 million was for an increased number of people. Yet your figures show a slight decrease.

General KROESEN. There is a decrease of 88 spaces from 1970 to 1971. These 88 are associated with a civilianization program for our junior ROTC program and we are replacing military officers with civilian teachers in the junior ROTC program. That is the only change from 1970 to 1971. The 800 spaces or the 792 that I spoke of is a change from 1969 through 1971, for the time period since the last hearing.

Mr. WHITTEN. Your best judgment is still that the increase in funds is for personnel, for increased numbers after you just said there was a decrease? Perhaps I am not following you.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. It is really, sir, a function of man-years. The distribution of our dollars is based on man-years. From fiscal 1969 to fiscal 1970 we built up from 5,100 to 5,900. So that gave us approximately 5,500 man-years. In 1971 we are from 5,900 down to 5,800 so that we have about 5,850 man-years in 1971.

Mr. WHITTEN. You say it is the change in man-years?

Mr. HHTCHISON. Yes, sir.

INCREASED ADMINISTRATION COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. The category "Administration and associated activities" also reflect a slight increase over the 1970 estimate. Would you please explain to the committee what are the various administrative type functions or activities included in this budget category?

Colonel ADAMSON. We would like to draw to your attention the fact that there is a reduction in 1971 from 1969. We have taken a reduction in Department of Army Headquarters of about 13 percent since 1969. We have reduced our field headquarters in CONUS approximately 11 percent since 1969. The increase here is devoted to two things: Increase in lawyers, which as you know, by congressional statute, we now provide individual soldiers a lawyer at summary and special courts, which we did not do before. This dramatically increased the number of lawyers that we needed to do this service. The second increase is for centralization in Headquarters, Department of the Army for the Computer Systems Command. Those are the slight increases in 1971 over 1970.

INCREASED LAWYERS

Mr. WHITTEN. How many additional lawyers have you taken on?
Colonel ADAMSON. Approximately 400, sir.
Mr. RHODES. Are these commissioned lawyers or civilians?
Colonel ADAMSON. They are commissioned lawyers.
Mr. WHITTEN. What is their length of service? You don't train lawyers in the service.
Colonel ADAMSON. Sir, I cannot answer that.
General BRINKER. I believe they have a 4-year commitment.
Mr. WHITTEN. I am right about that, am I not? I think I remember back some years ago that lawyers is one of the categories where it was felt that you should not be required to train them.
General BRINKER. They became draft-liable and we recruit them out of law school and they come in for a 4-year commitment as commissioned officers.

INCREASE IN INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL

Mr. WHITTEN. Under section 3 of the budget which shows the number of active duty military personnel by budget activity, you are showing an increase in the number of officers to be assigned to "Intelligence and Communications". However, the same activity reflects a decrease in the number of enlisted personnel. Why are you planning on an increase of 116 officers but a decrease of 1,598 enlisted personnel?
General KROESEN. Sir, I would have to provide that answer for the record. I do not have it.
Mr. WHITTEN. Do you have any information as to what the increased number of officers is, what type of officers they will be?
General KROESEN. No, sir; I do not.
Mr. WHITTEN. Could you supply that to the committee?
General KERWIN. Yes, sir.
(The information follows:)

The type officers are primarily military intelligence officers with special training in cryptologic activities.

The increase of 116 officer spaces between the end year position for fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971 is a restoration of officer spaces that were authorized following the annual review of the consolidated cryptologic program in October 1969. This detailed review established that these officer spaces had to be restored to continue specific missions in South Vietnam. The review also provided for a reduction of total spaces, including 1,598 enlisted men, in the worldwide allocation of manpower for the cryptologic program.

INCREASE IN ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Mr. WHITTEN. For "Administration and associated activities," you are requesting an increase of 146 officers and 344 enlisted personnel. Of the 10 budget activities, this is the only activity which shows an increase in personnel. Why do you require additional administrative personnel when all of your direct activities are showing decreases?
Colonel ADAMSON. Again, this is tied to our lawyer problem, sir. We have technicians also in this field who help our lawyers. That is why we have this increase.
Mr. WHITTEN. Off the record.
(Discussion off the record.)

SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Under "Support of other nations," you are showing a planned end strength of 17,623 officers and enlisted personnel, the same number as you planned for 1970. Why was it not possible to apply some of the reductions to this area?

General KROESEN. Sir, in this program we have no changes being made in our advisers, in the advisory effort worldwide. These are primarily our advisers in the military assistance program and personnel assigned to the international headquarters program and they will remain constant.

ENLISTED LAWYERS

Mr. RHODES. Can you use those enlisted lawyers as defense counsels?

General BRINKER. No, sir; we do not. They have to be commissioned in order to be used in that capacity. Now, if the accused asks for him to be used as his defense counsel then he may be used in that manner.

Mr. RHODES. That is a little curious to me. I recognize the fact that before you get a commission in JAG you ordinarily go to school and learn military law, but I should think that a person who is a member of a bar could receive a comparatively short course in military justice and qualify pretty well as a defense counsel, or assistant counsel.

General BRINKER. He could, but they would rather not. Our JAG would rather not invest the 2- or 3-month training time in this man. First, he has to go through his basic training which takes 16 weeks. Then there would be the additional time which he would have to go to learn the military end of the law. Then you would retain him for perhaps 14 or 15 months. Now, what they would rather do is—first, we have no shortage of volunteers to become commissioned as Army lawyers. We would rather get a man with a 4-year commitment so that you have the additional time in which to amortize his training and schooling.

Mr. RHODES. I won't argue the point right now although I may argue it later. It seems to me you are overlooking a pretty good chance to save a rather considerable amount of money. This is a little bit like training a paramedic; you don't have to make a surgeon out of him, I don't think you have to take a lawyer and make sure he knows all of the nuances of contract termination and everything else that you learn at the JAG school in order to make him a pretty good defense counsel. But we will talk about this when the JAG is up here.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Mr. WHITTEN. At this time I did not want to pass on to other matters without asking for comments from our Women's Army Corps.

We do note that we have with us today Col. E. P. Hoisington who is Director of the Women's Army Corps.

We would like to have you give us a statement and a report as to how you are faring with the Women's Army Corps, how many women you have, and what your situation might be. You might do it in your own words.

Colonel HOISINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you mentioned, I am Director of the Women's Army Corps.

On May 14 this year, the Women's Army Corps will celebrate the 28th anniversary of its founding in 1942. Its mission is to make available to the Army a source of volunteer womanpower, trained in noncombat occupational skills. The Women's Army Corps is composed of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted women in strengths as authorized by the Secretary of the Army. They are serving at all major Army stations throughout the United States and overseas. The Women's Army Corps has consistently gained in strength since 1966, when we had an established base of 8,000 enlisted women and 800 officers. In that year the President's Commission on the Draft recommended that more women volunteers be allowed to serve in the Armed Forces as one means of reducing the size of the draft calls. From a base of 8,000 enlisted and 800 officers, we have expanded the corps to a strength today of approximately 12,000 enlisted and 1,000 officers.

Our programed goal is 13,500 which we expect to attain by the end of fiscal year 1970 and sustain in fiscal year 1971. It is obvious that the decision to increase womanpower in the Armed Forces was sound for we have found that women today do not want to be denied the opportunity to serve their country in the Army, the other women's services, and in other Government agencies.

Our officer program has consistently grown in recent years, largely through the success of a two-part procurement program called the college junior and WAC student officer program. In the summer between their junior and senior year in college, we take 150 young women who have expressed an interest in joining the Army, to our training center at Fort McClellan, Ala. There we give them 30 days of typical Army training and familiarization with life in the Army to help them decide whether they really want to join the Army. Most of them like it and we have had more apply for our follow-on program, the WAC student officer program, than we can take. The Army has authorized us to accept 90 women each year from this college junior class as potential officers. They enlist in the United States Army Reserve (USAR) and during their senior year in college they are on active duty as WAC students receiving the pay and allowances of a corporal (E–4).

Upon graduation from college, they are commissioned in the USAR and come on active duty as officers with a 2-year obligation. We are proud of the success of this program and of all the wonderful young officers who are serving in staff and operational assignments at various levels of command and staff. During fiscal year 1969, our junior officer retention rate was 49 percent, the second highest in the Army.

We also have a direct commission program open to women college graduates and an officer candidate school whereby our enlisted women with at least 2 years of college training, usually acquired in the Army, can advance up the ranks and improve their status.

Enlisted women are utilized in approximately 130 of the Army's military occupational specialties. After 8 weeks of basic training, enlisted women are given specialized training at Army schools in a wide range of jobs in the fields of administration, communications, medical care and treatment, finance, air traffic control, automatic data processing, food service, and others. The enlisted women are assigned to specific commands for duty and are attached to a WAC unit for housing, off-duty supervision, and administration by the WAC officers and cadre of the WAC unit. The reenlistment rate for our enlisted women

compares very favorably with the men of the Army. During fiscal year 1969 our reenlistment rate was 36 percent, which was 6 percent higher than the overall Army rate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you very much, Colonel. We are very proud of the work that your Corps has done and I hope you will take it at the direction of the Chair to feel free to enlarge on your statement in the record so that your Corps will get the full credit they deserve in a little more lengthy way.

WOMEN SERVING IN VIETNAM

How many do you have in Vietnam at the present time?

Colonel HOISINGTON. At the present time, we have approximately 170 women serving in Vietnam at Headquarters, U.S. Military Assistance Command in Saigon and at Headquarters, U.S. Army, Vietnam, in Long Binh. We have had more volunteers for duty in these assignments than we have vacancies. The enlisted women at Long Binh are mainly clerk-typists. They work in administrative offices of the headquarters, and have a full-time WAC detachment commander (captain), first sergeant, and supply sergeant to supervise their activities. They live in an air-conditioned building at Long Binh and they work 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. They are making a contribution that makes them very proud. We also have WAC officers and warrant officers assigned to administrative, personnel, information, and intelligence positions at Headquarters MACV, HQ, USARV, and other Army activities in the country.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you.

May I also congratulate, through you, the women of the country. You know, the Appropriations Committee itself has finally seen the light. We now have women typists working for the Appropriations Committee for the first time in our history I am told. So we are getting modern.

Mr. RHODES. We even have two women members of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. They probably saw to this other item that I mentioned.

RECRUITING OF WOMEN

Mr. RHODES. Might I ask the colonel a question? Are you having any problems with recruiting? Do you keep your personnel strength up without too much trouble?

Colonel HOISINGTON. We are doing very well with recruiting. We are at about 87 percent of our objective right now. In our officer procurement we are doing exceptionally well.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you very much.

Colonel HOISINGTON. Thank you.

INCREASE IN ACADEMY CADETS

Mr. WHITTEN. In the case of Academy cadets, you are requesting an end strength for 1971 of 4,119, an increase of 254 over the planned end strength for 1970. How do you plan on recruiting these additional cadets?

General GETTYS. Our recruitment so far this year has, as an example, been exceptionally good. At this point in time we have about 1,000 more interested people than last year who have expressed a desire to go to West Point. The program last year was exceedingly good. We have an objective of sending from now on about 1,360 young men each year to West Point. We envision that we will have no trouble meeting that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you very much.

Will you have to lower your entrance standards in any way in order to gain this higher cadet input?

General GETTYS. No, sir.

ADEQUACY OF ACADEMY FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. How about your facilities? We continually have Members of Congress visiting the Academy. Without exception I think they have all been supporters of additional facilities throughout the years. I think, as I recall, they were successful in getting authorizations at least. How do your facilities stack up at the present time? Do you have any construction going on or are able to meet your needs as you see them now?

General GETTYS. We have a cadet academic building under construction at the present time. This has fallen a little bit behind. However, we hope to make this up. We also have in the 1971 program, the MCA program, an interchange, the Washington-Ruger Road interchange which is an overpass, a secondary sewage treatment facility, and academic facilities alteration. These are in the construction program which will be addressed later.

RECRUIT INPUT FOR 1971

Mr. WHITTEN. On your average strength table you indicate that your gains for fiscal year 1971 will be 484,000 enlisted personnel. In your statement you only account for 338,000 gains. Will the other 146,400 all be reenlistments?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. About 86,000 of them will be reenlistments. The balance of them will be those that will be returned to duty; that is, those that have been dropped from the rolls and then returned to duty.

MONTHLY DRAFT QUOTAS FOR 1971

Mr. WHITTEN. Please provide for the record the planned draft levels by month for fiscal year 1971.

(The information follows:)

Planned draft levels by month for fiscal year 1971

July	15,000	January	15,000
August	15,000	February	15,000
September	15,000	March	16,000
October	15,000	April	16,000
November	16,000	May	17,000
December	12,000	June	15,000

PLANNED END STRENGTH BY MONTH

Mr. WHITTEN. For the record will you also provide your total end strength by month for fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

(The information follows:)

TOTAL END STRENGTH BY MONTH FOR FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
July	1,509.2	———
August	1,513.9	———
September	1,513.4	———
October	1,488.3	———
November	1,466.8	———
December	1,436.0	———
January	1,413.2	———
February	1,402.0	———
March	1,386.6	———
April	1,377.9	———
May	1,368.1	———
June	1,362.6	1,239.0

GENERALS FLYING HELICOPTERS

Mr. WHITTEN. An article in the February 4, 1970, issue of the Army Times states that the Army plans to start training colonels and generals to fly helicopters. Why is it necessary for colonels and generals to fly helicopters?

What is the basis behind it?

General GETTYS. Sir, the helicopter program has grown to the point where there was a requirement for colonels and some generals to fly. Every one of the positions that we have at the moment—no, not every one, but a lot of the positions are underranked. With the increased air mobile type division which we have, particularly in Vietnam—and we have two of them there now—the requirements in the higher grades have gone up. This is one reason behind the increase in pilots.

REQUIREMENT FOR SENIOR OFFICER PILOTS

Mr. WHITTEN. Is the Army attempting to determine which officers have a specific need for this training or is any colonel or general who applies automatically considered?

In other words, is this a real need that we have and a means of selecting people to carry out a need or is this a program that is being made available generally within the limits of your totals to whoever wants to take it, take on this extra learning?

General GETTYS. Mr. Chairman, it starts out with an expressed requirement. Of course, everybody does not want this training, but some of them do. The basic requirement is initiated at the unit or organizational level.

Mr. WHITTEN. This article states that in order to apply for the program all you have to do is send a signed post card to Executive for Army Aviation in Washington, D.C., stating "I volunteer for rotary wing flight training." I didn't know that anything in government was that simple.

General KERWIN. It is really not that simple. This is for people who evidence an interest among lieutenant colonels, colonels, and general

officers. However, the actual requirements are set down by us. What we want to know is who is interested and who is motivated toward such training.

FLIGHT PAY FOR GENERALS

Mr. RHODES. Does he get flight pay after he gets his training?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir, he does.

Mr. RHODES. How much would this amount to for a colonel or a general?

General KERWIN. Did you say a colonel or a general?

Mr. RHODES. A colonel or a general.

General KERWIN. A brigadier general would get $1,980 and a colonel gets $2,940.

Mr. RHODES. Do you mean that a colonel gets more flight pay than a general does?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. RHODES. That is very interesting.

General KERWIN. It might seem somewhat unbalanced, however, general officers usually fly fewer hours.

Mr. RHODES. How many colonels and general officers do you plan to give this type of training to?

General BRINKER. This is a very tough competition which they get into. We are not looking for just any colonel or lieutenant colonel or general who wants to fly, but one who has real potential after he learns to fly. We selected the top 50 of those who signed that post card which you mentioned, based on their record, and then we had them start taking physical examinations to see whether they could qualify physically. We plan to send 25 in the first year. So in terms of numbers it is not a big program. A lot of people want it. In terms of competition it is pretty hard to be one of those selected.

Mr. RHODES. Do you have space available in your flying schools so that you do not have to increase the facilities in the schools to do this?

General BRINKER. Yes, sir.

General KERWIN. We have no problem there.

COST OF FLIGHT PAY

Mr. WHITTEN. Under "Pay and allowances of officers" the committee notes that in 1971 you plan to have 49 generals and 302 full colonels drawing flight pay at a yearly cost of almost $1 million. In 1970 your current plan calls for having 35 generals and 219 colonels drawing flight pay. Is this increase of 14 generals and 83 full colonels at a yearly cost of over $270,000 a direct result of this new program?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. This is a direct result of the new program, an expansion.

Mr. WHITTEN. I presume that when the colonel and the general is flying the helicopter that other folks are not flying them. Have you had, therefore, any offsetting reductions?

General GETTYS. No, sir. There would not be any offsetting reduction because this general or this colonel does not fly it all the time, of course. You have to have an assigned cockpit pilot for your helicopter.

Mr. WHITTEN. Does he get this extra pay because of his learning or because he is assigned to duty? Up to this point he sends in a post

card. I thought you gave a fair answer to that in that you said you are trying to find out who would be interested. Then you go on from there and do your work. Now, 25 does not sound like a large number. There are various other things that enter into it, I know. But after you have trained him does he get his extra pay because of his training or because of his assignment to put his training to use?

General KERWIN. When he is put in a particular position to put his training to use.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are you able to tell the committee now where those positions would be? Is that in the helicopter training school or in Vietnam or such other places of combat? Where do you plan to use these people?

General KERWIN. It would be throughout the world, sir. All the requirement slots for aviation trained personnel, including Fort Rucker Aviation School.

COST OF HELICOPTER PILOT TRAINING

Mr. WHITTEN. Would you please provide for the record an estimate of how much it will cost to train a senior officer to fly a rotary wing aircraft, including not only the O. & M. costs but also per diem and travel expense.

(The information follows:)

The cost to train a senior officer to fly a rotary wing aircraft follows:

O. & M.A.	$19,264
Per diem[1]	4,838
Travel	108
Total	24,210

[1] Reduced for officers who occupy Government quarters.

INCREASE IN FLIGHT PAY

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1971 you are showing that you will have 17,231 officers drawing flight pay, an increase of 1,595 over the number drawing flight pay in 1970. The committee also notes that in 1971 you will only have 9,826 enlisted personnel drawing flight pay, a decrease of 2,590 over the planned level for fiscal year 1970. Why are you planning a significant increase in the number of officers to draw flight pay but yet an equally significant decrease in the number of enlisted personnel to draw flight pay?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Sir, the increase in the officer area is due to our training output in previous years, for our buildup of aviators. The reason for the decrease in the enlisted area is our decreased warrant officer training program. While these warrant officers are in training they are in grade E–5 and draw flight pay as an enlisted man and our warrant officer training is going down in fiscal 1971.

Mr. WHITTEN. As it goes down it still leaves a question of why you are building the other end of it up.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. They were trained in previous years and they are staying in the Army so that they will continue to draw this pay.

Mr. WHITTEN. Under a prior agreement with them?

Mr. HUTCHISON. Yes.

REDUCTION IN WARRANT OFFICER REQUIREMENTS

Mr. RHODES. If the chairman will yield, I think the answer is that there is apparently an Army policy of putting a commissioned officer in every cockpit in a helicopter. They are apparently phasing out the warrant officer training. Is that correct?

General KERWIN. No, sir; that is not correct.

Mr. RHODES. Tell me why you are doing it in this way.

General KERWIN. General Gettys.

General GETTYS. I would like to have Colonel Bellochi answer that.

Colonel BELLOCHI. I work for General Gettys, sir.

The question of not training warrant officers is very simple: We have too many warrant officers on board. We have too many above authorizations. As you know, when the buildup started in Vietnam we instituted the warrant officer training program to fill the need at that time. We continued to train warrant officers to meet that need. Now due to the phasedown of requirements in Vietnam we have had to reduce the warrant officer training. So we have taken the reduction in aviation training in the warrant officer field. This does not mean that we are substituting commissioned officers for warrant officers. We are trying to get the two programs in balance.

Mr. RHODES. What long-term mix do you expect to have as between warrant officers and commissioned officers? What is your objective?

Colonel BELLOCHI. The structure requirement when it started out was approximately a 50–50 percent mix, that is 50 percent warrant and 50 percent commissioned. It is being changed slightly within the overall constraints of the Army's end strength. I don't have the figures on that.

Mr. RHODES. I hope that can be provided for the record. I think my original statement as to the Army's intent may well be true.

(The information follows:)

ARMY AVIATOR PROGRAM

A complete explanation of changes in Army aviator assets must include an explanation of both aviator requirements and the current and projected aviator assets.

Aviator requirements are computed by adding the total TOE and TD (authorized structure) spaces requiring an aviation qualified officer or warrant officer plus an allocation of additional spaces to provide for aviator transients, patients, students, and career development ground duty. The spaces allocated for career development ground duty are TOE and TD spaces not specifically requiring an aviator but to be manned by an aviator. Our current TOE and TD requirements are about evenly divided between commissioned officers and warrant officers. However, when the additional spaces for transients, patients, students, and career development ground duty are added, the commissioned requirement increases to approximately 56 percent of the total. The increased commissioned officer percentage results from the fact that career development ground duty is provided for commissioned officers only and commissioned officers have a greater requirement for career schooling than warrant officers.

There is no action being taken by the Army to convert TOE or TD positions now designated for warrant officer aviators to the commissioned ranks. Rather, the Army is still converting some positions previously designated for commissioned officers to warrant officers. The only change made in our aviator requirements during the past several years is to provide for additional career development ground duty for colonels and lieutenant colonels.

Within the total TOE/TD (structure) requirement for aviators, approximately one-half are concentrated in an unaccompanied tour area. The remaining aviator requirements are located in what the Army calls its sustaining base. However, the total requirements in the sustaining base are not large enough to provide a

reasonable interval between unaccompanied tours for aviators. As a result, the Army must currently train and retain an overage in aviators. This overage is not an overage to total Army officer end strength but rather an overage of aviator trained officers and warrant officers that must be taken fom total Army assets.

The Army currently has an overage in warrant officer aviators. In fiscal year 1969 the Army could not recruit sufficient commissioned officers to meet its commissioned officer aviator requirements. During this same period we had a very high aviator training requirement to meet the increased demand in Vietnam and to provide reasonable intervals between short tours for aviators. Therefore, additional warrant officer training was permitted to meet total aviator requirements. The Army cannot afford to maintain an overage in warrant officer aviators. Aviator warrant officers are trained only to do a single job—that of occupying a warrant officer aviator position. However, the commissioned aviator is qualified to perform duties both as a pilot and as an officer with his basic branch. Therefore, action is being taken to reduce the warrant officer overage while still maintaining a commissioned aviator overage. The commissioned officer overage permits us to use the aviators more effectively in other than aviator positions when they are not serving in an unaccompanied tour area. Since the entire aviator overage will be commissioned officers, our projected Fiscal Year 1971 inventory will consist of approximately 60 percent commissioned aviators and 40 percent warrant officers aviators. These percentages are reflected in the following table:

PROJECTED AVIATOR INVENTORY

End fiscal year—	Officer		Warrant officer		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1970	14,350	58	10,445	42	24,795	100
1971	15,128	60	9,921	40	25,049	100

The major action taken by the Army to reduce its warrant officer aviator overage is the appointment of approximately 2,000 warrant officers as commissioned officers. In addition, two other actions are being taken. First, we are offering warrant officer aviators serving in Vietnam, an opportunity to extend an additional 6 months overseas in exchange for release from active duty upon completion of their tour. Second, we are also releasing all other obligated volunteer warrant officers after completion of 30 months of their 36-month obligation. This problem is a temporary one growing out of the combat in Southeast Asia with its large aviator requirements. When the short tour and combat aviator requirements are reduced, we feel confident that the Army will be able to adjust its aviator strengths and eliminate the present necessary overages.

NEED TO LIMIT NUMBER OF PILOTS

Mr. RHODES. The Air Force has had to explain to this committee why they have so many more pilots than they do pilot slots. In other words, why do they have pilots doing jobs that do not require a pilot. You may well be putting Army people in a position where their career will be planned for them, in a flying slot, where you would like to have the flexibility to assign them into something else. Yet because they are pilots, you won't be able to do it without great embarassment. Now, speaking as one member, we are not going to put up with a huge increase in the number of commissioned pilots over your requirements. So if you get too many you are going to be embarrassed in future years as the Air Force has been. So don't overdo it.

Colonel BELLOCHI. If I may add to my statement, sir, in 1968 we had 8,035 warrant officers and in 1969 we had 11,000 in order to meet that buildup I spoke of. In 1970 we are projecting 10,000 and in 1971 we are projecting roughly 9,500 warrant officers. The warrant officers inventory is coming down, but at the same time the commissioned inventory will increase.

General BRINKER. May I say also that we have an unusual position in the Army in that we train warrant officers now and they go to Vietnam and we get a combat tour from them over there. Because it is a combat situation it is very undesirable to keep pilots for too long a time, we must bring them back to the States for some kind of duty. We do not have enough helicopter pilot seats in the States to occupy all our warrant officer pilots who have served their combat tour in Vietnam. We have found that we can get a better service out of pilots if we convert them to commissioned officers. The warrant officer is a specialist, he can only fly; whereas, with a little additional training, the commissioned officer can do many other things. Many pilots are in a waiting position, waiting to go back to Vietnam for their second tour. I don't think we are going to have a surplus of regular officer pilots after Vietnam because many of our pilots are not military career oriented. When and if the demand for pilots, particularly helicopter pilots in Vietnam, drops off we will be able to work this situation out very quickly and get good pilot utilization worldwide. At the present time the requirement for pilots in Vietnam is driving our pilot training program.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you.

Mr. WHITTEN. Turning now to warrant officers which you mentioned earlier, the original Army budget for 1970 called for an increase of 2,125 warrant officers, from 21,896 to 24,021 in 1970. What was the effect of the various reductions applied to the 1970 Army budget on the warrant officer program?

Colonel BARTHOLOMEES. This is principally in the aviation field where we increased our numbers of warrant officers in 1969 and 1970, and in 1971 we are coming back down to 20,000 total warrant officers.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is your plan for 1971?

Colonel BARTHOLOMEES. For 20,000 warrant officers for fiscal 1971; yes, sir.

COMMISSIONING OF WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee has been advised that during 1970 the Army has set a goal of converting 2,035 warrant officers to first lieutenants. Is this in connection with your earlier statement as to why you are converting warrant officers to first lieutenants?

Colonel BARTHOLOMEES. We are in the process of doing that. The total program was for 2,380 to be conducted in fiscal years 1969 and 1970. We have converted about 1,100 toward our total goal. In fiscal 1970, toward the 2,000 goal, we have converted about 800.

General KERWIN. This is in connection with that same statement, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RHODES. I don't believe they gave a very good answer as to why they think this is a desirable goal, No. 1, and No. 2, why the Army is jumping them into first lieutenants instead of second lieutenants. Will you provide something for the record with respect to that?

General KERWIN. Yes.

(The information follows:)

Question No. 1 has been answered by the insert on page 50. There are several cogent reasons for making them first lieutenants. First, these are experienced men who have demonstrated exceptional leadership potential by outstanding performance of duty of more than 16 months. Nearly all have had at least one tour in Vietnam. From the standpoint of experience, they are at least equal to commissioned officers who usually make first lieutenant after 12 months on active duty. Second, all under consideration for conversion are chief warrant officers (CW–2). A second lieutenant with over 2 years' service draws less pay than a CW–2. Third, many justifiably felt that serving as a second lieutenant would be a step down in prestige. By giving constructive credit for their experience, we obtain needed commissioned officers who have a 2-year obligation with only minimal additional training.

ARMY VETERINARIANS

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1971 you are showing 638 veterinarians for the Army, an increase of six over the 632 you had in 1970. If the total strength of the Army is decreasing, why do you require more veterinarians?

General NEEL. I cannot answer as to the difference of six, Mr. Chairman. I would have to provide that for the record.

(The information follows:)

There was no increase in the end strength for fiscal year 1971 for veterinary officers, however, the monthly phasing of accessions caused an increase of six man-years.

Mr. WHITTEN. Are your veterinarians tied in almost exclusively with the selection of food and food program?

General NEEL. Yes, sir. You see, after the horses left the Army it is practically a meat and dairy-type operation. Many of them have gone into research. They are very good at supporting our research projects. They also go into nuclear activities which involve the use of animals. Since Vietnam came along the dog has replaced the horse. Many of the vets devote themselves to care of dogs.

Mr. RHODES. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

ABSENTEEISM IN ARMY MESS HALLS

Mr. WHITTEN. Under subsistence of enlisted personnel, you are anticipating an increase in the absentee rate for fiscal year 1971. For fiscal year 1970, you originally planned on an absentee rate of 10.59 percent. In 1971, you indicate that this rate will increase to 22.55 percent. Why do you feel that the absentee rate will more than double in 1971?

Mr. NUTT. On July 1, 1968 the Army implemented a system known as the signature head count system. The previous system that was in effect prior to that time consisted of an individual standing at the door with a clicker counting the people. This led to erroneous counts and inaccuracies in meal attendance records. Under the present system each individual must sign his name, his meal card number and the unit to which he belongs. Because of this very definite audit trail that the present system allows we have been able to increase the absentee rate by almost double, as you indicate.

Mr. WHITTEN. Your wording there where you have been able to increase the absentee rate might leave somewhat of a wrong impression.

Mr. NUTT. Rather than saying we have been able to increase it, may I say that the absentee rate has increased.

Mr. WHITTEN. One other way to say it would be that you improved your accuracy 100 percent.

Mr. NUTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you.

USE OF COMMISSARIES OTHER THAN MESSHALLS

General KERWIN. There has also been a change in young soldiers' eating habits. Many of them prefer to eat in the PX cafeterias.

Mr. ADDABBO. Will the Chairman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

Mr. ADDABBO. With respect to eating habits, I just received one complaint from some of the boys coming back from Vietnam, stating that when they go out to eat they can't get into the commissaries, that they have to go into the black market because the commissaries are filled with officers and civilian personnel.

General KERWIN. I don't know which one he might be going to.

Mr. ADDABBO. In Saigon.

General KERWIN. In Saigon? I don't believe I could answer that question directly.

Mr. ADABBO. Will you check into that and let us know?

General BRINKER. I can give you some background now. The policy there is that only personnel without access to an organized mess are permitted to patronize the commissaries. We are trying keep the commissaries from growing into large operations over there. We feel if we let everyone use commissaries in Vietnam, many would be buying from commissary stores partially for eating, partially for uses that would not contribute to our objectives. So one of the policies there is that unless you do not have access to an organized mess, you ordinarily are not permitted access to the commissary.

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you.

CHANGE IN SUBSISTENCE COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. For 1970, you estimate that the yearly rate for subsistence will be $505.02. In 1971, you indicate that this rate will decline to $504.57. In the light of the rising cost of food, why do you feel that the yearly rate for subsistence will decline in 1971?

Mr. NUTT. The rate shown in the budget, Mr. Chairman, is a composite rate of Conus and overseas, specifically the Conus rate is $1.35 and the overseas rate is $1.41. As the Conus-overseas strength mix changes, and you consolidate the worldwide rate to a single rate, it causes the rate to vary from year to year. This decline in the rate reflects a decrease in total overseas strength for 1971 as compared to 1970.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you.

We had before us yesterday, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Hopefully, they are expecting the rapid inflationary trend will slow down and sooner or later will

show up in the retail prices. Now, I said hopefully because nobody can count on that, but perhaps the situation may be improved along that line, though improvement in prices will be reflected in low prices in other places, so that you do not know where you are at, really. But thank you for your information.

C-RATION

In 1971, you are requesting $33.7 million for C-rations, a decrease of approximately 9 percent from the $37 million planned for 1970. In light of the troop reductions in Vietnam, should not this reduction be even greater?

Mr. NUTT. We have reduced our projected requirements for the meal combat individual in 1971 in accordance with what the Army in Vietnam says its needs would be, Mr. Chairman. While it is true that there is no direct ratio to proposed or possible troop reductions, the Army in Vietnam maintains that it still needs this number of rations.

HOLIDAY MEALS

Mr. WHITTEN. You are showing a new item in the budget entitled "Holiday meals." And for this item you are requesting $423,000. Would you please explain to the committee what this item is?

General KERWIN. Sir, this is for Christmas and Thanksgiving.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is this a new program of attention to the servicemen or has this been included previously in your overall budget.

General KERWIN. It has been carried heretofore, but now we have broken it out. It is 36 cents each for Thanksgiving and Christmas.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is your opinion that it would be more apt to be in line with what you really prefer?

General KERWIN. Right, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. You feel you can give better attention to the holidays if the added cost of the meals does not come out of your general fund?

General KERWIN. That is correct.

NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1970, the Army requested approximately $1.5 million for the new food item program. The committee reduced this request to $750,000. We now note that you are showing $50,000 for this program in 1970. What happened to the program in 1970 and what happened to the other $700,000?

Mr. NUTT. The original 1970 program did include approximately $1.5 million for the purpose of production testing of an item called meal, uncooked, 25-man. Administrative and research difficulties have arisen which have made it necessary to slip the proposed test of this item until approximately fiscal year 1973. Because of this the entire program has been reduced to the $50,000 which remains. The remaining $50,000 is for the purpose of testing three items.

Mr. WHITTEN. That explains everything except what happened to the money.

Mr. NUTT. It was given up under Project 703 when the Army made its give up.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the review in which funds were recaptured?

Mr. NUTT. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. In 1971 you are requesting approximately $111,000 for the new food item program. What will the program consist of in 1971?

Mr. NUTT. This consists of production testing of the following items: Pineapple juice, instant; lemon juice, instant; spinach, precooked, dehydrated; peas, freeze-dried, compressed; bread mix; bacon, sliced, prefried, frozen; chicken, precooked frozen entrees. There are varying amounts of each of those for a total additional cost of $111,000.

Mr. RHODES. I hope they taste better than they sound.

Mr. WHITTEN. The Army has been one of the pioneers in the use of freeze-dried foods through the new food item program. Would you please tell the committee what developments are now underway with regard to the use and packaging of freeze-dried food and what your plans are for future developments?

Incidentally, I serve on another subcommittee where we have followed much of this through the Department of Agriculture. It has made lots and lots of differences in the domestic market, in the continental United States or in the States of the Union. Now, it is easy to see that it would go well especially where you have the problem of freight and movement and things of that sort. Would you briefly describe what this has meant to the service?

Mr. NUTT. As you are well aware, Mr. Chairman, the Army has had dehydrated foods for a number of years. Recently there have been two developments which have significantly improved the old dehydrated foods as we knew them. One is the freeze-dried product which enables you to have a very definite improved flavor and acceptability of any dehydrated item. However, while you improve the flavor and acceptability of a dehydrated item by freeze-drying it, you do not necessarily reduce the volume. If, however, you take the freeze-dried product and compress it, you reduce the volume impressively. The advantage of reduced volume is very obvious in shipping long distances.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do you then come back and add the moisture that you have pressed out?

Mr. NUTT. Yes, sir. You just add water to it and it normally goes right back to its original shape.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1970.

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee will come to order.

When we adjourned yesterday we had under discussion freeze-dried foods. I had occasion to taste the pineapple juice and it was excellent. We come now to another item which is of interest to the committee and a big item in the Department.

TRAINING TRAVEL

Under "Permanent change of station travel," the committee notes that you are requesting $524.7 million for fiscal year 1971, a decrease of $88.7 million below the level for fiscal year 1970. However, even

with this decrease, you are requesting an increase for training travel, from $10,574,000 in 1970 up to $11,288,000 in 1971.

What is the reason for this increase?

Mr. HUTCHISON. Sir, the training travel account represents the costs of those personnel that we send to and from training within the continental United States. If they come from overseas, that travel is charged to rotational. In fiscal 1971 we are projecting that 25 percent of our officer travel will be within the continental United States versus the 22 percent in 1970 and that our enlisted travel will be 50 percent in 1971 versus the 44 percent in 1970. That is the reason you see the slight increase in training travel in 1971.

SEPARATION TRAVEL

Mr. WHITTEN. Under separation travel for officers, you are requesting $17.5 million in 1971 in connection with the separation of 44,600 officers from the Army. According to the table of gains and losses, this is the total number of officers that will be separated during 1971. This would imply that every officer separated from the Army would draw some type of separation travel or separation payments. What would happen in the case of an Army officer retiring from the service that was living here in Washington, D.C. and owned his own home and planned to remain in the area? Would he, too, draw a payment for separation travel?

Mr. HUTCHISON. Sir, an officer separated from the service is paid to the point where he entered the service. If he entered the service in Texas he would get paid a travel payment to move from Washington to Texas, whether he moves or not. An officer retiring from the service is paid to his home of selection. That is part of the contract when he comes into the service.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is a part of the original contract?

Mr. HUTCHISON. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Of course, the point that was made by the question is if a man happened to get out at the point that he got in he just wouldn't be smart?

Mr. HUTCHISON. It depends on where his last duty station is, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. I mean if he got in in Texas—I believe that was your illustration—and he got out of the service back in Texas would he draw any travel?

Mr. HUTCHISON. He would draw 6 cents a mile, sir. If it was in the same town, the amount would be minimum.

EFFECT OF EXCESSIVE MOVES ON RETENTION

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee has long been critical of the excessive amount of funds the Army spends on permanent change of station travel. These excessive changes of station are reflected in the problems you are now having with retention rates. Since one of the reasons frequently cited for leaving the service is the excessive number of moves an individual is required to make, what efforts are now underway within the Army to attempt to improve this situation?

General BOYE. As long as we have the problems of Vietnam, the requirement to send people back to Vietnam frequently, in other words for a 12-month tour, this is going to have an impact on turbulence. It is certainly our desire, and as soon as we can, that we cut

down on this constant moving of our personnel both officer and enlisted. The requirements really are the overriding factor. We are well aware of it. Again, as soon as we can cut down on the requirements for the short tour assignments, we will cut down on these types of moves.

Mr. WHITTEN. I recognize this problem from years of service on this committee. There have been times where, by way of illustration, one man at a rather high level would be moved up and I recall where one was recalled from Europe to a high level position here in the Defense Department. At that time, and this was some years ago, they worked backwards to see what the total cost of that one change in assignment was and it was astronomical, considering the total number of people that made the change. When you multiply it by the cost of travel then you have the figures showing the impact. Now, I realize it is a real problem with you. You can't keep folks at the same place all the time. I know that regardless of how you try to work it out it is a problem but you do have this under constant surveillance?

General BOYE. Yes, sir.

RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. WHITTEN. You discussed earlier in your prepared statement your experience with retention of officers and enlisted personnel. I don't know that you gave us much information as to what the picture is so far as officers making the military a career. Have you seen any change in that, any change in the reenlistment rate, in those people taking time out before they decide? Can you tell us what the picture is as far as enlisted personnel or officers making a career of the service? Has there been any noticeable change?

General KERWIN. Although our enlistment rate has declined in terms of percentages, in fiscal year 1970 it has been favorable in terms of numbers. This is primarily due to the large number of people who entered the service in 1967 and 1968; who are now in the process of leaving the service. We project that the fiscal year 1970 rate will be slightly down again in most of the junior officer retention areas. The fiscal year 1971 rate both for the OCS and ROTC should go up. As I indicated in my opening statement, we are taking a series of actions, personalized actions, in an attempt to get people to return to or stay in the service. We will not see the results of these actions, probably until the second quarter of fiscal year 1971. In view of the actions we have taken, we do project that retention and reenlistment rates will improve.

EFFECT OF INCREASED PAY ON RETENTION

Mr. WHITTEN. You know that when anything passes up here they offer the best argument that they can in support of it. Every time you hear arguments for a pay raise, whether it be a civilian activity or a military activity, it is stated that the increase is needed in order to obtain more people. Can you see any effect that these increases in pay have had in this area, or has the cost of living gone up about as fast as the increase in pay?

General KERWIN. We have found by means of surveys that pay is not everything. As a matter of fact, in many cases pay is not necessarily the first priority; it is a whole package of things that must be

considered. Right now, of course, these include family separations, repeated tours in Vietnam, the housing problem, schooling problems for children, and so forth. Although pay does have some influence on our retention rates it is not necessarily the No. 1 factor.

RETENTION OF JUNIOR OFFICERS

Mr. WHITTEN. Last fall the Army completed a study of retention problems among junior officers. One of the recommendations resulting from the study was to "convert quasi-military duties to enlisted or civilian assignments whenever possible." While this is certainly a step in the right direction, how practical is this in light of Secretary Kelley's statement that "the civilianization program has approached the saturation point"?

General DAVIS. Sir, we think it is still a practical recommendation. The recommendation came, as the committee knows, from the Franklin Institute study on junior officer retention. The package of complaints that created that recommendation addressed those duties that many junior officers now find onerous which in the past, were not considered that way because it was just a different era. For example, things like commissary inventories, exchange inventories, the way we manage our duty officer setups; cases where an officer feels he may be only a telephone answerer; or other kinds of duties similar to those I mentioned. We have every expectation that with some sensible command actions in this area, particularly by people at our installations and our units, who are aware of this study—we have circulated it widely to the field—that we can take care of this.

BALANCING CIVILIAN AND MILITARY POSITION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. WHITTEN. With a peacetime Army—I don't mean it is peacetime everywhere, what with Vietnam—but with a big part of the activity around the world being in a noncombat category it is difficult frequently to provide the military people on a base with something to do, where, to a degree, they are marking time. At the same time, if you turn toward the civilians, then when you do get into a combat situation you have that many fewer military people. Do you have a constant problem of keeping an appropriate balance as between the two? What I mean is, let us take the average base far removed from where combat is going on. In peacetime with as many people as you have, from my experience up here, you almost have to make work for them. However, if you have people there and they are qualified in what the civilians can do, it seems to me it would be smart to use their services. On the other hand, if you do have to expand, and get back into combat, then you have to rush out and get civilians so that this man will not be tied down to his desk job. Is this a constant problem?

General DAVIS. Yes, I think it is fair to say that it is.

General TAYLOR. May I comment on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. General Taylor.

General TAYLOR. We find ourselves in this position today. For a number of reasons we have been reducing civilian personnel as you have read about. When we reduce civilian personnel that means in many instances there are certain types of jobs that still must be carried on, so it means that we have to use troops for that. Now, you

touched upon a very, very serious point when you asked about balance. It is something we are constantly faced with, attempting to try to civilianize where we can so that we can free the military personnel for training on the military side; on the other hand, when we have the reductions then we have to reverse the situation. So this is what we are experiencing today. I am almost sure it is going to take us 2 or 3 years to get back into a balance situation as we go through these current changes that we are faced with. You may recall in 1965 the then Secretary of Defense directed quite a civilianization program in which we displaced many military personnel with civilians. Of course, now that is starting to reverse itself.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General.

I think it is well to have that in the record to show what the full picture is.

OFFICER PERSONNEL DIRECTORATE

Another recommendation of the report which you mentioned in your statement was to "budget enough funds to permit at least an annual visit to each major installation by the Officer Personnel Directorate Career Counsel Team." Were those funds included in the 1971 budget?

General KERWIN. No, they are not in the MPA budget.

Mr. WHITTEN. What happened to the proposed annual visit I referred to? Did they have to cancel the trips?

General KERWIN. In some cases we had to cancel trips and in other cases we had to reprogram funds in order to meet the requirement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could you expand on this in the record so that we will see what the full picture is?

(The information follows:)

In addition to administrative visits, the Officer Personnel Directorate initially programed 321 visits during fiscal year 1970 to provide career counseling, assignment information and to increase the junior officer retention rate. The retention visits generally consisted of one to four officers per visit and were planned for the respective branch centers, schools, and major troop concentrations. The travel plan provided for:

(*a*) 197 repetitive visits to 16 locations, major branch schools and centers. (Repetitive visits are necessary to assure coverage of the recurring input of students into basic, advanced, and officer candidate courses and the normal rotation of officer personnel to and from short tour areas, primarily Vietnam.) Of these:

(1) 156 visits have been completed.

(2) 41 future visits are still programed.

(*b*) 124 other visits to 35 major installations are planned.

(1) 24 visits have been completed.

(2) 100 visits have had to be postponed.

This situation has resulted in token visits or no visit at all to 19 major installations.

Funds for officer retention visits in fiscal year 1971 will come from operations and maintenance, Army (OMA) funds as they did in fiscal year 1970.

ALL-VOLUNTEER ARMY

Mr. WHITTEN. In light of current retention problems, especially since more money may not necessarily be the panacea it is thought to be, what is your feeling about an all-volunteer Army, as to its attainability?

General KERWIN. Sir, we support, in principle, the concept of an all-volunteer Army. We recognize that there will be a cost attached to this. Just what that cost will be is difficult to determine at the moment.

We also feel if we do move to the all-volunteer Army that we should retain draft legislation in the event it is needed. We also feel the attainment of an all-volunteer Army must be on a phased basis. We must also know exactly what incentives are required to attract the people we want. One of our biggest problems, will be to improve the image of the Army to attract not just the quantity but the quality of people that we will need.

Assistance Programs

Mr. Whitten. Would you please provide for the record a 3-year table listing all the various assistance programs in which the Army participates, showing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned and the estimated cost by appropriation?

General Kerwin. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

ARMY ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

[Dollars in thousands]

Project	End strength		$ in thousands	
	Military	Civilian	Operation and maintenance	Military personnel
Transition:				
Fiscal Year 1969	0	391	$8,800	0
Fiscal Year 1970	0	391	8,700	0
Fiscal Year 1971	0	391	8,700	0
100,000				
Fiscal Year 1969	153	6	1,700	$2,100
Fiscal Year 1970	130	5	1,200	1,600
Fiscal Year 1971	125	4	900	1,400
Value:				
Fiscal Year 1969	0	0	115	0
Fiscal Year 1970	0	0	218	0
Fiscal Year 1971	0	0	0	0
Hire:				
Fiscal Year 1969	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Year 1970	0	0	267	0
Fiscal Year 1971	0	0	600	0
Referral:				
Fiscal Year 1969	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Year 1970	0	0	0	0
Fiscal Year 1971	0	0	0	0

Project 100,000

Mr. Whitten. Would you please bring the committee up to date on what the Army has done in connection with Project 100,000 during the past year?

General Kerwin. Yes, sir. Since October 1, 1966, the Army has had about 169,600 participants in Project 100,000. We have had a fair amount of success with this particular program. The individual is treated like all others. He is trained like all others when he goes through basic combat training and advanced individual training. Following BCT and AIT, roughly 41 percent of these people go to combat MOS and the remaining portion go to a support skill MOS.

Our overall appraisal of this program is that about 95 percent of these people are performing satisfactorily at the present time. We do not have any undue problems overall with this group. They do present a slight increase in the disciplinary problem; however, in comparison to the high school dropout, Project 100,000 individuals do not present the same problem to the same degree.

In Vietnam we have reports that Project 100,000 individuals have turned out to be fairly good soldiers. Our feeling on the project is that although it should be continued, it should not be increased. As our end strengths go down, proportionately speaking, the number of accessions in terms of Project 100,000 should be reduced.

Mr. WHITTEN. How many individuals do you plan on bringing into the Army under this project in fiscal 1971?

General KERWIN. We plan on about 40,000 accessions in fiscal 1971.

Mr. WHITTEN. What about fiscal 1970?

General KERWIN. 45,000 in 1970.

GAO REPORT ON PROJECT 100,000

Mr. WHITTEN. The GAO report on Project 100,000 criticized the Army with respect to the separation rate for the medically remedial enlistment program. What steps has the Army taken to improve this situation?

General NEEL. We are very conscious of the problem. I have developed some statistics here which I would like to present. This past year 1.7 percent of the total accessions were subsequently separated medically for conditions which existed prior to the enlistment. Going further, in a survey conducted at the recruiting command it appears from professional evaluation that 52 percent of these conditions could not possibly be diagnosed unless the individual stated that he had them; such things as epileptic seizures or asthma.

We are faced generally with two groups of people in our entry stations, those that are very motivated to get in and those that are very motivated to stay out. When you look at their forms which they fill out with their medical histories, it is very simple for them not to admit having had things in the past. So 52 percent of these we could not diagnose with anything we had available unless the patient had told us. There are 34 percent, of this 1.7 percent, about one-third, who could have been diagnosed by a very elaborate executive-type physical examination. I am referring to certain abnormalities of the spine that had not given any trouble in the past. Now, we do not do this type of examination, that is the Mayo Clinic type of physical examination, because of the obvious cost which is involved. These soldiers then might get into rigorous training and develop back injuries and then clinically we make the examination and find that they have these abnormalities. We find 9 percent of these are defects in medical judgment. The physicians at the examining stations failed to give proper cognizance to documentation which was presented or they failed to give enough weight to certain physical findings that they had; in other words, medical error.

We find that 4.6 percent were inexcusable. These are the ones where the vision was not checked, where the hearing was not checked. These are the inexcusable medical errors.

Now, if we combine these latter two, the mistakes in medical judgment and then the goofs or the inexcusable errors, we have something like 13.6 percent of these were faulty medical practice cases. The GAO was a little less lenient than we were on evaluating these and they came up with 14.6 percent of these latter two categories. So let's say 14 percent as the average between our 13.6 and 14.6. This would indi-

cate, then, that our actual EPTS rate due to faulty examinations is 0.2 percent. We believe that this is about as low as we will ever get it. The only alternative would be to go to this Mayo Clinic type executive physical examination with costs beginning at about $250 per person. We are spending about $24 per person. So by increasing the cost of the examination 10 times from $24 to $250—and we actually examined in this past year 779,000—you would then be increasing the cost of the physical examination, even if we had the resources to do it, 10 times for almost 800,000 people. So I don't think that the problem is as serious or as significant as it might appear. In other words, these 13,398 that were subsequently separated this past year is really only 1.7 percent of the total of which 0.2 percent were mistakes. The others we could not, with our present setup, detect.

General KERWIN. Mr. Chairman, I think Dr. Neel has addressed the overall question of taking people into the military through the AFEES. I think your question was directed at the medically remedial problem. From February 1967, to February 1969, we have taken in about 6,400 people of this particular category. I am familiar with the GAO report. It does cite the fact that we have taken people into the Army who probably should not have been, and who had to be discharged because particular medical deficiencies could not be corrected within 6 weeks. We are tightening up the criteria for accepting individuals with medical deficiencies. Furthermore, we have dropped several of the deficiency categories under which individuals were previously admitted because of the tremendous amount of difficulty in meeting the 6-week program.

Mr. WHITTEN. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. WHITTEN. In view of the GAO report and in view of the fact that when you get into this category of people who for one reason or another do not come up to the norm, do you think it would be better not to go as far as Dr. Neel has said but to give a little more attention to requiring a few letters of recommendation, you might say, or a few statements from those familiar with the applicant? Certainly from our experience here we have seen examples. Now, whether they are a significant percentage, that is another matter which you would know about.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact we do. On enlistments we check in the civilian community to find out about the individual, using letters of recommendation, also police records, convictions, and so forth. There has been some difficulty at times because we have been unable to obtain the necessary data or it just was not available. However, we do attempt to find out all we can about the individual.

REMEDIAL READING

Mr. WHITTEN. Reading seems to be one of the major problems not only in the youth which the military takes in but actually among the populace at large. Now, I mean reading thoroughly and fully and understandably, that is far different than just being able to understand some words in print.

What program do you have in the service to bring them up to at least a fifth grade or sixth grade level of reading?

General KERWIN. Sir, we have the Army preparatory training program which is the remedial reading program. From April of 1968 to December of 1969 we have selected about 20,143 students for this program. About 97 percent of these people come from Project 100,000. The remedial training program is a 6 weeks' program conducted at the Army training centers. Students in this program are given military subjects over a 3 weeks' period which are normally given in the first week of BCT. Students who fail to achieve a fifth grade reading level during the 6 weeks are not recycled, but are assigned to basic combat training.

Mr. WHITTEN. One of the other things that the GAO says is that while you have good intentions, because of the shortage of instructors as well as facilities, this program of remedial reading has lagged somewhat, that you have not been able to meet your obligations as you should. Is that one of your major problems?

General KERWIN. The facilities are always a problem, and this of course means money, Mr. Chairman. One of our problems is getting the proper type of trainer. In many cases in the training centers that I have visited the instructors are dependent wives who are trained in this particular field.

Despite the lack of good facilities we are attaining results and the motivation of the individuals in attempting to gain a fifth grade reading level is impressive.

Mr. WHITTEN. I don't know how in your position you would have the time to get personal knowledge along this line but do you or any of your associates have any idea that you can give to the committee as to the interest that the soldier has in trying to learn to read? Do you find that they have a desire to cooperate fully with you, or what is the general attitude of the soldier who needs this instruction and to whom you must see that it is given?

General KERWIN. Not too long ago, I attended, for the most part of one morning, a class conducted at Fort Benning. Most of the individuals are highly motivated to attain at least a fifth grade reading level because I think they are more embarrassed amongst their contemporaries more than anything else. Of course, it is highly desirable that the individual attain this just for the simple reason of safety. He must be able to read safety instructions and signs, comply with instructions given on the firing range, and so forth. Most of the individuals with whom I personally talked in this class desired this training and wanted to stay with it as long as they possibly could. There is a certain percentage who obviously are not motivated and do drop out, no matter what happens. I would suppose there are a few who wouldn't make the effort and spend the 6 weeks just to get out of training.

PROJECT TRANSITION

Mr. WHITTEN. With respect to Project Transition, what actions have you taken with respect to that?

General KERWIN. Sir, Project Transition, at the present time, is being conducted throughout the continental United States at 55 installations. You are aware that is is a counseling program, a teaching program, and a technical training program. It also includes a referral for placement at some time when the man is discharged. From January of 1968 to December of 1969 we counseled about 240,000 people.

During that time we had about 87,000 enrolled. We trained approximately 69,000. A recent survey indicated that about 31 percent of the individuals who were in this training program obtained jobs. Perhaps our biggest problem at the moment is attempting to get this program to the other half of the Army who are in Vietnam, or in Europe and at other stations. These are the individuals about to be discharged. We are developing a self-counseling booklet. Also, we are negotiating with the Veterans' Administration and the Labor Department in order to get teams to go to Vietnam and other overseas areas in order to contact the individual soldier, find out his interests, attempt to get him enrolled in the program, or at least make him aware of some of the services that are available to him.

Mr. WHITTEN. You feel that you have directed your attention to all of those fields in which the General Accounting Office took exception?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. We are looking at all of them.

PROJECT REFERRAL

Mr. WHITTEN. What has the Army done during the past year in connection with Project Referral and what are your plans for 1971?

General DAVIS. Sir, I believe the committee knows that Referral is a DOD sponsored program. It is a computer matched job assistance program and the Army will implement the program by making it an adjunct to our retirement services program. The Army has no funds budgeted for this program. The idea is that an individual leaving the service can provide a résumé of his skills and interests to be programed into a computer, and this would be matched against job requirements in the economy at large. The program is still being developed and we are aware of the fact that the committee observed last year that there might be a possible conflict between the Department of Defense referral interests and the interests of the Department of Labor in this regard. However, representatives of Assistant Secretary of Defense's office, prior to seeing the committee's comments in this regard, visited with the Under Secretary of Labor, Mr. Hodgson, and it has been established that the Department of Labor cannot provide a job-match program for at least 5 years. So we find no conflict. We plan to go ahead with the program, and to begin initial registration in the Army by about June of this year.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are staying in contact with the Department of Labor so that you can live harmoniously together and this can be referred to one place or the other?

General DAVIS. Yes, sir; so that there will be no conflict.

AIRBORNE TRAINING

Mr. WHITTEN. Turning to airborne training, yesterday afternoon we discussed how the Army is training colonels and generals to fly helicopters. The committee has also been advised that all newly appointed Regular Army officers are now eligible to volunteer for airborne training, regardless of duty assignment. An estimated 510 additional officers will be trained each year. What is the requirement for expanding airborne training?

General GETTYS. Airborne training, as you know, has not been required except for those officers who are going to go to airborne duty. Just recently, the Army, at the request of the Commandant at West Point, and other members of the staff, enlarged this program to include all Regular Army commissioned officers, and the distinguished military graduates who go into the Regular Army from the ROTC. The purpose of the airborne training, of course, is physical conditioning and certainly it is a morale building factor as far as units are concerned, and also the individual.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would these individuals draw jump pay?

General GETTYS. No. A man does not draw airborne pay unless he is in an airborne unit.

General KERWIN. However, he draws it during his training period.

General GETTYS. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTEN. Has not the use of helicopters in Vietnam been developed to such a degree that the airmobile unit have almost made the paratrooper obsolete?

General KERWIN. No, sir. We think there is still an important role for the airborne. In the Army at the present time we are taking a look at the force structure in an attempt to determine what proportion should be airmobile and what proportion should be airborne in order to meet our requirements.

FUTURE REQUIREMENTS FOR PARATROOPS

Mr. WHITTEN. The Army Combat Developments Command has completed a study regarding future requirements for paratroopers. Would you please provide the committee with a copy of this study?

General KERWIN. I will, sir.

USE OF MARIHUANA IN VIETNAM

Mr. WHITTEN. We read of the problems which you are having, and we read where all over the United States they are having a problem with marihuana and various other drugs.

What is the current situation with regard to the use of marihuana in Vietnam?

General KERWIN. Sir, in Vietnam, as you are well aware, marihuana is relatively easy to obtain and very cheap to purchase. We do know that the number of offenders has increased. We are very much aware of the problem. There is also a program within Vietnam, in conjunction with the Vietnamese Government, of attempting to identify the source of the marihuana. As you know, it is grown in Vietnam, particularly down in the delta areas. There is a program between the United States and the Vietnamese to eradicate the fields once they are identified. We have noticed no significant effects on the combat effectiveness of our troops in Vietnam because of the use of marihuana.

Mr. WHITTEN. I understand that you have been using German shepherds to detect hidden caches of marihuana. How widely are these dogs used and what has been the degree of success?

General GETTYS. Sir, we have a very intensive dog program in the Army. In addition to the marihuana sniffers as we call them, which you mentioned, we have sentry dogs, tracker dogs, and scout dogs. This program has proven very successful in Vietnam, both in the sentry and tracker roles, and to some extent in the detection of marihuana.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, at this time with the problem that we have with so many drugs in so many areas, including our schools, we don't want to let up. It has been my experience, and others whom I have talked to concur in this, that sometimes we make the penalty so severe that it is impossible to get convictions. Now, a few years ago I had some experience with a Federal judge; we were discussing a case where they had marihuana involved. To my surprise, I learned that marihuana does not have the habit-forming tendency that some of the other drugs do, such as heroin or codeine, but it can become a habit such as in drinking, and so forth.

How is this handled in the military? I am not advocating marihuana. But it has been my experience that if the punishment is somewhat within reason you are more apt to get convictions and punishment, whereas, if the penalty is so far out of line with the offense, you have a tendency to get an acquittal and no punishment at all. What is done with those, not only where you deal with marihuana but the other types? Draw the distinction, if you will, as between the types. Can somebody give me what the usual penalty is where military are involved? Of course, the rest of it I guess has to be dependent on the civilian government.

General DAVIS. I have some specifics here but I would like to lead into them with a general point, if I may.

The Army has approached the problem both preventively and correctively. In the preventive end, we try to orient all our people on drug dangers and have some specific programs for that. It is true that in the military the use of drugs or the possession thereof is an offense, but the penalties, as the judge said, vary quite widely. Our latest figures show, by way of illustration, punishment for wrongful possession, sale, transfer or use, or introduction into a unit or a base or installation of marihuana, narcotics or dangerous drugs, went about like this: For a 6 months' period there were 876 nonjudicial punishments which impose no confinement. Under article 15 in the Uniform Code, that is. There were 122 general courts-martial, 1,758 special courts-martial and 205 summary courts. Each offense is judged on its merits. Its severity will then be determined and action taken thereon.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish you would enlarge on this subject for the record.

General DAVIS. I will.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is a matter not only of grave concern to the military but a matter of very grave concern to the Nation as a whole. I have expressed myself from my limited experience dealing with various types of violations of the law. I wish you would enlarge for the record the story with respect to the various types of drugs in order that those who read the hearings will be able to see the difference in the gravity or dangerousness of the narcotics as well as the penalties that an individual might receive.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir; we will do that.

(The information follows:)

The "Manual for Courts-Martial, 1969" (revised edition), provides for a maximum punishment of a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and 10 years' confinement at hard labor for possession, sale, or use of habit forming drugs; whereas, the maximum confinement at hard labor for

possession, sale, or use of marihuana is 5 years. Army regulation 600–50 prohibits possession, use, sale or transfer of depressant, stimulant, or hallucinogenic drugs; the maximum punishment for violation of this regulation is a dishonorable discharge, forfeiture of all pay and allowances, and 2 years' confinement at hard labor. There is, however, no minimum prescribed sentence for any of these offenses, and commanders may suspend any sentence which may be adjudged. In deciding on the specific sentencing, court members and military judges consider such factors as the accused's motives, prior convictions, reputation, education, age, marital status, grade, and military record. Likewise, convening authorities remain free to consider the totality of the circumstances of each individual case including all the extenuating, mitigating, and aggravating factors in determining what sentence to approve. Thus, the accused himself is a more important determinant than is the offense or the type of drug involved. A review of drug abuse in all military services during 1968 showed that court-martial punishments ranged from 7 years' confinement at hard labor, total forfeiture, and dishonorable discharge for multiple drug offenses to 30 days at hard labor without confinement for unauthorized possession of drugs. Possession of marijuana constitutes the greatest percentage of drug violations in the Army. Sentences for these violations generally range from 1 to 3 months' confinement at hard labor. As General Davis previously mentioned, many of the drug offenses are not brought to trial under courts-martial, but are treated under article 15 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and nonjudicial punishment is imposed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General Davis.

SUPPORT OF FREE WORLD FORCES

How much is included in this budget for support of free world forces?

General KERWIN. $130.6 million.

Mr. WHITTEN. What countries are supported and in what amounts?

General KERWIN. The countries that are supported are the Republic of Vietnam, ——— million; Korea, ——— million; Thailand, ——— million; and for others the small amount of ———.

Mr. WHITTEN. What troops are supported, by country?

General KERWIN. Vietnamese troops, Korean troops, and Thai troops.

Mr. WHITTEN. Could you give us the numbers?

General KERWIN. Koreans, ——— Thais, ——— others, ———.

Mr. WHITTEN. Would you provide for the record a schedule showing under what activities in this budget these funds are included, broken down by country?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

MPA SUPPORT OF RVNAF AND FWMAF

[In thousands of dollars]

	RVNAF	ROK	Thai	Other	Total
Cost data:					
Pay and allowances, officers	——	——	——	——	8,993
Pay and allowances, enlisted	——	——	——	——	37,854
Subsistence of enlisted	——	——	——	——	70,828
PCS travel	——	——	——	——	9,100
Other military personnel costs	——	——	——	——	3,829
Total	——	——	——	——	130,604

Mr. WHITTEN. Are there questions?

Mr. ADDABBO. General, yesterday the chairman asked you to submit for the record for the period January 1969 through June 1971 the

breakdown of the level of troops in Vietnam. In submitting that for the record would you also supply the type of units that will be there between combat and noncombat units?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir, I will review this and submit it for the record. As you are aware, the exact levels and type of units for the remainder of fiscal year 1970 and for fiscal year 1971 will depend upon presidential decisions.

(The information follows:)

(Clerks note: The information was provided to the committee and is classified.)

UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS DEPOSIT PROGRAM

Mr. ADDABBO. In the justification book, under table 1, page 5, you show there an item "Interest and Dividends, $9,957,000." What would that cover?

Mr. HUTCHISON. That is the interest on the soldiers' deposits, those that are overseas who can deposit funds and draw 10-percent interest.

Mr. ADDABBO. Has there been a limitation on the amount of deposits that a serviceman can make into that account?

Mr. HUTCHISON. $10,000, sir.

Mr. ADDABBO. Are you engaged in a continuing program of education with respect to the servicemen about this particular savings account, informing them that the program is available to them?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. It is very widely publicized.

SUBSISTANCE LOSSES

Mr. ADDABBO. On page 33 of the justifications under "Subsistence in Kind," item 7, you show subsistence losses of $11 million. What would that represent?

Mr. NUTT. That represents losses to this appropriation for subsistence which this appropriation owns in Vietnam, due to climatic causes, aging of the subsistence involved, pilferage, enemy action, and similar type causes.

Mr. ADDABBO. Do you have a breakdown as to the amounts due to the different causes?

Mr. NUTT. No, sir; we do not have a detailed breakdown. The budget estimate includes the total loss from all causes.

Mr. ADDABBO. What is the percentage lost due to pilferage?

Mr. NUTT. The loss factor that is in the budget is 5 percent of which pilferage probably amounts to about 2 percent.

Mr. ADDABBO. Has that percentage increased or decreased?

Mr. NUTT. The loss factor has decreased from what it was originally. It was 7 percent. It is now 5 percent.

ACTIVE ARMY DIVISIONS SUPPORTED

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you.

General, how many active Army divisions will this budget support?

General KROESEN. Our current fiscal year 1970 program is for 17⅓ division forces. This is a reduction of 2⅓ divisions from the high for the Vietnam buildup of 19⅔.

Mr. ADDABBO. How many of those divisions are presently in Vietnam

General KROESEN. 7⅓, sir.

RACIAL PROBLEMS IN VIETNAM

Mr. ADDABBO. With respect to the men returning from Vietnam, I have been advised that most of our men are now noncombatants, that most of the actual combat has been turned over to the South Vietnamese and that many of our men are back in camps just hanging around and that because of this there has been an upswing in internal problems, with particular reference to racial disorders in and about the camps and that, most of the time when the soldiers are off duty. Now, have you received any reports about this?

General KERWIN. With respect to the first part of your question, the ratio between combatants and noncombatants has remained relatively stable. The percentage of combat forces to our total strength in Vietnam is over 60 percent. As to the second part of your question, there has been a better understanding throughout the Army of the fact that we are faced with a racial problem. There has been a recognition that there is a lack of communication not only between the white and the black soldiers, but between blacks themselves. In many cases we find out it is not what our policies are, but what people think our policies to be, a misunderstanding of them. There also tends to be, as you point out here, a polarization of the races, particularly in off-duty hours.

Having commanded in Vietnam, I do know that there is no racial problem when you get out with a fire support base, there is no difference between the whites and the blacks. However, the further back you go from the combat zone, the difficulties of providing off-duty recreation, and the fact that the men cannot leave some of the bases, does tend to exacerbate the racial problem. We have had in several cases difficulties between the races. We are very much aware of this problem. A team from DOD, which included members of my staff, visited Vietnam just recently, went to practically all the major bases and conducted seminars with the commanders concerning this problem. Now, my part in this was to assign a very knowledgeable black officer who comes from my office. He has worked on racial tension for some time and made presentations throughout most of Vietnam, including MACV headquarters.

We are very much aware that the racial tension problems have increased. We are taking all sorts of measures worldwide to brief the people as to what the problem is. We particularly want to bring to the commanders' attention what the indicators of racial tension are. Standard indicators such as IG reports, chaplain reports, and JAG reports do not fully apply nowadays. You have got to go down to the units, among the people, to find out whether or not there are racial tensions.

We are attempting to bring into the PX system the goods that appeal to black soldiers. We have also started a program for distribution of literature to the libraries concerning black heritage and history. We are also at the present time placing into our training, particularly in the schools, in the Continental United States, a program of

instruction for understanding racial tensions, and the importance of racial relations to combat effectiveness.

Mr. ADDABBO. General, as you said, in the field there are no athiests or racists, everybody is there to protect one another. Once they have time on their hands is where the problem arises. So would it be possible, or has a study been made to see if we can possibly pull out at a faster rate those men who are not needed so that we do not have them sitting around at the base? Some of the reports we have indicate that Vietnam duty is almost like stateside duty due to the lack of activity over there.

General KERWIN. We always have this problem of the rear areas. The men work maybe a 10- or 12-hour day and then because of the restrictions need the extensive recreation facilities. Those troops are required to support the American combat troops that we have there.

RACIAL PROBLEMS SURVEY

Mr. ADDABBO. General Westmoreland recently ordered a racial problem survey. Has that survey been completed?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. That is the one I referred to.

Mr. ADDABBO. Would you submit a copy of that for the record?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Recent racial incidents at military installations worldwide have indicated a necessity for a close analysis of potential problem areas which could negate much of the Army's past accomplishments in racial harmony, and impair the ability to accomplish our mission.

Our objective in this assessment has been to bring into sharper focus just where we are and how we can best proceed in this most sensitive area. We examined the complaints of alleged racial discrimination handled by the Army staff during the past year and reviewed the information received during interviews with commanders at all levels, and soldiers of all grades and races, during our factfinding trips to installations in continental United States and overseas. We also analyzed reports of racial incidents which have occurred at our installations in the past year. Finally, we took a hard look at our racial statistical data for possible indications of trends.

The first step in our assessement of racial tension in the Army was to answer the question, "Does the Army have a race problem?" The answer, I think, has to be "Yes." But the situation, although serious, can be dealt with as long as we recognize our problems. Unfortunately, for some of our problems, there are no immediate solutions.

The Army has a race problem because our country has a race problem. Our soldiers enter the service as products of our society, and continue, in this age of instant television communications and efficient press, to live as members of that society even while on active duty. They are not naive on the subject of race. Our soldiers have been made aware of it in many ways, and have built up a variety of attitudes long before they ever put on a uniform. Putting on the uniform does not tune them out.

No longer can the Army afford to think that putting black and white citizens in green uniforms relieves the commander of any responsibility to recognize the differences in racial background, experience and outlook among his troops. A Negro in uniform does not cease being a Negro and become a soldier instead. He becomes a Negro soldier. White troops, also, are not instantly cleansed of years of experience and attitudes. To take an ostrich-like approach to racial fears, hostilities and misunderstandings is indefensible—especially when the signs can be read in the racial obscenities written by both groups on latrine walls, and can be heard from an alarming number of black troops who readily complain that they suffer injustices solely because of their race. I can verify from my own experiences that the cries of the Negro soldier, enlisted and in some cases officers, have never been so loud.

The next step in our assessment was to examine the Negro soldier. I feel it is imperative that commanders divorce from their minds the age-old misconception that all Negroes are alike. It must be understood that the young Negro soldier, as well as the young Caucasion soldier, is much different from his counterpart of 10 years ago. His reaction to his continuing perception of discrimination has shifted. Formerly his typical response was hard work and endurance. Today the young black soldier is likely to have more personal and racial pride, more bitterness at real or imagined injustice, and often a chip on the shoulder.

The unfortunate dilemma of the young Negro soldier is that he has a legacy in the long grey line, but has not been told it. He is confused by the world around him—baited by some of his white racist bunkmates—hounded by black militants who preach violence and black separatism. And all the while he longs for military leadership throughout his chain of command to recognize and communicate with him.

A significant part of this assessment was an analysis of statistical data on the racial composition of the Army. We found many areas where the Army can be justly proud. The number of Negro noncommissioned officers in grades E–6 through E–9 and the number of Negro field grade officers have all shown a steady increase since 1964. There has, however, been a gradual decrease in the number of Negro E–5's and junior officers. A continuing problem has been the procurement and retention of Negro junior officers. At the end of 1968 there were more Negro lieutenant colonels than second lieutenants—more Negro majors than 1st lieutenants. If this trend continues, Negro field grade officer strength will also begin to decrease. Steps have been taken to prevent this, and I will discuss them later. In comparing all of our statistics with those from the other services, we find that the Army leads in every grade with the exception of E–5 percentages, where the Air Force is slightly higher.

Our next step was to examine the influences of militant groups on the Negro soldier. Representations of militancy are found in all strata of our society. It exists within all our institutions, on college campuses, in political parties, in labor unions, and even in the military. Militant groups and leaders are widespread, and their rhetoric is expounded freely in the mass media. Black militant leaders build upon the frustrations of Negroes and attempt to enkindle a spontaneous release in the form of aggressive action. Black militancy, as a whole, affords an emotional release in a continuing era of frustration and relative hopelessness. Many of our black soldiers were exposed to the ideology of the black militant prior to entering the Army. Some of these soldiers bring into the Army an inbred hatred for the so-called white establishment.

They expect to find racial discrimination in the Army and feel that racial equality can only be obtained by violently punishing those who commit discriminatory acts toward any of their black brothers. This type soldier is not necessarily a member of any militant group, such as the black panther party; and, fortunately, all evidence indicates that he is not a typical example of the average young Negro soldier. The average young Negro soldier tells us that he resents having his newly found racial pride misunderstood and interpreted as evidence that he is a black militant or a black racist. He realizes that the new problem facing the Army is protecting him and his white comrade from the influences of both the black and white racists. Information currently available to the Army staff does not substantiate that members of the black panther party are engaged in any organized activities in the Army. The exact number of black panthers in the Army is unknown. However, it does not appear that this organization has been able to gain a foothold in the Army; nor does it pose a serious threat at this time to Army morale, discipline and racial harmony.

Between December 1966 and October 1968, Department of the Army representatives accompanied a Defense Department fact finding team on visits to 19 military installations in the continental United States and six major overseas commands. They talked to hundreds of military personnel of all grades, races, and religions to assess field implementation of the Departments' regulations on equal opportunity and treatment of military personnel.

It was found during the visit to Europe that a communications gap was building between minority group enlisted personnel and their white company grade officers and noncommissioned officers. Complaints concerning promotions, malassignment by MOS, use of derogatory expressions in addressing Negro personnel, and poor German-American relations were noted. Generally, soldier comments went this way: "Like anybody else I understand being chewed out when I goof, but when they (NCO's and junior officers) say, 'You stupid black nigger,' or 'You

are the dumbest nigger I have ever seen,' I get mad. They don't refer to my white buddies by racial group—why me?" This situation is further complicated by the reaction of the "Overseas Weekly" to complaints of this type, which further fans the fire of misunderstanding and discontent. As has been the case in Germany for a number of years, personnel tend to frequent off-post facilities that cater to predominately white or black soldiers. This polarization is normally self-imposed because of different tastes for atmosphere, music, food, and dancing. Notwithstanding this fact, these places breed discontent and have led to explosive situations.

The administration of article 15, Uniform Code of Military Justice, came under serious attack from enlisted men during both formal and informal discussions. Generally the young black soldier, supported by many white and black career soldiers, expressed a belief that a dual standard of punishment was being imposed. This complaint was so prevalent that immediate followup action was taken by Headquarters, U.S. Army Europe. A detailed study of the administration of nonjudicial punishment was conducted.

This study made some very significant findings which are felt to be representative of the Army in general. It was found that commanders were not administering punishment in a racially discriminatory manner. It was noted, however, that such allegations as discriminatory reporting of offenses, and commanders' decisions to impose punishments being motivated by racial discrimination, are not susceptible to this type method of investigation.

Examining reductions in grade, both suspended and executed, it was found that a larger percentage of Negroes than Caucasians were reduced for their first offense. However, a larger percentage of Caucasians were reduced outright rather than being given a suspended sentence. This same trend was found in reductions for second offenses, and also in sentences involving forfeitures of pay and the restriction sanction.

The inquiry team found a clear disparity in the number of Negro soldiers administered nonjudicial punishment in contrast to his Caucasian counterpart. Approximately one of every eight soldiers in U.S. Army Europe is a Negro. However, he receives slightly more than one of every four nonjudicial punishments imposed in that command.

The relationship between the U.S. Army Europe soldier and his commander was found to have been impaired by a lack of confidence in the administration of nonjudicial punishment. The problem was found to have been particularly serious among Negro soldiers, primarily due to their receipt of such punishment in greatly disproportionate numbers without benefit of an acceptable and easily communicated rationale for same. Under these circumstances the question of whether the system is actually unfair or tainted by racial discrimination is moot. It is significant that most of the conclusions advanced by members of both races were based upon hearsay, and rather vague knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the alleged offense. Reliable information regarding the nature of the offense and the punishment administered was not being disseminated among the troops.

It was obvious that the average Negro soldier interviewed had little or nothing in common with his Caucasian commander. The Negro soldier's use of words or expressions accepted in the black community are frequently not understood, not allowed or both. Hillbilly music reminds him of things he would rather forget, and he feels that, even though it is seldom mentioned, his Caucasian superior resents any relationship between him and a German "Fraulein." Under these circumstances he develops no real identification with the authority figure who not only is empowered to order his life, but punish violations of those orders. There is little done to counterbalance these impressions. Negroes are getting more nonjudicial punishment; there are fewer of them; and in the segregated off-duty social pattern word travels fast. Every instance of discriminatory action, real or imagined, becomes significant and grows far out of proportion to reflect adversely upon the Army's pronouncements of equal opportunity which, unfortunately, never seem to filter down the chain of command.

As another example of a lack of effective communications, the team found that questions designed to reveal soldiers' sentiments regarding the welfare of their counterparts in the opposite race frequently resulted in confused stares. They could provide little information on how their comrades in the opposite race viewed any aspect of service in Europe. This indicated very little communication between Negro and Caucasian enlisted men.

Finally, although not a direct part of their study, the USAREUR inquiry team discovered an off-duty pattern of voluntary segregation which had polarized the racial groups, further complicating the communications problem. Based on these

findings, Headquarters, USAREUR initiated action to combat the lack of confidence in the administration of nonjudicial punishment, and disseminated the results of the study to subordinate commanders for the implementation of necessary corrective measures. In addition, the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Army, dispatched a letter to all Army Staff Judge Advocates listing actions necessary for the prevention of such complaints.

The findings of the staff visits to installations in U.S. Army, Pacific, generally parallel those of U.S. Army, Europe. There were, however, some observations which were more pronounced. In each group of minority group personnel interviewed, in all services, there was at least one member of the group who spoke of separatism and black power as the only means of guaranteed equality available to the black serviceman. Commanders were unaware that these personnel existed, which indicated that the chain of command was not providing the commander with this type of information. There were repeated reports of the use of offensive language, both verbally and in writing, on latrine and shower walls, in bunkers and gun pits. Finally, it was found that the polarization of the races and increased racial tensions were most obvious in those areas where troops were not in direct contact with the enemy. There was a total absence of racial tensions in the "fire bases" in Vietnam.

The findings of visits to Conus installations illustrate the complexity of the changing racial situation in the Army. In October 1968, after completion of the visits to Southeast Asia, it was concluded that racial tension appeared to be more serious overseas than in Conus. In his report, the Director for Civil Rights. Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Rights and Industrial Relations) commended the commanding generals of Fort Bragg and Fort Benning for their commitment, concern, and leadership in the area of racial harmony. Another installation singled out for praise was Camp Lejeune. It is interesting to note, also, that this factfinding team found no evidence of widespread racial violence in Army installations in Conus.

Since the summer of 1968, numerous charges have been leveled against the Army and its sister services concerning the existence of intense racial tensions on our installations, in Conus and overseas. Invariably, reports reaching this headquarters have stated that there have been no serious racial problems. In August 1969, after mounting press, public, and congressional interest in the riots at Camp Lejeune and other installations, the Army staff requested major commanders to submit a report of significant incidents with racial overtones which had occurred since August 1, 1968. They were further requested to provide information relative to trends, and the effects these incidents had no morale and discipline.

The commanders reported that these incidents of group disorders and acts of violence, involving persons of different races, had occurred on Army installations worldwide.

Although incidents, group disorders, and acts of violence are occurring among our soldiers on installations worldwide, reports from the field state there are no discernible trends, nor has there been any significant adverse effect on morale or discipline. Most disturbances are thought to be spontaneous in nature.

However, our analysis of the racial situation Army-wide is not in full agreement with these estimates of the local situation. This was further strengthened by the results of our recent discussions with white and black troops at Fort Riley and Fort Bragg. We feel that it is not be taken lightly when, in a military environment, regardless of geographical location, men begin fighting men of another race.

During the period August 20 to August 28, 1969, I visited Fort Bragg and Fort Riley. The purpose of these visits was to evaluate the current status of equal opportunity and nondiscrimination policies and analyze current efforts to promote racial harmony within the Army.

At both installations, the team was given a briefing by the installation general and special staffs, followed by conferences with commanders at all levels, and soldiers of all grades and races. In both cases, the staffs had little knowledge of racial tensions at the installation. However, as we went further down the chain of command we found more and more awareness of and concern for the existence of racial tension. The junior officers and lower enlisted men were quick to respond to questions concerning racial animosities. Most black enlisted men and many white enlisted men and junior officers said that the degree of racial understanding in the Army is low and that tensions are getting worse.

Assessments of the degree of danger varied, but several different individuals said if nothing is done, there are likely to be large-scale disruptions in a year or two.

As a result of observations made during these visits and an analysis of recent complaints of alleged racial discrimination received at this headquarters, we have identified certain emerging racial trends.

Because of a nationwide movement toward black self-awareness, self-determination, and destiny control, the young black soldier entering the Army is more desirous of retaining his identity rather than losing it. Because of a lack of understanding of this resurgence of interest in black consciousness, some white officers and NCO's see the young black soldier's racial pride in terms of a conspiracy, or infiltration by subversive groups. White troops, by the same token may feel put off by the tendency of blacks to band together as a closely knit minority. The attitudes of Negroes today seem to have many of the white soldiers and officers apprehensive. Meanwhile, the Negro looks upon these reactions of caucasian personnel as further example of white oppression. It is obvious that a need exists for mutual understanding.

The problem of polarization of the races is becoming more serious and is a direct result of a lack of proper communications. We found at Fort Bragg two self-imposed segregated noncommissioned officers club annexes, one catering to blacks and one catering to whites. There was a general consensus that these clubs have not caused any deterioration in racial harmony among personnel at Fort Bragg. At Fort Riley, several Caucasian enlisted personnel and one Caucasian junior officer complained of being thrown out of quasi-private clubs in the surrounding towns because they attempted to enter these clubs along with a Negro military buddy. Ironically, these clubs are run by local chapters of the American Legion, the AMVETS, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The increase in aggressiveness and vocalism of the Negro soldier is not necessarily a problem. It only becomes a problem when a commander overacts and writes off the spirited ones as troublemakers and militants. On the other hand, he must be firm and insure that his troops realize that discipline is not discrimination.

As a part of the Negro soldier's new awareness and racial pride, he has developed a drive toward total togetherness. We have identified this as a most significant and dangerous trend. It is reflected by an increasing number of group-type assaults, by mob response to intervention of military police, and by petitions signed by large numbers of black soldiers complaining of alleged racial discrimination in their units. The young white soldier has not been given much attention in this study, because he has not undergone the drastic change found in the black soldier. However, he plays a key role in the maintenance of racial harmony in the Army. Generally speaking he gets along well with his black counterpart during duty hours. It is during off-duty hours that he withdraws from the role of the aggressor and becomes more passive than he has ever been before. He sees the new black awareness as a threat to his security and therefore seeks the companionship of other white soldiers for protection and strength. Fortunately, at this time, he is using his knowledge of the system to strike back at the black soldier. Our big problems will come when the white soldiers decide or are forced to also ban together for retaliation. The Negro feels that he is the victim of institutionalized racism in the Army. He complains of many things to prove this point—the lack of Negro cosmetics in the post exchanges—little if any visibility of the Negro soldier in training films and other publications. He also complains of the unfairness in the discretionary decisions of whether simply to warn a man or punish him under article 15 or whether to bring him before a trial by court-martial. If the standards of treatment are not clearly defined, it is easy for a man who has come out second best to conclude that he has been mistreated. If the man is black, it is natural for him to assume racial discrimination. Many commanders and noncommissioned officers never openly acknowledge the existence of racial differences, or even state what their policies are, thus permitting tensions to mount in their units.

Meanwhile, black soldiers see racial slurs on latrine walls, observe overt acts of discrimination, real or imagined, in their daily lives, and naturally assume the commander condones it all. Often they complain about the same things which their white comrades complain about. But the Negro blames discrimination while the Caucasian faults the Army as a whole. The Army's efforts to afford equality of opportunity have, over the years, resulted in a situation where the

majority of Negro troops are now concentrated in the combat arms rather than in service, supply, and labor units as was the case during World War II. This same equality has also caused an imbalance in the number of Negro officers assigned to units where a large percentage of the troops are Negro. The Negro enlisted man does not understand why he does not see many Negro field grade officers and erroneously takes this as a further example of discriminatory practices. We heard this complaint often on our trips.

After an in-depth analysis of these personal observations, reports from the field, and reports of Department of Defense and DA factfinding trips, we developed some conclusions to our assessment of racial tension in the Army. Principal staff sections dealing with matters of racial discrimination prove or disprove specific allegations made by soldiers, but seem unable to determine the root causes of such charges. Thus commanders are provided with raw statistics (number of cases) without an in-depth assessment of the problems incident to the cases. In this age of social upheaval, the standard indicators for assessing troop attitudes, morale and discipline are not always effective. All indications point toward an increase in racial tension, which is more pronounced in those units where troops are not in daily contact with an armed enemy.

Unless immediate action is taken to identify problem areas at the squad and platoon level, increased racial confrontations can be expected. Aggressive command action, firm but impartial discipline, and good leadership can prevent physical confrontations of racial groups. Our leaders at higher levels are sometimes handicapped by a lack of proper intelligence of the actual racial situation in their commands. However, troops at squad and platoon level, along with their junior officers, are well aware of the dangerous situation in which they live. Negro soldiers seem to have lost faith in the Army system. They are not aware of the many accomplishments of the Army in their behalf and their leaders are either unaware their troops have complaints or are unprepared to handle the problems which come to their attention. All young black troops and a large number of white troops expressed a desire to openly discuss racial differences and misunderstandings in order that tensions can be lessened.

Report after report continues to drive home the message that our principal problem is that people don't communicate on this problem to remove the apparent lack of mutual understanding. We must also understand that there are biased blacks as well as biased whites, and the commander who lets it be known that he won't condone any trouble from either group will never have racial problems in his unit.

With racial discord the greatest morale problem, and the most difficult challenge to leadership today, the Army is, nevertheless, turning loose its junior officers and NCO's to cope with these problems without any formal training. A need clearly exists for instruction on race relations to sensitize our leaders and give them the assistance they urgently need. I might add, at this point, that the Army staff has been closely monitoring the equal opportunity program, and much of the material in this assessment was gathered, analyzed, and acted upon long before the current series of racial incidents at military installations.

As an example, in January 1969, we initiated action to include this subject as a major area of interest for all Army inspectors general during the conduct of their inspections. This should greatly assist in correcting the deficiencies in communications mentioned in this briefing.

Steps have been taken to combat the decreasing number of minority group junior officers. The U.S. Military Academy has endeavored to recruit more Negro cadets. Forty-five Negro cadets entered West Point this past June. In addition, Department of the Army is studying methods to increase ROTC enrollments in colleges whose student bodies are predominantly Negro.

Several other actions have been taken or are being taken to reduce racial tensions and promote racial harmony in the Army. A recent Chief of Staff message for dissemination to all troops restated the Army's commitment to equal opportunity and treatment for all personnel. Briefings on racial tension have been presented to key Department of the Army staff officers, to selected general officers, and to several commanders in the field. A Department of the Army representative will accompany a Department of Defense factfinding team on additional trips to oversea commands to assess racial matters. A series of seminars will be conducted at installation level and higher echelons to afford us an opportunity to discuss racial problems and ways to reduce them. We will try to develop a set of indicators to assist commanders in the early detection of the root causes of racial unrest. We also plan to incorporate instruction in race relations into our training programs. Continuous

emphasis is being placed on the procurement of Negro junior officers, and we are also working on a plan to redistribute Negro field grade officers more evenly throughout the Army to offset the imbalance of those officers assigned to units with large concentrations of Negro soldiers. Another matter which is receiving continued emphasis is the recognition of Negro personnel by insuring that they receive appropriate coverage in all available news media, both within and outside the Army, and by insuring also that they receive their share of recognition in Army historical records and publications. Finally, the merchandising staff of the Army and Air Force exchange service is analyzing the types of merchandise and publications available in post and base exchanges to insure that the needs of Negro service personnel and their dependents will be met.

In summary, the roots of the race problem lie outside the Army. But the tendrils have spread within it, and must be recognized and dealt with. We are not just concerned with the possibility of race riots at Army posts, real though that may be. Such outbreaks will happen only because of a decline in discipline and morale. Our regulation on equal opportunity and treatment holds commanders, at all levels, responsible for promoting racial harmony in their units. Our past achievements in equality of opportunity have been made possible by outstanding leadership. This same leadership must exert itself in the elimination of racial tensions and the removal of all vestiges of racial discrimination from Army life.

CLOSING OF TRAINING CENTERS

Mr. ADDABBO. With the reductions in forces, how many training centers have been closed within the last year?

General GETTYS. We are in the process now of closing training centers at Fort Gordon and Fort Benning. We are phasing down from 560 companies to 460 by March of 1970. We will go from 460 to 400 by September of 1970 and we will go down to 300 companies by July of 1971. These are the basic training companies.

Mr. ADDABBO. Are those closings and savings reflected in this budget?

General GETTYS. Yes, sir.

General KERWIN. I would like to point out that this is not closing installations, these are the training companies within the installations.

TRAINING PRIOR TO VIETNAM DUTY

Mr. ADDABBO. All right. What is the present minimum amount of training time a serviceman receives before he is sent to Vietnam?

General KERWIN. The minimum time by law is 16 weeks. In most cases, though, the individual does stay longer than that. If he is scheduled to go to Vietnam, he gets an extra week of Vietnamese training. Of course, he will have his leave and travel time on top of that. The minimum is 4 months.

TROOP DEPLOYMENTS TO THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. ADDABBO. Are we planning to increase the troop levels in South Korea or in the Middle East?

General KERWIN. Sir, I don't think I could answer that question. I am in the individual personnel business and not directly involved with the strategy.

Mr. ADDABBO. With the present cutbacks, in the event of any further worsening of conditions in the Middle East would we be able to fulfill any troop commitments there?

General KERWIN. Here again I believe you are in the operations side, whereas I am involved with the individual personnel programs.

Mr. ADDABBO. Could you supply for the record any information that you might have as far as additional troops for South Korea or the Middle East?

General KERWIN. Sir, I will look into it.

(The information follows:)

The Army is not planning to increase troop strength in South Korea or the Middle East.

In the event of further worsening conditions in the Middle East, the U.S. Army would be able to meet any troop commitments there, provided conditions remain short of a major confrontation, and provided there is no concurrent military situation requiring fulfillment of our commitment to NATO. No troops will be sent to the Middle East unless the President of the United States orders their commitment.

MALARIA IN VIETNAM

Mr. ADDABBO. We have had a serious problem with malaria in South Vietnam. Has that been brought under control?

General NEEL. We still have more malaria than we would like to have over there but the rate this past year, through November, has been down. The rate per thousand of average strength per year was 19.7; this past year—1969—that is, as compared to 24.8 in 1968. Now, when I was out there in 1965 it was at the alltime peak of 48.5. So we have gone from 48 down to 19.

ACCEPTANCE STANDARDS FOR MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. ADDABBO. We have had in the past several reductions in the standards of acceptance for military service. Will there be further revisions in the standards?

General KERWIN. I see no further revision in the standards at the moment.

Mr. ADDABBO. Will they be upgraded because of the reductions in forces?

General KERWIN. Sir, I don't think I could address that at the present time. It would depend to a great degree on what reductions in forces we do have and whether we move to an all-volunteer Army. Certainly what the requirements are will be a necessary part of the answer.

Mr. ADDABBO. In your statement you say the manpower program for fiscal year 1970 provides for an end strength of 1,363,000. In a recent briefing I was given information that this would be ———. Is this just by coincidence or by design?

General KERWIN. I would say, sir—and again—this would be on the operational side—that it would be mostly by coincidence if that did happen.

INVOLUNTARY VIETNAM TOURS

Mr. ADDABBO. In your statement on page 6 you say in spite of troop reductions in Vietnam additional personnel will be required to serve a third involuntary tour in that area in fiscal year 1970.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir; that is right. At the present time we have about 50 individuals who are back on their third tour of duty in Vietnam. By the end of fiscal year 1970, we will have returned approximately 100 individuals for their third involuntary tour.

Mr. ADDABBO. What would be the reasons for that?

General KERWIN. The primary reason is the requirement for certain skills. We attempt to keep the people in the sustaining base, here in the continental United States, and also in Europe, a minimum of 25 months. Unless we get a proper ratio between the number of people needed in Vietnam and the sustaining base, then personnel with those particular skills in scarce supply, for which we would have less need will have to go back on an involuntary basis more often than someone who has a common skill.

Mr. ADDABBO. Couldn't that be prevented by proper assignment of a draftee or an enlistee in training in the States when he enters the service?

General BRINKER. You can't fill all of these positions with draftees because they simply don't have the experience, the expertise, or the leadership. The ones that are having to go back again and again are highly skilled career people and the ones who have had a chance to learn these things and have been trained to do them. You could achieve the numbers required but you wouldn't get the proper skills in order to get the job done or to lead the draftees that are going over in large numbers.

Mr. ADDABBO. We have increased the contingent at the Military Academy. Couldn't we prepare ourselves through the Military Academy by training them right in the schools so that they would have the skills in time? If you had taken this 4 years ago, by this time they would have had the skills to replace these men, rather than having to send them back again.

General KERWIN. Those returned for their third involuntary tour at the present time are enlisted personnel. Very shortly it will probably pertain to some officers.

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you. No further questions.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Rhodes.

ACTIVE ARMY DIVISIONS SUPPORTED

Mr. RHODES. General, you mentioned there were 17⅓ divisions projected for fiscal 1971. Is that the end strength for 1971 or the beginning strength?

General KROESEN. Our program right now allows for us to retain the 17⅓ divisions through this fiscal year.

Mr. RHODES. The beginning of the year you will have 17⅓ and at the end of the year you will have 17⅓?

General KROESEN. I cannot say that. I can only say that our program will allow us to retain them but later decisions may change the total number.

Mr. RHODES. As far as you now know, the situation will be as I have mentioned?

General KROESEN. As far as I now know, the program is for 17⅓ divisions.

Mr. RHODES. Do you have any regimental combat teams on top of the 17⅓ divisions or any separate battalions?

General KROESEN. We have separate battalions in the continental United States. We have separate brigades in our special mission forces in Panama and Alaska. We have a special mission brigade in Berlin.

Mr. RHODES. Could you furnish for the record at this point a listing of the various organized groups of Army troops down through the separate battalions?

General KERWIN. We will do that, sir.

Mr. RHODES. I don't mean a listing by number or by name but a listing by quantity.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. That cannot be published, though. That will have to be classified.

Mr. RHODES. All right. It can be expurgated.

(The information follows:)

Army force structure for fiscal year 1970

	Army forces
Division forces:	
Divisions:	
Airborne	1
Infantry	5
Mechanized	4
Armored	4
Airmobile	2
Total	16
Brigades:	
Airborne	1
Infantry	2
Mechanized	1
Total	4
Armored cavalry regiments	5
Special mission forces:	
Brigades: Infantry	4
School troop brigades:	
Infantry	1
Armored	1

RACIAL MIX IN VIETNAM

Mr. RHODES. My colleague from New York asked some very good questions about the racial situation in Vietnam. Could you give us some idea of what the racial mix is in Vietnam at the present time, mainly with regard to troops in combat elements? Why don't you provide it for the record. Provide the mix in combat units as against the mix in noncombat units and, if you can, compare it with the racial mix in units in the continental United States, also.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

NEGRO PERCENT OF ARMY STRENGTH

	Army-wide	Continental United States	Total RVN	Major combat units RVN
Negro (percent)	9.9	8.9	9.8	10.0

TRAINING SENIOR OFFICERS TO FLY HELICOPTERS

Mr. RHODES. Also, would you provide for the record a better statement than I think we have had on the probable assignments for colonels and generals who will receive flight training, and also a justification of the requirements for colonels and generals to take flight training now. This is a change in policy. I do not know why it is necessary. I think we need some better justification, for the record, of it than we now have.

General KERWIN. Very well, sir.

(The information follows:)

Training of senior officers as aviators is not a new or radical idea, nor is it a change of policy.

The U.S. Navy instituted a senior officer flight training program prior to World War II to meet rapidly expanding requirements. Notable graduate from the program was Admiral Halsey.

Senior officers have been brought into Army aviation on a fairly regular basis since 1942 (approximately two per year). Comparatively large groups of colonels and lieutenant colonels were trained in 1946–48 (25), 1955–57 (24), 1960–61 (27), and 1962–64 (32). Some of the most notable architects of modern Army airmobility were graduates of these special programs or individual inputs. Among them are General Howze, Lieutenant General Kinnard, and Lieutenant General Tolson.

Historically, the Army has based its authorization for senior officer aviators on identifiable TOE/TDA positions in the force structure, plus add-ons such as transients, patients, students, and career development ground duty. This approach, although valid in the past, is inadequate to cope with the present and future dynamic changes permeating the airmobile-minded Army.

Structure requirements for colonel aviators in fiscal year 1964 were 120, as compared to 138 listed in fiscal year 1970 requirements. Many of these requirements have developed on a case-by-case basis as the specific need for an officer with the aviation skill was developed and justified. Current planning on post-T-day force levels indicates that colonel aviator requirements will continue in the range of about 138. There is reason to believe that the need for aviation-trained colonels in the Army will be substantially greater than the number generated by a detailed analysis of aviation positions.

The airmobile concept has been rewritten in the past 5 years to incorporate new combinations of aviation and ground combat units such as aerial artillery battalions, air cavalry squadrons, and the larger airmobile division. Other divisional aviation has been modified and expanded. Nondivisional aviation has been expanded to the point in Vietnam where the daily operations of combat support and combat service support forces are conditioned by heavy reliance on air vehicular support for mission accomplishment. Tactical air mobility provided by nondivisional aviation makes it possible to conduct airmobile combat operations with a standard ground division on a substantial scale. Experience to date in Vietnam shows that the Army is irrevocably committed to aviation as the primary means of vehicular mobility in low-level conflict situations.

Despite this expansion of Army aviation in the field, however, there has been no senior officer infusion program in the past 5 years. Several general officers have taken positions in the airmobile divisions in Vietnam after abbreviated school training, followed by many hours of flying in combat to achieve the aviation designation. This method of infusion is less desirable because the individual lacks the qualification of aviator when he needs it most—as a leader of troops in combat. There are many other general officers and colonels in Vietnam who are not aviators but who, by virtue of their key positions, make the majority of the decisions for commitment of aviation and air assault forces.

Of the 396 colonels in Vietnam at the end of 1968, only 21 were aviators. Most of the aviator colonels are in the command and staff chain of the aviation structure. While they perform essential functions in the chain of command, it is the nonaviator colonel in the chain of command who makes the majority of the daily decisions on the time, place, and circumstances of aviation and airmobile force commitments.

It seems clear that much of the overall effectiveness of airmobile warfare in

Vietnam rests with the nonaviator colonels. A greater presence of aviator colonels in the Army could permit the placement of aviator colonels in key nonaviation positions where their knowledge and experience would further enhance the effectiveness of the substantial aviation investment in the combined arms operations.

Changes in the character and magnitude of aviation research and development, training, and logistics, paralleling the expansion of airmobility on the battlefield suggest that more senior officers be trained as aviators. Aircraft R.D.T. & E. programs with associated systems and subsystems have grown in leaps and bounds to the point where the maintenance of a modernized aircraft fleet is sensitive to accurate selection, phasing, and funding of items. Capital investments in aviation training, equipment, and facilities have soared during the past 5 years. Annual training costs have risen about fourfold. Similar expansions have occurred in logistics structure, operations, and costs while the aircraft inventory to be supported has grown from 6,539 to 11,922. In view of these changes, it is hardly surprising to find that the number of aviators serving in joint and Army staff activities increased from about 65 in 1965 to approximately 250 at present. It emphasizes, however, the increasing needs for senior officer aviators in high-level management positions.

Expansion of airmobility in the Army has been marked by increased decentralization of aviation functions on the one hand, and greater centralization of management on the other hand. To satisfy the accounting requirements of Department of Defense, pressures are developed toward centralized management control over all aspects of the program from the drawing board to the battlefield. Attainment of airmobility goals under these pressures will require a substantial number of senior officers comprising the best meld of command, staff, and technical expertise that can be aggregated.

It is estimated that the cost of training and maintaining a colonel on flight status for the reasonable average of 6 years would be approximately $57,600. Considering the fact that he would bring a wealth of branch material knowledge and skill to the aviation program, the costs seem reasonable. The blend of individuals of this type with the career aviator colonel combines the strongest possible ground orientation with the strongest possible collection of aviation skills. This combination will afford the depth of leadership and management skills required to cope with the growing aviation program. It is estimated that the potential payback would justify a continuing senior officer flight training program.

An applicant merely submits a postcard notification and a flight physical. This action triggers the selection process. Selection for flight training is done by a board of officers consisting of a general officer and four senior colonels not eligible for the program. From the list of applicants they pick the best qualified by a detailed analysis of the applicants' personnel records.

Upon graduation from flight school, these aviators will be assigned throughout the Army structure and joint or combined staffs where their aviation expertise can be used best in enhancing accomplishment of the Army mission.

The Army has identified general officer positions which should be filled by qualified aviators in order to maximize their effectiveness within the respective organizations. Generally, these are command positions within our airmobile divisions, aviation brigade, aviation training, and aviation procurement and development agencies. In order to provide necessary flexibility in assigning general officers in these positions, other positions have been identified for which it is highly desirable to fill with a qualified general officer aviator. These positions are primarily those associated with the establishment of Army training doctrine or the planning of tactical operations.

It is emphasized that the assignment of a qualified general officer to these latter positions is highly desirable not only because they can contribute much in the way of aviation and airmobility doctrine, but also because some rotational base must be available for reassignment to and from the positions for which a general officer aviator is required.

RETIREMENT AFTER 20 YEARS OF SERVICE

Mr. RHODES. Turning to the incentives for staying in the service, it seems to me that after a person has been in for 20 years, he has more incentive to get out than to stay in. In other words, the very incentives which have kept him in the service for 20 years, after that become very powerful incentives for getting out.

I am wondering if you have had a chance to address yourself to this problem, and have you found a solution for it?

General KERWIN. There is no doubt that there are certain incentives to leave the service. I had an individual visit my home just the other day who was a former member of the JAG Corps, who less than 4 months after retirement was drawing $45 an hour for his services down in the South.

Each individual, I think, when he reaches the 20-year mark then assesses his chances of being promoted to the rank of colonel and to the general officer ranks. He also has to make an assessment of the effects of family separation in Vietnam and the number of repeated tours. Certainly the size of his family and the requirement to educate his children have a very heavy influence on his decision.

This was addressed by a DOD committee and they found it was very difficult and very critical for a man to make an assessment at the 20-year point in his career. There are many factors, of course, to include the high cost of living today and family separation because of Vietnam, that tend to cause a man at that point in time to leave the service.

CASH PAYMENT IN LIEU OF BENEFITS

Mr. RHODES. There are certain educational benefits which accrue to members of the armed services after a certain period of service. Have you ever thought of offering these individuals the cost of those educational benefits if they will stay in for a certain period of time in lieu of the education? In other words, I suspect a lot of people get out because the opportunity is there, and they feel if they do not take it now, the opportunity will end. It might be an incentive for them to stay in the service if they got an equivalent benefit.

General KERWIN. You could offer an educational benefit. However, we must consider how we can take advantage of the time and the money it takes to give that man a particular education. If it takes him 2 years, we probably would require 2 to 4 years of additional service from him. There is the question of service utilization to get a return for our money.

You bring out a very good point, though. The greatest desire of the young man nowadays is to get an education. In our studies of the all-volunteer Army and the effect we think this will have, we have learned that one of the biggest incentives to come into the Army or to remain in the Army is either to complete a college education or go on to a graduate degree. I think it would be more profitable to the Army to offer the man a college education or graduate degree to meet the requirements of the Army in the early stages of his career rather than after 20 years of service.

Mr. RHODES. Of course, you have the problem later on, I think, of making sure that the individual fulfills his obligation and does it with credit. In other words, you have a tremendous investment at the very beginning of a man's career before you really have had a chance to assess him or he has a chance to assess the degree to which he finds the service congenial.

General KERWIN. That is very true.

Mr. RHODES. It is a problem. I am glad to know that the Army is addressing itself to it. I think too many times we find ourselves training junior executives for corporations and not realizing very much

in the way of benefits after they reach their peak. I do not think there is any doubt that an officer certainly has reached his peak about the time he has served 20 years. From there out until maybe the 28th year, he is at the very height of his capabilities and the degree of service he can give the country.

I certainly hope we would address ourselves to an attempt to keep people after 20 years service.

I used to be a personnel man in the service. We used to have all sorts of tussles with the form 20 classification record, and later on, just before I got out of the service in World War II, the classification process practically controlled personnel assignments, promotions, and the like, which I now think was a good idea. At the time, I resisted it rather bitterly, as much as a major can resist anything that comes down from on high.

CAREER PLANNING

What is your situation now insofar as classification of the individual is concerned, and at what stage do you actually plan a career for a Regular Army man?

General KERWIN. I will ask General Boye, who heads the Office of Personnel Operations to address that.

General BOYE. As General Kerwin mentioned in his statement, in addition to the military occupational skills, the MOS's which we have, of which we have some 69 general groupings and even up to almost 1,000 breakdowns of the skills from there—we have now grouped the skills together into larger groupings with the express purpose of permitting an enlisted man in a given skill area to look ahead to promotion to the top rank.

This does not mean he can stay in the confines of the narrow area he starts. As he develops and as his education and on-the-job training improve, he may have to move into different parts of that skill.

This has had a very important impact on that enlisted man's future. He can look ahead and, if he applies himself, he can see the senior ranks available to him.

DETERMINATION OF PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Mr. RHODES. Have you any continuing studies to determine, No. 1, the personnel needs of the various elements of the Army and, No. 2, the means by which those needs will be filled? In other words, have you a continuing personnel inventory to compare with the continuing requirements of personnel throughout the Army?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. RHODES. Would you like to enlarge on that a little bit for us?

General KERWIN. There is a continuing procedure to determine what our requirements are and what the force structure should be, also what the skill requirements within that force structure are, both in the top 6 enlisted personnel and in the officer corps. Then, as far as enlisted personnel are concerned, it is a question of determining how many people we need, what the training program should be in both the BCT and AIT, and what our long-range schooling program should be.

In the officer corps there is the need to determine how many officers we need by branch, what their training should be, the requirements for military and civil schooling.

We are constantly reassessing this to determine, in my particular area of responsibility, whether we are looking far enough ahead to provide the people trained in the skills required to meet the force structure of the Army.

Mr. RHODES. I think it very important that this effort continue. In fact, I sometimes wonder if we could not do a better job of training people in civilian life who are so-called hard core unemployed and people who have not received the same advantages through life as others have, if we could use the methods you just described, not only in training these people, but in training them so we could be sure that there would be a job at the end of the training pipeline.

This is one of the problems we have in society.

The further you develop skills which fit into the pattern of the Army of the future, the better off we will be as far as our planning for the future is concerned.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. We are also continually looking at the program we have to make sure we get the best training for the money we spend and the number of trainers involved.

CENTRALIZED ENLISTED PROMOTIONS

Mr. RHODES. I gathered from your statement that you now have centralized promotions in the top grades of enlisted men.

General KERWIN. E–8 and E–9, sir.

Mr. RHODES. In other words, an E–8 stationed at Fort Riley, Kans., would be promoted to E–9 at such time as somebody in Washington determines that he merits that promotion?

General KERWIN. In the past, sir, we had decentralized promotions to fill a quota of vacancies throughout the world. Now records of all E–8's and E–9's are reviewed at Department of the Army, and selection for promotion is handled by General Boye's office. Competing personnel are all matched against each other in order to assure that we select the very best from among the group. Our first selection boards, both for E–8 and E–9, were completed not too long ago.

We feel that the centralized system provides much more equity and objectivity to all eligible personnel, no matter where they are, worldwide. So far, we feel we have been quite successful in making the promotion system more visible to the individual. We are also thinking at the present time of extending this system down to the lower grades, once we increase our capability.

FAIRNESS OF EFFICIENCY REPORT SYSTEM

Mr. RHODES. I suppose you have to depend largely on the evaluation of the NCO by the officer who happens to be his commanding officer at the time, as well as those who have been previously.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. I brought out in my opening statement, we have a standardized promotion form which is used worldwide. It takes into consideration the amount of Federal service, time in grade, enlisted evaluation score, civilian education, and military education. The soldier is given a score based on a total of 1,000 points. Within that and the commander's evaluation, he then competes against all other people from the other posts, camps, and stations.

Mr. RHODES. Of course, you will never get over, I suppose, the fact that certain officers just rate higher than other officers do in evaluating their subordinates.

General KERWIN. Sir, this is a continuing problem.

Mr. RHODES. That is right

General KERWIN. We are always faced with the fact that some people rate higher than others. We have never been able to come up with a system that determines whether you add for the hard rater or deduct for the easier rater.

Mr. RHODES. I do not suppose you ever will, unless you have a man in the service long enough so that those ratings sort of even out through the years. Even then, I guess you can never be sure, as long as people are people, that they are being absolutely fair.

General KERWIN. This entire question of the efficiency report system, particularly as applied to officers, is reviewed constantly, and I have it under review in my office now. General Davis has a team to look not just at the form which is used but also the methods used in completing the form to attempt to insure that what is put on the form is the best evaluation.

UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS DEPOSIT PROGRAM

Mr. RHODES. The gentleman from New York also mentioned the savings deposits which soldiers can make. What rate of interest do you pay?

General KERWIN. Ten percent, sir.

Mr. RHODES. Ten percent?

General KERWIN. Yes, sir. An individual overseas can deposit up to $10,000. The amount that you can deposit is the unallotted portion of your pay, not to exceed $10,000. Primarily, the deposit program is to reduce gold flow.

Mr. RHODES. Is it possible to make cash deposits other than of your pay?

General KERWIN. No, sir; no cash deposits may be made other than the unallotted portion.

Mr. RHODES. But you can accumulate from pay up to $10,000?

General KERWIN. That is correct, sir.

GRANTS, SUBSIDIES AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Mr. RHODES. On page 6, I noticed an item called grants, subsidies, and contributions. It is not a large item, but it intrigued me because I do not know to whom you grant, whom you subsidize, or to whom you contribute.

General KERWIN. Sir, I will ask Mr. Hutchison to address that question.

Mr. HUTCHISON. Sir, I will have to furnish that for the record. I cannot recall.

General TAYLOR. That is a reimbursable item that you are looking at. It has to do with rewards for apprehension of deserters.

Mr. RHODES. "Subsidy" is a bad word. I do not like it.

General TAYLOR. I do not like it, either, sir.

(The information follows:)

The item you referred to, as defined by the Bureau of the Budget, comprises grants, subsidies, gratuities, and other aid for which cash payments are made to States, other political subdivisions, corporations, associations, and individuals; contributions to international societies, commissions, proceedings, or projects, whether in lump sum or as quotas of expenses; contributions fixed by treaty;

grants to foreign countries; taxes imposed by taxing authorities where the Federal Government has consented to taxation (excluding the employers' share of Federal Insurance Contribution Act taxes); and payments in lieu of taxes.

The amount in the MPA budget identified with this object classification consists only of rewards, not to exceed $25 in any one case, and payments for expenses of prisoners, not to exceed $25 where no reward is paid, made incident to the pursuit, arrest, apprehension, and delivery of deserters, escaped military prisoners, and members absent without leave. These costs are collected from the members' pay and are credited to the MPA appropriation.

Mr. RHODES. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES

Mr. WHITTEN. In last year's hearings, on page 102, there was a tabulation showing the overseas station allowances. Would you please provide for the record a similar schedule.

(The information follows:)

The cost-of-living allowance rates are prescribed for officer and enlisted men with and without dependents and they vary by grade and number of dependents in each country and locality within the country where authorized. This allowance represents the difference between all living costs, except housing, in the United States and similar costs at overseas stations. The U.S. base is determined from data obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the military services. The oversea base is determined from State Department price information wherever possible. The rates are established after comparing prices of selected goods and services, purchased at oversea stations, with prices prevailing in the United States. These rates are constantly reviewed and revised by the Per Diem, Travel, and Transportation Allowance Committee, based on changing economic conditions in the overseas areas. Therefore, detailed reports reflecting numbers and allowances at any specific time do not constitute a valid basis for projecting future requirements. The estimated requirements for U.S. Army Forces reflected in this budget estimate are based on actual amounts expended during the latest period prior to submission of the budget estimate, updated in accordance with known strength changes in the countries or localities affected. Examples of cost-of-living allowances currently authorized in different countries are as follows:

DAILY COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES—CAPTAIN O-3

	Without dependents	1 dependent	2 dependents	3 dependents	4 dependents	5 or more dependents
Afghanistan	$2.70	$3.25	$3.40	$3.60	$3.80	$4.00
Juneau, Alaska	6.60	7.90	8.35	8.80	9.30	9.80
Nome, Alaska	7.20	8.65	9.10	9.60	10.15	10.70
Algeria, Algiers	5.10	6.10	6.45	6.80	7.20	7.60
Melbourne, Australia	.90	1.10	1.15	1.20	1.25	1.35
Vienna, Austria	2.40	2.90	3.05	3.20	3.40	3.55
Quebec City, Canada	1.20	1.45	1.50	1.60	1.70	1.80
Bombay, India	.30	.35	.40	.40	.40	.45
Norway	1.50	1.80	1.90	2.00	2.10	2.25
Karachi, Pakistan	1.20	1.45	1.50	1.60	1.70	1.80
Switzerland	4.20	5.05	5.30	5.60	5.90	6.25
Venezuela	4.20	5.05	5.30	5.60	5.90	6.25
St. Thomas, V.I	3.00	3.60	3.80	4.00	4.25	4.45

DAILY COST-OF-LIVING ALLOWANCES—E-4

Afghanistan	$1.60	$1.90	$2.00	$2.15	$2.25	$2.35
Juneau, Alaska	3.90	4.60	4.90	5.25	5.50	5.75
Nome, Alaska	4.25	5.00	5.35	5.70	6.00	6.30
Algeria, Algiers	3.00	3.55	3.80	4.05	4.25	4.45
Melbourne, Australia	.55	.65	.65	.70	.75	.80
Vienna, Austria	1.40	1.65	1.80	1.90	2.00	2.10
Quebec City, Canada	.70	.85	.90	.95	1.00	1.05
Bombay, India	.20	.20	.20	.25	.25	.25
Norway	.90	1.05	1.10	1.20	1.25	1.30
Karachi, Pakistan	.70	.85	.90	.95	1.00	1.05
Switzerland	2.60	2.90	3.10	3.35	3.50	3.65
Venezuela	2.60	2.90	3.10	3.35	3.50	3.65
St. Thomas, V.I	1.80	2.10	2.25	2.40	2.50	2.60

PROCUREMENT OF MILITARY PERSONNEL

Mr. WHITTEN. Would you please provide for the record the following. First, a table indicating your estimate for fiscal year 1971, officer and enlisted procurements by source, and compare these procurements with fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

(The material follows:)

COMPARISON OF PROCUREMENT BY SOURCES, FISCAL YEARS 1969, 1970, 1971

OFFICER

Source	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
Service academies	759	715	716
ROTC	14,435	14,810	15,338
OCS	8,807	8,339	7,000
Voluntary active duty [1]	1,206	2,644	62
JAG, CHAP, WAC, MSG [2]	1,065	1,312	298
MC, DC, VC	3,627	3,222	2,813
RA appointments (from civil life)	36	30	30
Miscellaneous [3]	394	50	50
Total male and WAC	30,329	31,122	26,307
Nurses and Army medical specialists	1,237	1,612	1,711
Warrant officers	5,933	5,209	1,893
Involuntary active duty (Reserve)	37		
Grand total	37,536	37,943	29,911

ENLISTED (IN THOUSANDS)

Draftees	254.3	202.2	182.0
Reserve and National Guard	6.2	3.0	2.4
Regular Army 1st enlistees	200.9	171.4	156.0
Reenlistments within 90 days	73.6	79.2	78.6
Reenlistments over 90 days	4.5	7.8	7.2
Other enlisted gains	34.6	55.5	58.2
Total	574.1	519.1	484.4

[1] Includes interservice transfer and direct appointments with concurrent call to active duty except for professional branches.

[2] Includes both voluntary active duty and direct appointments with concurrent active duty. Does not include ROTC.

[3] Includes administrative gains, such as recall from retired lists, order to AD for 90 days or less, and order to AD of Reserves and ARNGUS officers for duty with Army staff and NGB.

RECRUITMENT COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. Second, would you provide for the record a table indicating the amount to be expended for the recruitment program for fiscal year 1969, and the estimate for 1970 and 1971.

(The material follows:)

COST OF ARMY RECRUITMENT PROGRAM

[In millions of dollars]

	MPA	OMA	Total
Fiscal year 1969 (actual):			
Personnel	17.3	3.4	20.7
Advertising		3.0	3.0
Related expenses		5.3	5.3
Total	17.3	11.7	29.0
Fiscal year 1970 (estimate):			
Personnel	20.1	3.8	23.9
Advertising		3.0	3.0
Related expenses		5.2	5.2
Total	20.1	12.0	32.1
Fiscal year 1971 (estimate):			
Personnel	20.2	3.7	23.9
Advertising		3.0	3.0
Related expenses		4.8	4.8
Total	20.2	11.5	31.7

OFFICER RATIOS TO TOTAL STRENGTH

Mr. WHITTEN. Third, the officer ratio to total strength by fiscal year, similar to the table appearing on page 104 of last year's hearings.

(The material follows:)

Officer ratio to total strengths (authorized officer ratio).

Fiscal Year:	*Percent*
1971	12.10
1970	12.08
1969	11.26
1968	10.55
1967	9.82
1966	10.02
1965	11.47
1964	11.50
1963	11.50
1962	11.50
1961	11.50

ARMY STRENGTH BY PRIMARY MISSIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Fourth, the Army strength by primary mission for fiscal years 1969, 1970, and 1971.

(The material follows:)

DISTRIBUTION OF ARMY STRENGTH BY PRIMARY MISSION

[In thousands]

	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
Division forces	701.1		(1)
Special mission and general support forces	415.2		(1)
Other [2]	395.0		(1)
Total Army	1,511.3	1,362.6	1,239.0

[1] Composition of the force structure for fiscal year 1971 is contingent upon future Presidential decisions.
[2] Includes individuals.

ACTUAL STRENGTH OF OFFICERS BY GRADE

Mr. WHITTEN. Fifth, the actual strength of officers by grade for the last 10 years.

(The material follows:)

OFFICERS BY GRADE SINCE 1962—ACTUAL STRENGTHS [1]

	June 30, 1962 [2]	June 30, 1963	June 30, 1964	June 30, 1965	June 30, 1966	June 30, 1967	June 30, 1968 [2]	June 30, 1969 [2]	June 30, 1970 [3]	June 30, 1971 [3]
General	493	483	484	484	486	498	501	499	497	497
Colonel	5,094	5,000	5,022	5,053	5,264	5,582	6,032	6,352	6,242	5,983
Lieutenant colonel	12,642	12,235	12,243	12,285	13,329	14,674	16,176	16,645	16,538	15,483
Major	17,775	17,035	17,026	17,105	18,430	20,386	22,814	25,070	24,280	22,914
Captain	31,081	29,432	30,013	29,964	32,258	34,117	35,133	38,713	39,100	39,050
Lieutenant	37,673	33,907	35,262	36,346	36,125	51,595	64,743	60,854	56,293	46,038
Warrant officer	10,820	9,677	10,226	10,304	11,313	16,112	20,170	23,739	21,723	20,000
Total	115,578	107,769	110,276	111,541	117,205	142,964	165,569	171,872	164,673	149,965

[1] Excludes reimbursable positions. [2] Includes Reserve component units involuntarily recalled to active duty. [3] Program strengths.

HEADQUARTERS STAFFS

Mr. WHITTEN. Would you also provide for the record a table showing the personnel assigned to headquarters, separated between Washington and the field, and including also the unified and specified commands for the period 1967 through 1971.

(The information follows:)

MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED IN HEADQUARTERS ACTIVITIES

	Washington	Field headquarters	Unified commands	Total
June 1967	3,856	6,462	9,501	19,819
June 1968	4,189	7,396	13,127	24,712
June 1969	4,224	7,626	14,744	26,594
June 1970	4,187	7,530	15,030	26,747
June 1971	4,145	7,530	15,058	26,733

MILITARY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE ARMY

Mr. WHITTEN. In addition, would you provide for the record a chart similar to the one appearing on pages 77 and 78 of last year's hearings covering military personnel assigned to activities outside the military departments.

(The information follows:)

MILITARY PERSONNEL PROGRAMED AUTHORIZATIONS TO ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, JUNE 30, 1971

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

	Officer	Enlisted
OSD	270	71
OSD activities	368	74
OJCS	272	184
Other JCS accou ts	41	168
Defense agencies	1,196	1,764
Unified commands and activities	6,291	8,767
Allied commands and boards	578	2,568
Joint defense colleges	56	21
Defense schools	82	207
MAAG's, missions, military groups	675	466
Army with Navy and Air Force	105	21
Non-Defense accounts	14	1
Total	[1] 9,948	[1] 14,312

ADDITIONAL MILITARY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED ON A REIMBURSABLE BASIS

Activity:		
Classified activity	51	94
NASA	117	4
Selective Service	225	
American Battle Monuments	9	
Federal Aviation Agency	5	
Panama Canal Company	40	3
Cemeterial expenses	2	4
Civil administration, Ryukyu Islands	18	11
Office of Economic Opportunity	4	1
Atomic Energy Commission	2	
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	14	
Department of Transportation	2	
Department of Labor	1	
U.S. Soldiers' Home	5	
Total	495	117

[1] Figures include some spaces to be reduced under ongoing reduction programs. These spaces cannot be withdrawn until the service affiliation of these spaces can be identified by country, by region.

TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. General Kerwin, I have some questions I would like answered for the record.

General KERWIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Cite for the record the legislation and set forth in full the provisions relating to the number of commissioned officers, by rank.

(The information follows:)

The number of commissioned officers by rank authorized in the Army is provided for by the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954 (OGLA), section 3202, title 10, United States Code (see inclosure 1), as amended by Public Law 90–228, December 28, 1967. The provisions of the act and amendment are as follows:

1. The OGLA places a ceiling on the number of generals, colonels, lieutenant colonels and majors by means of separate tables for each of the services. There are no limitations on the number of captains versus lieutenants. The Army table, inclosure 2, is for officer strengths from 50,000 to 150,000. The grades for each of the strengths were based, at the time the table was prepared, on requirements as closely as could be computed without reference to specific force structures. If the total number of officers is between two figures in the table, grade authorizations are determined by interpolation.

2. Not more than one half of the general officer strength may be in grades above brigadier general.

3. A vacancy in any grade may be filled by an authorized appointment in any lower grade.

4. Notwithstanding the authorization under section 3202, title 10, United States Code (OGLA), the Army general officer strength is governed by the Senate Armed Services Committee ceiling of 487. Not chargeable under this ceiling, but chargeable under OGLA are General of the Army (1) and retired general officers on active duty. The vacancies between the Senate Armed Services Committee ceiling on general officers and the number authorized under OGLA are programed as an increase in the grade of colonel.

5. The OGLA excludes the following categories of officers: Dean and permanent professors, USMA, and reimbursables (civil functions, CIA, Selective Service, etc.). In addition, Public Law 90–228, enacted December 28, 1967, excludes MC and DC officers below the grade of brigadier general from the OGLA and permits the Secretary of the Army to prescribe the grades below brigadier general for these corps under regulations prescribed by SECDEF. DOD Directive 1320.7, dated May 3, 1968, implements the authority contained in Public Law 90-228 for MC officers only. For DC officers, the provisions of the new law have not been implemented.

§ 3202. Army: Officers in certain commission grades

(a) The authorized strength of the Army in officers on active duty in each of the following grades on the last day of each fiscal year, exclusive of officers on active duty for training only and officers serving with other departments or agencies on a reimbursable basis, is based on the total number of those officers authorized by the Secretary of the Army in all commissioned grades, as follows:

If the total number authorized is—	The authorized strength in grade is—			
	For general officers	For colonels	For lieutenant colonels	For majors
50,000	350	3,352	6,940	9,350
60,000	400	3,752	8,045	10,950
70,000	425	4,102	9,150	12,500
80,000	450	4,452	10,205	14,050
90,000	475	4,752	11,260	15,600
100,000	495	5,002	12,265	17,060
110,000	510	5,202	13,270	18,370
120,000	520	5,402	14,175	19,080
130,000	530	5,602	15,075	20,800
140,000	540	5,802	15,875	22,095
150,000	550	6,002	16,675	23,300

If the total number authorized by the Secretary is determined to be between two of the figures named in the first column of the table, the corresponding authorized strengths in grade are determined by mathematic interpolation between the respective authorized strengths named in the table. If it is determined to be more than 150,000, the Secretary shall fix the corresponding authorized strengths in grade in general conformity with the table.

(*b*) Not more than one-half of the general officer strength may be in grades above brigadier general.

(*c*) A vacancy in any grade may be filled by an authorized appointment in any lower grade.

(*d*) In time of war, or of national emergency declared after May 5, 1954, by Congress or the President, the President may suspend the operation of any provision of this section. August 10, 1956, c. 1041, 70A Stat. 172; September 2, 1958, Public Law 85–861, section 1(63), 72 Stat. 1463.

ARMY SECTION OFFICER GRADE LIMITATION ACT OF 1954 (SEC. 3202, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE)

If the total number authorized is—	The authorized strength in grade is—			
	For general officers	For colonels	For lieutenant colonels	For majors
50,000	350	3,352	6,940	9,350
60,000	400	3,752	8,045	10,950
70,000	425	4,102	9,150	12,500
80,000	450	4,452	10,205	14,050
90,000	475	4,752	11,260	15,600
100,000	495	5,002	12,265	17,060
110,000	510	5,202	13,270	18,370
120,000	520	5,402	14,175	19,680
130,000	530	5,602	15,705	22,095
140,000	540	5,802	15,875	22,095
150,000	550	6,002	16,675	23,300

Mr. DAVIS. Translate the provisions of the Officer Grade Limitation Act into a table showing the number of authorized commissioned officers by rank for fiscal year 1969, fiscal year 1970, and fiscal year 1971.

(The information follows:)

The following tables show the number of authorized commissioned officers by fiscal year:

1. Fiscal year 1969 actual grade distribution for 148,133 officers authorized in accordance with section 3202, title 10, U.S.C., as amended by Public Law 90–228, December 28, 1967. (Numbers in parentheses are actual strength.)

Grade	Other than Medical Corps		Medical Corps		Total	
General	[1][2] 548	(499)			548	(499)
Colonel	[3] 5,823	(5,939)	430	(413)	6,253	(6,352)
Lieutenant colonel	15,959	(15,976)	976	(669)	16,935	(16,645)
Major	22,221	(22,295)	4,243	(2,775)	26,464	(25,070)
Captain/lieutenant	96,498	(96,340)	1,435	(3,227)	97,933	(99,567)
Total	141,049	(141,049)	7,084	(7,084)	148,133	(148,133)

Note: All figures exclude reimbursables.
[1] Includes Medical Corps general officers.
[2] Does not include 1 general officer registrar, USMA.
[3] Does not include 22 professors, USMA, authorized under separate provisions of law.

2. Fiscal year 1970 projected grade distribution for 142,950 officers authorized in accordance with section 3202, title 10, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 90–228, December 28, 1967.

Grade	Other than Medical Corps	Medical Corps	Total
General	[1,2] 543		543
Colonel	[3] 5,725	448	6,173
Lieutenant colonel	15,566	972	16,538
Major	21,629	2,651	24,280
Captain/lieutenant	92,669	2,747	95,416
Total	136,132	6,818	142,950

Notes: All figures exclude reimbursables.
[1] Includes Medical Corps general officers.
[2] Does not include 1 general officer registrar, USMA.
[3] Does not include 22 professors, USMA, authorized under separate provisions of law.

3. Fiscal year 1971 projected grade distribution for 129,965 officers authorized in accordance with section 3202, title 10, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 90–228, December 28, 1967.

Grade	Other than Medical Corps	Medical Corps	Total
General	[1,2] 530		530
Colonel	[3] 5,477	450	5,927
Lieutenant colonel	14,514	969	15,483
Major	20,136	2,778	22,914
Captain/lieutenant	83,108	2,003	85,111
Total	123,765	6,200	129,965

Notes: All figures exclude reimbursables.
[1] Includes Medical Corps general officers.
[2] Does not include 1 general officer registrar, USMA.
[3] Does not include 22 professors, USMA, authorized under separate provisions of law.

Mr. DAVIS. Compare the number of authorized officers by rank with the number of officers contained in your fiscal year 1971 budget request.

(The information follows:)

The number of officers by rank authorized under OGLA, Public Law 90–228, the Senate Armed Services Committee limitation, and the provisions of the United States Code are the same as the number contained in the fiscal year 1971 budget request. The following tables depict the authorized and programed officers by rank as contained in the fiscal year 1971 budget request.

END FISCAL YEAR 1970			END FISCAL YEAR 1971		
Grade	Authorized	Program	Grade	Authorized	Program
General officer	543	[1] 497	General officer	530	[1] 497
Colonel	6,173	[2] 6,242	Colonel	5,927	[2] 5,983
Lieutenant Colonel	16,538	16,538	Lieutenant Colonel	15,483	15,483
Major	24,280	24,280	Major	22,914	22,914
Captain/Lieutenant	95,416	95,416	Captain/Lieutenant	85,111	85,111
Total	142,950	142,950	Total	129,965	129,965

[1] Notwithstanding the authorization under sec. 3202, title 10, United States Code (OGLA), the Army general office strength is governed by the Senate Armed Services Committee ceiling of 487. Not chargeable under this ceiling, but chargeable under OGLA, are General of the Army (1) and retired general officers on active duty (8 anticipated in fiscal years 1970 and 1971). Not chargeable under either the Senate or OGLA ceilings, but budgeted for, is the dean of Academic Board, USMA. Therefore, total programed general officers for end fiscal years 1970 and 1971 is 497.
[2] Not chargeable under OGLA, but reflected in the programed strength, are 22 colonels authorized under separate provisions of law as permanent professors and the registrar, USMA, plus those vacancies in the grade of general officer authorized under OGLA. All figures exclude reimbursables.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the authorization for temporary promotion of officers?

(The information follows:)

The authorization for temporary promotion of officers is chapter 339 of title 10, U.S. Code, containing sections 3441 to 3452.

Mr. DAVIS. Why are temporary promotions required?

(The information follows:)

The basis for making temporary promotions is set forth in 10 USC 3442, which reads:

3442. Commissioned Officers; regular and reserve components: appointment in higher grade

(a) Whenever the number of officers of the Regular Army in any regular grade above second lieutenant is less than the number authorized, the vacancies may be filled by the appointment of qualified officers, as prescribed in subsection (c).

(b) Whenever, under authorization by Congress, the number of commissioned officers of the Regular Army on active duty plus the number of other commissioned officers of the Army ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days is more than the authorized strength of the Regular Army in commissioned officers on the active list, the Secretary of the Army shall determine the additional number of officers in each of the commissioned grades based upon the number of officers serving on active duty and the tasks being performed by the Army. Vacancies resulting from that determination may then be filled by the appointment of qualified officers, as prescribed in subsection (c).

(c) Subject to subsections (a) and (b), a regular commissioned officer, or a reserve commissioned officer who is serving on active duty, may be appointed in a temporary grade that is equal to or higher than his regular or reserve grade, without vacating any other grade held by him. Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, appointments made under this subsection shall be made on a fair and equitable basis. Selections shall be based upon ability and efficiency with regard being given to seniority and age. Aug. 10, 1956, c. 1041, 70A Stat. 195.

Mr. DAVIS. Provide a table showing by rank, the number of officers as of June 30, 1969, by permanent and temporary rank.

(The information follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY—REGULAR ARMY COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY PERMANENT GRADE AND GRADE IN WHICH SERVING

Permanent grade	Total strength	Grade in which serving										
		General Of the Army	General	Lieutenant General	Major General	Brigadier General	Colonel	Lieutenant Colonel	Major	Captain	First Lieutenant	Second Lieutenant
Total	45,866	1	18	44	196	254	6,050	11,414	14,284	9,105	2,257	2,243
General of the Army	1	1										
General												
Lieutenant General												
Major General	127		18	40	69							
Brigadier General	144			4	117	23						
Colonel	2,863				10	213	2,640					
Lieutenant Colonel	3,935					16	2,748	1,174				
Major	10,842					2	662	9,717	461			
Captain	14,046							523	13,233	290		
1st Lieutenant	5,425								590	4,748	87	
2nd Lieutenant	8,480									4,067	2,170	2,243

Mr. DAVIS. How many officers, in each category of rank, now serve in temporary ranks two or more above permanent rank?

Regular officers serving in temporary grades two or more grades higher than the permanent grade (June 30, 1969).

		Number by permanent grade	Number by temporary grade in which serving
07–010	General	22	18 (general); 4 (lieutenant general).
06	Colonel	10	10 (major general).
05	Lieutenant colonel	16	16 (brigadier general).
04	Major	664	662 (colonel); 2 (brigadier general).
03	Captain	523	523 (lieutenant colonel).
02	1st lieutenant	590	590 (major).
01	2d lieutenant	4,067	4,067 (captain).

USAR/NG officers serving in temporary grades 2 or more higher than the permanent grade as of June 30, 1969, is not available; however, data as of Nov. 30, 1969 follows:

		Number by permanent grade	Number by temporary grade in which serving
07–010	General		
06	Colonel		
05	Lieutenant colonel		
04	Major	3	3 (colonel).
03	Captain	7	1 (colonel); 6 (lieutenant colonel).
02	1st lieutenant		
01	2d lieutenant	1	1 (captain).

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the effect of restricting temporary grades for use strictly in time of emergency declared by Congress or the President, or time of war?

(The information follows:)

This would greatly affect the Army's ability to maintain the required officer grade structure for the size force authorized by Congress. Eligibility for Regular Army (permanent) promotions is based on tenure as prescribed by law. Temporary promotions are a function of structure vacancies.

If temporary promotions were only authorized in a declared emergency and then terminated 6 months after termination of the emergency, it is conceivable that the total authorized strength of the Army would not be greatly reduced. In this instance, the Army would not be able to fill vacancies with an officer holding the grade commensurate with the responsibilities. This would have adverse impact on both structure and morale.

The Korean emergency has been in effect since 1950. If promotions over the past 20 years had been based on that emergency, this restriction would have had no effect. However, if the future should result in a series of "short-term emergencies" with attendant promotions followed by reductions in grade the organizational and personal instability would be most disadvantageous.

Temporary promotions based solely on a declared emergency or time of war would be unduly restrictive in the present world environment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, gentlemen. We appreciate your appearance before us. You have broken the ice in a good way. If those who follow you do not follow through, it is their own fault.

General KERWIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate your comment.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1970.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY
and
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. W. J. SUTTON, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE
MAJ. GEN. W. P. WILSON, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD RESERVE
MAJ. GEN. E. W. WILLIAMSON, DEPUTY CHIEF, OFFICE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS
MAJ. GEN. L. B. TAYLOR, DIRECTOR OF ARMY BUDGET, OFFICE, COMPTROLLER OF THE ARMY
COL. R. G. HOFFMAN, CHIEF, ROTC, USMA, OCS DIVISION, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PERSONNEL
B. E. PETHTAL, CHIEF, COMPTROLLER DIVISION, OFFICE, CHIEF, ARMY RESERVE

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY
MILITARY PERSONNEL
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY
Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

	Identification Code 07-05-2070-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct program:			
	1. Reserve component personnel	235,218	296,800	305,200
	2. Reserve officer candidates	33,330	32,800	31,300
	Total direct obligations	268,548	329,600	336,500
	Reimbursable (total)	683	1,000	1,000
10	Total obligations	269,231	330,600	337,500
	Financing:			
	Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11	Federal funds	-475	-600	-600
14	Non-Federal sources 1/	-208	-400	-400
25	Unobligated balance lapsing	18,652	....	....
	Budget authority	287,200	329,600	336,500

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY
MILITARY PERSONNEL
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY
Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2070-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Budget authority:			
40 Appropriation	287,200	306,700	336,500
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay increase	....	22,900	....
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	268,548	329,600	336,500
72 Obligated balance, start of year	55,779	51,307	70,907
74 Obligated balance, end of year (-)	-51,307	-70,907	-87,407
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-2,224	....	....
90 Outlays excluding pay increase supplemental	270,796	290,850	316,250
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	....	19,150	3,750

1/ Reimbursements from Non-Federal sources are for subsistence furnished Reserve Component officers during field training and inactive duty training (10 U.S.C. 4621).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY
MILITARY PERSONNEL
RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY
Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-2070-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military	176,546	232,332	236,740
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military	44,943	36,377	36,154
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	21,252	24,312	24,564
22.0 Transportation of things	4	228	228
26.0 Supplies and materials	24,808	35,239	37,650
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	995	1,112	1,164
Total direct obligations	268,548	329,600	336,500
Reimbursable obligations:			
26.0 Supplies and materials	683	1,000	1,000
99.0 Total obligations	269,231	330,600	337,500

LANGUAGE SHEET

Section 1 - LANGUAGE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army Reserve on active duty under sections 265, 3019, and 3033 of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law; /$306,700,000/ (1)
$336,500,000. (2)

Section 2 - EXPLANATION OF LANGUAGE CHANGES

(1) Deletion of FY 1970 appropriation.

(2) Insertion of FY 1971 appropriation.

APPROPRIATION	BUDGET PROGRAM (Number and title)
Reserve Personnel, Army	3200 Reserve Component Personnel

BUDGET PROJECT ACCOUNT	TITLE	(In Thousands of Dollars) ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR 1969	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1970	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1971
		$	$	$
3210	Training--Pay Group A	173,830	203,221	207,703
3220	Training--Pay Group D	13,923	16,756	17,143
3230	Training--REP--Pay Group F	30,790	58,335	61,207
3240	School Training	6,832	8,648	8,985
3250	Special Training	8,503	8,232	8,501
3260	Administration and Support	1,340	1,608	1,661
	Total Direct Obligations	235,218	296,800	305,200

JUSTIFICATION

Budget Program 3200 provides funds for direct military personnel costs of pay and allowances, clothing, subsistence, and travel for members of the Army Reserve.

The programed paid drill strength for FY 1970 is average 258,796 and end 260,000 and for FY 1971 is average 260,000 and end 260,000. This budget provides active duty and reserve duty training for the above including REP-63 input of 55,172 in FY 1970 and 39,000 in FY 1971.

Individual training is programed as follows:

	FY 1970		FY 1971	
	OFF	ENL	OFF	ENL
Individual Reinforcements	3,600	37,300	3,600	37,100
USAR Schools	3,000	0	3,000	0
Mobilization Designees	4,100	0	4,300	0
Service and Army Area Schools	8,768	3,154	8,768	3,154
Special Training	24,218	3,901	24,218	3,901

RESERVE PERSONNEL IN PAID STATUS

RESERVE COMPONENT USAR

Pay Groups	Paid Drills	Paid Days of Active Duty for Training		FY 1969 (PAST YEAR) BEGIN	FY 1969 (PAST YEAR) AVERAGE	FY 1969 (PAST YEAR) END	FY 1970 (CURRENT YEAR) AVERAGE	FY 1970 (CURRENT YEAR) END	FY 1971 (BUDGET YEAR) AVERAGE	FY 1971 (BUDGET YEAR) END
A	48	15	Off	32,201	31,721	32,218	32,199	32,700	33,205	33,700
			Enl	209,306	205,319	214,955	205,100	191,297	203,927	205,720
			Off	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
F	0	Minimum 4 Mos.	Enl	2,732	11,871	14,149	21,497	36,003	22,868	20,580
Paid Drill Training Sub Total			Off	32,201	31,721	32,218	32,199	32,700	33,205	33,700
			Enl	212,038	217,190	229,104	226,597	227,300	226,795	226,300
			Total	244,239	248,911	261,322	258,796	260,000	260,000	260,000
Paid Active Duty Training Only Sub Total			Off	12,456	10,175	10,175	10,700	10,700	10,900	10,900
D	0	15	Enl	54,840	35,391	35,391	37,300	37,300	37,100	37,100
			Total	67,296	45,566	45,566	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000
TOTAL PAID STATUS			Off	44,657	41,896	42,393	42,899	43,400	44,105	44,600
			Enl	266,878	252,581	264,495	263,897	264,600	263,895	263,400
			Total	311,535	294,477	306,888	306,796	308,000	308,000	308,000

Averages computed by doubling the end strengths of the months of July through May, adding 30 June strengths of the previous year and the year under consideration, and dividing the total by 24, except for Pay Group D. Pay Group D represents the total number of personnel participating during the fiscal year, and average and end strengths are identical in any one year.

PROGRAM DRILL PAY STRENGTHS

	FY 1969			FY 1970			FY 1971		
	Begin	Ave	End	Begin	Ave	End	Begin	Ave	End
Officer:									
Pay Group A									
TOE Units	23,596	23,136	23,491	23,491	23,194	23,416	23,416	23,921	24,416
TDA Units	5,726	5,637	5,481	5,481	5,740	6,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
S&F, USAR Sch	2,538	2,594	2,878	2,878	2,889	2,900	2,900	2,900	2,900
Sel Svc (USAR Aug)	341	354	368	368	376	384	384	384	384
Total	32,201	31,721	32,218	32,218	32,199	32,700	32,700	33,205	33,700
Enlisted:									
Pay Group A									
TOE Units	191,327	188,778	197,548	197,548	187,296	173,097	173,097	185,727	187,520
TDA Units	16,186	14,640	15,212	15,212	15,606	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000
S&F, USAR Sch	1,793	1,901	2,195	2,195	2,198	2,200	2,200	2,200	2,200
Total	209,306	205,319	214,955	214,955	205,100	191,297	191,297	203,927	205,720
TOTAL DRILL PAY	241,507	237,040	247,173	247,173	237,299	223,997	223,997	237,132	239,420
Officer	32,201	31,721	32,218	32,218	32,199	32,700	32,700	33,205	33,700
Enlisted	209,306	205,319	214,955	214,955	205,100	191,297	191,297	203,927	205,720

PAID DRILL STRENGTH BY MONTH

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimated	FY 1971 Estimated
1 July	244,239	261,322	260,000
31 July	244,081	258,192	260,000
31 August	240,458	258,100	260,000
30 September	243,178	258,000	260,000
31 October	243,308	258,100	260,000
30 November	245,366	258,200	260,000
31 December	247,477	258,300	260,000
31 January	248,370	258,600	260,000
28 February	251,243	258,900	260,000
31 March	253,503	259,200	260,000
30 April	258,188	259,500	260,000
31 May	258,980	259,800	260,000
30 June	261,322	260,000	260,000
(Average)	(248,911)	(258,796)	(260,000)

ENLISTED INPUT/6 MONTHS TRAINING PROGRAM

	Enlistments	Input	Man-Months Mid-Month Ave. Str.
FY 1967 Actual	28,400	69,934	277,869
FY 1968 Actual	17,684	11,722	136,819
FY 1969 Actual	48,511	36,182	142,456
FY 1970 Estimate	47,500	55,172	257,961
FY 1971 Estimate:			
July 1970	2,840	3,500	34,670
August	2,840	3,500	32,005
September	2,840	3,500	29,341
October	2,840	3,500	26,675
November	2,840	3,500	24,010
December	2,840	500	20,144
January 1971	2,840	3,500	17,613
February	2,840	3,500	17,618
March	2,840	3,500	17,622
April	2,840	3,500	17,628
May	2,840	3,500	17,809
June	2,760	3,500	19,284
TOTAL FY 1971 Estimate	34,000	39,000	274,419

APPROPRIATION	BUDGET PROGRAM (Number and title)
Reserve Personnel, Army	3300 Reserve Officer Candidates (ROTC)

BUDGET PROJECT ACCOUNT	TITLE	(In Thousands of Dollars) ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR 1969	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1970	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1971
		$	$	$
3310	Senior ROTC	30,300	27,791	26,051
3320	Scholarship Program	2,606	3,678	4,067
3330	Junior ROTC	424	1,331	1,182
	Total Direct Obligations	33,330	32,800	31,300

JUSTIFICATION

Budget Program 3300 provides funds for direct military personnel costs of subsistence allowance, clothing, pay and allowances for summer camp training, subsistence and travel for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized under the provisions of Public Law 88-647, dated 13 October 1964, and Public Law 89-51, dated 28 June 1965.

This estimate is based on an enrollment of 109,500 cadets in the Senior Division and 124,500 cadets in the Junior Division in FY 1971. The program includes an attendance at advanced summer camp training of 16,000 in July 1970 and 16,500 in June 1971, and at basic summer camp training of 3,600 in July 1970 and 3,600 in June 1971.

It is estimated that 16,700 Second Lieutenants will be commissioned from the program at end FY 1970 and 14,700 will be commissioned at end FY 1971.

RESERVE OFFICER CANDIDATES (ROTC) ENROLLMENT

	FY 1969			FY 1970			FY 1971 *		
	Actual Ingoing	Average	Actual Outgoing	Preliminary Ingoing	Average	Estimated Outgoing	Estimated Ingoing	Average	Estimated Outgoing
							MS-I 47,000	43,340	39,680
				MS-I 46,885	43,233	39,580	MS-II 29,000	27,685	26,370
MS-I	72,481	62,361	52,241	MS-II 28,392	27,105	25,817	MS-III 17,500	17,300	17,100
MS-II	41,391	37,777	34,163	MS-III 16,970	16,775	16,580	MS-IV 16,000	15,814	15,627
MS-III	19,439	19,132	18,825	MS-IV 18,181	17,969	17,757			
MS-IV	17,671	17,159	16,648						
Bas	113,872	100,138	86,404	75,277	70,338	65,397	76,000	71,025	66,050
Adv	37,110	36,291	35,473	35,151	34,744	34,337	33,500	33,114	32,727
Total	150,982	136,429	121,877	110,428	105,082	99,734	109,500	104,139	98,777
Advanced Camp	18,236		18,362	17,436		16,000	16,000		16,500
Basic Camp	2,415		2,919	2,835		3,600	3,600		3,600
Junior Div	102,003		91,655	116,000		108,425	124,500		116,370
Estimated Yield of Commissioned Officers from Outgoing MS-IV			(Actual) 16,306			16,700			14,700

*Includes Foreign Students:
MS-I - 140
MS-II - 80
MS-III - 40
MS-IV - 40

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-2060-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct obligations: Reserve component personnel.....	319,468	390,700	387,100
Reimbursable obligations: Reserve component personnel....	801	900	900
10 Total obligations.....	320,269	391,600	388,000
Financing:			
Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11 Federal funds.....	- 110	.....	.....
14 Non-Federal sources 1/.....	- 691	- 900	- 900
25 Unobligated balance lapsing.....	1,431	.....	.....
Budget authority.....	320,900	390,700	387,100
Budget authority:			
40 Appropriation.....	320,900	356,800	387,100
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases....	.....	33,900	.....

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are for subsistence furnished Army National Guard officers during field training and for inactive duty training (10 U.S.C. 4621).

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 8

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-2060-0-1-051	19 69 actual	19 70 estimate	19 71 estimate
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	319,468	390,700	387,100
72 Obligated balance, start of year	56,649	63,817	84,517
74 Obligated balance, end of year (-)	-63,817	-84,517	-101,617
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	3,612	.....	.....
90 Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	315,913	342,400	363,700
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	.....	27,600	6,300

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

OBJECT CLASSIFICATION (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-2060-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military personnel	264,223	312,785	312,017
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military personnel	18,140	19,986	19,918
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	8,477	15,467	16,997
26.0 Supplies and materials	28,102	41,816	37,653
41.0 Grants, subsidies and contributions	454	571	439
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	72	75	76
Total direct obligations	319,468	390,700	387,100
Reimbursable obligations:			
26.0 Supplies and materials	801	900	900
99.0 Total obligations	320,269	391,600	388,000

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Army National Guard while on duty under sections 265, 3033, or 3496 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32 United States Code, or while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law; [$396,800,000] $387,100,000: Provided, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code. (1) (2)

---

1. Deletion of the FY 1970 appropriation.

2. Insertion of the FY 1971 budget request.

APPROPRIATION: National Guard Personnel, Army		BUDGET PROGRAM (Number and title): 3100 National Guard Personnel		
		(In Thousands of Dollars)		
BUDGET PROJECT ACCOUNT	TITLE	ACTUAL FISCAL YEAR 1969	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1970	ESTIMATE FISCAL YEAR 1971
		$	$	$
3100	National Guard:			
	Direct Obligations:			
3110	Training - Pay Group A	273,129	300,022	309,486
3120	Training - REP - Pay Group F	29,305	66,547	54,799
3130	School Training	11,467	18,344	17,512
3140	Special Training	2,774	2,518	2,182
3150	Administration and Support	2,793	3,269	3,121
	Total direct obligations	319,468	390,700	387,100
	Reimbursable obligations	801	900	900
	Total obligations	320,269	391,600	388,000

JUSTIFICATION

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL IN PAID STATUS (EXHIBIT 020206-1)

Pay Groups	Paid Drills	Paid Days of ACDUTRA		FY 1969			FY 1970		FY 1971	
				Begin	Average	End	Average	End	Average	End
A	48	15	Off	31,938	31,838	30,432	32,214	33,000	33,072	32,650
			Enl	353,030	346,361	346,067	338,860	342,483	349,986	354,467
Drill Pay Status			Off	(31,938)	(31,838)	(30,432)	(32,214)	(33,000)	(33,072)	(32,650)
			Enl	(353,030)	(346,361)	(346,067)	(338,860)	(342,483)	(349,986)	(354,467)
Sub-total				384,968	378,199	376,499	371,074	375,483	383,058	387,117
F	0	90-180	Off	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
			Enl	4,214	10,743	12,455	22,226	24,517	16,942	12,883
Total Paid Status			Off	31,938	31,838	30,432	32,214	33,000	33,072	32,650
			Enl	357,244	357,104	358,522	361,086	367,000	366,928	367,350
				389,182	388,942	388,954	393,300	400,000	400,000	400,000

FY 1971 STRENGTH PLAN

	Off and WO	Aggregate Enl Men	Total	REP	Paid Drill
30 Jun 70	33,000	367,000	400,000	24,517	375,483
Jul	33,350	366,650	400,000	26,029	373,971
Aug	33,700	366,300	400,000	26,141	373,859
Sep	33,750	366,250	400,000	22,203	377,797
Oct	33,600	366,400	400,000	18,615	381,385
Nov	33,400	366,600	400,000	15,877	384,123
Dec	33,200	366,800	400,000	13,683	386,317
Jan	33,000	367,000	400,000	12,233	387,767
Feb	32,800	367,200	400,000	11,933	388,067
Mar	32,600	367,400	400,000	12,433	387,567
Apr	32,400	367,600	400,000	12,683	387,317
May	32,250	367,750	400,000	12,783	387,217
Jun	32,650	367,350	400,000	12,883	387,117
(Average)	33,072	366,928	400,000	16,942	383,058

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MANPOWER PROCUREMENT PROGRAM, FY 1971
(Opens 400,000 Closes 400,000)

OPENING STRENGTH

Officers	33,000
Enlisted Pers	367,000
TOTAL	400,000

MONTH	NON-PRIOR SERVICE ENLIST-MENTS TAKE ACDUTRA In 71	OTHER EM GAINS	TOTAL EM GAINS	TOTAL EM LOSSES	OFFICER GAINS	OFFICER LOSSES	OFF	ENL	TOTAL	ACDUTRA INPUT
JUL	3,400	1,640	5,040	5,550	1,000	450	33,350	366,650	400,000	5,800
AUG	3,400	1,640	5,040	5,550	600	450	33,700	366,300	400,000	5,500
SEP	3,700	1,640	5,340	5,550	500	450	33,750	366,250	400,000	3,500
OCT	3,700	1,640	5,340	5,550	300	450	33,600	366,400	400,000	3,900
NOV	4,000	1,660	5,660	5,550	250	450	33,400	366,600	400,000	4,000
DEC	4,000	1,640	5,640	5,550	250	450	33,200	366,800	400,000	4,200
JAN	4,000	1,640	5,640	5,550	250	450	33,000	367,000	400,000	4,200
FEB	4,000	1,640	5,640	5,550	250	450	32,800	367,200	400,000	4,200
MAR	4,400	1,640	6,040	5,550	250	450	32,600	367,400	400,000	4,200
APR	4,400	1,670	6,070	5,550	250	450	32,400	367,600	400,000	4,200
MAY	4,400	1,610	6,010	5,550	300	450	32,250	367,750	400,000	4,200
JUN	3,850	1,640	5,490	5,550	850	450	32,650	367,350	400,000	4,300
TOTAL	47,250	19,700	66,950	66,600	5,050	5,400				52,200
						AVERAGE	33,072	366,928	400,000	

REP TRAINING PROGRAM FY 1971

FY 1970 Carryover:	Input	Graduates and Losses	End of Month	Man Months
Jan	4,534			
Feb	4,240			
Mar	4,500			
Apr	5,000			
May	7,000			
Jun	7,000		24,517	107,377
FY 1971 Input:				
Jul	5,800	4,288	26,029	25,273
Aug	5,500	5,388	26,141	26,085
Sep	3,500	7,438	22,203	24,172
Oct	3,900	7,488	18,615	20,409
Nov	4,000	6,738	15,877	17,246
Dec	4,200	6,394	13,683	14,780
Jan	4,200	5,650	12,233	12,958
Feb	4,200	4,500	11,933	12,083
Mar	4,200	3,700	12,433	12,183
Apr	4,200	3,950	12,683	12,558
May	4,200	4,100	12,783	12,733
Jun	4,300	4,200	12,883	12,833
	52,200			203,313
			Manyears	16,942

FY 1971
TRAINING PROGRAMS

	Average Strength	Federal Status	School	Adm Excused		Strength Participation		Attendance Factors				
FIELD TRAINING												
1st Quarter:												
Officers	33,350	(-)	(375)	(-)	=	32,975	x	55% x 98%	=	17,773		
Enlisted	366,650	(25,679)	(288)	(7,000)	=	333,683	x	55% x 98%	=	179,855	197,628	
4th Quarter:												
Officers	32,450	(-)	(375)	(-)	=	32,075	x	45% x 98%	=	14,145		
Enlisted	367,550	(12,833)	(288)	(7,000)	=	347,429	x	45% x 98%	=	153,216	167,361	
						Total Trainees.....					364,989	
						Officers.....					(31,918)	
						Enlisted.....					(333,071)	
ARMORY DRILLS												
All Units:												
Officers	33,072	(-)	(375)	(-)	=	32,697	x	98.8%	=	32,305		
Enlisted	366,928	(16,942)	(288)	(-)	=	349,698	x	97.0%	=	339,207		
						Total Trainees.....					371,512	

OPENING REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Gentlemen, this morning we will review the fiscal year 1971 request for Reserve and Guard personnel, Army. We have before us today presenting the Reserve and National Guard budgets Maj. Gen. Ellis W. Williamson, acting chief, Office of Reserve Components; Maj. Gen. William J. Sutton, Chief, Army Reserve; and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief, National Guard Bureau. We welcome you gentlemen and your supporting witnesses.

The request for Army Reserve personnel for 1971 is $336,500,000, an increase of $29,800,000 over the amount currently appropriated for 1970. The budget document indicates that a supplemental covering pay act costs of $22,900,000 will be requested for fiscal year 1970. If this supplemental is approved as requested, then the net increase of 1971 over 1970 will be $6,900,000.

The request for National Guard personnel is $387,100,000, an increase of $30,300,000 over the amount currently appropriated for 1970. However, the Guard will be requesting a supplemental of $33,900,000. If this supplemental is approved, then the net result will be a decrease of $3,600,000 below the amount required for 1970.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF MAJ. GEN. E. W. WILLIAMSON

This being your first appearance before the committee in your present capacity, General Williamson, we would like the record to show your biographical sketch.

General WILLIAMSON. Thank you, sir.

(The biographical sketch follows:)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH, MAJ. GEN. ELLIS W. WILLIAMSON, DEPUTY CHIEF, OFFICE OF RESERVE COMPONENTS

Ellis W. Williamson was born in Raeford, N.C., June 2, 1918. He was graduated from high school at Raleigh, N.C. in 1936 and from Atlantic Christian College, N.C. in 1940 with a Bachelor of Arts degree. He was commissioned a second lieutenant of infantry in March 1941 after having entered Federal service with the North Carolina National Guard in September 1940. General Williamson's education has continued throughout his career. His military education includes the basic and advanced courses at The Infantry School 1942–43, the Command and General Staff College 1950; the Armed Forces Staff College 1953, and the National War College 1960. His continued civilian education includes the Graduate School of Business at Harvard University 1962 and a Master's degree in International Affairs from George Washington University 1963.

Through high school and college he was a member of the North Carolina National Guard, 120th infantry. He remained with this regiment through World War II, rising in rank from a private in the band to the last regimental commander of the unit prior to returning the unit to State control in January of 1946. In this National Guard regiment he served as a commander through platoon, company, battalion, and regimental levels. He was also a staff officer at battalion and regimental levels.

He was integrated into the Regular Army establishment in 1946 and spent the next 3 years as an instructor of tactics at the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga.

The Korean war started just as General Williamson was finishing the regular course at the Command and General Staff College in Leavenworth, Kans. He immediately joined Headquarters X Corps, made the amphibious landing at Inchon, Korea and spent a major portion of the next 20 months as G–3 of X Corps.

He then served 2 years in the Office of the Chief of Staff of the Army; followed by 2 years in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

In 1956 he assumed command of the 13th Infantry Regiment at Fort Carson, Colo. He took the regiment to Germany on Operation Gyroscope which included the movement of all military personnel and their dependents.

After commanding the regiment for 2½ years, he spent 1 year as Chief of the Training Division in Headquarters, 7th U.S. Army in Germany.

General Williamson returned to the United States to attend the National War College in 1959-60.

He spent 3 years in headquarters, Department of the Army in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, where he dealt with planning, programing, and budgeting.

In the summer of 1963 he moved to the Island of Okinawa and organized the 173d Airborne Separate Brigade. He carried this unit into Vietnam in May of 1965, becoming the 1st U.S. Army ground combat troups to enter the conflict. In the spring of 1966 he returned to the United States and after a short period as Assistant Commandant at The Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., he assumed command of the U.S. Army Training Center at Fort Polk, La., which was engaged in training troops for immediate movement to Vietnam.

In July 1968 he returned to Vietnam where he commanded the 25th "Tropic Lightning" Division for 14 months. In October 1969 he returned to duty on the Department of the Army staff where his present assignment is Deputy to the Chief, Office of Reserve Components.

He was promoted to the rank of brigadier general in August 1963. In October 1966, he was promoted (temporary (AUS)) to rank of major general.

General Williamson's awards include: Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal with 2 OLC, Silver Star with 5 OLC, the Legion of Merit with 1 OLC, Bronze Star (3 OLC), Purple Heart (2 OLC), Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal with 28 OLC, Distinguished Unit Citation, Combat Infantryman's Badge. British Distinguished Service Order, the French Croix de Guerre (SS), National Order of Vietnam (4th and 5th Class), Gallantry Cross with Palm, Meritorious Unit Citation, Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with 2d Palm, Psychological Operations Medal (First Class) and Vietnamese Armed Forces Honor Medal First Class. General Williamson is also a qualified parachutist. He served through five campaigns in Europe during World War II, seven during the Korean war and six campaigns in Vietnam.

General Wiliamson is married to the former Margaret McNeill of Charlotte, N.C. They have two children, a son Dan and a daughter Nan, ages 19 and 16.

General Statement, Deputy Chief, Office of Reserve Components

Mr. Whitten. You may proceed, General Williamson.

General Williamson. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, last year my predecessor, Maj. Gen. John M. Hightower, presented the Army Reserve component program to you in general terms. Lt. Gen. W. R. Peers, Chief, Office of the Reserve Components, had hoped to appear before you this year; however, he is on a special assignment. Consequently it is my privilege to be here today to tell you briefly of the Ten-Point Management Program instituted last fall by General Peers, to review the accomplishments of last year, and to sketch in general terms our plans for the immediate future.

As in previous years, Maj. Gen. W. P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, and Maj. Gen. W. J. Sutton, Chief of Army Reserve, are here today to present statements on the budgets for which they are appropriation directors. Also present to discuss the ROTC program is Col. R. G. Hoffman, representing the Army General Staff Director for that program.

As one of the terms of reference, I shall compare the budgets for actual fiscal year 1969, our current estimates for fiscal year 1970 and our estimates as reflected in the President's budget for fiscal year 1971.

The first chart tabulates for the 3 years previously mentioned all of the budget accounts directly supporting the Army Reserve components. Although the total amounts requested for fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971, by coincidence, are identical, the various appropriations differ between the 2 years. While this committee will not discuss the operation and maintenance budgets today, these have been added, as have the two military construction appropriations, to present a complete picture.

ARMY RESERVE COMPONENT BUDGETS

[In millions]

	Fiscal year		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
NGPA	$319.5	$390.7	$387.1
OMARNG	275.3	312.6	287.4
RPA	268.5	329.6	336.5
(ROTC)	(33.3)	(32.8)	(31.3)
OMA (Prog 5)	90.2	110.1	132.0
Subtotal	953.5	1,143.0	1,143.0
MCARNG	11.5	15.0	15.0
MCAR	9.0	10.0	10.0
Total	974.0	1,168.0	1,168.0

The fiscal year 1970 increase over actual fiscal year 1969 is due primarily to two factors, the pay increases for both military and civilian personnel effective July 1, 1969, and the increase in Reserve Enlistment Program (REP) input in fiscal year 1970.

The second chart shows how the personnel funds were spent in fiscal year 1969 and our proposals for fiscal years 1970 and 1971:

ARMY RESERVE COMPONENTS BUDGETS—PERSONNEL APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions]

	Fiscal year		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Training unit personnel	$446.9	$503.2	$517.2
Training indiv reinf	13.9	16.8	17.1
Training, REP	60.1	124.9	116.0
School training	18.3	27.0	26.5
Special training	11.3	10.7	10.7
Administration	4.2	4.9	4.8
ROTC	33.3	32.8	31.3
Total	588.0	720.3	723.6

This tabulation reveals the fluctuation in the REP training account. Because of Active Army requirements in the training centers, some of our untrained enlistees could not be sent to active duty for training in fiscal year 1969. During the first half of fiscal year 1970, that is from July to December 1969, the Reserve components sent approximately 12,000 more personnel to the training centers than we had planned when we discussed the budget with this committee last year. Our origi-

nal program had been for an input of 116,000 this current year. Provided we can make certain fund adjustments in the next few months, we are hopeful of having a total of 126,000 input during this fiscal year. As a result the number of REP's awaiting initial training will be reduced by some 10,000 from that projected for June 30, 1970. However, we have one word of caution. There has been an increased loss in the Army National Guard and a requirement to increase our input. If that increase is maintained, we may lose a little ground on our approach to a 10,000 reduction.

The funds requested for fiscal year 1971 will support an average and end strength of 660,000, of which 400,000 will be in the Army National Guard, and 260,000 in the U.S. Army Reserve. In addition, training will be provided for approximately 48,000 U.S. Army Reservists in the Individual Ready Reserve group, of which 40,000 will be individual fillers.

The third chart depicts operation and maintenance funds in terms of activities supported:

ARMY RESERVE COMPONENTS—OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE BUDGETS

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Fiscal year		
	1969, actual	1970, estimate	1971, estimate
Training operations	$135.9	$151.7	$164.4
Logistics	$167.7	$201.5	$192.9
Air defense	$43.5	$48.8	$39.8
Administration	$18.4	$20.7	$22.3
Total	$365.5	$422.7	$419.4
Provides support for:			
Technician end strength	28,638	30,679	30,916
ARNG	24,211	24,552	24,249
USAR	4,427	6,127	6,667
Stock fund procurement	$31.5	$40.6	$31.7
ARNG	$20.8	$24.0	$11.0
USAR	$10.7	$16.6	$20.7
Repair parts:	$19.6	$25.5	$22.1
ARNG	$16.2	$20.1	$16.0
USAR	$3.4	$5.4	$6.1

Included in the items in the first column are civilian personnel costs associated with those activities. The lower part of the chart tabulates technician strength and the funds for purchase of stock fund equipment and for repair parts. Funds for major items of equipment for the Reserve components are included in the PEMA appropriation.

During the past year the Army Reserve components units made some progress over the previous year. I would be less than candid, however, if I did not point out that while the dedication and enthusiasm of our leadership remains at a high level, and our training, on the whole, has improved, the lack of modern equipment for home station training together with a shortage of nearby training facilities for weekend maneuvers will make it difficult for units to reach combat readiness objectives of Army war plans.

During the past year the Army Reserve components did receive approximately $150 million in modern equipment. Partially offsetting this acquisition, however, was the retirement of some obsolete equipment deemed uneconomically reparable and a withdrawal of some equipment for use by the Active Army elsewhere.

The Chief of Staff recently addressed a memorandum to all Army Staff Agencies directing that more emphasis be placed on improving support of the Army Reserve components. The Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics has initiated positive action to accelerate the flow of Army materiel to the Reserve components.

As I mentioned previously, General Peers last fall initiated a management plan referred to as the Ten-Point Improvement Program for the Reserve components. Some of the projects are directed to the units, some to the Army Staff. The overall impact has been to give new impetus all along the line to improvements of our Reserve.

Efforts have been successful to reduce the number of untrained REP personnel. The units mobilized in May 1968 now have returned to the Reserve components and have been provided with training equipment. We certainly appreciate the recognition of the Reserve components by the President recently when he received representatives of the previously mobilized units. The number of USAR technicians, so vital to the functioning of units, is expected to be substantially increased by the end of fiscal year 1970, from a beginning strength of about 4,500 to an end strength of just over 6,000.

During the past year, readiness reports submitted by the units have been refined and provide top management with more accurate data on unit status.

The Reserve components consist of a large number of trained personnel, dedicated to respond as soon as practicable to the Army effort. I see our job as the requirement to bring to reality the expression of our first President when he said that our militia must be in the position that they may appear "truly respectable in the eyes of our friends and formidable to those who would otherwise become our enemies."

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General.

TEN POINT RESERVE COMPONENT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

It is noted that in your statement you briefly mentioned the 10 point management program instituted last fall by General Peers. I would like you for the record to enlarge in some detail on this program.

(The information follows:)

The Ten-Point Reserve Component Improvement Program is basically a management tool to focus attention of all activities contributing to the readiness of the ARNG and USAR units.

A brief description of each of the 10 points follows:

1. *Equipment.* Included are efforts to increase the flow of equipment to the USAR and ARNG units for essential training. Distribution policies, for example, between home station and active training sites, also are included.

2. *Home station facilities and training areas.* Included is assessment of requirements for additional secure storage areas for the additional equipment, adequacy of nearby training areas particularly for combat units, and provision of adequate home station facilities, either by expansion of present armories or centers or construction of new buildings.

3. *Personnel recruitment and retention.* Emphasizes reenlistment of the well trained competent citizen-soldier, particularly the young leaders.

4. *Personnel qualifications.* Additional professional and technical training requirements are determined and means are sought to permit the Army Guardsmen and U.S. Army Reservists to receive the required training.

5. *Technicians and advisors.* Recognizes the key role in unit readiness played by the full-time technician, normally also a member of the unit, and the advisor. an active Army officer or enlisted man.

6. *Aviation.* Includes a program to increase the number of Reserve component aviators who have had Vietnam experience as well as to increase the number of modern aircraft available to the ARNG and USAR units.

7. *Improved readiness.* Refers to various tests and experiments to explore additional means of increasing the readiness of USAR and ARNG units.

8. *One Army concept.* Applies primarily to Army Staff to include consideration of the Reserve component requirements in Army plans. Also included are plans to insure more Active Army participation with ARNG and USAR units in the field.

9. *Public affairs program.* The objective is to improve the image of the Reserve components in the eyes of the local communities as well as on a national scale.

10. *Management.* This is primarily an effort to consolidate the activities listed above, insure balance in the efforts being made, and to seek the necessary funds to support the program.

The Ten-Point Program was initiated last September and progress toward each of the 10 points is assessed on a monthly basis and reported to the Chief of Staff. Copies of the report are circulated to U.S. Continental Army Command and all Department of the Army staff agencies.

The program has been explained at meetings of Army staff agency heads, to the deputy commanders of each Continental Army, and to the Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee. It also has been publicized in various publications of the ARNG and the USAR.

Mr. WHITTEN. Also, would you provide for the record a copy of the directive which spells out the details of this program.

(The information follows:)

No formal directive has been initiated nor is one anticipated with regard to the Ten-Point Reserve Component Improvement Program. It is considered essentially a managerial tool.

SHORTFALL IN COMBAT READINESS

Mr. WHITTEN. You mention also that the lack of modern equipment for home station training, together with a shortage of nearby training facilities for weekend maneuvers, will make it difficult for units to reach combat readiness objectives of Army war plans.

Would you expand on that statement briefly at this time?

General WILLIAMSON. Yes, sir.

As you recall, in early 1968 we made a conscientious effect to reorganize our Reserves and put them in position to respond to the requirements of the Army. In some cases it was necessary that we put those units near population centers. As we go closer to the population centers, we find it more difficult to find local training areas. So, the lack of local or weekend training areas constitutes a restriction to us.

In the last few months, however, I think we have made material progress in assisting Reserve component units in using facilities available to the Active Army.

I visited a unit a few days ago, a North Carolina unit, which goes into Fort Braggs, N.C. They actually exchange training areas and training facilities and equipment during their training period. We are making progress in that area.

CHANGES IN ARMY RESERVE EQUIPMENT DURING 1969

Mr. WHITTEN. Provide for the record a breakdown of the $150 million in new equipment you received, and also spell out what you retired and what was withdrawn for use by the Active Army.

You might also put in the record where you allocated this new equipment.

General WILLIAMSON. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

EQUIPMENT RECEIVED BY RESERVE

Receipts of major equipment items by Army Reserve components in fiscal year 1969 were as follows:

Item	Quantity to ARNG	Quantity to USAR	Total quantity	Cost at replacement prices (in thousands)
Gun, self-propelled, 175-millimeter	0	7	7	$1,125
Howitzer, 8-inch, self-propelled	10	5	15	2,022
Howitzer, 155-millimeter, self-propelled	18	24	42	5,000
Rifle, M–14	15,000	4,800	19,800	2,574
Recovery vehicle, light	47	0	47	4,383
Truck, cargo, 1¼-ton	934	743	1,677	19,678
Truck, utility, ¼-ton	389	105	494	1,723
Truck, dump, 5-ton	549	206	755	13,127
Lighter, amphib, LARC V	0	16	16	700
Carrier, cargo, M548	191	0	191	7,688
Tractor, wheel, industrial	21	19	40	2,000
Scraper, earth moving, 18-cubic-yard	64	24	88	1,400
Grader, road, motorized	63	40	103	1,818
Crane, wheel-mounted, 20-ton	10	19	29	2,252
Telephone, field, TA–312	22,080	12,466	34,546	748

The above list includes the 15 items of highest total dollar value received in fiscal year 1969. The total value of receipts by ARNG/USAR in fiscal year 1969 (estimated at $150 million) includes approximately 100 additional specific line items of lesser value. The $150 million was computed at estimated replacement costs and was distributed as follows: $98 million to ARNG and $52 million to USAR.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN FROM RESERVE

Withdrawals of major items of equipment from Army Reserve components in fiscal year 1969 for use by Active Army follows:

Item	Quantity from—		Total Quantity	Cost at original processing prices [1]
	Army National Guard	U.S. Army Reserve		
Airplane, fixed wing, 01 model	17	3	20	$386
Recovery vehicle, medium	23	27	50	8,470
Carrier, armored personnel	0	52	52	1,412
Radar, AN/TPS–25	3	0	3	152
Crane-Shovel, trk mtd, 20-ton	47	20	67	2,912
Carrier, mortar, 81mm	21	0	21	786
Truck, cargo, 10-ton	37	0	37	987

[1] In thousands of dollars.

EQUIPMENT RETIRED

The total value of major equipment items retired by ARNG/USAR in fiscal year 1969 is estimated, at replacement costs, to be $90 million. A complete list of items is not available. The $90 million was estimated at ——— of dollar value of equipment assets on hand at the beginning of the fiscal year. The ——— is a considered estimate, probably somewhat low, based on the fact that very few major equipment items have effective life of more than ——— in a typical year would be retired). Retirements include items which reach unserviceable and uneconomically reparable condition and which have salvage value only, plus items deliberately retained for cannibalization only, plus items lost due to damage in use or other casualty. For example, in fiscal year 1969 there were 11 aircraft retired due to crash damage, nine destroyed in a hangar fire (Trenton, N.J.) and 18 aircraft converted to cannibalization status.

General Statement, Chief, Army Reserve

Mr. Whitten. We will next hear from General Sutton on the Reserve personnel, Army, request.

General, will you proceed.

General Sutton. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is always a pleasure to appear before you to present the Army Reserve and ROTC budget and to inform you of the current status of the programs. The Army Reserve deeply appreciates your demonstrated interest and efforts over the years to improve Army Reserve readiness.

Here with me today from my office are: Mr. Pethtal, my Comptroller, Colonel Gill, Chief, Personnel Division, Colonel Huddlestone, Chief, Organization and Training Division, Lt. Col. Talbot, my budget officer.

Also with me today is Colonel Hoffman from the Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. He is available to respond to questions on the Army ROTC which is included in the "Reserve Personnel, Army" budget.

My office is responsible for the implementation and execution of approved plans, policies, and programs pertaining to the U.S. Army Reserve, including the preparation, justification, and execution of the budgets that provide for our direct financial support.

For "Reserve Personnel, Army" our fiscal year 1971 request is for $336.5 million, of which $305.2 million is for the Army Reserve and $31.3 million is for the ROTC.

An amount of $306.7 million was appropriated by the Congress for fiscal year 1970. The addition of a supplemental amount of $22.9 million for the military pay raise brings total fiscal year 1970 to $329.6 million. This amount will provide for the support of an Army Reserve average strength of 258,796 and end strength of 260,000.

The fiscal year 1971 budget request is for $336.5 million, a net increase of $6.9 million over fiscal year 1970. This results primarily from the higher average strength and man-years of REP training in fiscal year 1971 over fiscal year 1970.

Our established mission is to furnish, in the event of war or national emergency, and at such other times as national security may require, units effectively organized, trained, and equipped in time of peace for rapid mobilization, expansion, and deployment; such units to be of the types and numbers to meet the requirement of the Army, and also, additional qualified individual personnel for necessary replacement and expansion of the Army. Our objective is to bring these units and indi-

viduals to the highest state of readiness attainable—a state of readiness that will insure a minimum requirement of postmobilization training.

The other important program supported in this budget is Army ROTC with an enrollment of 109,500 students in the Senior Division and 124,500 students in the Junior Division. The ROTC program over the past 10 years has provided over 63 percent of the Active Army's newly commissioned second lieutenants. Over 50 percent of our Regular Army second lieutenants are products of ROTC, and 35 percent of the present Active Army officer corps received their commissions through ROTC.

ORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY RESERVE

We have had no significant troop structure changes since the major reorganization in fiscal year 1968. Within our major units and smaller units we had as of December 31, 1969, 3,478 company and detachment size units. These have authorized strengths ranging from 93 to 100 percent of TOE, with the overall average being 95.6 percent.

MOBILIZATION AND DEMOBLIZATION

Forty-five U.S. Army Reserve company/detachment-size units were mobilized on May 13, 1968. Of these, 35 units or 77 percent served in Vietnam. The remaining 10 units were employed to strengthen the Strategic Reserve.

In addition to the 5,181 members of units mobilized, 2,752 members of the Individual Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve were mobilized and assigned to Active Army, Army Reserve, and Army National Guard units.

The last of our mobilized units was released from active service on December 12, 1969, after having compiled a splendid record of service. The units that were deployed to Vietnam drew the highest priase and acclaim from every level in the Active Army.

STRENGTH

The strength of the Army Reserve as of November 30, 1969, was 1,410,000, consisting of 1,184,000 in the Ready Reserve and 226,000 in the Standby Reserve. There were 277,000 in the Retired Reserve. The Ready Reserve consists of those units and individuals available for immediate employment in the expansion of the active forces in the event of mobilization.

PAID DRILL STRENGTH

Our actual end fiscal year 1968 strength was 244,239 or some 10,000 short of the program. The principal causes of this shortage were the reogranization and the suspension of enlistments until the reorganization was completed.

For fiscal year 1969 we programed to attain the minimum average strength in accordance with Public Law 90–500. Although still contending with the after effects of the fiscal year 1968 reorganization, Army Reserve unit commanders were able to increase the unit strength

by 17,083 for an end fiscal year 1969 strength of 261,322, and an average strength of 248,911 for the year.

For fiscal year 1970, Public Law 91–121 required that we program to attain an average strength of not less than 255,591. The fiscal year 1970 strength program in this budget is for an average of 258,796. Our December 31, 1969, actual strength was 258,869, and our actual average through December 31, 1969, was 259,360 which should insure our attaining the Public Law 91–121 average strength provision. In short, the fiscal year 1970 strength position of the Army Reserve is very good.

This fiscal year 1971 budget is for a begin, average, and end strength of 260,000, and I am confident that we will attain that strength program.

ENLISTED PERSONNEL PROCUREMENT

We are now relying almost entirely on non-prior-service enlistments for the maintenance of unit strength.

The Reserve enlistment program (REP–63) continues to be of great importance in the maintenance of Army Reserve strength and the stabilization of our trained unit personnel. These young men are enlisted for position vacancies to troop units, undergo their varying periods of active duty training, then return to their units as individually trained soldiers.

RESERVE ENLISTMENT PROGRAM TRAINING INPUT

The budget program for REP–63 input to training for fiscal year 1970 is 55,172 and for fiscal year 1971 is 39,000. This program would result in 13,000 awaiting input to REP training at end fiscal year 1970 and 8,000 at end fiscal year 1971.

PROGRAM DATA

The following are strength and significant active duty for training programs for fiscal year 1971. For the Army Reserve, this estimate provides active duty and reserve duty training for a beginning strength of 260,000, including 36,003 enlisted personnel in the "REP–63" active duty training program. The end strength is budgeted to be 260,000, including 20,580 enlisted personnel in "REP–63" training.

The budget provides for 39,000 non-prior-service enlistees to enter on a tour of active duty for training under "REP–63."

Active duty for training is included for 3,000 nonunit officer students in USAR schools and for 4,300 officer mobilization designees.

Individual reinforcement training is included for 3,600 officers and 37,100 enlisted personnel. This provides MOS refresher training for members of the Individual Ready Reserve who are subject to being ordered to active duty on mobilization.

School training is for 8,768 officers and 3,154 enlisted, and includes Army service schools, Army area schools, OCS, and language training.

Special training is for 24,218 officers and 3,901 enlisted, and includes special tours, seminars, command post exercises, supervision and operation of units, precamp conferences, and unit members in USAR schools.

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

The senior division of the ROTC produces junior officers for the Active Army and Reserve Components. The program is operated at selected civilian and military colleges.

For the senior division, the budget provides training for a fiscal year 1971 entering enrollment of 109,500. End fiscal year 1970 commissions are estimated to be 16,700, and the 16,970 MS III enrollment in fiscal year 1970 will produce about 14,700 junior officers at end fiscal year 1971.

Since August of 1961, all commissioned ROTC graduates have been ordered to 2 or more years of active duty with the Army.

For the junior division, enrollment of 124,500 is budgeted for fiscal year 1971.

My statement on the Army ROTC addresses only the budget for that program. Colonel Hoffman will respond to any program and policy questions you may have on the ROTC.

Mr. Chairman, this completes my opening statement. We appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you to present our fiscal year 1971 budget.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General Sutton.

GENERAL STATEMENT, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

We will now hear from General Wilson on the National Guard, Army, request.

General WILSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I welcome the opportunity to appear before you to report upon the functions and activities of the Army National Guard. We are here today to request funds to provide the necessary pay, allowances, subsistence, clothing, and travel for training and readiness of Army National Guard personnel during fiscal year 1971.

The fiscal year 1971 National Guard personnel, Army budget request is $387.1 million. This will support a beginning, ending, and average strength of 400,000.

Before proceeding with the details of this budget, I should like to review certain accomplishments during fiscal year 1969, our major programs for fiscal year 1970, and to discuss program forecasts for fiscal year 1971.

STRENGTH

On June 30, 1969, the federally recognized strength of the Army National Guard was 388,954. The total number of officers and warrant officers was 30,432, and the number of enlisted personnel was 358,522. The average strength for the year was 388,942.

The fiscal year 1970 program provides for an Army National Guard yearend strength of 400,000. The units mobilized in May 1968 returned to State control September through December 1969. As of December 31, 1969, our strength was 393,404.

ENLISTMENT AND REP PROGRAM

Authorized strength levels are maintained by Army National Guard units through enlistment of prior service personnel and the recruitment of nonprior service personnel who are required to take active duty training with the Army. The active duty training required for all recruits under this program varies from a minimum of 4 months to that period required for military occupational specialty qualification. In fiscal year 1969, 31,290 recruits entered training. The average period of active duty training was approximately 5½ months.

The backlog of personnel awaiting training is not anticipated to be a major problem in fiscal year 1970 or fiscal year 1971. The budget was based on an anticipated backlog at end of fiscal year 1970 of approximately 26,000. However, we are experiencing a higher than programed loss rate and now estimate that about 35,000 will be awaiting entry into active duty training at end of fiscal year 1970. In an effort to offset this higher than programed loss rate, the National Guard Bureau and the States have launched a drive aimed at greatly increasing the numbers of prior service personnel in our units. In this drive we are also seeking to greatly increase the number of personnel who will remain in the Army National Guard after their 6-year military service obligation has been completed.

MILITARY OCCUPATIONAL SPECIALTY (MOS) TESTS

The Army National Guard continued MOS testing of personnel during fiscal year 1969 and fiscal year 1970, and during fiscal year 1969 attained an overall qualified rate of 93.2 percent.

TRAINING ON WEEKENDS

The fiscal year 1971 budget provides for the conduct of 48 training assemblies, the same level as that for fiscal year 1970. The conduct of multiple unit training assemblies, generally one weekend per month, continued to provide improvement in our level of readiness during training year 1969. The training objective was the conduct of platoon Army training tests. Of 1,341 combat Army platoons, 476 were exempted from the tests because of lack of facilities, lack of equipment, or because of recent reorganizations. Ninety-eight percent of the 865 platoons tested satisfactorily completed the test.

UNIT TRAINING ASSEMBLY ATTENDANCE

In fiscal year 1969, percentage of attendance at inactive duty training assemblies for officers was 98.8. Percentage of attendance of enlisted men was 96.8. The percentage of all personnel participating in inactive duty training was 96.9.

As of December 31, 1969, the fiscal year 1970 percentage of attendance is 98.3 for officers, 96.3 for enlisted personnel, and 96.5 for the aggregate.

TRAINING AT ARMY SERVICE AND AREA SCHOOLS

During fiscal year 1969, 9,777 guardsmen attended courses of instruction conducted in Army service and Army area schools. The current request supports an enrollment program of 10,251.

The National Guard Bureau restricted enrollment in the State OCS program during the summer of 1969 in recognition of some officer overstrength that existed from the last major reorganization. The enrollment for 1970 was 2,502 which included 118 members of the Army Reserve. The fiscal year 1971 budget request supports an attendance of 5,000 based upon projected officer losses.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AVIATION

During fiscal year 1969, the number of aviators on flying status decreased to 1,640 including those assigned to mobilized units.

In fiscal year 1969, flying hours totaled 175,689, a decrease from fiscal year 1968. The program for fiscal year 1970 is 201,250 flying hours.

During the first half of fiscal year 1970 the ARNG aviation program stabilized and began to indicate a continuance of the upward trend which was interrupted by the Vietnam buildup. Initial flight training quotas for the Army National Guard were discontinued during fiscal year 1965. During fiscal year 1970 the Army National Guard received about 450 unprogramed quotas for this program. Because of the tremendous interest on the part of young guardsmen, and because of the command emphasis placed on the program by the National Guard Bureau and the States, all of these quotas were filled on a very short notice. The fiscal year 1971 request provides for 35 students to enter this program. We anticipate that a larger unprogramed number of quotas will be made available. At the same time recruiting efforts have been directed at the warrant officer aviators being separated from active duty. As of the end of December 1969, there were 1,703 aviators on flying status. Program objective for ending fiscal year 1970 is 2,000 and for ending fiscal year 1971 it is 2,500.

Paralleling the upswing in assigned aviators is the receipt of new type aircraft into the ARNG inventory. CH–34 aircraft are programed for 26 States and OV–1 for the fixed wing surveillance companies. In addition to enhancing the readiness posture on the ARNG aviation units this will permit more realistic integrated training and assist in the recruiting of prior service aviators.

EQUIPMENT

The Army National Guard equipment posture has not changed materially since last year. Demobilized ARNG units were provided minimum essential training equipment through DA allocation from available depot stocks and redistribution of assets within the ARNG inventory. Current and projected changes in force structure generates sizable equipment requirements. In some instances the new units being added are authorized more sophisticated equipment items than

those units being replaced. Limited improvement has been realized through DA allocation of some standard A-type equipment items. In some cases, receipt of new equipment has permitted the limited purging of obsolete or C. & T. classified items from the ARNG inventory. Continued emphasis on equipment maintenance at all levels as well as increased funding for acquisition of repair has resulted in improved equipment serviceability for training and a more favorable status of materiel readiness.

STATE DUTY

During calendar year 1969 the National Guard was called to State active duty by Governors for civil disturbance emergencies 67 times. They were actually committed to the streets 51 times. In no instance was it necessary for a State Governor to request the President of the United States for Federal assistance. Additionally, the National Guard was called to State duty 89 times to assist civil authorities during natural disasters and other emergencies helping out in hurricanes, floods, snow storms, train wrecks, power failures, missing person searches, et cetera.

RELEASE OF ARMY NATIONAL GUARD UNITS

Release from Federal service of the Army Guard units mobilized in 1968 was completed in December 1969, with units returned to State control. The first units released from active duty were the 19 company-size units which served in Vietnam. These units were released beginning in July 1969, and continued through November 1969. The remaining 64 company/detachment size units were released by December 12, 1969.

The Army National Guard structure now consists of eight combat divisions, 28 brigade level organizations, 70 group headquarters, 163 battalions, 128 battalion headquarters units, and other supporting units. Total units 3.038. During fiscal year 1970 we lost 12 Air Defense units which were replaced by other units in order to retain our 400,000 mandated strength.

OVERALL BUDGETARY SIGNIFICANCE

The fiscal year 1971 budget for National Guard personnel, Army totals $387.1 million, a decrease of $3.6 million, compared to the fiscal year 1970 program of $390.7 million. A summary of the separate projects of this program follows.

TRAINING—PAY GROUP A

Provided within this project are the pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, travel for both unit training assemblies, and annual field training. There will be 31,918 officers and 333,071 enlisted personnel participating in 2 weeks' annual field training, and 32,305 officers and 339,207 enlisted personnel participating in unit training assemblies at home stations and at weekend training sites. The fiscal year 1971 estimate of $309.5 million for this project is $9.5 million more than the fiscal year 1970 program of $300 million. The difference is attributable to an increase in annual field training participants of 7,275 and in armory drills of 11,750.

TRAINING—RESERVE ENLISTMENT PROGRAM—PAY GROUP F

This provides the support for pay, travel, subsistence, and clothing for the training of nonprior service personnel on active duty training of not less than 4 months at Army training centers. The in-training strength at the start of fiscal year 1971 is estimated to be 24,517 trainees, and support is provided for 52,200 nonprior service personnel to enter training in fiscal year 1971. The fiscal year 1971 estimate of $54.8 million is a decrease of $11.7 million under the fiscal year 1970 program of $66.5 million. It reflects a decrease caused by an input of 52,200 in fiscal year 1971 compared to an estimated input of 60,780 in fiscal year 1970.

SCHOOL TRAINING

This program provides support for pay, allowances, travel, and subsistence for the attendance of 9,523 personnel at Army Service and area schools, and 258 at Air Defense training. The fiscal year 1971 estimate of $17.5 million, a decrease of $0.8 million under the fiscal year 1970 amount of $18.3 million is primarily attributed to a decrease of approximately 264 students during fiscal year 1971.

SPECIAL TRAINING

This provides for essential special tours of full-time training duty to maintain individual and unit capability to administer, plan, and conduct training, such as preannual training conferences, command post exercises, short notice annual practice, and statutory boards. These tours vary in length from 2 to 90 days and permit participation of individual members as well as unit staffs in training missions essential to the overall readiness posture of the Army National Guard. The fiscal year 1971 estimate of $2.2 million is $0.3 million less than programed for fiscal year 1970 as a result of the transfer of annual field training for Air Defense (SNAP) personnel to training—pay group A.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

This provides for pay and allowances of 93 Army National Guard officers on active duty tours with the Army under various statutory authorities; permanent change of station travel; death, disability, and hospitalization benefits, and that portion of the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance which is paid by the Government.

The fiscal year 1971 estimate of $3.1 million is a decrease of $0.3 million under fiscal year 1970, mainly because of the reduction in group life insurance costs for a 52,200 REP input in fiscal year 1971 compared to 60,780 REP input in fiscal 1970.

SUMMARY

In 1969 we saw the mobilized units of both the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard returned to State control.

During their period of mobilization, the National Guard was commended as having provided outstanding service in support of the active forces in Southeast Asia and in the Continental United States. They were also commended for the dispatch and the efficiency with which

they brought serious disorders under control in numerous towns and cities throughout these United States.

Guardsmen continue to reflect their professional competence, teamwork, and devotion to American ideals. The units have demonstrated that if properly equipped the Army National Guard can achieve a high mark of performance, serving both State and Nation.

This concludes my statement. I will be happy to answer questions which the committee members may ask.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you, General.

USE OF NATIONAL GUARD IN DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES

In connection with your statement, I would like you to list the places where the Guard was called out, the length of time, the number of people, and the dates, in natural disasters as well as other problems.

General WILSON. Yes, sir; I would be glad to. It comes almost daily. We saw more of this than being called to Federal active duty.

Mr. WHITTEN. I can easily believe that.

(The information follows:)

NATIONAL GUARD IN DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1969

Date	Place	Nature of disturbance	Status of troops	Number of troops	
				Called	Committed
Jan. 1, 1969	Pender, Neb	Blizzard	State	3	3
Jan. 1–3, 1969	Ash, N.C	Search for missing person	do	53	53
Jan. 2–4, 1969	Hartington, Neb	Blizzard	do	4	4
Jan. 8–9, 1969	Wilcox County, Ala	Search for evidence in Judges slaying.	do	42	42
Jan. 9–10, 1969	Mobile, Ala	Search for missing person	do	47	47
Jan. 13–15, 1969	Lima, Ohio	Oil line burst with fires	do	309	309
Jan. 15–19, 1969	Springville, Ala	Train wreck	do	48	48
Jan. 16–26, 1969	Central, Neb	Downed plane	do	72	72
Jan. 18–21, 1969	Washington, D.C	Possible civil disturbance, inauguration (Mr. Nixon).	MUTA	1,694	1,694
Jan. 22–24, 1969	Chambers County, Ala	Search for missing person	State	13	13
Jan. 24–27, 1969	Hazlehurst, Miss	Tornado	do	15	15
Jan. 24–30, 1969	Soldotna, Alaska	Flood	do	15	15
Jan. 25–28, 1969	California	do	do	431	431
Jan. 25, –Feb. 1, 1969	Broken Bow and Arthur, Neb.	Power failure	do	5	5
Jan. 27–29, 1969	Okanogan County, Wash	Snow storm	do	31	31
Jan. 28–Feb. 15, 1969	Southern section, N. Dak	do	do	29	29
Jan. 29, 1969	Mason County, Wash	do	do	11	11
Jan. 30, 1969	Napoleon, Ohio	Ice jam on river	do	64	64
Jan. 30, 1969	Allenstown, N.H	Search for missing person	do	31	31
Jan. 31–Feb. 4, 1969	Morris and Appleton, Minn.	Snow storm	do	9	9
Feb. 2, 1969	Franklin County, N.C	Search for missing person	do	190	190
Feb. 6–18, 1969	Mobile, Ala	Possible civil disturbance	do	364	364
Feb. 9, 1969	Linden, Ala	Search for missing person	do	40	40
Feb. 12–21, 1969	Madison, Wisc	University riot	do	2,249	2,249
Feb. 13–16, 1969	Durham, N.C	Civil disturbance	do	965	0
Feb. 15–16, 1969	Columbia, S.C	University riot	do	49	49
Feb. 16–19, 1969	Rainsville, Ala	Power failure	do	13	13
Feb. 17–26, 1969	Richmond and Anson County, N.C.	Ice storm	do	[1] 57	57
Feb. 18–20, 1969	Crete, Nebr	Train wreck	do	109	109
Feb. 20–23, 1969	Berkeley, Calif	College disturbance	do	1,905	1,905
Feb. 25–Mar. 5, 1969	California	Flood	do	197	197
Feb. 28–Mar. 22, 1969	Central, N.D	Snow removal	do	53	53
Mar. 5–6, 1969	Rice Patch Island, N.C	Search for missing person	do	87	87
Mar. 5–7, 1969	Durham, N.C	Civil disturbance	do	603	0
Mar. 12–15, 1969	do	do	do	660	660
Mar. 17, 1969	Stevens Pass, Wash	Avalanche control	do	2	2
Mar. 20–21, 1969	Tallapoosa County, Ala	Search for missing person	do	56	56
Mar. 26–May 4, 1969	Cities along the Mississippi River, Iowa.	Floods	do	848	848

See footnotes at end of table.

NATIONAL GUARD IN DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1969—Continued

Date	Place	Nature of disturbance	Status of troops	Number of troops: Called	Number of troops: Committed
Mar. 29–Apr. 1, 1969	Charleston, S.C	Civil disturbance	do	221	221
Mar. 31–Apr. 2, 1969	Abilene, Kans	Eisenhower's funeral	do	241	241
Apr. 1–3, 1969	Cities along the Mississippi River, Ill.	Floods	do	64	64
Apr. 2–6, 1969	Montgomery and Selma, Ala.	Civil disturbance	do	459	459
Apr. 3–5, 1969	Chicago, Ill	Memorial Rev. King	do	5,373	5,373
Apr. 3–6, 1969	Baltimore, Md	do	do	609	0
Apr. 4–6, 1969	Washington, D.C	do	MUTA	1,522	0
Do	Atlanta, Ga	do	State	510	510
Apr. 4–21, 1969	Cities on Big Sioux, Vermillion and James Rivers, S.D.	Flood	do	[2] 556	[2] 556
Apr. 7–8, 1969	Selma, Ala	Civil disturbance	do	62	62
Do	Waycross, Ga	Possible civil distrubance	do	89	89
Apr. 8, –May 10, 1969	Cities on Red, Cheyenne, and Moose Rivers, N.D.	Floods	do	466	466
Apr. 9–22, 1969	Cities along the Mississippi River, Minn.	do	do	316	316
Apr. 10, 1969	Hampton, S.C	Civil disturbance	do	66	0
Apr. 18–19, 1969	Raleigh, N.C	Possible civil disturbance	do	452	0
Apr. 21,–May 1, 1969	Whiteside County, Ill	Flood	do	100	100
Apr. 21–May 25, 1969	Charleston, S.C	Civil disturbance	do	3,918	1,050
Apr. 23,–May 3, 1969	Henderson County, Ill	Flood	do	48	48
Apr. 25–27, 1969	St. Augustine, Dade City and Tampa, Fla.	Civil disturbance	do	21	21
Apr. 28–30, 1969	Denmark, S.C	College disturbance	do	256	256
Apr. 28–May 3, 1969	Des Moines, Iowa	Fireman's strike	do	99	99
Apr. 29–30, 1969	Columbus, Ohio	Prison security	do	358	358
Apr. 29–May 1, 1969	Winston Salem, N.C	Civil disturbance	do	162	162
Apr. 29–May 1, 1969	Mansfield, Ohio	Reformatory riot	do	76	76
Apr. 29–May 4, 1969	Cairo, Ill	Civil disturbance	do	224	224
May 1–6, 1969	Mobile, Ala	do	do	415	415
May 5–9, 1969	New Orleans, La	do	do	759	759
May 6–7, 1969	Hanover. N.H	College disturbance	do	9	9
May 7, 1969	Cleburne, Tex	Flood	do	29	29
May 8–9, 1969	Washington D.C	Disturbance at Howard U	MUTA	[4] 835	835
May 8–10, 1969	Green County, Ohio	Tornado	State	195	195
May 9, 1969	Lawrence, Kans	Civil disturbance	do	37	37
May 10–11, 1969	Zap, N. Dak	do	do	970	970
May 12–15, 1969	Baton Rouge La	College disturbance	do	1,448	
May 15–June 3, 1969	Berkeley, Calif	do	do	5,600	5,600
May 16–21, 1969	Burlington, N.C	Civil disturbance	do	502	502
May 19–26, 1969	Jefferson City, Mo	College disturbance	do	239	239
May 21, 1969	Groveton, N.H	Flood	do	2	2
May 21–25, 1969	Greensboro, N.C	Civil disturbance	do	735	735
May 26, 1969	Sacramento, Calif	do	do	530	530
May 27–30, 1969	Blount County, Ala	Search for missing person	do	49	49
May 29–30, 1969	Charleston, S.C	Civil disturbance	do	376	376
May 31–June 1, 1969	Blacksburg, S.C	do	do	84	
June 5, 1969	Marshall, Ala	Search for missing person	do	24	24
June 13–15, 1969	Loudon, N.H	Possible civil disturbance	do	203	203
June 18, 1969	Lansing, Kans	Prison riot	do	72	
June 20–July 3, 1969	Charleston, S.C	Hospital workers strike	do	301	301
June 22–23, 1969	Salina, Kans	Tornado	do	157	157
June 22–24, 1969	Tellico Plains, Tenn	Search for missing person	do	147	147
June 15–18, 1969	Belen, N. Mex	Flood	do	66	66
June 25–26, 1969	Jasper, Minn	Tornado	do	23	23
June 26–27, 1969	Salina, Kans	Tornado clean-up	do	7	7
June 26–July 1, 1969	Omaha, Nebr	Civil disturbance	do	881	
July 4–6, 1969	Lakewood, Ohio	Flood	do	127	125
July 4–9, 1969	Sandusky, Ohio	do	do	72	72
July 5–9, 1969	Norwalk, Ohio	do	do	156	145
July 5–18, 1969	Oakville, Iowa	do	do	268	268
July 10, 1969	Wheatland, Wyo	Collapsed dam	do	10	10
July 13, 1969	Kennedy Park, Wyo	Forest fire	do	25	25
July 16, 1969	Pershing County, Nev	Dynamite of power poles, flumes and irrigation canals.	do	11	11
July 17–20, 1969	Youngstown, Ohio	Civil disturbance	do	163	163
July 19, 1969	Onamia, Minn	Search for missing person	do	100	100
July 21–24, 1969	Columbus, Ohio	Civil disturbance	do	1,113	1,113
July 22–28, 1969	York, Pa	do	do	619	619
July 24, 1969	Sutton, N.H	Search for missing person	do	2	2
July 29–Aug. 10, 1969	Springfield, Weathersfield, Brattleboro, and Ascutney, Vt.	Floods	do	38	38

See footnotes at end of table.

NATIONAL GUARD IN DOMESTIC EMERGENCIES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1969—Continued

Date	Place	Nature of disturbance	Status of troops	Number of troops Called	Number of troops Committed
July 31–Aug. 2, 1969	Baton Rouge, La	Civil disturbance	State	532	532
Aug. 2, 1969	Town Creek, Ala	Search for missing person	do	41	41
Aug. 3, 1969	Noel, Mo	Explosion and fires	do	109	109
Aug. 6, 1969	Prattville, Ala	Search for drowned person	do	8	8
Aug. 6–7, 1969	Outing, Minn	Tornado	do	64	64
Aug. 7, 1969	Tofte, Minn	Search for missing person	do	105	105
Aug. 8, 1969	Salem, N.H	Search for information	do	2	2
Aug. 9–13, 1969	Hamilton and Clermont Counties, Ohio.	Tornado	do	672	672
Aug. 16–18, 1969	Apalachicola, Fla	Hurricane Camille	do	3	3
Aug. 17–19, 1969	Kerr County, Tex	Range fire	do	137	137
Aug. 17–31, 1969	Mobile, Ala	Aided Mississippi, and clean up in Alabama during Hurricane Camille.	do	136	136
Aug. 17–Sep 5, 1969	Coastal area of Miss	Hurricane Camille	do	[3] 3,878	3,878
Aug. 16–27, 1969	Southeast area of La	do	do	424	424
Aug. 20–21, 1969	Pence Springs, W Va	Flood	do	97	97
Aug. 21–24, 1969	Richmond, Va	do	do	710	710
Aug. 22–Sep. 7, 1969	Nelson County, Va	do	do	45	45
Aug. 24–25, 1969	Piedmont, W. Va	Train derailed	do	29	29
Aug. 19–24, 1969	Forest City, Ark	Civil disturbance	do	85	85
Aug. 27–29, 1969	Forest City, Ark	do	do	182	182
Aug. 31–Sept. 4, 1969	Fort Lauderdale and Broward County, Fla.	do	do	293	293
Sep. 1, 1969	Pratt, Kan	Flood	do	14	14
Sep. 4–10, 1969	Aliceville, Ala	Civil disturbance	do	121	121
Sep. 9–13, 1969	Indianapolis, Ind	Airplane crash	do	5	5
Sep. 11–12, 1969	Glendora, Miss	Train derailed	do	512	512
Sep. 19, 1969	Hampton, N.H	Search for evidence	do	1	1
Sep. 22, 1969	Hampton, N.H	Search for weapon	do	1	1
Sep. 22–23, 1969	Mullins, Marion County, S.C.	Civil disturbance	do	56	56
Sep. 22–23, 1969	Tallahassee, Fla	Flood	do	5	5
Sep. 29, 1969	Madison, Wis	Civil disturbance	do	1,053	1,053
Sep. 30–Oct. 27, 1969	Berry and Oakman, Ala	Haul water	do	6	6
Oct. 2, 1969	Manchester, N.H	Search for weapons	do	1	1
Oct. 6, 1969	Las Vegas, Nev	Civil disturbance	do	357	357
Oct. 7–9, 1969	Las Vegas, Nev	do	do	357	357
Oct. 8–9, 1969	Vicinity of Daytona, Fla	Downed plane	do	2	2
Oct. 9–11, 1969	Chicago, Ill	Civil disturbance	do	2,251	100
Oct. 13–14, 1969	Abilene, Kans	Stamp Dedication for President Eisenhower.	do	66	17
Oct. 15, 1969	Baltimore, Md	Civil disturbance	do	593	16
Oct. 15, 1969	Detroit, Mich	do	do	1,365	----
Oct. 15–16, 1969	Washington, D.C	Anti-War Moratorium	MUTA	578	----
Oct. 18, 1969	Laramie, Wyo	Possible civil disturbance	do	8	8
Oct. 24–26, 1969	Laramie, Wyo	do	State	135	135
Nov. 14–16, 1969	Washington, D.C	War Moratorium	MUTA	[4] 1,521	[3] 741
Nov. 28–30, 1969	West Palm Beach, Fla	Possible civil disturbance (Rock Festival).	State	387	----
Dec. 3, 1969	Opelika, Ala	Possible civil disturbance	do	82	----
Dec. 8, 1969	Watts, Calif	Civil disturbance	do	[2] 12	----
Dec. 10–11, 1969	Akron, Ohio	do	do	595	----
Dec. 16, 1969	Stevens Pass, Wash	Avalanche control	do	6	6
Dec. 16–17, 1969	Madison, Wis	Civil disturbance	do	2	2
Dec. 28–31, 1969	Burlington, St. Albans, and Rutland, Vt.	Snow emergency	do	35	35
Dec. 29–31, 1969	Ticonderoga, N.Y	do	do	58	58
Dec. 30–31, 1969	Weston, Logan, Hinton, and Williamson, W. Va.	Floods	do	126	126
Dec. 30, 1969–Jan. 1, 1970	Maccaine River area, Va	do	do	48	----

[1] 10 Air National Guard.
[2] Air National Guard and Army National Guard.
[3] Air National Guard.
[4] Army National Guard.

AUTHORIZATION REQUEST, ARMY RESERVE

Mr. WHITTEN. General Sutton, you are requesting funds to support an average paid drill strength of 260,000 and an average paid strength of 308,000. What average paid drill strength have you requested in the authorization bill?

General SUTTON. My average paid drill strength authorization is 255,591 for fiscal year 1970. That is the minimum average paid drill strength for the year.

Mr. WHITTEN. My question was what you had asked in the authorization bill of the legislative committee.

General SUTTON. We asked for 260,000 average paid drill strength for the units.

Mr. WHITTEN. What was the paid strength request of the Army Reserve when you submitted your budget to OSD?

General SUTTON. The paid drill strength request in the fiscal year 1971 budget submitted to OSD was for 260,000 average strength. In fiscal year 1970 we had some units on active duty that did not count in the average. That resulted in the figure of an average strength authorization of 255,591 for the year, which would end at 260,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. What did you request in the way of funding?

General SUTTON. The amount of dollars?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes.

General SUTTON. The figure is $336.5 million.

AUTHORIZATION REQUEST, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. WHITTEN. General Wilson, you are requesting funds to support an average paid strength of 400,000. Is this the same as your authorization request?

General WILSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. What was the paid strength request of the National Guard when you submitted your budget to OSD?

General WILSON. We asked for 400,000, sir—beginning, ending, and average of 400,000.

Mr. WHITTEN. What was your original funding request?

General WILSON. Sir, we asked for slightly more money than we got. I will have to furnish the exact figure for the record.

Mr. WHITTEN. That will be fine.

General WILSON. I can say in what areas we requested it.

(The information follows:)

We requested $385 million. A reduction of $0.8 million was made for adjustments in subsistence rates and $2.9 million was added for the increased per diem cost.

DECREASE IN PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Mr. WHITTEN. An increase of $4,408,000 in personnel compensation is requested for the Army Reserve. However, you show a compensation decrease of $223,000 in personnel benefits. Personnel benefits would seem to be a direct function of personnel compensation. Therefore, why would you show a decrease? You may provide that for the record.

(The information follows:)

Personnel compensation and personnel benefits are not related in every element of this budget. In this case, Army Reserve military base pay is included in personnel compensation: Military, while the $50 per month subsistence allowance to advance course senior division ROTC cadets is included in personnel benefits: Military. For fiscal year 1971, the personnel compensation amount increases because of increased man-years (+1,371) of REP training in fiscal year 1971 over fiscal year 1970, while the decrease in personnel benefits results from the reduction in average advance course ROTC enrollment (—1,360) in fiscal year 1971 under fiscal year 1970.

INCREASE IN SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Mr. WHITTEN. General Sutton, you are requesting an increase of $2,411,000 for supplies and materials. If the increase in paid strength is less than one-half of 1 percent, why do you require an increase of about 7 percent in supplies and materials?

General SUTTON. We have a higher strength level in fiscal 1971 than we had in fiscal 1970.

Mr. WHITTEN. Your paid strength increase is less than one-half of 1 percent. The increase in supplies and materials, however, is about 7 percent. I was asking why there is a much larger increase in supplies and materials as compared with the relatively small increase in the number of people.

General SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I could give you exact figures if I could furnish it for the record but generally the difference is for required clothing we have needed.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, you are getting clothing of which you have been deficient.

General SUTTON. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

As of July 1, 1970, the AG–44 overcoat will replace the old OG–107 overcoat as part of the required Active Army uniform. Active Army stocks of used OG–107 overcoats have been reduced to approximately 50,000.

Many Army Reserve REP–63 enlisted personnel are now receiving the new AG–44 overcoat during initial (REP) training. As of July 1, 1972, all Army Reserve enlisted unit members in the cold weather zones will be required to wear the AG–44 overcoat. Therefore, this fiscal year 1971 budget provides for one-half of that requirement with the remainder to be included in the fiscal year 1972 budget. The fiscal year 1971 increase of $2.3 million is to provide 39,000 AG–44 overcoats for the Army Reserve.

It is essential that the large number of prior service and previously REP trained enlisted personnel in the Army Reserve also receive the proper uniform. They must not be required to wear the old OG–107 overcoat while Active Army personnel and new Army Reserve enlistees wear the new AG–44 overcoat. Such denial would tend to erode the vital principle that the Army Reserve is needed and will be properly supported, and would erode the desire of older members to reenlist when they become eligible. Clothing uniformity is essential to a military unit's obtaining maximum efficiency and effectiveness.

SHORTAGE OF PAY GROUP A OFFICERS

Mr. WHITTEN. Turning to numbers of personnel, why are you increasing your average officer strength for pay goup A by 1,006, while at the same time decreasing your average enlisted strength by 1,173?

General SUTTON. Our officer strength has been lower than authorized. We seriously need additional officers for this program and we

feel that we can get this many more officers toward the goal that we should have. We are confident we will do that.

Mr. WHITTEN. In other words, in your judgment, again, this is a case of being deficient, and you are now taking up the slack.

General SUTTON. This is not from the standpoint of budget limitations, but from the standpoint of the past availability of officers. This year we feel we will get that many more of the officers we need.

INCREASE IN PAY GROUP D OFFICERS

Mr. WHITTEN. Likewise, you are programing an increase in average strength for pay group D of 200 officers, offset by a decrease of 200 enlisted personnel. Is this based on the same reasoning?

General SUTTON. No, sir. This was an adjustment because we needed more officers in that group than we did enlisted men.

INCREASED PER DIEM COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. General Wilson, you are requesting $16,997,000 for travel and transportation of persons, an increase of $1.5 million over 1970. Why is this increase required?

General WILSON. That is in the administrative support?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is on travel and transportation of persons, a request of $1.5 million increase over the preceding year.

General WILSON. That is per diem cost. The per diem increased from $16 to $25 a day for the school program that we normally have, sir. It is a computed figure to include the increased per diem cost.

INCREASE IN PAY GROUP A TRAINING COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. Also, General, on page 5 of the justification book, you are requesting an increase of $9.4 million for training pay group A, while the other categories all show a decrease. Why are you placing increased emphasis on pay group A?

General WILSON. This is to provide for an increase in the personnel attending annual field training and the unit training assemblies, primarily because the units that have returned from active duty are back now in the program. They were not there last year.

There is also a decrease in the REP program which increases the number of enlisted personnel in pay group A.

INCREASED CLOTHING COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 11, you show an increase of $410,000 for individual clothing and uniform gratuities, officers. An increase of almost 40 percent would seem to be out of line with the planned increase for officers in pay group A.

On page 9 of your justification book is a list of the various articles of clothing issued to a new member of the Army Reserve. Included in this list is a subdued insignia. You might address yourself to the clothing gratuities as well as the subdued insignia for the Army Reserve.

General SUTTON. Could I furnish that for the record?

Mr. WHITTEN. You might add to that how much is included in the budget for the purchase of subdued insignia.

General SUTTON. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

In fiscal year 1970 approximately 3,500 officers will be commissioned and entitled to an initial uniform allowance of $200 or $700,000, and 6,500 officers will be entitled to a maintenance allowance of $50 or $325,000 for a total of $1,025,000. In fiscal year 1971 it is estimated that 5,500 officers will be commissioned and entitled to a uniform allowance of $200 or $1,100,000, and 6,700 officers will be entitled to the $50 maintenance allowance or $335,000 for a total of $1,435,000, an increase of 2,200 officers and $410,000 over fiscal year 1970. Page 20 of the National Guard personnel, Army budget lists the clothing authorized new members of the Army National Guard and does not include insignia of grade or the subdued insignia.

Enlisted members of the Army Reserve receive issue-in-kind clothing for initial issue and for replacement. CTA 50–905 clothing items are issued for home station use, and the remainder of the AR 700–84 full clothing bag is issued on entry into REP–63 training. Subdued insignia has been a part of the issue to new enlistees since 1968, and this fiscal year 1971 budget includes $36,000 for subdued insignia.

SUBDUED INSIGNIA

Mr. WHITTEN. Does the Army National Guard issue subdued insignia to any of its members?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, we do.

Mr. WHITTEN. How much is included in the budget for the purchase of this insignia?

General WILSON. It is part of our replacement clothing cost, sir. I will have to break that out separately. It is tied in with that.

Mr. WHITTEN. Do so, if it is not too big a job.

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Procurement of subdued insignia and wear by the Army National Guard is authorized. Since no mandatory wear date was established and availability uncertain, no specific program was developed to implement the change throughout the ARNG. Issue to ARNG enlisted personnel is made through the replacement clothing project as required. Use of subdued insignia is considered more advantageous than the sew-on type because of lesser number of insignia is required and there is less damage to clothing items.

AUGMENTED RATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. General Sutton, on page 11 of your justification book you state that 80 percent of all active duty training subsistence is budgeted at the augmented field ration rate. Why is 80 percent of the active duty training subsistence augmented?

General SUTTON. It is to provide for the additional costs of the Army Reserve units operating their own messes while at annual training. We estimate that 80 percent of our units will operate their own messes and that 20 percent will eat at established Army messes.

Mr. WHITTEN. You might enlarge on it for the record.

(The information follows:)

Army regulations provide a 10 percent cost augmentation for Army Reserve units for operation of their own mess during annual field training. The 10 percent augmentation covers the additional costs of condiments and supplies required for the opening and short-period operation of unit field ration messes.

ABSENTEE RATE AT RESERVE MESS FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 15 of the justification book in the calculation for subsistence requirements, you use an absentee rate of 5 percent. The Army estimates an absentee rate of 22.55 percent. According to the testimony yesterday, this comes about, as I understood the testimony, by reason of a change in the method of count and the method of keeping up with attendance.

Heretofore, they had a checker who clicked a clicker as the people went in.

As I recall further, now they sign in and sign out and a lot of other things which enables them to have a much more accurate count.

I notice the Reserves are able to hold absenteeism to 5 percent. Is this actual, or could this again be a faulty method that you may use?

General SUTTON. No, sir. I think it is as actual as we can get it for the Army Reserve.

There is a vast difference in what happens in the active service as compared to ours. In the active service this is a day-to-day operation where, by proper authority, personnel may absent themselves. In the Army Reserve, on the other hand, we know pretty well how many people are going to be present for each meal.

For example, we may get a unit from the city and transport it in trucks to a rifle range. The men are out there and there is no place else to go to eat. All of them who are there will eat. Then when we are at annual training a small number may be on pass and absent for a meal.

I think our 5 percent is as accurate as we can get it.

We do have the same head count, and so forth, as is prescribed in the regulations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Your job is relatively simple in that regard, compared to the active duty.

General SUTTON. Yes, sir; very much fewer meals.

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 25, under subsistence of enlisted personnel, you make no allowance for absenteeism, indicating you do not count on any individuals missing any meals. Is it so close that you do not count it in, or do you anticipate some slight difference?

General SUTTON. We anticipate that the absenteeism will be too minor to count.

AUGMENTED RATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. General Wilson, on page 15 of the justification book you are showing for subsistence of enlisted personnel a 50-percent rate for ration augmentation. Would you please explain this?

General WILSON. We augment the ration in field training, sir. That has been normal for the times we do that. That is where the augmentation comes in, sir.

ABSENTEE RATE AT GUARD MESS FACILITIES

Mr. WHITTEN. Why is there not an absentee factor included in these calculations?

General WILSON. Actually, sir, the number of people attending annual training is based on our percentage that we know will be there. That reduction has already taken place.

For example, we run about 98 percent total people who will be there, and that is what we figure on the ration, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. Turning to the Army Reserve budget, the various costs for each activity are computed by a rather complex formula, and yet in the case of per diem only a total figure is given. How did you develop your per diem requirements?

Mr. PETHTAL. From actual past pay experience on per diem.

INCREASED ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

Mr. WHITTEN. You are requesting for administration and support an increase of $53,000 over 1970. Of what does this consist? It is not a big item. You might place an answer in the record.

(The information follows:)

This fiscal year 1971 increase of $53,000 is primarily for the Government's Servicemen's Group Life Insurance (SGLI) contribution for an increase of 1,371 man-years of REP–63 (initial) training. (Fiscal year 1970 21,497 MY, fiscal year 1971 22,868 MY)

COST OF OFFICER AND ENLISTED TRAVEL

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 16 of the justification book under the section on travel, you are using 6 cents per mile for officers and 5 cents for enlisted personnel. What is the justification for this? Do you travel in bigger cars?

General SUTTON. No, sir; that is within the standard authorization.

Mr. WHITTEN. Was this statement made by the Congress in the authorizing legislation?

Mr. PETHTAL. No, sir. The reason is that more of the enlisted personnel travel by charter bus or by Government transportation. More officers than enlisted normally travel by automobile. The 6 cent and 5 cent estimates are based on actual past cost experience.

ISSUE OF WINTER UNDERWEAR

Mr. WHITTEN. General Wilson, on page 20 you list all items of clothing to be issued to a REP trainee. Two of the items on the list are winter underwear and are issued only when climate conditions warrant. Yet on page 17 you apply the full price in computing your clothing requirements. Since some of the REP trainees will not require winter underwear, would this not tend to overstate your requirements to some extent?

General WILSON. It may, Mr. Chairman, but this has been based on experience and based on what we have had to do. It might, but I do not think it will, sir.

Mr. WHITTEN. It is not significant?

General WILSON. It is not significant, no, sir.

INCREASED TRAVEL COSTS FOR SCHOOL TRAINING

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 21 of the justification book, General Wilson, for the section on school training you are showing a decrease in pay and allowances for both officers and enlisted personnel. However, for

this same activity you are showing an increase in travel costs for both officers and enlisted personnel.

If pay and allowances decrease, why would travel costs increase by $781,000?

General WILSON. The increased cost covers a full year for increased per diem whereas fiscal year 1970 is for half a year.

SPECIAL SECURITY FORCE

Mr. WHITTEN. General Wilson, on page 31 under special training, 137 officers are identified under the heading of "Special security force." What type of training is this?

General WILSON. Selected National Guard troop units are designated as land special security forces by each Army commander and are designated for protection of specific installations for facilities such as electric powerplants, key communication centers, or critical industrial complexes. Selected unit commanders are provided opportunity to reconnoiter their assigned site and plan for its defense.

DECREASE IN ROTC ENROLLMENT

Mr. WHITTEN. On page 34 of the Army Reserve justification book, you indicate that during 1969 you had 72,481 college freshmen enrolled in ROTC. In 1970, this number dropped to 46,885. Would you please discuss the causes of this 35-percent drop?

Colonel HOFFMAN. Yes, sir.

We have figures that in Military Science–I we had a decrease from 72,000, as you indicated, to 47,000. The bulk of this decrease is for the reason of institutions going from the required basic course for all of the physically able male students participating in the course, to the elective course where only those who volunteer to go in the program actually participate. We figure about 60 percent of our decrease can be attributed to the fact that some 39 institutions went from mandatory to elective ROTC.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like you to show in the record the names of those institutions, and what the effect has been, insofar as you have it, in the total number of people who went from one to the other, of the agitation which has been going on in certain areas between groups who have different viewpoints in the field. I would like the record to show the full story.

(The information follows:)

INSTITUTION CONVERTING FROM REQUIRED ELECTIVE ROTC DURING 1969

By law this is an institutional prerogative. Title 10 United States Code states, "membership of students in the program shall be elective or compulsory as provided by State law or the authorities of the institution concerned." Thirty-nine institutions switched from a required to an elective basic program last year.[1]

[1] During senior year 1969–70 only 53 institutions out of the 283 enrolling ROTC cadets maintained some form of a required basic program.

Institution	SY 1968–69 Enrollments		SY 1969–70 Enrollments	
	MS I	MS II	MS I	MS II
1. Arizona State University	1,025	537	185	147
2. University of Arizona	965	605	113	134
3. University of Arkansas	534	373	175	134
4. University of San Francisco	97	88	64	48
5. University of Georgia	708	526	246	154
6. Louisiana State University and A. & M. College	1,010	594	267	189
7. McNeese State College	700	450	118	53
8. NE. Louisiana State College	1,107	572	166	93
9. Southern University and A. & M. College	935	538	346	120
10. Loyola College	226	75	109	75
11. Western Maryland College	163	102	74	60
12. Worcester Polytechnical Institute	323	133	147	58
13. Eastern Michigan University	1,459	60	200	67
14. Mississippi State University	438	327	104	63
15. University of Mississippi	365	251	79	69
16. University of Southern Mississippi	528	326	172	57
17. Creighton University	323	312	48	58
18. St. Peter's College	402	303	67	78
19. Alfred University	296	181	89	115
20. Canisius College	408	121	82	100
21. Niagara University	404	313	74	62
22. Siena College	206	128	77	42
23. Davidson College	277	257	140	156
24. John Carroll University	593	555	167	303
25. University of Akron	818	502	135	107
26. University of Dayton	1,337	1,045	230	192
27. Xavier University	465	481	95	58
28. Drexel Institute of Technology	908	74	168	82
29. Duquesne University	226	149	54	60
30. Gannon University	438	345	135	64
31. Lafayette College	493	180	158	158
32. LaSalle College	739	99	153	101
33. University of Scranton	384	67	80	54
34. South Carolina State College	233	177	230	161
35. South Dakota School of M. & T	382	269	271	257
36. South Dakota State University	562	368	299	412
37. University of South Dakota	511	358	151	332
38. Trinity University	232	191	84	70
39. St. Norbert College	253	189	283	31
Total	21,473	12,221	5,835	4,574

PROJECTION OF FUTURE ARMY ROTC ENROLLMENTS

Mr. WHITTEN. If only 28,392 of the 72,481 students enrolled in MS–I in 1969 entered MS–II in 1970, how did you determine that of the 46,885 that will enter MS–I in 1970, 29,000 will go on to MS–II in 1971? If the 1969 to 1970 ratio should hold true, then only 18,500 will enter MS–II in 1971.

Colonel HOFFMAN. Again, sir, this is related to our experience factors of the units that have the mandatory as opposed to the elective. We get a higher percentage of those in the elective school who are MS–I who will continue on. Consequently, we think we will get a higher percentage of the 47,000.

INSTITUTIONS DROPPING ARMY ROTC

Mr. WHITTEN. Has ROTC been taken out of any institutions, or is it a case of its being shifted from a required program for all qualified male students to a volunteer system? Have some institutions quit your program entirely?

Colonel HOFFMAN. We have two institutions in which we are phasing out. They are Dartmouth and Harvard University. We will leave them in June of this year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Rhodes?

INSTITUTIONS APPLYING FOR ROTC PROGRAMS

Mr. RHODES. Have you applications from other universities and colleges for ROTC programs?

Colonel HOFFMAN. Yes, sir, we have.

Mr. RHODES. Would you list those for the record?

Colonel HOFFMAN. Very good, sir.

(The information follows:)

ACTIVE APPLICANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW SENIOR DIVISION ROTC UNITS
(AS OF FEB. 1, 1970)

Alabama A. & M. College, Normal, Ala.
Alcorn A. & M. College, Lorman, Miss.
Austin-Peay State College, Clarksville, Tenn.
Campbell College, Buies Creek, N.C.
Clarion State College, Clarion, Pa.
Delaware Valley College of S. & A., Doylestown, Pa.
East Central State College, Ada, Okla.
Erskine College, Due West, S.C.
Florida Technological University, Orlando, Fla.
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Ga.
Grambling College, Grambling, La.
Houston Baptist College, Houston, Tex.
Howard Payne College, Brownwood, Tex.
Indiana Institute of Technology, Fort Wayne, Ind.
Missouri Western College, St. Joseph, Mo.
Northwestern State College, Alva, Okla.
Oglethorpe College, Atlanta, Ga.
Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Wash.
Pennsylvania State University, Delaware County Campus Chester, Pa.
Rollins College, Winterpark, Fla.
St. Augustines College, Raleigh, N.C.
St. Benedicts College, Atchison, Kans.
St. Leo College, St. Leo, Fla.
St. Martin's College, Olympia, Wash.
Samford University, Birmingham, Ala.
Savannah State College, Savannah, Ga.
Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oreg.
Southern State College, Magnolia, Ark.
Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Okla.
Stout State University, Menomonie, Wis.
Sul Ross State College, Alpine, Tex.
Troy State College, Troy, Ala.
University of Guam, Agana, Guam.
University of Tampa, Tampa, Fla.
University of West Florida, Pensacola, Fla.
Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa.
Valdosta State College, Valdosta, Ga.
Weber State College, Ogen, Utah.
Wisconsin State University at Eau Claire, Eau Clarie, Wis.
Wisconsin State University at La Crosse, La Crosse, Wis.
Wisconsin State Univesrity at Platteville, Platteville, Wis.
Wisconsin State University at River Falls, River Falls, Wis.

EFFECT OF DECLINE IN ROTC ENROLLMENTS

Mr. RHODES. If the strength of the ROTC program continues to go down, will the Army have problems in providing the officer personnel to be required for the future?

General WILLIAMSON. Yes, we will have problems in that area if it goes down materially, because we depend upon the ROTC program as a major source of our supply of officers.

We can, as you know, take up a major portion of the slack with our officer candidate schools, however.

ARMY ROTC SCHOLARSHIPS

Mr. RHODES. The Naval ROTC program has for many years provided practically free college education for selected young men. Does the Army ROTC also do this?

Colonel HOFFMAN. Sir, the program which the Navy had was actually incorporated into law in 1964 in the Vitalization Act, and all of the services have the same benefits that the Navy had under the Holloway act. We now have 5,500 scholarships which we award to students. This is the total number available. The Army will come up to its authorization this year.

Mr. RHODES. So the Army has 5,500 and the Navy has 5,500?

Colonel HOFFMAN. Yes, sir, as well as the Air Force.

NATIONAL GUARD AVERAGE STRENGTH

Mr. RHODES. General Wilson, the end strength of the Army National Guard I think is 388,000.

General WILSON. That is the average fiscal year 1969 strength, yes, sir.

Mr. RHODES. That was the average and the end, was it not?

General WILSON. That was the average, sir. Based on the law, we were to average about 388,000, and that is about what we were. We were just a little over our average strength.

Mr. RHODES. Is the figure of 400,000 an average figure, or is it a beginning figure?

General WILSON. It is a beginning and ending and average figure for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. RHODES. That will be difficult to attain.

General WILSON. Actually, we have our program so we have a 3-percent leeway. In other words, we have to give the States some flexibility to be able to maintain an average of 400,000. Actually, it will fluctuate up and down. It will be over sometimes and under sometimes, but we will be able with the 3 percent the Department has given us to maintain the average of 400,000.

Mr. RHODES. You think you will be able to recruit up to the point where you can maintain the average of 400,000 for fiscal 1971?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, I do.

SHORTFALL IN RESERVE READINESS

Mr. RHODES. I was a little disturbed about your statement, General Sutton, concerning the state of training of some of the Reserve units. Do you see any light in the future on this? Will we be able to regain the former excellence that you had in some of our Reserve units?

General SUTTON. I believe that was in General Williamson's statement, but I can address myself to the question. His statement related to the lack of equipment needed to train these units to the company level training that we are trying to achieve.

Mr. RHODES. I think also the lack of pay for weekend drills was included.

General SUTTON. We have most of the drills we need. Our strength is slightly above the average required by the law. We have a goodly amount of equipment on which to train, and our training program is progressing. Actually, our training proficiency is increasing right now, but in order to attain the prescribed readiness objectives we have got to have more equipment, modern equipment, more and better training facilities, and additional manpower support.

ABSENTEEISM IN GUARD MESS FACILITIES

Mr. RHODES. General Wilson, is the reason that you do not have as high a rate of absenteeism at meals as the Regular Army does, that since your people are called for weekend drills they do not have any PX to go to for food?

General WILSON. There is no place else for them to go.

Mr. RHODES. They come expecting to be fed, and they would be pretty unhappy if they were not fed.

General WILSON. They sure would be.

Mr. RHODES. There is a very valid reason for your difference in figures.

General WILSON. Of course, we do know what our normal lapse rate in personnel is. It has run around 1½ to 2 percent over the years. We have programed that in the amount of food that we buy, sir.

Mr. RHODES. I think that is all, Mr. Chairman.

COMMITTEE SUPPORT FOR GUARD AND RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITTEN. General Williamson, General Sutton, and General Wilson, this committee has always been a strong supporter and believer in the Reserve concept. I think with the inflationary spiral we have in this country, we have to lean more and more, as I think we should have done all through the years, on the part-time citizen soldier in a state of readiness. I think we can maintain our Armed Forces that way a whole lot better and reduce the pull on the economy of a huge peacetime Regular Army or Military Establishment.

The questioning this morning does not evidence a lack of interest but, instead, evidences our confidence in your work and the job that all of you are doing.

I would again like to say for the record, we hope you will feel free to enlarge your answers if you feel it proper.

General WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I think if you give the Reserve forces the wherewithal, the ingredients to produce the readiness that you want, you get what you need to augment the Active Forces with the Reserve forces.

Mr. WHITTEN. It sounds as if you believe in your Service, and that is what you should do. We also agree.

General SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say the Army Reserve certainly appreciates the interest of the committee in the Reserve.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

EFFECT OF ACTIVE DUTY ON GUARD AND RESERVE UNITS

Mr. RHODES. May I ask one more question. I hate to do it, but I think it is an important question.

You can answer for the record, if you want to.

Historically, whenever a Reserve or National Guard unit is called to active duty, it is always difficult to rehabilitate the unit after the active duty period is over because you lose so many people, either by transfer or because their enlistments run out or because they do not like the idea of being called to active duty.

Would you provide for the record some sort of general statement as to the experiences you have had in the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve in rehabilitating the units which have been called to active duty?

General SUTTON. The Army Reserve is right on schedule. We are already back up to an average of about 60 percent of authorized strength.

General WILSON. We will be glad to furnish that for the record. We feel we have made excellent progress, much better at this time than after any other mobilization that we know of.

Mr. RHODES. Thank you.

(The information follows:)

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

To expedite rehabilitation of demobilized units we have taken the following actions:

1. Priority for REP training spaces, to permit personnel to complete active duty training before annual training.
2. Relief from enlisted evaluation testing for promotion purposes of returning men.
3. Approval for direct appointment as second lieutenants of exceptionally qualified combat veterans of Vietnam.
4. Prior to the release of mobilized ARNG units, States were provided funds to procure authorized stock fund equipment at the training requirements level. Within item availability, Department of the Army made a special allocation of PEMA equipment items to the National Guard to reequip demobilized units. Thus, ARNG demobilized units were provided adequate equipment support to immediately conduct meaningful training upon return to home station.

U.S. ARMY RESERVE

The last of the 35 units that were deployed to Vietnam were released from active duty in November 1969. Although less than 15 percent of the original members remained in these units after demobilization, the January 31, 1970 reports show that the strength has increased to approximately 67 percent of authorized. The units that were assigned STRAF missions were released from active duty in December 1969. Initial reports indicate a strength in training of about 32 percent of authorized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Thank you again, gentlemen.

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1970.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

WITNESSES

VICE ADM. CHARLES K. DUNCAN, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL
VICE ADM. G. M. DAVIS, MC, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF, BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY
REAR ADM. W. D. GADDIS, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND REPORTS, OFFICE OF NAVY COMPTROLLER
CAPT. R. LENIHAN, U.S. NAVY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR WOMEN
CAPT. D. WIELAND, U.S. NAVY, AVIATION TRAINING DIVISION, OPNAV
A. P. KENYON, ASSISTANT FOR PLANS AND POLICY, BUPERS
LT. COMDR. J. E. ROBINSON, U.S. NAVY, FINANCE DIVISION, NAVAL SUBSISTENCE OFFICE

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; [$4,368,400,000]. $4,402,300,000

(10 U.S.C. 600,683-4, 701-4, 744, 1035, 1037, 1212, 1475-80, 2031, 2101-11, 2421, 2634, 5401, 5404, 5406-17, 5441-2, 5444-7, 5449-52, 5454-7, 5501, 5503, 5537, 5865, 6081-6, 6148, 6221, 6911-12, 6960, 6969; Chapters 3, 5, 7, 9 and 10 of Title 37, United States Code; 50 U.S.C. App. 2201-16; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

Program and Financing (In Thousands of Dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-1453-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct program:			
1. Strategic forces	119,262	139,648	140,612
2. General purpose forces	2,489,355	2,504,980	2,316,044
3. Intelligence and communications	210,400	242,517	231,206
4. Airlift and sealift	4,760	6,042	5,730
5. Guard and reserve	99,448	110,199	110,287
6. Research and development	53,106	65,308	64,153
7. Central supply and maintenance	91,588	108,014	103,477
8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1,294,740	1,454,749	1,319,825
9. Administration and associated activities	77,048	88,040	80,539
10. Support of other nations	15,493	22,503	30,427
Total direct program	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
Reimbursable (total)	31,889	31,800	31,800
10 Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

Program and Financing (In Thousands of Dollars)--continued

Identification Code 07-05-1453-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Financing:			
Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11 Federal funds	-13,695	-15,404	-15,404
14 Non-Federal sources 1/	-18,194	-16,396	-16,396
Budget authority	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
Budget Authority:			
40 Appropriation	4,455,200	4,368,400	4,402,300
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	-	373,600	-
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
72 Obligated balance, start of year	161,092	84,958	126,958
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-84,958	-126,958	-140,758
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-55,169	-	-
90 Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	4,476,165	4,326,550	4,388,350
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	-	373,450	150

1/ Reimbursements from Non-Federal sources are derived from sale of meals and clothing to service members (10 U.S.C. 4621).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

Object Classification (In Thousands of Dollars)

Identification Code 07-05-1453-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military	3,144,491	3,411,006	3,159,133
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military	885,365	893,947	848,412
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	109,029	112,687	102,582
22.0 Transportation of things	100,669	111,811	94,703
25.0 Other services	9,834	11,091	9,308
26.0 Supplies and materials	198,482	194,134	180,866
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	3,239	3,311	3,014
43.0 Interest and dividends	4,091	4,013	4,282
Total direct obligations	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
Reimbursable obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military	2,184	2,063	2,063
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military	698	647	647
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	7	90	90
26.0 Supplies and materials	29,000	29,000	29,000
Total reimbursable obligations	31,889	31,800	31,800
99.0 Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

PERSONNEL SUMMARY

Identification Code 07-05-1453-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct program:			
1. Pay and allowances of officers	1,023,812	1,095,665	1,048,910
2. Pay and allowances of enlisted	2,841,336	3,050,671	2,816,276
3. Pay and allowances of cadets	11,179	12,373	12,423
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	302,146	293,198	271,174
5. Permanent change of station travel	240,685	264,898	229,965
6. Other military personnel costs	36,042	25,195	23,552
Total direct program	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
Reimbursable program:			
1. Pay and allowances of officers	1,445	1,256	1,256
2. Pay and allowances of enlisted	1,303	1,319	1,319
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	29,134	29,125	29,125
5. Permanent change of station travel	7	100	100
Total reimbursable program	31,889	31,800	31,800
10. Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION

(In thousands)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
Total obligations	$4,487,089	$4,773,800	$4,434,100
Reimbursable program	-31,889	-31,800	-31,800
Total direct obligations	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	---	-373,600	---
Appropriation	4,455,200	4,368,400	4,402,300

This appropriation finances the costs of the military personnel forces of the Navy. For the first time the program and financing schedule for this appropriation reflects budget activity classifications which are identical to the ten major program classifications used for management purposes throughout the Department of Defense. These same classifications are also used as the budget activity structure for the Operation and Maintenance appropriation.

The tables immediately following summarize the cost of Navy military personnel both in terms of the personnel categories, i.e., pay and allowances of officers, enlisted, etc., and in terms of the major defense programs (budget activities) and operating programs where personnel work.

The remainder of this book contains material in the same form that has been used for a number of years to present the requirements for the military personnel appropriation.

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION - continued

Primarily, Navy military personnel are engaged in programs for operation of the Navy. Except for military personnel costs, these programs are financed by the Operation and Maintenance appropriation. Navy military personnel are also engaged in Operation of Defense Agencies; Research and Development, Navy; and Research and Development, Defense Agencies. In addition, a small number of Navy military personnel are assigned to other Government agencies outside Department of Defense. The costs of these personnel are financed as a part of the reimbursable program for this appropriation with reimbursements received from the Government agencies to which such personnel are assigned.

Obligations for military personnel are distributed to each of the budget activities on the basis of standard rates. These rates are derived by averaging total obligations for officers and enlisted personnel. The resulting rates are multiplied by the number of personnel assigned in each activity. Obligations for permanent change of station travel and support of allies are excluded from these average rates and entered directly in the applicable budget activity account.

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
	Direct program:			
1	Strategic Forces:			
	Officers	2,115	2,176	2,169
	Enlisted	20,243	19,905	20,082
	Total	22,358	22,081	22,251
2	General Purpose Forces:			
	Officers	41,640	36,577	34,276
	Enlisted	429,104	363,092	334,390
	Total	470,744	399,669	368,666
3	Intelligence and Communications:			
	Officers	4,167	4,345	4,211
	Enlisted	34,569	33,176	31,184
	Total	38,736	37,521	35,395
4	Airlift and Sealift:			
	Officers	249	261	248
	Enlisted	376	451	420
	Total	625	712	668
5	Guard and Reserve:			
	Officers	1,789	1,588	1,579
	Enlisted	16,813	16,025	16,056
	Total	18,602	17,613	17,635

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
6	Research and Development:			
	Officers	1,568	1,670	1,627
	Enlisted	7,371	7,705	7,572
	Total	8,939	9,375	9,199
7	Central Supply and Maintenance:			
	Officers	4,561	4,994	4,708
	Enlisted	7,841	7,256	7.015
	Total	12,402	12,250	11,723
8	Training, Medical & Other General Personnel Activities:			
	Officers	23,806	24,099	23,091
	Enlisted	163,078	153,702	137,734
	Academy cadets	4,435	4,243	4,243
	Total	191,319	182,044	165,068
9	Administration and Associated Activities:			
	Officers	4,288	4,359	3,559
	Enlisted	5,413	5,205	5,723
	Total	9,701	9,564	9,282
10	Support of Other Nations:			
	Officers	703	870	1,094
	Enlisted	1,177	1,668	2,521
	Total	1,880	2,538	3,615

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
	Total direct program:			
	Officers	84,886	80,939	76,562
	Enlisted	685,985	608,185	562,697
	Academy cadets	4,435	4,243	4,243
	Total	775,306	693,367	643,502
	Reimbursable program:			
	Officers	88	88	88
	Enlisted	250	250	250
	Total	338	338	338
	Total Military Personnel:			
	Officers	84,974	81,027	76,650
	Enlisted	686,235	608,435	562,947
	Academy cadets	4,435	4,243	4,243
	Total	775,644	693,705	643,840

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(In thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Program				Total
			Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Navy	R&D Defense Agencies	
1	Strategic Forces	1971	$140,612	-	-	-	$140,612
		1970	139,648	-	-	-	139,648
		1969	119,262	-	-	-	119,262
2	General Purpose Forces	1971	2,315,774	$270	-	-	2,316,044
		1970	2,504,712	268	-	-	2,504,980
		1969	2,489,103	252	-	-	2,489,355
3	Intelligence & Communications	1971	211,929	19,277	-	-	231,206
		1970	224,067	18,450	-	-	242,517
		1969	192,946	17,454	-	-	210,400
4	Airlift and Sealift	1971	5,730	-	-	-	5,730
		1970	6,042	-	-	-	6,042
		1969	4,760	-	-	-	4,760
5	Guard and Reserve	1971	110,287	-	-	-	110,287
		1970	110,199	-	-	-	110,199
		1969	99,448	-	-	-	99,448
6	Research and Development	1971	-	-	$63,908	$245	64,153
		1970	-	-	65,065	243	65,308
		1969	-	-	52,565	541	53,106
7	Central Supply & Maintenance	1971	99,305	4,172	-	-	103,477
		1970	103,754	4,260	-	-	108,014
		1969	88,197	3,391	-	-	91,588

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(In thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Program				Total
			Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Navy	R&D Defense Agencies	
8	Training, Medical & Other General Personnel Activities	1971	$1,319,825	-	-	-	$1,319,825
		1970	1,454,749	-	-	-	1,454,749
		1969	1,294,740	-	-	-	1,294,740
9	Administration & Associated Activities	1971	73,618	6,921	-	-	80,539
		1970	80,858	7,182	-	-	88,040
		1969	70,765	6,283	-	-	77,048
10	Support of Other Nations	1971	30,427	-	-	-	30,427
		1970	22,503	-	-	-	22,503
		1969	15,493	-	-	-	15,493
	Total Direct Program	1971	4,307,507	30,640	$63,908	$245	4,402,300
		1970	4,646,532	30,160	65,065	243	4,742,000
		1969	4,374,714	27,380	52,565	541	4,455,200
	Reimbursable Program	1971	-	-	-	-	31,800
		1970	-	-	-	-	31,800
		1969	-	-	-	-	31,889
	Total Program	1971	-	-	-	-	4,434,100
		1970	-	-	-	-	4,773,800
		1969	-	-	-	-	4,487,089

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Programs				Total	Officers	Enlisted
		Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Navy	R&D Defense Agencies			
1. Strategic Forces	1971	22,251	-	-	-	22,251	2,169	20,082
	1970	22,081	-	-	-	22,081	2,176	19,905
	1969	22,358	-	-	-	22,358	2,115	20,243
2. General Purpose Forces	1971	368,641	25	-	-	368,666	34,276	334,390
	1970	399,644	25	-	-	399,669	36,577	363,092
	1969	470,717	27	-	-	470,744	41,640	429,104
3. Intelligence and Communications	1971	33,163	2,232	-	-	35,395	4,211	31,184
	1970	35,424	2,097	-	-	37,521	4,345	33,176
	1969	36,343	2,393	-	-	38,736	4,167	34,569
4. Airlift and Sealift	1971	668	-	-	-	668	248	420
	1970	712	-	-	-	712	261	451
	1969	625	-	-	-	625	376	249
5. Guard & Reserve	1971	17,635	-	-	-	17,635	1,579	16,056
	1970	17,613	-	-	-	17,613	1,588	16,025
	1969	18,602	-	-	-	18,602	1,789	16,813
6. Research & Development	1971	-	-	9,174	25	9,199	1,627	7,572
	1970	-	-	9,350	25	9,375	1,670	7,705
	1969	-	-	8,877	62	8,939	1,568	7,371

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Programs				Total	Officer	Enlisted
		Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Navy	R&D Defense Agencies			
7. Central Supply and Maintenance	1971	11,409	314	-	-	11,723	4,708	7,015
	1970	11,926	324	-	-	12,250	4,994	7,256
	1969	12,112	290	-	-	12,402	7,841	4,561
8. Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities	1971	165,068*	-	-	-	165,068*	23,091	137,734
	1970	182,044*	-	-	-	182,044*	24,099	153,702
	1969	191,319*	-	-	-	191,319*	23,806	163,078
9. Administration and Associated Activities	1971	8,625	657	-	-	9,282	3,559	5,723
	1970	8,866	698	-	-	9,564	4,359	5,205
	1969	9,011	690	-	-	9,701	4,288	5,413
10. Support of Other Nations	1971	3,615	-	-	-	3,615	1,094	2,521
	1970	2,538	-	-	-	2,538	870	1,668
	1969	1,880	-	-	-	1,880	703	1,177
Total Direct Program	1971	631,075*	3,228	9,174	25	643,502*	76,562	562,697
	1970	680,848*	3,144	9,350	25	693,367*	80,939	608,185
	1969	762,967*	3,400	8,877	62	775,306*	84,886	685,985

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Programs				Total	Officer	Enlisted
		Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D Navy	R&D Defense Agencies			
Reimbursable Program	1971	-	-	-	-	338	88	250
	1970	-	-	-	-	338	88	250
	1969	-	-	-	-	338	88	250
Total Program	1971	-	-	-	-	643,840*	76,650	562,947
	1970	-	-	-	-	693,705*	81,027	608,435
	1969	-	-	-	-	775,644*	84,974	686,235

* Includes U. S. Naval Academy Cadets
As follows:
1971 4,243
1970 4,243
1969 4,435

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY MILITARY PERSONNEL CATEGORY

(In thousands)

Category	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
DIRECT PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowances of officers	$1,023,812	$1,095,665	$1,048,910
Pay and allowances of enlisted	2,841,336	3,050,671	2,816,276
Pay and allowances of cadets	11,179	12,373	12,423
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	302,146	293,198	271,174
Permanent change of station travel	240,685	264,898	229,965
Other military personnel costs	36,042	25,195	23,552
Total direct program	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowances of officers	1,445	1,256	1,256
Pay and allowances of enlisted	1,303	1,319	1,319
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	29,134	29,125	29,125
Permanent change of station travel	7	100	100
Total reimbursable program	31,889	31,800	31,800
Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100
TOTAL PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowances of officers	1,025,257	1,096,921	1,050,166
Pay and allowances of enlisted	2,842,639	3,051,990	2,817,595
Pay and allowances of cadets	11,179	12,373	12,423
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	331,280	322,323	300,299
Permanent change of station travel	240,692	264,998	230,065
Other military personnel costs	36,042	25,195	23,552
Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	FY 1969 Actual		FY 1970 Estimate		FY 1971 Estimate	
	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1969	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1970	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1971
DIRECT PROGRAM:						
Officers	85,681	84,886	82,648	80,939	78,523	76,562
Enlisted	668,886	685,985	647,980	608,185	585,006	562,697
Academy Cadets	4,172	4,435	4,161	4,243	4,156	4,243
Subtotal	758,739	775,306	734,789	693,367	667,685	643,502
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM:						
Officers	92	88	88	88	88	88
Enlisted	279	250	250	250	250	250
Subtotal	371	338	338	338	338	338
TOTAL PROGRAM:						
Officers	85,773	84,974	82,736	81,027	78,611	76,650
Enlisted	669,165	686,235	648,230	608,435	585,256	562,947
Academy Cadets	4,172	4,435	4,161	4,243	4,156	4,243
TOTAL	759,110	775,644	735,127	693,705	668,023	643,840

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

STRENGTH, GAINS, AND LOSSES, BY IDENTITY

	Commissioned Officers	Warrant Officers	Enlisted Personnel	Cadets	Total
Actual, Fiscal Year 1969:					
Begin	80,291	4,790	675,058	4,591	764,730
Gains	13,104	90	191,511	1,380	206,085
Losses	12,914	475	180,584	1,536	195,509
End	80,481	4,405	685,985	4,435	775,306
Average	81,107	4,574	668,886	4,172	758,739
Estimate, Fiscal Year 1970:					
Begin	80,481	4,405	685,985	4,435	775,306
Gains	12,865	1,001	137,909	1,151	152,926
Losses	17,274	539	215,709	1,343	234,865
End	76,072	4,867	608,185	4,243	693,367
Average	78,095	4,553	647,980	4,161	734,789
Estimate, Fiscal Year 1971:					
Begin	76,072	4,867	608,185	4,243	693,367
Gains	10,308	-0-	132,668	1,358	144,334
Losses	14,242	443	178,156	1,358	194,199
End	72,138	4,424	562,697	4,243	643,502
Average	73,989	4,534	585,006	4,156	667,685

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

GRADE STRUCTURE, BEGINNING, END, AND MAN-YEAR STRENGTHS BY IDENTITY

	30 June 1969	30 June 1970	30 June 1971	Man-Years FY 1970	Man-Years FY 1971
Commissioned Officers:					
Admiral	8	8	8	8	8
Vice Admiral	44	41	41	41	41
Rear Admiral (UH)	88	100	100	100	100
Rear Admiral (LH)	157	161	161	159	159
Captain	4,251	4,346	4,343	4,431	4,362
Commander	8,555	8,676	8,826	8,870	8,701
Lieutenant Commander	15,070	15,882	15,972	15,836	15,717
Lieutenant	23,214	20,087	18,040	22,223	20,307
Lieutenant Junior Grade	20,411	18,339	17,614	17,325	17,635
Ensign	8,683	8,432	7,033	9,102	6,959
Subtotal	80,481	76,072	72,138	78,095	73,989
Warrant Officers:					
W-4	589	464	307	539	389
W-3	131	50	248	63	188
W-2	1,723	3,226	3,392	2,219	2,929
W-1	1,962	1,127	477	1,732	1,028
Subtotal	4,405	4,867	4,424	4,553	4,534
Total Officer Personnel	84,886	80,939	76,562	82,648	78,523

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

GRADE STRUCTURE, BEGINNING, END, AND MAN-YEAR STRENGTHS BY IDENTITY

	30 June 1969	30 June 1970	30 June 1971	Man-Years FY 1970	Man-Years FY 1971
Enlisted Personnel:					
E-9	3,660	3,465	3,383	3,529	3,411
E-8	9,551	9,274	9,021	9,497	9,119
E-7	42,373	37,748	36,704	41,115	37,226
E-6	84,114	81,585	75,664	80,735	78,627
E-5	123,312	108,374	100,472	108,140	104,426
E-4	152,038	128,466	119,134	138,280	123,798
E-3	143,755	133,687	113,672	149,026	127,338
E-2	97,655	81,358	76,449	93,869	79,028
E-1	29,527	24,228	28,198	23,789	22,033
Total Enlisted Personnel	685,985	608,185	562,697	647,980	585,006
Total Officer & Enlisted	770,871	689,124	639,259	730,628	663,529
Cadets, U.S. Naval Academy	4,435	4,243	4,243	4,161	4,156
Grand Total	775,306	693,367	643,502	734,789	667,685

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	Difference 1971 compared with 1970	Justification page
1	Pay and allowances of officers	$1,023,812	$1,095,665	$1,048,910	$ -46,755	1-22
2	Pay and allowances of enlisted personnel	2,841,336	3,050,671	2,816,276	-234,395	1-34
3	Pay and allowances of cadets	11,179	12,373	12,423	+50	1-48
4	Subsistence of enlisted personnel	302,146	293,198	271,174	-22,024	1-51
5	Permanent change of station travel	240,685	264,898	229,965	-34,933	1-58
6	Other military personnel costs	36,042	25,195	23,552	-1,643	1-70
	Total direct program	4,455,200	4,742,000	4,402,300	-339,700	
	Reimbursable program	31,889	31,800	31,800	--	
	Total obligations	4,487,089	4,773,800	4,434,100	-339,700	

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Basic pay	$738,701	$806,490	$774,936
2	Incentive pay for hazardous duty	58,160	56,780	57,543
3	Special pay	24,589	25,911	23,113
4	Basic allowances for quarters	94,123	91,119	85,704
5	Basic allowances for subsistence	49,120	47,486	45,116
6	Station allowances overseas	3,197	3,156	3,114
7	Uniform allowances	2,614	2,876	2,054
8	Family separation allowances	3,880	3,240	2,413
9	Separation payments	20,807	29,830	25,862
10	Social security tax - employer's contribution	28,621	28,777	29,055
	Total direct program	1,023,812	1,095,665	1,048,910
	Reimbursable program	1,445	1,256	1,256
	Total obligations	1,025,257	1,096,921	1,050,166

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Basic pay	$2,022,221	$2,200,394	$2,025,002
2	Incentive pay for hazardous duty	42,267	41,210	42,125
3	Special pay	132,264	121,897	95,117
4	Proficiency pay	36,871	38,277	38,379
5	Reenlistment bonus	66,841	89,995	101,994
6	Basic allowance for quarters	276,243	273,086	249,150
7	Station allowances overseas	6,492	6,399	6,307
8	Clothing allowances	82,091	73,023	68,663
9	Family separation allowances	17,372	16,579	12,602
10	Separation payments	65,620	84,419	75,915
11	Social security tax - employer's contribution	93,054	105,392	101,022
	Total direct program	2,841,336	3,050,671	2,816,276
	Reimbursable program	1,303	1,319	1,319
	Total obligations	2,842,639	3,051,990	2,817,595

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 3: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
2	Midshipmen	$11,179	$12,373	$12,423
	Total direct obligations in budget document	11,179	12,373	12,423

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 4: SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Basic allowance for subsistence	$110,181	$106,568	$99,712
2	Subsistence in kind	191,965	186,630	171,462
	Total direct program	302,146	293,198	271,174
	Reimbursable program	29,134	29,125	29,125
	Total obligations	331,280	322,323	300,299

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 12

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Accession travel	$35,939	$32,817	$29,501
2	Training travel	26,508	26,304	25,534
3	Operational travel between duty stations	56,676	58,254	50,427
4	Rotational travel to and from overseas	78,536	87,324	75,708
5	Separation travel	38,050	53,174	44,699
6	Travel of organized units	4,976	7,025	4,096
	Total direct program	240,685	264,898	229,965
	Reimbursable program	7	100	100
	Total obligations	240,692	264,998	230,065

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Apprehension of military deserters, absentees, and escaped military prisoners	$193	$200	$200
2	Interest on uniformed services savings deposits	4,091	4,013	4,282
3	Death gratuities	3,239	3,311	3,028
4	Servicemen's Group Life Insurance	28,519	17,671	16,042
	Total direct obligations in budget document	36,042	25,195	23,552

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee will come to order.

This afternoon we will take up the appropriation request for "Military Personnel, Navy."

Our principal witness will be Vice Adm. Charles K. Duncan, Chief of Naval Personnel.

The Navy is requesting for this item, "Military Personnel, Navy," $4,402,300,000.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1970 for "Military Personnel, Navy," is $4,368,400,000. We note that, in addition, you will be asking for a supplemental appropriation of $373,600,000 to cover Pay Act costs. If the Congress were to approve the full amount of the supplemental then the total appropriation for 1970 would be $4,742 million. Therefore, your request, Admiral Duncan, actually reflects a decrease of $339,700,000 below the planned level for 1970. Is that correct?

Admiral DUNCAN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDERWS. We are pleased to have you and your supporting witnesses with us to discuss this request. I believe this is your second appearance before our committee.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDERWS. I hope you feel more at ease and better each time you make an appearance.

Admiral, I note that you have a prepared statement. We will be glad to hear from you uninterrupted at this time.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, as Chief of Naval Personnel, I am pleased to present the appropriation requirements for Navy military personnel. We have planned the fiscal year 1971 request so that we can maintain our manpower readiness at an adequate level.

It is well recognized, I believe, that our Navy can be only as good as the men and women in it. Despite a large investment in quality ships, planes, and weapons systems, we must continue to emphasize the necessity for having people of equal quality to man our Navy.

We request your assistance in fulfilling our goal of obtaining and maintaining the most professional naval personnel in the world. However, there are a number of problems in meeting our personnel commitments of which you should be aware. I would like to summarize some of these for you.

GENERAL PERSONNEL STATUS

(*a*) *Officer personnel.* Officer procurement in general is adequate, since overall officer requirements in fiscal year 1971 have decreased by about 4,300 as compared with this year. Nonetheless, we foresee increasing difficulty in procuring reserve officer candidates in the future as a result of reduced draft calls, the lottery draft, availability of large numbers of competing scholarships, and opposition to the military from some segments of the public. Even without these influences, we have heretofore experienced difficulty in procuring enough people to meet aviation requirements and expect this trend to continue for the foreseeable future.

The NROTC program, which for many years has been and continues to be a consistently reliable and productive source of officers, has shown

a 30-percent decrease in nationwide applications during the past 3 years in that portion of the program in which the Navy subsidizes tuition. This changes selectivity in this program from about 1 out of 10 formerly to 1 out of 6. We believe this phenomenon is attributable largely to the antimilitary activities of many dissident student groups. We have begun a phased withdrawal of NROTC units from Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, and Tufts, necessitated by our inability to operate programs which are viable and conform to statutory provisions within the restrictions imposed by these colleges.

We have not had the numbers of nominations for the Naval Academy we would like in order to be selective. In recent years, we have nearly exhausted the list of qualified alternates and competitors in order to fill entering classes. Since congressional nominees comprise about 80 percent of each class at the Naval Academy, we solicit your assistance in encouraging qualified young men from your States to apply for a nomination.

The Navy has serious shortages of surface, submarine, and aviation line officers in the grades of lieutenant commander and senior lieutenant. Prior to the fiscal year 1970 budget cuts, we compensated partially for these shortages by programing ensigns and lieutenants (junior grade) into more senior billets. However, the release of nearly 4,600 of these junior officers, necessary to meet budget reductions, has considerably restricted this assignment technique.

The aforementioned shortage has the further undesired effect of requiring longer than normal sea tours for many in order to man our units at an acceptable experience level. This unavoidable action further aggravates our officer retention problem. Additionally, it has delayed our input into service college and graduate education program, thereby creating long-range shortages of professionally educated officers in many areas.

The Navy share of the authorized fiscal year 1971 pilot training rate is curreently 1,850. In view of our actual shortage of about 1,200 pilots in the rank of commander and below and low pilot retention, and even more significant, an experience shortage of 3,100 pilots in the critical 6 to 14 year service period, we foresee no further significant reduction of training output unless positive pilot inventory control can be realized.

(*b*) *Enlisted personnel.* As the Navy's size decreases, emphasis on high quality enlisted personnel becomes more important. This year, for instance, we have requirements for 79 percent of our recruit input to be in the higher mental groups, yet our best estimate is that only about 70 percent will be attained. Further, indications are that neither quality nor quantity objectives can be met in fiscal year 1971 unless we continue to increase our recruiting effort.

A variety of factors are contributing to a foreseeable period of recruiting difficulty. During the past 10 years, recruiting success has been linked directly with the draft. In low draft call periods, we fell short of our goal; and only about two-thirds of the recruits were in the higher mental groups. When draft calls were high, we exceeded our goals; and, more importantly, recruit quality improved to more than three-quarters high mental group people.

To meet manpower requirements, plans are being developed to maximize recruiting. We are striving to strengthen the Navy recruiting

service by such planned actions as expanding and professionalizing advertising campaigns, increasing recruiters in the field, and developing additional enlistment incentives.

While total Navy enlisted strength is approximately equal to the numbers authorized, there are shortages in some skill areas at the petty officer first and second class level. These shortages have plagued us for some years primarily because of our limited success in retaining people in these grades.

TRAINING

One means toward our objective of improving personnel quality is a smaller Navy is better training for a higher proportion of officers and men. While our overall Navy training programs are slightly reduced, a higher proportion of personnel will be trained. There will be slightly higher student loading in areas such as graduate and professional education and in new technological developments and weapons. We need more officers in graduate training and at the War College to make up for deficiencies in meeting quotas during the Vietnam buildup.

On the other hand, we have been mindful of the need for exercising maximum efficiency and economy in the use of our slender resources. We have energetically sought and found ways to consolidate courses, shorten curriculums, and eliminate those of lower priority. We have designed a taut education and training program to produce maximum effectiveness in terms of trained personnel for minimum expenditure of manpower and money.

DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONNEL

The Navy's fiscal year 1971 budget admission provides for the following distribution of personnel: 60.9 percent in the operating forces; 19.3 percent in training activities as instructors, students, and staff; and 19.8 percent elsewhere.

The number, and consequently the cost, of permanent change of station moves is directly related to constantly changing technology, retention postures, and strength cuts. More than half of the PCS moves each year are made by new accessions, losses to the Navy, and persons undergoing training. For instance, during fiscal year 1970 about 150,000 people will come into the Navy and about 230,000 leave. The Navy is attacking the retention problem to reduce turnover and thereby reduce the number of additional moves involved in training replacements. However, our efforts are frustrated to a large extent by early release programs necessary in meeting budget cuts. Early release programs also created many vacancies in the operating forces which required additional PCS moves to balance personnel assets. Wherever possible, we filled these vacancies from ships being inactivated in the same port so that PCS costs were not involved. The strength reduction in this current year is the largest in any one year since 1947 and in fiscal year 1971 will amount to approximately 50,000 more.

RETENTION

As in the past years, officer and enlisted retention continues to be one of the Navy's most pressing problems. The situation has deteriorated further during the last year to where its seriousness adversely

affects fleet readiness. Retention is expected to remain a serious problem in the foreseeable future unless large scale corrective action can be taken. Our inability to retain sufficient high-quality personnel has resulted in shortages in the middle grade officers of the pilot, surface warfare, legal, medical, and nuclear power submarine groups and enlisted personnel in the technical ratings. The seriousness of the problem will manifest itself even more noticeably in our future effectiveness. The rapid growth in technology requires a stable, high-quality base of career personnel in sufficient quantity to insure that we maintain the leadership vital to future fleet readiness.

In the unrestricted line, pilot retention has declined from 60 percent in fiscal year 1966 to 31 percent in fiscal year 1969 with a projected retention of approximately 26 percent next year. Surface officer retention has remained at a critically low rate during the same 4-year period varying between 14 and 19 percent and is expected to continue below 20 percent. Nuclear submarine officer retention dropped from 75 percent in fiscal year 1966 to 59 percent in fiscal year 1969 with a projected rate of 36 percent in fiscal year 1970. Recent implementation of the $15,000 continuation pay program for nuclear submarine officers has met with some initial success, and retention in this community is expected to improve after fiscal year 1970.

First-term enlisted retention rates have declined from 24 percent in fiscal year 1966 to 16 percent at the end of fiscal year 1969 with a corresponding decline in career retention rates from 90 percent to 78 percent. A reversal of this trend is not expected in view of the most recent first-term retention rate of 9 percent for the first half of the current fiscal year.

Considerable effort has gone into developing a comprehensive Navy career motivation program. Many items of this program are being instituted within the Navy at no cost to the Government, but a number of more significant ones will require substantial funding. In the face of some unfavorable public sentiment toward the military and the adverse effects of sudden personnel reductions, the piecemeal implementation of moderate, although desirable, career motivation items by themselves will probably not reverse the trend of declining retention. Actions required to effect rapid budget reductions are counter productive to retention efforts. Even though costly, efforts to improve the military image, increase the attractiveness of sea duty, and improve military living conditions ashore and at sea should be intensified.

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS—MPN

The detailed budget justification for the request under the appropriation "Military Personnel, Navy" is as follows:

Navy strength at the end of fiscal year 1971 will be 643,502, down 49,865 from the planned fiscal year 1970 end strength of 693,367.

The total budget request under this appropriation for fiscal year 1971 is $4,402,300,000, a decrease of $339.7 million below the currently planned fiscal year 1970 program and is primarily due to planned strength reductions.

In order to meet reductions imposed on the fiscal year 1970 appropriation requests, the Navy was required to undertake a program of accelerated reduction in end strength of over 73,000 officers and men, about 10 percent of our beginning fiscal year 1970 strength. As men-

tioned, this is the largest reduction since 1947. Its effect on fleet readiness and the lives of those affected was somewhat more dramatic than other early release programs because dollar savings with least long-range impact could be achieved only by releasing large numbers of our people early in the fiscal year and accepting a large immediate reduction in fleet operational capabilities. The inactivation of about 125 ships was included in the actions required to accommodate the end-strength reduction. These reductions, in themselves, caused considerable turbulence since personnel identified for release could not, in most cases, be taken only from billets being eliminated.

Almost 4,600 officers were released early. They were, for the most part, young reserve officers serving their initial period of obligated service. The result has been dilution of the junior officers experience level and reduction of the career base. Although the reason for the precipitous release of this large number was carefully explained and was generally understood, the impact on the individual was not lessened. It will take continued and consistent effort to restore confidence in officer career management in order to encourage promising officers to choose a career in the Navy.

Approximately 92,000 enlisted personnel were released early and consisted largely of first term petty officers from whom we recruit, through reenlistment, our career force. Recovery from the effects of these personnel reductions will require a greater training effort, stabilization in our long-term personnel plans and actions, and employment of increased resources for the recruitment of talented men.

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS—RPN

The request for funding under the appropriation "Reserve Personnel, Navy", for fiscal year 1971 is $144,200,000. This amount will provide an average reserve strength in drill pay status of 129,000. It will also provide training tours for 3,350 personnel in non-drill pay status and 12,294 tours in essential schools and special training. This estimate also provides for an average of 9,756 regular and contract enrollees in the NROTC program and for 1,860 students under instruction during the summer in the Reserve Officer Candidate (ROC) and Aviation Reserve Officer Candidate (AVROC) Program.

As we make reductions in Active Navy Forces, we plan to rely even more an a strong reserve posture. To do this, we must bring the Naval Reserve to an even higher state of readiness. Certain significant actions in the area of reorganization and more modern equipment have been taken during the past year. These actions, which include the transfer of ships and aircraft from the Active Forces as replacements for older Naval Reserve units, have required a realinement of Naval Reserve training to accommodate their more modern equipment. The result will be a more effective Naval Reserve Force with a higher degree of responsiveness when mobilized.

In conclusion, I must say that we have a fine, dedicated group of people in the Navy who are a great asset to the United States because of the valuable service they are giving to the country. In these difficult times they are faced with ever-increasing workloads resulting from necessary force reductions, yet they are doing a fine job. I solicit your support in providing funds to permit adequate manning so that our people may continue their outstanding performance. Inadequate man-

ning causes overwork which contributes to frustrations, poor job satisfaction, and an undesirable career environment. We will continue to do our utmost to employ our people efficiently and to preclude duplication of effort.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, Admiral Duncan. That is a fine statement, even though to me it appears to be a discouraging statement. Like almost everyone else, you are having your problems in the Navy.

I am sure these cuts, which I think are drastic, are imposed by budgetary limitations. You are requesting from this committee appropriations for a yearend strength of 643,502, which is 49,865 below the 1970 level.

OSD REDUCTION OF NAVY REQUEST

How much did the Navy Department request of OSD for Navy personnel?

Admiral DUNCAN. For fiscal year 1971, $4.550 billion, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. The DOD and the Budget Bureau allowed $4.402 billion?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, you were cut initially by DOD and/or Budget $148 million.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

REDUCTION IN NAVY PERSONNEL

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice that you reduced your manpower strength 49,000 in 1971 and 73,000 in 1970. A reduction of 122,000 officers and men in a 2-year period at a time when the country is at war is unprecedented, is it not?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS It is as far as I know, and I have been on this committee for a long time.

RETENTION PROBLEMS

I was disturbed by your statement with reference to your ability to retain men in the service. The percentage of retained people is going down. For the first half of this year it hit 9 percent. That is frightening.

I assume one of our big problems is that of retaining men and officers, especially qualified men and officers, in the Navy. That has been a problem for a long time.

Frankly, I wish I had the answer to it. Congress has made some effort to give service people in the Navy better quarters. We have had reenlistment bonuses. We have had salary increases. Still, the trend of retention isdown.

It could be that by the end of this year you will not retain any. You kept 9 percent in the first half. But I admire your determination to do the best you can with what you have. That is what I get from your statement.

EFFECT OF LOTTERY DRAFT ON OFFICER PROCUREMENT

In your statement you mention that you foresee increasing difficulty in procuring officers as a result of reduced draft calls, the lottery draft,

and so forth. We are aware of the effect of reduced draft calls, but how will the lottery draft have an effect on Navy procurement of officers and men?

Admiral DUNCAN. We think this, along with the reduction in draft calls, makes the young men more willing to take a chance, if you will. Under the new law, they are vulnerable for 1 year. The combination of the draft lottery and lowered draft quotas makes the young men less likely to volunteer before the draft and, therefore, he will take the chance on waiting.

EFFECT OF DRAFT ON NAVY ENLISTMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS. What percentage of the men in the past few years who enlisted in the Navy would you say did so because of the fact that the draft was breathing on their neck?

Admiral DUNCAN. It would be very difficult to determine that exactly, Mr. Chairman. We have had some studies along that line. The Gates Commission, I believe, used those studies. The studies showed that about 40 to 50 percent would have volunteered otherwise.

As you know, we take only volunteers, or have for the last 5 years, and of those, 40 to 50 percent stated that they were not motivated by the draft.

RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. ANDREWS. We had a lengthy discussion with the CNO and the Secretary a few days ago about this same problem of retention. They concluded, if I remember correctly, that traditionally the Navy has been sea duty. I believe in your statement you said that about 60 or 65 percent of the personnel went to the fleet, which means sea duty.

When a young man joins the Navy, he knows full well that he is expected to do a lot of sea duty, but he joins at the age of 18, 19, and 20. He may have in mind making the Navy a career. But he gets married along about age 22, 23, or 24, and when he does, his prolonged absence from home and his wife causes him to change his opinion about staying in the Navy.

Isn't that about the picture?

Admiral DUNCAN. That is quite correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. I do not know of any way that you can correct that situation. You have a problem, and frankly, I do not know how you will solve it.

I have been told—and it is my opinion—that the Navy men today are enjoying possibly more fringe benefits than they ever did before in the history of the Navy. Your morale is high among those who remain. Their future is just as bright as it ever was. Very few of them have been sent to Vietnam, and you are pulling out those who have been to Vietnam. So, there is not a threat of going to war.

Just what is the problem? Tell us how we can help you correct it, if such is possible.

Admiral DUNCAN. The things you have mentioned, the high tempo of operations and the long deployments away from home, are operating, of course, to discourage reenlistments.

In addition to that, we think the general sentiment in the country has something to do with reducing the attractiveness of the military as a career.

In regard to compensation, while money, as you said, may not compensate under certain circumstances, it is quite true that where we have added monetary incentives and in some cases cumulative ones, we have attained a considerable degree of success in reenlistments among the enlisted people in the critical rates. We believe that, indeed, compensation for difficult conditions is one of the important things.

SHORTFALL IN AVIATOR PROCUREMENT

Mr. DAVIS. In your statement, Admiral Duncan, you state that you expect continued difficulty in procuring enough people to meet aviation requirements. Is this by reason of Navy standards or by reason of a falloff in the number of applicants?

Admiral DUNCAN. The standards are quite high for flight training, as you know. The physical standards are high. Of course, it requires considerable perseverance and the determination to get successfully through flight training.

In addition to that, we have this year on January 1 extended the required obligated service. We did this intentionally. We knew it could drive down the number of applicants. On the other hand, we needed so much to get more experienced pilots. This no doubt has acted somewhat as a deterrent to prospective aviation training volunteers.

One of the things I was trying to convey in my statement was that we really have to work very hard to meet our quotas for naval aviators. In view of adverse circumstances such as reduced draft pressures, we do not expect the situation to improve and it probably will deteriorate.

Mr. DAVIS. How would your percentage of completions of the course stack up, comparatively speaking? Is there any noticeable difference among those who are dropping out before completion?

Admiral DUNCAN. You mean by a change in obligated time, last year versus this year?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Admiral DUNCAN. I would like to know if Captain Wieland has an answer.

Captain WIELAND. I do not believe it has been in force long enough to know if they are dropping because of a change in the obligated service. It was publicized well in advance. It went into effect on January 1. I do not believe it is statistically significant at this time.

Mr. DAVIS. Has your raising the standards for enrollment in the flight training program permitted a larger percentage of completions of the course? In other words, do you have any less dropouts by reason of raising the standards for entrance?

Admiral DUNCAN. As Captain Wieland said, we have not had time to measure the success. The overall attrition has been about 27 percent in flight training.

Mr. DAVIS. About what portion of the applicants are you accepting?

Admiral DUNCAN. If men are physically qualified and have a college degree, we take nearly all of them.

DECLINE IN NROTC APPLICANTS

Mr. DAVIS. You mentioned the problems you have been having with NROTC. I believe we discussed that at considerable length here last year.

You indicate that you have had a decline of about 30 percent in the number of applicants for the NROTC program. Have you any reason to evaluate the causes for this? Is it a general resentment, a public attitude, or the fact that they do not have the draft board breathing so closely down their necks? I suppose all of those enter into it.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, although the program to which I referred, and where there had been such a reduction in applicants, is sometimes called the scholarship program or the regular program. I do not think that program is so much influenced by the draft pressure.

We believe that there are other reasons for the smaller number of applicants. One is that the man enrolled in the NROTC today is sometimes mentally or in some cases physically harassed or abused on campus. Of course, this is only our estimate, but the young man possibly shies away from being an ROTC member in view of this sometimes hostile environment. Such members actually have had various materials thrown at them.

Another thing, of course, is that in this country, and rightly so, there is a growing opportunity to get scholarships for young men who are intelligent. Our NROTC men have been intelligent. There is a much larger opportunity to obtain a college education without having to wear the military uniform on campus and being harassed. I think they take that opportunity.

Several years ago we were running about 24,000 applicants. The number actually taking the test this last December was down to about 12,000, the lowest we have had since 1946 when the program was initiated.

EFFECT OF COLLEGES CANCELING NROTC PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS. Will the withdrawal of your NROTC program from Brown, Columbia, Dartmouth, Harvard, and Tufts represent an absolute decline in numbers of your units, or are replacements coming in to take the place of those which are being dropped?

Admiral DUNCAN. It will represent no change in the number of students because we have plenty of spaces in other colleges. It does represent a minus 5 in the number of units. We do not intend at present to try to establish new units in this very transitional time, although we do have some applications from colleges.

We are negotiating with several colleges, and whether or not we will be able to negotiate successfully, I am not sure. It may be that we will lose about five other colleges. If we do, we still have enough spaces to take our authorized students.

INABILITY TO OPERATE VIABLE NROTC PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS. When you use the term that the withdrawal is because of inability to operate programs which are viable, is that another way of saying you simply are not getting the cooperation from university officials that you need to have in order to keep the program there?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes sir. Various faculties have laid down conditions under which we feel we cannot stay on campus, either because it is against the law, literally, or because it is demeaning. They want

to put us in a completely extracurricular activity status, and we do not feel we can have an officer program under those conditions.

SANCTIONS AGAINST COLLEGES CANCELING NROTC PROGRAM

Mr. WYMAN. Is there any sanction or retaliation or anything else that you can do with these institutions that are doing this? Is there something you can take away from them?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do no believe there is anything that the Navy can take away from them.

Admiral GADDIS. You can take away other Federal support. It might hurt you more than it does them. I do not know.

Mr. ANDREWS. You are talking about research grants. We have discussed that.

Mr. WYMAN. It bothers me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. It bothers me.

Admiral DUNCAN. If you took away research grants from certain colleges, you might find it difficult to get the same research. That is a sort of two-edged sword. We are not overly disturbed at these five colleges. Naturally, these are good colleges, and we would have preferred to stay in. We had been at Harvard since 1926. We would have preferred to stay there.

On the other hand, when the atmosphere and environment are such that you cannot run a good officer-producing program, we would just as soon leave.

Mr. WYMAN. I am an alumnus of Harvard, yet I am ashamed of many things Harvard University has done in recent years. This is one of them.

(Off the record.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you had any trouble at Auburn University, Auburn, Ala.?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, Mr. Chairman.

INCREASED RECRUITING PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. When discussing enlisted personnel, you state that "Indications are that neither quality nor quantity objectives can be met in fiscal year 1971 unless we continue to increase our recruiting effort."

Does this mean that your budget is possibly overstated with respect to recruit input?

Admiral DUNCAN. No. We think we will have to work extremely hard to keep the quality and quantity up, and if there are moves in the direction of easing of the draft or the all-volunteer forces, we think we will have to have a greatly expanded recruiting effort.

As I mentioned in my statement, we ourselves are looking at ways that we can improve our recruitment.

Mr. ANDREWS. My next question: How do you propose to increase your recruiting effort?

Admiral DUNCAN. We are getting advice on a professional advertising campaign. Understand, we do not pay for any TV, radio or newspaper space. We probably receive somewhere between $8 million and $10 million a year free space.

Mr. ANDREWS. They are good programs.

Admiral DUNCAN. We do have advice from a professional company.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you pay that company?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, we do.

Mr. ANDREWS. They, in turn, get the services of artists free for the Navy?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, sir. They only develop advertising ideas and formats. We actually produce the material.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you pay local radio stations for running the Navy programs?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, we do not.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you pay television stations?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, we do not.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you plan to intensify that program in connection with your recruiting effort?

Admiral DUNCAN. We intend to intensify all the publicity means we can, yes sir.

INCREASE IN FIELD RECRUITERS

Mr. ANDREWS. Second, you plan to increase the number of recruiters in the field. How many recruiters did the Navy have in 1969, and what are your plans for 1970 and 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have actually decreased our staff under budget constraints, but we have maintained the number of canvassers.

Mr. ANDREWS. What do you mean by "canvassers"?

Admiral DUNCAN. These are our young enlisted men who travel to high schools seeking recruits.

Mr. ANDREWS. They are not termed recruiting officers?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, sir. Only naval officers are considered recruiting officers, the officers supervise recruiting operations in the field and are the ones who generally recruit on college campuses, but are not referred to as canvassers.

Mr. ANDREWS. I am thinking of the Navy chief who mans an office, and the office is open 8 or 10 hours a day for people to walk in and join the Navy.

Admiral DUNCAN. We have maintained the canvassers level. We have 2,365 military canvassers in the field.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral, do you feel that you are doing all you can in the field of recruiting?

Admiral DUNCAN. The people in recruiting feel that we will have to make a drastically increased effort, and that it will cost money and people.

COST OF NAVY RECRUITING PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you asking for additional money in this budget for recruiting?

Admiral DUNCAN. The budget goes up $142,000 over fiscal year 1970.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a substantial increase. What is the total for recruiting in 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. In 1971, that totals $7,026,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is up roughly $142,000.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you think that is enough?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, I do not think it is enough.

Mr. ANDREWS. If you had more money, what would you do?

Admiral DUNCAN. We would have more advertising. We would put more men out in cars. We would visit more campuses. We have found that there is a direct relationship between the number of recruiters in the field and the number of successful recruits you get.

Mr. ANDREW. The more recruiters you have, the more enlistees you have?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

EFFECTIVENESS OF RECRUITING OFFICE

Mr. ANDREWS. What about this man downtown in an office, who sits there by himself, maybe with a stenographer. Do his efforts pay off?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir. The office, of course, has to be open and manned at all times because of the young men who walk in and wish to find out what the Navy has to offer. These office personnel give tests and generally administer the recruiting office.

Others travel quite long distances sometimes to small towns and various areas where we are trying to recruit. They appear at high schools, shopping centers, and wherever else young prospects may be found.

EFFECT OF EARLY RELEASE PROGRAM ON RETENTION

Mr. ANDREWS. You are releasing an unusually large number of people from the service, on the one hand. On the other hand, you are having trouble retaining people. Are the people who are released screened thoroughly to determine whether or not they would like to make the Navy a career?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have done our best in this current year of very high releases, to insist that the commanding officer let the man know, if he is a good man, that we want him. They are required to conduct interviews. For every man leaving the Navy, yes, we have made a determined effort to let the good men know, even though the Navy is decreasing, that we have a very urgent need for them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then you feel that you are doing all you can to retain men in the service, but regardless of your effort, your retention rate is going down?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

ENLISTMENT INCENTIVES

Mr. ANDREWS. Third, you plan on developing additional enlistment incentives. Would you please tell the committee what type of incentives you have in mind?

Admiral DUNCAN. We were thinking of perhaps more assured schools, that is, schooling promised for men who have the proper test score. We are going to broaden and have broadened what we call the direct procurement programs. You know, I am sure, of our success in the Seabee field, although frankly this is rather unique. We have broadened it somewhat. We have now opened it to machinists' mates because we have a very grave shortage there.

We want to try to guarantee to men who have the proper mental score, formal schooling. We find formal schooling is a present incen-

tive to both young enlisted men and young officers. We are thinking of expanding automatic advancement in rating for some schools. We send them to school, and those who stand in the upper percent of the class are automatically advanced to 3d class petty officers.

These are the sorts of incentives we are thinking of.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION OF SEABEES

Mr. ANDREWS. You mentioned the Seabees. Are you having the same retention and recruiting problems with Seabees that you have with other branches of the Navy?

Admral DUNCAN. We have the retention problem. We have not had the recruiting problem.

In the first place, the Seabees may enlist for shorter terms, and they enlist at higher ratings. They may come in at 2d and 3d class.

Mr. ANDREWS. On the average, they are older men?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. I think they are a unique situation, really.

Mr. ANDREWS. They do not have as much sea duty as the younger sailors?

Admiral DUNCAN. They do not have much sea duty, but they do have rather strenuous deployments out of country, to Guam and——

SEABEES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any in Vietnam now?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many?

Admiral GADDIS. At this time, we have ———. They are deployed on the basis of ——— months incountry and ——— mouths out of country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you planning to withdraw all of them within the immediate future?

Admiral GADDIS. Ultimately, as the requirement for their kind of work decreases; yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are those Seabees combat prepared?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, they are combat qualified. They have no weapons larger than rifles. They operate similar to combat engineers in the Army.

Admiral DUNCAN. In addition to the Seabee battalions which you are familiar with, we have the Seabee teams. We have ——— Seabee teams in Vietnam now. They are the ones doing the pacification, rural construction work. They usually consist of one officer and 12 enlisted, a corpsman, and 11 Seabees.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the rate of the officers?

Admiral DUNCAN. The officer probably would be a lieutenant; or a lieutenant, junior grade.

JOINT RECRUITING COMMAND

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you investigated the possibilities of a joint recruiting command so that the Services could concentrate their total resources on selling the advantages of the Military, rather than competing for individuals? This is accomplished to some extent on the civilian side through the Civil Service Commission.

Admiral DUNCAN. We in the Navy have not specifically investigated it. There have been over the last 15 years, that I know of, studies in OSD about combining recruiting I believe they have always come to the conclusion that it would not be profitable.

We are now in most places what they call colocated or in offices opening into one another, and sometimes with a communal waiting room. A great percentage of our offices are "colocated" with the Marines, Air Force, and Army.

NAVY EFFORTS TO IMPROVE RETENTION

Mr. ANDREWS. I am sure you are familiar with a news story in Navy Times, dated, November 12, 1969, headlined, "Career Proposals Pushed by BUPERS."

I am sure you have read it. You probably wrote it.

Admiral DUNCAN. I did not write it. We did gain quite a bit from that motivation conference, Mr. Chairman. Actually, several of the things we have done which we feel are important were not mentioned there.

For example, we have asked local commanders to provide storage for automobiles and personal effects of bachelors who are going to deploy, which is very important to them, so their automobile is not left unprotected or they do not have to pay for its storage.

There was recently set up a Services and benefits council, a council consisting of all the interested commands in the area who deal with the personal affairs of men and their dependents.

We have tried very hard to upgrade the service to the men, trying to see that when they come to the personnel offices they are met in the first place with a courteous attitude and met by knowledgeable people who will understand their problem and will help them out.

These are some of the areas that we have been working on.

GRADUATE TRAINING

Mr. ANDREWS. In your statement you mention that the Navy needs more officers in graduate training, and at the War College, to make up for deficiencies in meeting quotas during the Vietnam buildup.

How does the Navy determine which officers require graduate training?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have several methods of determining that. For a long time we have had a study of billets where we considered it would be very desirable to have graduate education.

Then, knowing that the same graduate education is of great benefit at sea, we use a multiplier, if you will—in other words, if one billet ashore is required, we have a multiplier for the number of officers we should educate to allow for rotation at sea.

In addition to that, we recently had a rather thorough study to try to determine what are the educational needs of the future, 10 or 15 years from now. We now have installed in the Pentagon a unit whose specific job is to examine these future professional educational needs of the Navy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Navy pay for the graduate schooling?

Admiral DUNCAN. We do pay for graduate schooling, although a lot of officers get graduate education on their own, either at night, as

at George Washington, or sometimes in conjunction with going to the Naval War College, for example.

But when we send a man to Monterey, Calif., for example, or send him to MIT or other graduate schools, the Navy pays his salary and the cost.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any obligation attached to the graduate work?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir. We require 2 years' service for 1 year in school.

Mr. ANDREWS. What has been your experience about resignation after receiving graduate work?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not have authoritative statistics, but we have had no alarming evidence of resignation of people who have had graduate work.

I know some people think that officers will take graduate work and then resign. That fact is, we believe it is a retention device, for several reasons.

No. 1, as I mentioned to you, the young men of this country are interested in higher education. We learn that every time we take polls. They all want graduate education. We have many resignees who say they are leaving because they cannot get graduate education where, as nuclear submarines, we could not spare them. We know there is a very strong urge on their part to get graduate education.

If a young man goes to graduate education at 4 years' service, let us say, and spends 2 years at graduate schools and has on top of that 4 years' required service, you see he is up to 10 years, and we think he probably will stay.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thought you said you had a requirement of 2 years' service for each 1 year of graduate work.

Admiral DUNCAN. Two years for each 1 year of graduate work.

Mr. ANDREWS. If he goes 2 years graduate, he would be obligated for 4 years' service.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. Perhaps I did not state it clearly. I meant if he had been in the fleet for 4 years, and then went to 2 years of graduate work giving him a 4-year obligation, he would end up with 10 years' service, and we think, by and large, we would have a career man.

RETENTION OF NUCLEAR SUBMARINE PERSONNEL

Mr. ANDREWS. I was disturbed about your statement with reference to retention of nuclear submarine personnel. You have quite an investment in a man who goes aboard a nuclear submarine, have you not?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, we have.

Mr. ANDREWS. How do you account for the decrease in the retention of those submariners?

Admiral DUNCAN. These are very highly qualified young men.

Mr. ANDREWS. They are hard to replace.

Admiral DUNCAN. They take a very, very difficult and long training program. When they get on the ship, the work is extremely demanding. In the attack submarines, they operate for very long periods away from home. In the *Polaris* submarine, as you know, they go 60 days undersea at a time.

Apparently this is not to their liking, particularly because we did not have enough extra officers to allow them to go to graduate school, as officers in most other communities, as we call them, did.

That is why we came to the Congress and asked for a continuation pay of $3,750 a year for 4 years.

This has been successful to the extent that I believe we have stemmed the tide, the outflow. That was our main objective. We have had 406 officers sign up for this 4-year continuation pay.

CONTINUATION PAY FOR NUCLEAR SUBMARINE OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that classified as a retention bonus?

Admiral DUNCAN. I believe we call it continuation pay.

Mr. ANDREWS. You pay him to remain in the service?

Admiral DUNCAN. He remains in the service 4 years, and he gets $3,750 extra a year.

Mr. ANDREWS. $15,000 for the 4 years, over and above his pay and allowances?

Admiral DUNCAN Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is about as generous as you can be with them; is it not?

Admiral DUNCAN. It would seem so, and yet we have not had them all take it. However, we have reduced the rate of resignations. This is the important thing. We were having 22 to 28 resignations a month. We got it down last October to five a month.

The important thing was to retain enough officers to give them duty rotation as other officers have. We had nuclear submarine officers staying 15 years at sea. The wife and family did not like to look ahead and see this road.

Now we believe we are making some progress. As I told you, we had about 400 people sign up for this bonus. We have 51 of these young officers in graduate school now. They will start following, we hope, a more normal career pattern.

POLARIS CREWS

Mr. ANDREWS. How many crews are required to man a Polaris submarine?

Admiral DUNCAN. In the Polaris only, we use two. In the other submarines, the attack submarines, we have one crew.

Mr. ANDREWS. If a man goes into the submarine service, he knows he is going to get sea duty, does he not?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. When a man goes into Polaris work, he is at sea 60 days and on the beach for 60 days?

Admiral DUNCAN. Not exactly, sir. The cycle is really 180 days. This includes 30 days refit and 60 days at sea, all of which is away from family life and 30 days crew rehabilitation and a 60-day training period on the beach.

Mr. ANDREWS. Where does he spend those 60 days on the beach?

Admiral DUNCAN. In the ship's home port engaged in Polaris training—that is why it fits the two-crew concept so well—they have a complete training setup ashore. Remember that each time they make a cruise, they introduce a roughly one-fifth new crew. They have

to train as a team while they are in. As I said, they have complete mockups called Polaris trainers.

One of the things that, frankly, we think has caused them to resign has been the fact that these ships have been run hard, and there is so much maintenance and upkeep work in port, that they really seem to get very little time off at all.

As you mentioned earlier, when they first come in the nuclear power program, perhaps they are not married. The impact of the demanding work does not seem as bad as when they get married and have children. Then they see this rather unending series of years where they are going to sea followed by difficult periods in port. That is what we want to break up.

Mr. ANDREWS. So at least 50 percent of his time is spent ashore?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Two months out and 2 months in.

Admiral DUNCAN. It is not exactly as clean cut as that.

Admiral GADDIS. He spends 2 months at sea, 1 month in refit, 2 months in training, and 1 month essentially free time, light duty, out of the 6 months.

Admiral DUNCAN. The refit time of which Admiral Gaddis speaks is a very hard-working period at bases like Holly Loch or Rota or Guam. Their families are not there. They are working from morning until midnight.

Admiral GADDIS. They are on separated duty half the time. Your point is well taken.

GAO REPORT ON GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mr. ANDREWS. The GAO recently released a draft report on "Improvements Needed in Determining Graduate Education Requirements for Military Officer Positions." The report points out that in May 1969, the Navy liberalized its validation criteria to permit the validation of positions in which graduate education was "highly desirable."

Prior to this, the requirement was for only positions in which graduate education was "essential."

Why was the criteria changed?

Admiral DUNCAN. May I address the general subject of the GAO report before answering your direct question.

We take strong exception to the GAO report. We do not feel that they really went into this thoroughly. They focused on subject matter related to certain jobs.

I mentioned earlier the desire of young men to have graduate education. We also believe very strongly that naval officers need graduate education. We think it is just as applicable at sea.

For a young man who has taken a graduate degree in electrical engineering to perform ashore in a very technical billet we think he should have been out afloat with the equipment. We think this is a link that is absolutely needed if he is to do his job. We do not want the man just to have the shore experience.

Also, as I believe most educators agree, graduate education is valuable not only for the knowledge acquired, but for the thinking habits, the approach to problems, the original thinking it fosters. We think

a high proportion of our officers need it and, as you get to higher rank, an even higher proportion.

So, we do not agree at all with the wording of the GAO report which alleges that when an officer is at sea he is not utilizing graduate education. We simply have a difference of opinion there. We think they do use their graduate education.

To answer your specific question, I could use my job as an example, perhaps. If the job of the Chief of Naval Personnel was coded essential rather than highly desirable perhaps an outside agency such as GAO would say, "Is this officer performing the job all right? He doesn't have a graduate degree."

Yes; he is performing all right.

So then they say the job does not require graduate education. Still, it is highly desirable for the job to have a graduate degree.

There is another analogy which may be more familiar, I think our situation is very similar, perhaps, to a high school teacher. The rules do not say it is essential that you have a graduate degree to be a high school teacher, but if you have a graduate degree, they pay you higher initially and throughout your teaching career.

We think the term "highly desirable" has a lot of validity, particularly since the determination involves a very thorough examination of the nature and demands of the billet.

There are the reasons we changed the criteria from "essential" to "highly desirable." We think that "highly desirable" is a reasonable criteria.

NUMBER OF OFFICERS RECEIVING GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you put in the record at this point the number of officers who have been given graduate schooling in the last 3 or 4 years?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

(The information follows:)

Number of Navy officers given graduate education by fiscal year:

1966	583	1968	711
1967	597	1969	602

USE OF GRADUATE EDUCATION TO IMPROVE RETENTION

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe you have already stated the graduate work given an officer is another fringe benefit that you have offered him in your effort to stem the tide of retention reduction.

Admiral DUNCAN. It allows a military officer the same opportunity for growth as the civilian would have. One of the GAO recommendations was that positions requiring graduate education would be occupied by civilians. Again, we take very serious objection to this, because we think the uniformed man must be allowed to grow intellectually as well as his civilian counterpart.

We would resist very strongly any attempt of this sort to say that civilians who occupy certain positions are the educated ones, and the uniformed people are not. The implications of that are plain for all of us to see.

I mentioned in my statement that during the buildup for Vietnam we simply could not spare people from cockpits, from nuclear subs,

and operational jobs. Our quota went far below what we thought our need was.

We have more than doubled that quota now. We expect to put in this year, 1970, 1,092.

So, we are not only trying to keep up what one might term a sustaining rate of people to meet our needs. We have to catch up with this valley of several years when we could not spare the officer to go to graduate school. That is why our graduate education quotas are going up while the Navy is going down.

This is a most important point, and one which I am sure you can appreciate I have some difficulty selling, even in various parts of the Defense Establishment. We must go up in graduate education while the Navy is going down.

Mr. ANDREWS. If you did not go up with that fringe benefit of graduate education, your rate of retention might go down.

Admiral DUNCAN. We believe it would.

OFFICERS WITH GRADUATE DEGREES NOT USED IN VALIDATED POSITIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. The report also points out that in some instances officers with graduate degrees are not utilized in validated positions. Would you comment on this phase of the report?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

I would make two statements:

One, to repeat what I said, the GAO defined nonutilization as going to sea. Of course, going to sea is a naval officer's profession, and we believe his education is utilized when he is at sea. However, we would agree there is room for improvement in the utilization ashore. This sometimes happens because such officers are extremely smart and capable men. As such, individuals may wish to broaden their general career background by seeking experience in fields other than in which educated, or they may be requested and detailed to other positions because of their overall capabilities.

Accordingly, there are people who are not doing the exact work for which they are qualified by their graduate degree.

We think we can improve in this respect.

NUMBER OF OFFICERS WITH GRADUATE DEGREES VERSUS REQUIREMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you supply for the record the number of naval officers having graduate degrees, the number of validated positions, and the number of validated positions occupied by individuals with graduate degrees.

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned, in determining graduate school requirements, we use a multiple of the validated positions to allow for rotation to sea. We believe we have a need for more than the number of validated positions, but we will furnish the answer as you have requested it, Mr. Chairman.

(The information follows:)

There are 10,898 naval officers now on active duty who have graduate education. Navy has 4,901 billets requiring graduate education and, of these, 3,195 are filled by officers having that education. Among those with graduate education, but not occupying billets requiring such education, are: Many at sea; some who are at a more senior rank than the billets require; and some who have obtained graduate education on their own either not related to billet requirements or putting them in excess of total requirements.

COST OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mr. ANDREWS. How much is included in the 1969, 1970, and 1971 budgets in support of the graduate education program, including all appropriate pay and allowances and travel costs?

(The information follows:)

COSTS FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION BY FISCAL YEAR

	MPN	O. & M.N
1969	$17,332,000	$8,367,000
1970	21,543,000	10,094,000
1971	25,654,000	11,985,000

RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral Duncan, regarding retention problems, you state "The Navy is attacking the retention problem to reduce turnover and thereby reduce the number of additional moves involved in training replacements."

How are you attacking the retention problem?

Admiral DUNCAN. We are attacking it first within the service, as I mentioned, by trying to give incentives which we can offer which will retain people. We are doing a lot of things that may seem little, but we hope add up to quite a bit—paying attention to the man's family when he is deployed, trying to make it easier for them.

(Off the record.)

Mr. ANDREWS. You go on to state that, "The situation as deteriorated . . . to where its seriousness adversely affects fleet readiness."

EFFECT OF RETENTION ON FLEET READINESS

What is the current status of fleet readiness?

Admiral DUNCAN. Concerning personnel—as you know, fleet readiness is made up of many other items—there are a great number of ships in the lowest category, C–4, in personnel readiness, and a lot of this is brought about by the terriffic turbulence generated this year. A total of 182 ships were decommissioned, and all personnel aboard had to be transferred to other duty stations or separated, as appropriate.

The "early release" men had to be replaced. We suffered a great turbulence which we hope will level out this summer. There are many shortages of skills, as well as people not in billets for which they were trained.

This is manifestly inefficient because of all the transfers we have had to make. This has put a great many ships in category C–4.

Mr. ANDREWS. What do you mean by category C–4 ship?

Admiral DUNCAN. I did not mean to use a term that was purely Navy language. However, we categorize our ships as either 1, 2, 3, and 4.

EFFECT OF SHIP CONDITION ON RETENTION RATES

Mr. ANDREWS. This committee has been briefed several times about the deplorable condition of our ships. When I say "deplorable," I

think that is an understatement. I think it was Charley Bennett of Florida who did an excellent job with his committee preparing a report.

In the report he had pictures of our ships showing the deterioration that had taken place. If I remember correctly, a sizable proportion of our ships are over 20 years of age, and some are even 25 or 30 years of age.

Those pictures clearly indicate to me, a layman, that living conditions aboard those ships are not what would be recommended by Duncan Hines.

I have been thinking that maybe your retention problem can be directly connected with the condition of our ships. Am I wrong in that thought?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, sir; I think there is a very definite link there.

As you have already said, a very high proportion of our ships are old. In addition to that, you have an inherent condition in our warships that you simply cannot have the room that a person in other walks of life would have.

We hope—I do not knew whether we will, but we would hope to get to the Congress a proposal for sea pay to compensate for this. All of our men, until they make chief petty officer, live in bunk tiers, three high, sometimes four high, with a locker at the bottom.

Mr. ANDREWS. On the fantail of a destroyer, it is pretty rough living.

Admiral DUNCAN. Additionally there are quite a few men per toilet facility. We expect a man to make a career under the conditions we are indicating. Many hardships and deprivations are involved.

Certain ratings, such as boatswain's mate and radarman, may do 14 or 15 years' duty at sea in 20 years, living under these conditions.

Of course, as you know, they are at sea sometimes a month at a time, and away from home port where they cannot live off the ship for 8 months at a time.

We definitely feel that some particular recognition for both officers and men is in order, because these conditions are really not duplicated on a career basis anywhere else that we know of.

PILOT RETENTION

Mr. ANDREWS. If pilot retention will will declined from 60 percent in 1966 down to 26 percent in 1971, what plans do you have underway for reversing this trend?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have some studies which perhaps are not far enough along to mention to the Congress, but I will mention them anyway.

We think probably the road to go in this regard is to come up with some sort of continuation proposal such as the nuclear submariners—try to keep the pilot on long enough for him to become a career man, or at least for 3 or 4 more years, because our need, as I believe I pointed out, is even more drastic for experienced pilots—men in the 6- to 14-year bracket. You cannot send a squadron out with all or even nearly all pilots who have just graduated from flight school and completed subsequent required training.

That is the sort of thing that we think would be successful.

Again, it comes right back to what are the basic troubles in general—long deployments, living conditions on the ship, family housing, and so forth. All of these things apply to aviators as well as everyone else.

AIRCRAFT ACCIDENT RATE

Mr. ANDREWS. What about your accident rate among pilots, both in a theater of war and elsewhere?

Admiral GADDIS. Outside of combat, sir, it is better in recent years than it has been in the past.

Admiral DUNCAN. The accident rate in the first 6 months of 1970 was 1.31 per 10,000 flying hours, as compared to 1969, when the rate was 1.41 per 10,000 flying hours.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is away down from what it was 10 years ago.

Admiral DUNCAN. 1968 and 1969, incidentally, were identical in that the accident rate was 1.41 per 10,000 flying hours for both years.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish you would put a chart in the record showing the accident rate for the last 10 years, if it goes back that far, both in war zones and out of war zones.

(The information follows:)

ACCIDENT RATES[1]

	Navy-wide	Noncombat zone	Combat zone[2]		Navy-wide	Noncombat zone	Combat zone[2]
Fiscal year:				Fiscal year:			
1960	1.93			1966	1.27	0.93	——
1961	1.72			1967	1.37	.95	——
1962	1.55			1968	1.41	1.04	——
1963	1.46			1969	1.41	1.07	——
1964	1.37			1970[3]	1.31	.92	——
1965	1.25						

[1] Rates per 10,000 flight hours.
[2] Using combat flight hours.
[3] Through December 1969.

Mr. ANDREWS. Tell us about your experience in the war zone. Are you still using Navy pilots in the war zone?

Admiral GADDIS. About ——— sorties a month.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that down?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir, that is down this year.

Admiral DUNCAN. To further answer your question, the cumulative attrition rate for operations in South Vietnam has been ——— thousand attack sorties. When we were operating in North Vietnam, it was ——— thousand attack sorties. Naturally, in South Vietnam it has gone down.

Mr. ANDREWS. Put a chart in the record showing the rate in the last 5 years.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

(The information was provided to the committee and is classified.)

RETENTION RATE FOR NUCLEAR SUBMARINE OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. What is your projected retention rate for nuclear submarine officers in fiscal year 1971?

You have discussed that briefly heretofore.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. The retention rate for nuclear submariners, as you have noted, has rather plummeted on us from 75 percent down last year to 59 percent, and it looks like this year 36 percent.

I said in my statement that we expected an upturn. The reason we do is because of the 406 young men who have already signed up, and we expect more to sign up, for the bonus. We expect the retention rate to turn up in 1971.

It would be difficult for me to make a scientific prediction, but I would guess we would get up into the 50-percent bracket. That, frankly, is our minimum goal. If we can get up to about a 52-percent retention rate, we will have a good, healthy nuclear submarine force.

Mr. ANDREWS. With few exceptions, if a man is in the Navy as an officer, regardless of where he is stationed, and has been in there 10 years, he can resign any time he wants to.

Admiral DUNCAN. After 10 years, he may resign, except currently we are holding certain people involuntarily, primarily nuclear submarine officers, 1 additional year beyond completion of their minimum required active duty service. We were holding quite a number when I testified before you last year, but since that time, due to the decrease in the Navy, it now applies only to nuclear submariners and certain medical specialists.

NUCLEAR SUBMARINE OFFICERS CONTINUATION PAY

Mr. ANDREWS. What about new people volunteering for submarine service? Do they get the bonus?

Admiral DUNCAN. No. They can get the bonus only at the time their obligated service is about to expire.

There is provided in the law something that we think is very good. A man may sign up a year in advance at the end of his obligated service and receive his bonus spread over 5 years—in other words, $3,000 per year over 5 years. We encourage that because it gives us better planning. He otherwise would not be entitled really until about the end of his obligated service.

Mr. ANDREWS. Are both enlisted and officers entitled to the bonus?

Admiral DUNCAN. The enlisted are not entitled to the bonus of which you are speaking. This is aimed at the submarine-qualified and nuclear-qualified officers. We do have other variable reenlistment bonuses for enlisted men, but they apply if the man has a certain skill—nuclear power, a sonar man, a POLARIS-qualified missile man, and so forth.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let us say he is a noncommissioned officer and he has a skill that you want and use and need. His enlistment period runs out. What do you give him to stay in?

Admiral DUNCAN. If he is in one of the critical ratings that we need and one which requires very long training, he does get a variable reenlistment bonus if this is his first reenlistment. It would depend on the criticality of his rating. It runs anywhere from a multiple of twice the normal bonus to 4 times the normal bonus.

Mr. ANDREWS. Up to $10,000?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

Admiral GADDIS. Also, if he ships over for a longer term, he obviously get more, also. However, the maximum payment cannot exceed $10,000.

Admiral DUNCAN. It is limited to $10,000 because of the arithmetic of it, because the maximum normal bonus is $2,000 by law. Therefore, if he is what we call the highest multiple of 4, giving him a total of 5, he may then collect a maximum of $10,000.

NAVY CAREER MOTIVATION PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral Duncan, you make the statement that "Considerable effort has gone into developing a comprehensive Navy career motivation program."

Would you please summarize this program for the committee, and then provide details for the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. Some years ago there was a detailed study of which I think most of the committee are aware, called the Alford Report study.

Since that time, we have shifted this to a permanent group in the Bureau of Naval Personnel, and we call it the Career Motivation Group. This group has absorbed the earlier recommendations of the Alford Board.

Through the means of career motivation conferences, they have added new items and purified, if you will, items that are meaningful and items that may be attained.

We keep a running count of how we are doing, if you will, in such things—I have mentioned some of them—as housing, the variable reenlistment bonus, the attempt to pay men in advance of permanent change of station travel, et cetera. These are some of the many items we bring up.

We listen to the men and determine the things that they feel are important to them.

Mr. ANDREWS. I was impressed earlier in your testimony by the statement you made to the effect that the Navy was storing automobiles for officers who go overseas for a relatively short period of time. Little things like that have a tremendous appeal.

Admiral DUNCAN. They do.

(The information follows:)

NAVY CAREER MOTIVATION PROGRAM

The retention problem has become so serious that we are making a major effort to identify the problem and its causes, and to take corrective actions.

Retention rates, particularly among high quality officer and enlisted personnel trained at Navy expense, continue to decline, and are in some cases at less than half of tentative goals. This trend is caused by excessively high demands on personal lives, including long repetitive periods of sea duty and resultant prolonged family separation, inadequate living conditions afloat and ashore, compounded by increasingly attractive opportunities in the domestic economy. There are many reasons why people do not choose to remain in the Navy. The significant ones have been identified. They are considered significant because they are areas in which a change can be expected to produce a change in retention rates. The broad spectrum of significant influences has led to a comprehensive approach to solutions identified as the career motivation program. The following chronology summarizes the development of the program.

. Navy personnel research, Navy and independent attitudinal surveys, separation questionnaires, transition questionnaires, letters of resignation, career counseling

reports, retention symposia, the report of the Secretary of the Navy's Task Force on Navy/Marine Corps Personnel Retention, and the report of the U.S. Navy Career Motivation Conference, 1969, have identified the principal causes of declining retention and recommended corrective program actions to reduce the problem.

December 1964: The Secretary of the Navy appointed Task Force on Navy/Marine Corps Personnel Retention.

November–December 1965: Task force report covering 94 subject areas designed to improve personnel retention was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy for consideration.

January 1966: The Secretary of the Navy approved 83 subject areas consisting of 115 separate recommendations.

March 1966: The Chief of Navy Personnel established a implementation group to manage implementation of the Retention Task Force recommendations.

February 1968: In response to a requirement from SECNAV, the Chief of Naval Personnel established a Retention Plans and Programs Division to develop, recommend and monitor necessary actions to achieve desired officer and enlisted retention goals, with direct liaison authority with the Secretary of the Navy, other services and civilian industry. This division absorbed the functions of the implementation group.

October 1968: The Chief of Naval Operations expanded retention effort to the career motivation concept, and announced an all-Navy career motivation conference to identify practical ways to improve motivation and retention.

November 1968: The Chief of Naval Personnel convened a preparatory all-Navy career motivation workship at the Bureau of Naval Personnel to identify officer and enlisted career motivation problems to be resolved by the career motivation conference in March 1969.

March 1969: The Chief of Naval Operations convened U.S. Navy Career Motivation Conference, 1969, composed of 35 senior representatives of fleet and type commanders, and selected major shore commands. Some 200 recommendations were made by the Conference.

April 1969: The Secretary of Defense established "Project Volunteer" to develop actions to enable Defense to achieve all-volunteer Armed Forces. Navy input included retention task force and career motivation conference recommendations.

November 1969: Recommendations of career motivation conference, remaining SECNAV task force items, and other project volunteer items were integrated to form the career motivation program which consists of approximately 280 separate tasks.

CAREER MOTIVATION PROGRAM

I. Compensation:
   A. Pay.
   B. Allowances.
II. Conditions of service:
   A. Working conditions.
   B. Living conditions.
   C. Family separation.
   D. Personnel administration.
   E. Administrative irritants.
   F. Fringe benefits.
   G. Welfare and recreation.
III. Career factors:
   A. Educational opportunities.
   B. Career patterns.
   C. Assignment.
   D. Incentives.
   E. Selection.
   F. Career motivation program.
IV. Job satisfaction:
   A. Leadership.
   B. Job content.
   C. Collateral duties and paperwork.
V. Communications:
   A. Internal information.
   B. External image.

Within the overall career motivation program some of the major actions we are considering include:

COMPENSATION

Pay:

A salary system at competitive rates.

Meaningful sea pay based on years of service at sea.

Allowances:

A variable housing allowance where living costs exceed base used in salary system.

Continuation bonus authority for use in officer communities when needed. A mid-career variable reenlistment bonus for use in ratings with inadequate second term reenlistment rates.

CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

Working conditions:

Personnel and funding resources to meet fleet commitments under reasonable operating conditions to reduce excessive family separation.

Reducing trend to 7-day work weeks.

Living conditions:

Closing the total married and bachelor housing deficit using new construction, leasing, installment purchase, increasing basic allowance for quarters, and a variable housing allowance.

Provide storage ashore for fleet bachelor personal effects, and for automobiles where feasible, when deployed.

Establish minimum annual funding for habitability alterations in ships.

Family separation:

Establish policy of overhauling near homeport.

Increase capacity of shipyards near homeports.

Personnel administration:

Review and eliminate enlisted watchstanding requirements resulting from civilian substitution programs.

CAREER FACTORS

Educational opportunities:

Expand tuition aid program.

Increase educational opportunities for officers and enlisted men.

Selection:

Improve the quality of recruit inputs.

Maintain promotion opportunity.

Career motivation program:

Specialty pay for primary duty career counselors.

Collateral duties and paperwork:

Reduce use of fleet personnel in manning watches ashore in homeports.

COMMUNICATIONS

External image:

Expand use of all media to call attention to the modern Navy and its role in national defense and obtain support from the highest levels of the national civilian leadership to improve the overall image of service.

STUDIES ON RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you also provide for the record the results of studies the Navy has conducted during the past 2 years on the subject of retention problems.

(The information follows:)

During the past 2 years the following studies have been undertaken to examine the officer and enlisted retention problem:

(*a*) Navy-wide attitudinal surveys of officer and enlisted personnel have been conducted annually since 1964 in addition to considerable motivational research. The surveys are so structured that responses of personnel can be

evaluated by paygrade, warfare or staff specialty, marital status, and other background and experience variables. Specific areas of exploration concern career intentions, career incentives and education programs, and morale factors. These studies are conducted by the Navy Personnel Research and Development Laboratory in Washington, D.C. The latest survey which was conducted in June 1969 and indicates that enlisted personnel retention would be most greatly enhanced by improvements in the pay and allowances system and by changes that would decrease family separation and allow less dislocation during a career. For officer personnel this survey also indicates pay and allowances to be of prime interest also with housing and location or duty station. Statistical summarys of these surveys are lengthy volumes which are readily available for review. Motivational research is also conducted by the Center for Naval Analysis and the Personnel Research Laboratory, San Diego.

(*b*) Questionnaires are received from both officers and enlisted personnel prior to their separation. For enlisted personnel the Navy career plans questionnaire was developed in connection with the administration of Project Transition. It is to tool to assist in transition counseling. It is filled out by all enlisted personnel 6 months prior to their separation. Information identifying the reasons for reenlistment are obtained by the questionnaire. Most recent summaries indicate limited home life and low pay as prime reasons for enlisted personnel leaving the naval service. Officer resignation letters and separation questionnaires provide family separation, desire to continual education and pay and allowances as prime motivational factors for officers leaving the Navy. A continual research program for analysis of these sources insures we are aware of the current reasons expressed by our people as they leave active Navy service.

(*c*) In addition to research conducted throughout the officer corps and within the several communities, e.g., pilot, submarine, and surface warfare communities, the Chief of Naval Operations conducted a career motivation conference in the spring of 1969. The career motivation conference resulted in about 190 retention recommendations which were added to 115 recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy's 1965 Retention Task Force and became the basis of the Navy's present career motivation program. Based on this study and these recommendations it was subsequently determined that the main reasons people leave the Navy are: Compensation, conditions of service, career factors and job satisfaction. Tasks within each of these areas are presently under action of study.

(*d*) In addition to the above, the following special studies have been completed during the last 2 years:

1. Regular Officer Resignee Survey (Pers R. & D. Lab survey).
2. Study of Enlisted Personnel Rention in the Navy. (PRL San Diego SRR 68–6.)
3. Civil Engineer Corps Career Motivation Study (Pers R. & D. Lab WRR 68–18).
4. Veteran Naval Aviator Survey (Pers R. & D. Lab WSR 69–2).
5. Attitudinal Study of Resigned/Retired Nuclear Trained Submarine Officers. (Pers R. & D. WSR 69–4.)

RETENTION STUDIES CURRENTLY UNDERWAY

Mr. ANDREWS. Also provide for the record a brief of any studies that are now underway.

(The information follows:)

In addition to the continuing study of officer resignation letters, officer separation questionnaires, project transition questionnaires and the annual Navywide personnel surveys, mentioned above, the following additional specific areas of research are currently underway.

STRONG VOCATIONAL INTEREST BLANK (SVIB)

The purpose of this research is to evaluate an interest scale, based on the strong vocational interest blank, for use in selecting from among applicants for officer commissions those most likely to remain as career officers. Preliminary data specific to naval officers, suggests that intensive research on the SVIB as a predictor of naval career choice will provide a promising approach to the problem of officer retention.

Similar research is being conducted to develop and evaluate a vocational interest test (NVII) as a predictor of career motivation among enlisted men.

PRINCE STUDY

(Personnel reactions to incentives, naval conditions and experiences) was initiated in January 1970. This is the first large scale in-depth longitudinal retention study of Navy men in their first enlistment. The purpose is to study Navy incetives, policies and procedures, preservice and service experiences, duty assignment, satisfaction, social influences, and expectations as they affect the reenlistment intentions and decisions of Navy men during their first enlistment.

1971 BUDGET REDUCTIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. The Navy budget for 1971 plans for a year-end strength of 643,502. This is a decrease of 49,865 below your planned year-end strength for fiscal year 1970 of 693,367. How did you determine your requirements for 1971 as opposed to 1970, and where will the reductions be applied?

Admiral DUNCAN. I would like to furnish the complete list for the record. We were required to reduce a certain number of men and the accompanying dollars.

We have cut staff. For example, we have cut both Atlantic and Pacific Fleet staffs. We have had a reduction in the Headquarters staff here in Washington. We have deactivated certain ships, which I believe you are familiar with. For 1971, I believe a net reduction of four ships.

Admiral GADDIS. Originally we would have been up 23. So, that is really a reduction from our normal plan of 27 ships.

Admiral DUNCAN. We have taken reductions in every area that we could find.

Some, incidentally, in South Vietnam and, supporting ships and stations.

(The list follows:)

During the budget review, Navy manpower for fiscal year 1971 was adjusted from the planned fiscal year 1970 end strength of 693,367 to 643,502, a reduction of 49,865. The following cuts were applied:

	Ships	Air	Support
Major force issues SEASIA realinement Reserve ships	[Deleted]		
Program II ships (slippages)	[Deleted]		
OSD decisions	[Deleted]		−17,357
Presidential budget reductions	−3,220		−795
Total adjustments (ship/air/support)	−9,331	−2,544	−32,644
Total SECDEF adjustments		−44,519	
Additional force adjustments related to fiscal year 1970 strength reductions		−5,346	
Total decrease		−49,865	

NAVY RIVERINE FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. We had a sizable fleet of riverine boats down in South Vietnam. Have they all been turned over to the South Vietnamese?

Admiral DUNCAN. It is my understanding that they have not all been turned over, but a high percentage of them have been. The turnover program is going very rapidly and very well. We keep men on the boat.

Actually, it is a staged thing. The number of U.S. people attached to the boat changes as the Vietnamese crew take over.

Some of the people of Vietnam, as this process is taking place, have been shifted to the advisory group; in other words, from assignments to the operating boat to advising the South Vietnamese on organization, training—in effect, in every related area.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have U.S. Navy men on all the riverine boats that are now manned by South Vietnamese?

Admiral GADDIS. Not every one, sir.

I think to explain the process is the simpler way.

A Navy boat crew is replaced as South Vietnamese are available, depending upon the difficulty of the job and the nature of the billet that they replace. When a whole crew takes over, then the Vietnamese Navy takes over that boat.

Mr. ANDREWS. You do not keep any U.S. Navy personnel abroad that boat?

Admiral GADDIS. The boat would be completely manned by Vietnamese Navy. Depending on the detailed qualifications of the people, either for maintenance or possibly for some assistance in ordnance, we would have people ride with them.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, if they can maintain it, you give it to them, lock, stock, and barrel.

Admiral GADDIS. As soon as they can do the job, we give it to them.

Mr. ANDREWS. Unless you are convinced they can get the job done, you keep U.S. Navy personnel aboard the boat?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. The President's budget states that very probably future reductions can be made in Vietnam. However, because of the obvious need to maintain the security of any plans of this nature, this type of information is not included in the budget.

Would you tell the committee what type reductions are now under consideration for fiscal year 1971 in Vietnam for the Navy? If you prefer to do so, you may give your answer off the record.

(Off the record.)

SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. On the programing and financing schedules, there is a decrease in each of the programs reflected, except for Program No. 10, Support of Other Nations.

The committee notes that in the past 2 years, this program has doubled from $15 million to a planned level in 1971 of $30 million. Why is such a substantial increase in support of other nations necessary when all other areas of the budget are being decreased?

Admiral GADDIS. This is the category of personnel who are assisting the South Vietnamese Navy. So, people who move from being a member of a boatcrew to being an adviser to the Vietnamese Navy on the operation of that boat, go from Program 2 to Program 10.

We are not increasing the program. This is a functional transfer between operational programs, from operating to advisory status. That is the reason for the change.

Admiral DUNCAN. Frankly, I did not understand the question when it was first posed, but Admiral Gaddis has explained it. The numbers do go up because they are shifted to the advisory group. That is the figure that shows up in "Support of Other Nations."

CHANGE IN OFFICER-ENLISTED MANNING

Mr. ANDREWS. On the table which sets forth active duty military personnel by budget activity, the Navy, under the program entitled "Strategic Forces," is planning on a decrease of 7 officers, but an increase of 377 enlisted personnel.

Why would you require an increase of 377 enlisted personnel without requiring a corresponding increase in officers?

Admiral DUNCAN. The slight increase is related to the phasing of different types of aircraft associated with the fleet ballistic missile control system. Also, there is a switch when certain ships are being converted to Poseidon or undergo long overhauls. These go to single crews, and the net manpower fluctuations result in the figure you mentioned there.

Mr. ANDREWS. Under administration and associated activities, you are showing a decrease of 800 officers, but an increase of 518 enlisted personnel. What is the purpose of this switch in your officer-enlisted manning?

Admiral DUNCAN. As I mentioned, in making our cuts, we cut a great many staffs, including the headquarters here in Washington. We cut the district headquarters, and including support to the Defense agencies.

I would like to answer the latter part of your question for the record, if I may.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right.

(The information follows:)

The officer level for fiscal year 1971 in program IX shows a reduction from the level shown in fiscal year 1970. During the budget review process there were significant reductions in the officer levels associated with the various OPNAV offices, Department of the Navy staff offices, and the Naval Air Facility here in Washington. Additionally there were reductions in the Offices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. At the time that the final budget was submitted there were certain personnel adjustments which had not been distributed throughout all programs because of the personnel turbulence experienced during the last programing/budgeting cycle. These needed adjustments were displayed in program IX for programing purposes. These adjustments have since been effected so that a current publication of the Department of the Navy 5-year defense program would show the officer level fairly constant except for the specific personnel reductions mentioned above as well as some minor reprograming.

The fact that enlisted personnel spaces increase fiscal year 1970 to fiscal year 1971 is specifically related to the distribution problem mentioned above. Again, the amout of turbulence experienced during this last programing and budgeting cycle necessitated the programing of the enlisted numbers into program IX until specific adjustments could be effected elsewhere. Adjustments have since been incorporated into the Department of the Navy 5-year defense program and the enlisted levels are now fairly constant fiscal year 1970 to fiscal year 1971.

NAVY PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO DEFENSE AGENCIES

Mr. ANDREWS. On page I-13 of the Navy budget, under the table that sets forth active duty military personnel by budget activity and by operating programs, the committee notes that you are planning to increase the number of intelligence and communications people that are assigned to the operation of defense agencies from 2,097 in 1970 to 2,232 in 1971.

Why are you increasing the number of people assigned to defense agencies for intellignce and communications by 135?

Admiral DUNCAN. First, overall, during this year we made some rather marked decreases in both communications and intelligence, in which I know the committee has a high interest. They were reduced in the thousands.

In this particular 1971 budget, there is a reduction related to the *Wright*, which is one of the ships being inactivated. In connection with the assignment of additional people to defense agencies, I am sure they asked us for additional support, but I will have to answer specifically for the record.

Admiral GADDIS. It represents an assignment of additional personnel to man defense agencies activities, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS What?

Admiral GADDIS. It is an assessment from DIA.

Mr. ANDREWS. You mean a levy?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes. From DCA and DIA.

Mr. ANDREWS. The levy comes from higher up.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. They could take them all if they wanted to?

Admiral GADDIS. They have chosen not to, but they have centralized certain functions.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have a hypothetical question. They could take them all?

Admiral GADDIS. They could; yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. And you would say, "Aye, aye, sir," and send them all up there through channels and all.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Put something in the record explaining it.

(The information follows:)

The entries on page 1–13 of the Navy budget concerning increases in Navy intelligence and communications people in the Defense agencies are incorrect due to an administrative error. The budget should show:

	Fiscal year	Operation of the Navy	Operation of Defense agencies
Page 1–13: 3. Intelligence and communications	1971	33 307 (vice 33, 163)	2, 088 (vice 2, 232).
	1970	35, 424	2, 097.
Page 1–14: Total direct program	1971	631, 219 (vice 631, 075)	3, 084 (vice 3, 228).
	1970	680, 848	3, 144.

REDUCTION IN NAVY WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. On page I–18, there is a table on gains and losses. According to this table, you are planning on losing 443 warrant officers in fiscal year 1971, but gaining none. Does this indicate that the Navy is intentionally cutting back on the warrant officer program?

Admiral DUNCAN. No. We are going ahead on the warrant officer program. This is merely a matter of the time of commissioning to balance off the authorized number of officers. We are going ahead each year without warrant program. It is merely the timing of commissioning them to tie in with the authorized end strength.

Mr. ANDREWS. I imagine that when an economy move hits you and you are told to reduce overall, you have to do a lot of homework to know where to reduce.

Admiral DUNCAN. In this particular case and in certain others, Mr. Chairman, we have to make adjustments in order to meet the prescribed end strength. As you know, the Naval Academy and the NROTC and other officer programs all turn out officers in June, which would peak us sometimes over end strength. By delaying certain commissioning only a matter of a week or so, we can adjust to the proper end strength. We are not stopping making warrants.

Mr. ANDREWS. When you get mandatory orders from upstairs, "Reduce your end strength," I would assume they leave up to you where the reduction should be made.

Admiral DUNCAN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. That creates, I am sure, a series of headaches.

Admiral DUNCAN. That is right.

There is one point that I should make. Frequently, strength reductions in specific programs are prescribed from above. In other words, they make decisions for us. Nevertheless, as I said, we can change commissioning dates at the end of the year.

TRAINING SENIOR OFFICERS AS HELICOPTER PILOTS

Mr. ANDREWS. The Army has recently announced a plan to train generals and colonels to fly helicopters. Does the Navy plan on instituting a similar program?

Admiral DUNCAN. No, sir. We have an orientation course for captains who are going to command carriers where a lot of helicopters are operating, but it is not a flying course which teaches them to fly helicopters. It is an orientation course.

Mr. ANDREWS. Suppose a flag officer in the Navy desired to get helicopter training and become a qualified helicopter pilot, would the Navy permit him to do so?

Admiral DUNCAN. I know of no such request, and I know of no such officer training.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Navy have any plans for training admirals or captains to fly fixed-wing aircraft?

Admiral DUNCAN. I know of no plans for training captains or admirals to fly fixed-wing aircraft.

INCREASE IN PERSONNEL DRAWING FLIGHT PAY

Mr. ANDREWS. In 1971, you are showing that you will have 23,277 officers drawing flight pay, an increase of 577 over the number drawing flight pay in 1970.

The committee also notes that in 1971 you will have 12,443 enlisted personnel drawing flight pay, an increase of 1,038 over the planned level for 1970.

If you are cutting back on the total number of personnel in the Navy in 1971, why do you require these rather significant increases in both officers and enlisted personnel drawing flight pay?

Admiral DUNCAN. Insofar as the officers are concerned, the total number of officers qualified as naval aviators does go up because, you remember, for the past several years we have had quite a shortage. We are merely attempting to reduce the deficit.

In the enlisted bracket, actually it is really the same thing. We come closer to meeting requirements.

Mr. ANDREWS. You can elaborate on that in the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

INCREASE IN PERSONNEL DRAWING FLIGHT PAY

OFFICERS

The average strength was reduced in fiscal year 1970 through planned early releases necessitated by congressional reductions to the fiscal year 1970 budget request, even though the action brought inventory well below written requirements. No early releases for pilots are planned in the 1971 budget because it is critical that we more nearly match inventory and requirements, therefore the increase in fiscal year 1971 over fiscal year 1970.

ENLISTED

Severe monetary constraints were imposed on incentive pay for hazardous duty in fiscal year 1970 as a result of budget reductions. The numbers for fiscal year 1970 were well below requirements. In fiscal year 1971 a small growth factor exists over the current fiscal year 1970 numbers, however, the 1971 numbers are more closely related to the needs of the naval service.

ARMY TRAINING OF NAVY HELICOPTER PILOTS

Mr. ANDREWS. I read from the committee report on the defense appropriation bill for 1970, page 40:

The committee also believes it would be desirable for the Navy and the Air Force, in cooperation with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, to give serious consideration to allowing the Army to train all helicopter pilots. The Army has the largest training facility for this purpose, and the committee understands the Army could expand the base plant if additional requirements were placed upon it. It costs the Army about $30,000 to train a helicopter pilot, whereas it costs the other services much more. It would also be expected that with an increased production rate, the Army's average cost for helicopter pilot training would decrease. Helicopter pilots trained by the Army are well qualified, as has been demonstrated in Vietnam.

The committee recognizes that advanced training in the particular operating procedures of the Navy and Air Force would be required after their basic helicopter pilot training. This training could be accomplished without any difficulty.

The committee desires a report on this suggestion by the Secretary of Defense.

The Air Force people told us that they are going forward with a plan to comply with this request beginning the first of the year. What has the Navy done about this recommendation of the committee?

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, the Navy has studied the suggestion of the committee very thoroughly, and Admiral Connolly has addressed a letter to the chairman of the committee, Mr. Mahon.

I would like Captain Wieland to explain to you the Navy's position in this matter.

Mr. ANDREWS. Captain Wieland, will you explain the Navy's position in connection with the committee's suggestion last year that the Army train the Navy's chopper pilots?

Captain WIELAND. Yes, sir.

We have studied this very carefully. We have not found Army training of our helicopter pilots an attractive alternative for essentially two reasons:

One, we would receive an officer less suited to our needs; and, second, the cost of training him by the Army would be higher than training him ourselves.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you any figures on that?

Captain WIELAND. Yes, sir, I have.

Mr. ANDREWS. This report says the Army can train them for $30,000.

Captain WIELAND. Mr. Chairman, the problem arises since the Army and the Navy's cost bases are different. You cannot compare these two costs directly. We have put the cost of having an officer trained by the Army and having one trained by the Navy on the same basis as nearly as we were able to do so. It would cost us $28,000 to have an officer trained by the Army to meet our needs. We can do the same job for $21,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that based on experience you have had in training?

Captain WIELAND. Yes, sir.

There are reasons for this. For instance, there are some costs in having the Army train our officers that are not directly related to flight training. It costs us $5,193 in per diem because the Army does not have BOQ's for the officers going through flight training. We must add this to the cost of the Army's training for us.

The Army says, "We will train your helicopter pilots for $19,887 a copy." We consider in addition to this $19,887 we must add $5,193 for per diem, and we would additionally need to give the officer a minimum of 25 hours to make him aware of the Navy problem and make him acquainted with our methods and procedures. This would add $3,124 to the total cost of training him as a satisfactory pilot for sea-based operations.

That is how we get our $28,308 as the cost for the Army to train our helicopter pilots.

Mr. ANDREWS. The answer is that the Navy has said no.

Captain WIELAND. No, sir. We said we would respectfully request that you reconsider this directive. We will do what we are told.

Mr. ANDREWS. We have a letter from Admiral Connolly?

Captain WIELAND. Yes, sir; to Mr. Mahon.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish you would place the letter in the record at this point. Have you a copy of it?

Captain WIELAND. Yes, sir, I do.

(The letter follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1970.

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense, House Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In compliance with the instructions of your committee we have searched for a more economical way to train helicopter pilots. We recently achieved economies in our program by shortening the syllabus 18 flying hours and reducing time to train 8 weeks. We did this by eliminating carrier qualification training and some formation flying. We are unable to convert to an all rotary syllabus by December 31, 1970 while meeting our pilot training requirements because we do not have helicopters for an expanded rotary wing program. We could provide rotary-wing-only training for 190 of the 647 helo pilots required in fiscal year 1972.

I believe that data we have generated merits further consideration of alternatives available. Our data shows that we are turning out Naval Aviators much

more suited to our needs. We are doing this at costs substantially lower than the costs of having our pilots trained by the Army, or of training them ourselves in an all rotary wing program. The lower cost to train stems from using less expensive T–34 and T–28 propeller aircraft for the first 141 hours of the syllabus. After the student pilots learn to think and perform airborne, to use instrument readings to know where and how they are in this environment, they receive 70 hours flying helicopters. This turns them into well-qualified helicopter pilots with a knowledge of what airplane operators think and do. Propeller aircraft training is given in place of—not in addition to—rotary wing training. It results in savings of about $4.8 million per year. We have provided your staff with data supporting this rationale.

Unless there is something incorrect in what we believe to be the case, it is the Navy's desire to continue to train helo pilots as we do. On the other hand, we do not wish to appear to oppose the committee's wishes. If the committee does not agree that we are in fact meeting the basic desire of the committee—to save training dollars—we will move to an all helicopter program.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS F. CONNOLLY,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Air).

Captain WIELAND. I might add, we do not have the resources in helicopters to go immediately to rotary-wing training. The crux of the matter lies in the cost to fly fixed-wing versus rotary-wing aircraft.

We are using some very unsophisticated aircraft to train our helicopter pilots, namely the T–34 and the T–28, and these are much cheaper to operate than helicopters.

Admiral GADDIS. I might add, for the record, that we are preparing a prior-approval reprograming request for consideration of the committee relative to our helicopter pilot training in fiscal year 1970. We recognize exactly the desire of the committee, and we would hope you would consider it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral, the committee will stand adjourned until 10 o'clock tomorrow.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 4, 1970.

NAVY PHYSICIANS AND DENTISTS

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee will come to order.

We will continue the Navy request for funds for Navy personnel with Adm. Charles K. Duncan and members of his staff.

RETENTION OF DOCTORS AND DENTISTS

Admiral Duncan, in 1971 the Navy is showing a requirement for special pay for physicians and dentists for 6,052 individuals, a decrease of 338 below the 1970 level.

Is this reduction merely in line with the overall reduction in strength for the Navy, or does it reflect a retention problem of physicians and dentists?

Admiral DUNCAN. This decrease is in line with the overall strength reduction in the Navy. The retention problem, to which Admiral Davis might like to speak, is still with us. He has a very small percentage who have duty over 8 years. We do have a very severe retention problem.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral Davis, how many doctors do you have on board?

Admiral DAVIS. We have on the general order of 4,600. By the end of this year, we will have 4,589.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many dentists do you have aboard?

Admiral DAVIS. We will have on board 1,772 by the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is situation with reference to doctors? Are you getting all you need?

Admiral DAVIS. We are able to get sufficient numbers of doctors as a result of the Berry plan, which is just an extension of the draft process applying to doctors.

BERRY PLAN

Mr. ANDREWS. Tell us briefly how the Berry plan operates.

Admiral DAVIS. The Berry plan was set up in order to provide the military service a sufficient number of trained specialists.

Mr. ANDREWS. It amounts to a deferment of obligated service until after they have completed their medical education.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Navy pay for the education, or does the individual pay for it?

Admiral DAVIS. There is no Government subsidy under the Berry plan. It simply allows the man to plan for his future.

Mr. ANDREWS. How long do you defer him under the Berry plan—through internship or residency, or just graduation from medical school?

Admiral DAVIS. There are three measures under the Berry plan. One is to bring the man in immediately after internship. The second plan is to bring him in after one year of specialty training. The third plan is to completely defer him until his entire specialty training is over.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then when he does go into the service; how many years of obligated service does he have?

Admiral DAVIS. Always 2.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of the men you take in through the Berry plan, how many are you able to retain in service beyond the 2 years of obligated service?

Admiral DAVIS. Virtually none.

Mr. ANDREWS. They get in and get out?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

REGULAR NAVY DOCTORS

Mr. ANDREWS. What about your professional Regular Navy doctors? How many of them do you have on board?

Admiral DAVIS. There are approximately 1,800.

Mr. ANDREWS. About 40 percent of the total number of doctors.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. You say that as of today you have no crying need for doctors.

Admiral DAVIS. I would like to clarify the statement, if I may.

Mr. ANDREWS. Maybe I made it too strong.

Admiral DAVIS. The problem is that, as a result of the Berry plan and the draft, we are able to get the numbers we are authorized. We

have a critical need in certain specialties and cannot get them through the Berry plan, simply because they are not available.

We do not feel, on the whole, that we have enough authorized spaces for physicians to meet the total requirements that are placed upon us.

This is a matter of the internal management of our organization. We are only allowed a certain number, which we can get. Were we allowed more, we could get more, too.

Mr. ANDREWS. You say you have about 1,800 Regular Navy doctors.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes. This requires some comment in order fully to understand. A goodly number of these are people undergoing training. One reason we are able, in my opinion, to live in Navy medicine is because of our training programs.

Young men who go into our training programs have to become Regular Navy in order to qualify for them.

RETENTION OF REGULAR NAVY DOCTORS

Mr. ANDREWS. After they take your training program as a Regular Navy doctor, what is your retention rate among that group?

Admiral DAVIS. It is very poor. Actually, for those who stay on after 8 years, it begins to improve. If they have gotten their obligation paid off and their specialty training before 8 years, we oftentimes will lose them.

TRAINING OF NAVY DOCTORS

Mr. ANDREWS. Just what type training do you give them, in what fields?

Admiral DAVIS. In every medical specialty.

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe you told us last year you had a team working on heart transplants.

Admiral DAVIS. Not heart transplants. We have a team which is working on kidney transplants.

Mr. ANDREWS. Tell us briefly what they are doing and how they are coming along.

Admiral DAVIS. We have a young doctor who was especially trained at the University of Colorado where they have one of the biggest programs going on in transplantation. He is now back at Bethesda setting up a transplantation program there. He has had one successful transplant since he has been there.

We are, at a minimum, going to establish a very excellent kidney dialysis team. Whether we will stay in the transplant business is not clear to me at this time, to be perfectly frank.

We do no cardiac transplants except in animal experimental cases.

NAVY USE OF CIVILIAN MEDICAL FACILITIES

Mr. ANDREWS. When you have cases that your people are not capable of handling, what do you do?

Admiral DAVIS. If you will recall, under the medicare program for the Armed Forces, the so-called Champus program, those people will be sent to civilian medical facilities, providing they are dependents. If they are active duty, we have a similar program which pays the cost of providing the care.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you ever have specialists come into your hospital?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir. Every training hospital we have is backed up by the very best consultants that we can secure in the area.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have highly specialized doctors who come out to Bethesda to do surgery and visit patients?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir; all the time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Suppose a man goes out there and wants to call his personal physician, can he do that?

Admiral DAVIS. No, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Under what circumstances do you permit outside doctors to go into your naval hospitals?

Admiral DAVIS. They must be a duly recognized consultant. We will allow anyone who comes into our hospital, at the request of the patient concerned, to bring in his own physician if he wants.

Mr. ANDREWS. I did not get that.

Admiral DAVIS. If there is a patient at one of our hospitals who wants somebody else who is not on our chosen consultant staff, we permit this. However, this does not obligate us to do what this gentleman may recommend, although if it is reasonable we would certainly do it.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, you put your opinion or the opinion of your men above his.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is what it comes down to.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir. If it is a controversial issue, this is the way we decide it.

Mr. ANDREWS. I may be talking about things that do not happen too often, if ever.

Admiral DAVIS. Very rarely.

CIVILIAN CONSULTANTS

Mr. MINSHALL. You said a moment ago, Admiral, a duly recognized consultant. How does one become duly recognized?

Admiral DAVIS. There is an established procedure. To be duly recognized simply means that he is approved by the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery. We have certain qualifications.

I have on my staff some of the best medical expertise in the civilian community who advise me as to who are the outstanding ethical, best men in the field.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you go out and seek these people, or do they come to you? How do they get on this approved list?

Admiral DAVIS. Generally speaking, the doctors in a given specialty who are with us will request that such-and-such, Dr. Jones in the community, who is a great neurosurgeon, be appointed as a consultant. We will then go to the neurosurgical board and say, "Is Dr. Jones a reputable and ethical man, and would you recommend him?" If they do so, then we generally approve Dr. Jones.

Mr. MINSHALL. In other words, you seek out these consultants?

Admiral DAVIS. We do.

Mr. MINSHALL. How much do you pay them?

Admiral DAVIS. They are now allowed to be paid up to $100 a visit. Previously it was $50, up to a year ago.

Mr. MINSHALL. How much use have you made of these consultants?

Admiral DAVIS. We use them all the time in our training programs. They not only come and see patients, they come and lecture to our staffs. They are a very valuable part of our training program. Many are professors in universities.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you give them honorariums or lecture fees?

Admiral DAVIS. All of this comes under the $100 per visit.

Mr. MINSHALL. How many doctors are so consulted in the Washington area?

Admiral DAVIS. An estimate would be 50 to 75.

Mr. MINSHALL. That is all. Thank you.

CONTINUATION PAY FOR PHYSICIANS

Mr. ANDREWS. Even though you are showing a decrease in the total number of physicians and dentists for 1971, you are showing an increase in continuation pay for physicians. How successful do you feel this continuation-pay program is?

Admiral DAVIS. We feel it is quite successful in the upper range, Mr. Chairman. By this I mean the real purpose of the continuation pay, insofar as I was concerned, was to try to stem the tide of the 20-year, well-trained specialists whom we had as career Navy physicians, leaving the service at that particular time. This left us with a deficit of older men to use in our training programs. This continuation pay has been very effective in this particular group.

Mr. ANDREWS. How much is this continuation pay?

Admiral DAVIS. In this group, if they are captains with over 20 years' service, it is 4 months' base pay per year.

Mr. ANDREWS. They get that in addition to the regular pay?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. For that, how much longer do they serve?

Admiral DAVIS. One year. The law provides that you can pay up to 4 years of obligation at one time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the program successful?

Admiral DAVIS. It has been highly successful in this particular group. It has been less successful with the younger men whom we were losing.

Mr. ANDREWS. With the great demand for doctors throughout the country and the lucrative practices that they enjoy, a man must have a sense of devotion to duty to stay in the Navy as a doctor. Isn't that correct?

Admiral DAVIS. This is correct, yes, but as I think back a little bit, this sense of devotion does not extend down very deep in many instances, unfortunately.

TURNOVER OF NAVY DOCTORS

Mr. MINSHALL. What is your turnover rate in doctors?

Admiral DAVIS. Every 2 years we lose nearly 60 percent of our corps. It is about 30 percent a year. That is because of the draftee and Berry plan 2-year obligee, which makes up 60 percent of our total.

Mr. ANDREWS. But you get them back under that plan.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. The figures are that you have approximately 4,600 doctors, 1,800 of whom are Regular Navy.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, you have about 2,800 where you have the turnover?

Admiral DAVIS. This is correct; every 2 years, yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. As you lose under the Berry plan, you gain under the Berry plan.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, but none of these people stay in the service, you see. They are not our hard-core career people.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is your 1,800, you are talking about, the hard core. You do have losses in that group?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, we do. It is going down every year.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many would you say are in there for a lifetime of Navy service out of the 1,800?

Admiral DAVIS. An estimate would be 30 to 40 percent.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of the 1,800.

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

NAVY NURSES

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the situation today with respect to Navy nurses?

Admiral DAVIS. We are approximately 400 short of our authorized allowance.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the authorized strength for Navy nurses?

Admiral DAVIS. We are authorized 2,724.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many do you have on board?

Admiral DAVIS. We have 2,290 on board.

Mr. ANDREWS. How do you get your nurses, Admiral?

Admiral DAVIS. We get them from civil life as one means of procurement, which is not a very successful method of procurement. Then we subsidize the training programs in three different areas.

There are two types of nursing schools, one conducted with the hospital itself, called the hospital diploma program; the other conducted in a university setting, called the collegiate program.

We will subsidize under the collegiate program a girl in her last 2 years, if she so elects, paying her the pay and allowances of an E–3 and her tuition and educational requirements.

In the hospital-diploma school, we will subsidize the last year for the girl who is engaged in a 3-year program as opposed to a 4-year program in the collegiate program. We will subsidize her in her last year, paying her the pay and allowances of an E–3. This obligates the hospital-diploma girl for 2 years. The collegiate-program girl is obligated for 3 years for the 24 months.

Mr. ANDREWS. What about the retention rate of those nurses?

Admiral DAVIS. The rate of retention is also poor. At the end of 2 or 3 years, as a general rule, about 30 to 40 percent of these girls will leave.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any restriction against nurses marrying?

Admiral DAVIS. No, sir.

MALE NURSE PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have a male nurse program?

Admiral DAVIS. We do.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is relatively new, is it not?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Tell us how it works.

Admiral DAVIS. We have 40 people in this program today. They are generally from highly selected corpsmen. It is working very well, except it is small and does not meet our needs.

We have something in the nature of 130 male nurses on duty right now. The retention of these is very minimal.

Mr. ANDREWS. What type service do they render?

Admiral DAVIS. They can do any type of general nursing service, but as a rule we try to employ them in certain restricted areas.

For instance, with the Marine Corps out in the field, those who have anesthetist training make very excellent ones. They make very fine nurses on male urological wards.

Mr. ANDREWS. You have 130 male nurses?

Admiral DAVIS. We have 132 right now.

Mr. ANDREWS. Your retention there is also bad?

Admiral DAVIS. It is poor.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do they get commissions?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir, depending upon their age and qualifications.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many of the 132 male nurses are officers?

Admiral DAVIS. All of them are officers.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the highest ranking male nurse?

Admiral DAVIS. I would guess lieutenant commander by now.

NAVY CORPSMEN

Mr. MINSHALL. What is your counterpart in the Navy for a practical nurse program? Is that your corpsman?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MINSHALL. How many corpsmen do you have in the service now?

Admiral DAVIS. Slightly more than 30,000. Of those, you might be interested to know, 17,000 have some technical rating. By this I mean they have had advanced training in some particular specialty.

Mr. MINSHALL. What is your retention rate with the corpsmen?

Admiral DAVIS. Perhaps on the order of 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. MINSHALL. How long does it take to train a corpsman to do his job?

Admiral DAVIS. We have three schools for corpsmen. The "A" school runs about 3 months. In this 3-month period of time he gets a basic educational training along health care needs. He then goes into a hospital for practical experience for, hopefully, 9 months to a year. We have been able lately to do this. Two years ago or so, we could not keep them more than 4 to 6 months because of the need in Vietnam. That is the basic course.

From there on, we have independent school training programs, and then we have certain technological training programs, such as X-ray technicians and laboratory technicians.

ADEQUACY OF HOSPITAL STAFF

Mr. MINSHALL. What is your personnel situation in your various hospitals under your command? I am thinking specifically of Bethesda Naval Center. Do you have enough help there?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir. In most categories.

Mr. MINSHALL. There is no problem?

Admiral DAVIS. There is some problem insofar as nursing. There is a shortage of nurses, which we have spoken about, which is reflected as an equitable spread as much as we can in all of our hospitals.

Mr. MINSHALL. How about civilian help?

Admiral DAVIS. We have had to share some of the cutback that the others have shared, and we have tried to place this in areas that were not patient-care related.

Mr. MINSHALL. For example?

Admiral DAVIS. There is a considerable amount of training out there. We have a Navy medical school, a dental school, and we have a research institute. In these areas they are the ones who have been, by and large, taking the largest cuts.

We are trying to keep the patient-care facilities as well staffed as possible.

NUMBER OF NAVY HOSPITALS

Mr. ANDREWS. How many hospitals does the Navy operate?

Admiral DAVIS. Thirty-seven.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many beds?

You may put that in the record.

(The information follows:)

Sixteen thousand, nine hundred and thirty-seven beds currently are being operated in these 37 naval hospitals.

NAVY HOSPITAL SHIPS

Mr. ANDREWS. How many hospital ships are in service?

Admiral DAVIS. We have two in service.

Mr. ANDREWS. Where are they located?

Admiral DAVIS. Off Vietnam.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many beds?

Admiral DAVIS. There are 560 beds in each ship. Each ship is capable of expansion to 700.

HOSPITAL OCCUPANCY RATE

Mr. ANDREWS. What is your rate of occupancy in the hospitals?

Admiral DAVIS. Our rate of occupancy in the CONUS-based hospitals now is down probably to about 70 percent. We have had some reasonable decline in the last 6 months of our average daily patient load. Previously it ran about 14,500. Now it is perhaps down to 12,500.

VENEREAL DISEASE

Mr. ANDREWS. Comment on the venereal situation briefly. Is it better or worse?

Admiral DAVIS. It is slightly better. Overseas it is better.

Mr. ANDREWS. Put some figures in the record.

(The information follows:)

VENEREAL DISEASE—ACTIVE DUTY NAVY AND MARINE CORPS[1]

[Rates per 1,000 average strength]

	Fiscal year—		
	1967	1968	1969
Worldwide	48.4	47.0	48.2
United States	19.0	20.7	21.8
Outside United States	144.0	144.1	115.1
Vietnam	112.9	107.5	93.7
Ships	47.1	41.2	49.6

[1] Includes chancroid, gonorrhea, and syphillis.

Mr. ANDREWS. What about the venereal situation in Vietnam?

Admiral DAVIS. The venereal situation in Vietnam is statistically definitely improved.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that due in any way to the fact that you have fewer Navy men in Vietnam today?

Admiral DAVIS. I cannot quote statistics on that. We do not have them up to date.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it is due primarily to the fact that the Marines in Vietnam are restricted from going into some of the larger communities, such as Danang. Therefore, they have less chance of exposure.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you had any breakthroughs in the treatment of venereal disease?

Admiral DAVIS. No.

Mr. ANDREWS. The same old treatment?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, but that is good treatment as compared with 20 years ago. It is very successful treatment.

This is one of our problems with venereal disease. Everyone knows it is so good that they have lost some of their sense of restraint.

MARIHUANA

Mr. ANDREWS. What about the marihuana situation, the dope situation, in South Vietnam? We read some frightening stories about it. What experience has the Navy had, and what are you doing to try to correct it?

Admiral DAVIS. I think Admiral Duncan can respond to this perhaps more knowledgeably as to the exact things that are being done.

It is a significant problem. We are attacking it vigorously, and I think with some degree of success.

In certain areas, particularly in the area of the experimenter, which I think most of these lads are, the curiosity types, I think a great deal of success is being recorded. Many of those boys are being very successfully rehabilitated and perhaps will not be a problem for the future.

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral Duncan, what do you say about this?

Admiral DUNCAN. Our experience in drug abuse in Vietnam is not any higher than in other places, such as Norfolk and San Diego. During the last year we have had to discharge over 3,800 people for drug abuse.

On the other hand, we did retain also a very large number. For example, we retained about 1,450 young men who the evidence showed had been only curiosity puffers, if you will. We have 1,990 men who were rehabilitated successfully.

This does not by any means suggest that everyone who uses drugs is discharged. Not at all. But those who are pushers or sellers, of course, undergo disciplinary action at the discretion of the commanding officer, and those who are users are brought before a board for a review and determination as to whether they should be discharged from the Navy.

As I say, over 3,800 were discharged last year. This has been a rather rapidly rising curve over the past 2 or 3 years. We are watching it very closely. We do consider it a serious problem.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is serious with that number involved.

What is the determining factor as to whether or not you retain a man in the service who has become addicted to dope in any form, or release him?

Admiral DUNCAN. His case would be reviewed not only by his command but in the Bureau, where I have experts in this field.

In general, though, the cut line between the man who is sure to be discharged is the one who uses the so-called hard drugs, such as heroin.

As for users of marihuana, again, if they were a pusher or seller, they would get a court-martial at the discretion of the commanding officer.

The general break line is whether or not the man is using LSD or hard drugs, and whether the user is guilty of selling or pushing any form of drug abuse.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the most frequently used drug in Vietnam?

Admiral DAVIS. Marihuana.

Mr. ANDREWS. What treatment do you give them for the use of marihuana, Admiral Davis?

Admiral DAVIS. Marihuana is a nonaddicting drug, except perhaps psychologically, and requires no treatment after withdrawal.

Mr. ANDREWS. What do you mean, after withdrawal? After he breaks the habit?

Admiral DAVIS. There is a great question whether marihuana is habit forming. This drug has no dependency state upon it like barbiturates and particularly like heroin or any of the opium derivatives.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any heroin cases?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir. We discharged 151 men last year who were identified to hard narcotics. In what is known as the acid or LSD type, there were 1,857 discharges last year.

EFFECT OF MARIHUANA ON USER

Mr. MINSHALL. You said marihuana was not a habit-forming drug. Do you consider marihuana has any bad characteristics as far as its effect on the user is concerned?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, I do.

Mr. MINSHALL. What are they?

Admiral DAVIS. I think they distort his judgment. I think they have some effect on his depth perception. I think the major thing that happens is that they put him in with a crowd where psychologically,

sooner or later, he tries something that is far worse and will be definitely addicted.

Mr. MINSHALL. In other words, the use of marihuana leads to addiction to hard drugs?

Admiral DAVIS. That is the major danger, in my opinion, of marihuana.

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, one of the things they have found is that marihuana affects different personalities differently. You cannot say for sure how marihuana will affect a person.

Secondly, the contents of a marihuana cigarette may differ. It is a mild hallucinogenic in comparison to LSD, and has been shown in some cases to produce such things as flashbacks, as they are known, as is prevalent with LSD. We consider marihuana dangerous.

Although, as Dr. Davis says, it is not in itself addictive, it does lead to the use of hard drugs.

Mr. MINSHALL. I do not think you should try to minimize the potential effects of marihuana, as many people have done.

Admiral DAVIS. I agree.

Admiral DUNCAN. In the Navy we just cannot have it—period. If we discover its use, we simply cannot tolerate it.

NAVY REGULATIONS REGARDING MARIHUANA

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you feel the regulations in the Navy are strong enough to prevent the use of marihuana?

Admiral DUNCAN. I think the regulations are sufficiently strong. I think the question would be to what extent we are discovering the users.

I think possibly part of this rapidly rising curve of discharges shows our investigative procedures are improving all the time.

Mr. MINSHALL. What are your penalties for the use of marihuana?

Admiral DUNCAN. As I mentioned, each case has to be determined on its own. If he is proven to be a casual curiosity puffer—I have seen estimates that 70 percent of our high school students have tried it—and he is otherwise a dependable man and has shown himself to be dependable, he is retained and warned.

If he has used a harder drug, he is discharged.

If he is a pusher of marihuana or is shown to have used it over a long period, he is discharged.

However, each case has to be examined on its own.

Mr. MINSHALL. In other words, you have a rather flexible policy.

Admiral DUNCAN. We have a policy of examining each case to determine appropriate disposition based on the facts.

We consider that the drug-abuse problem is extremely serious and we are doing everything we can to stop the rising trend.

USE OF POLICE DOGS TO DETECT MARIHUANA

Mr. MINSHALL. Are you using police dogs in any way to seek out the pushers of pot?

Admiral DUNCAN. We are not using them extensively. The Marine Corps—I am sure they will be here to speak for themselves—have used dogs and have had some success. We find the best avenue for exposing

these men, very frankly, is that they tell on one another. So, if our investigative service uncovers a user, almost invariably they will obtain information as to other users.

NAVY FILM ON DRUGS

Mr. MINSHALL. You have an excellent film on LSD that I had a copy of and, as a matter of fact, I am still using. I have shown that to schools, not only in my district, but some of the local schools here in the Washington area. The comments on it are very excellent.

My feeling is that, if it saves one kid from ever using LSD, it will have served its purpose.

Have you any plans to update or improve that film in any way?

Admiral DAVIS. There are plans for other and additional visual aids along this line. That film, as you know, has been shown extensively in thousands of places.

Mr. MINSHALL. I would like a copy of it.

Admiral DUNCAN. We have very excellent pamphlets on this subject, also, which we send out to all commands. They are very well written and are particularly directed to the young man.

(Off the record.)

DOD DRUG-ABUSE TEAM

Admiral DUNCAN. There is a Department of Defense drug-abuse team headed up by one of the officials of the Department of Defense which is quite active and includes representatives of all the services. We have programs for developing additional films and additional literature. We try to keep an aggressive campaign.

We keep reminding our commanding officers that drug abuse is a matter of prime concern to the Navy and that continuous attention and effort are required.

AVAILABILITY OF DRUGS

Mr. ANDREWS. From what I read and hear, Admiral Davis, you can buy any of these drugs in South Vietnam almost as easily as you can Coca-Cola. That presents a very serious temptation to young men who go down there.

Admiral DAVIS. With your permission, Mr. Andrews, I would like to boost that up. It is not just in Vietnam. You can get the hard drugs much easier in Vietnam than the others, but it is a great surprise and shock to me to see how easy it is to get marihuana or barbiturates and amphetamines virtually anywhere in the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Even in high schools.

Admiral DAVIS. Even in junior high schools. Just one figure that I noticed in the paper which shook me recently was that the city of New York has reported 275 deaths as a result of children less than 12 years of age using hard drugs in 1 year.

(Off the record.)

NAVY NURSES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. How many nurses does the Navy have now serving in Vietnam? You may supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

There are 32 Navy nurses in country, plus 58 in hospital ships for a total of 90.

Mr. ANDREWS. How does this compare with the number serving there 1 year ago?

Admiral DAVIS. The same number right now.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many nurses are assigned to Southeast Asia? Supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

There are 13 Navy nurses in Taipei plus the 90 in Vietnam for a total of 103.

NAVY HOSPITAL SHIPS

Mr. ANDREWS. Since action is falling off in Vietnam, do you plan to bring either or both of the hospital ships home, or to leave them there as part of the Vietnamization program?

Admiral DAVIS. As the action begins to decline, as far as the Marines and Navy are concerned, one of them is already scheduled to be inactivated, and the other will be dependent entirely upon what our troops are there who need to be supported.

NAVY HOSPITAL IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. How many hospitals does the Navy have in South Vietnam?

Admiral DAVIS. We have only the one, other than the hospital ships.

Mr. ANDREWS. Where is it located?

Admiral DAVIS. Danang.

Mr. ANDREWS. What size hospital is it?

Admiral DAVIS. It is now a 400-bed hospital, having been recently reduced by 200 beds.

Mr. ANDREWS. What type construction?

Admiral DAVIS. It is a variable type. It has quonset-like temporary construction.

Mr. ANDREWS. No brick and mortar?

Admiral DAVIS. No, sir. It is not a permanent construction type hospital.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you plan to close that?

Admiral DAVIS. If the pullout continues, we will close that.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you reduced the staff?

Admiral DAVIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you brought back some doctors?

Admiral DAVIS. We haven't, but in the spring we are pulling back some.

NAVY HOSPITAL SHIPS

Mr. ANDREWS. Do all the services use the hospital ship, or only the Navy and Marine Corps?

Admiral DAVIS. The Army in the area uses it quite frequently.

Mr. ANDREWS. How far offshore are the ships anchored?

Admiral DAVIS. Anywhere up to 12 or 15 miles, sometimes quite close, sometimes right in the bay at Danang.

Mr. ANDREWS. You do not keep them full?

Admiral DAVIS. A year ago, the percentage of occupancy was some-

thing in the nature of 60 to 80 percent. Now it is running about 40 percent.

Mr. ANDREWS. How do you transport patients to and from the hospital ships?

Admiral DAVIS. By and large, helicopters.

ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. MINSHALL. Have you had an opportunity, Admiral Duncan, to review the report of the President's Commission on an all-volunteer force?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have had an opportunity for review and are in the process of making an analysis of it. We have not been asked as yet to make a complete analysis of our position on the report.

Mr. MINSHALL. Would you care to comment on it now, or would you rather wait until you have completed your review?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not believe I would want to comment in great detail until we have completed our review. I am sure you have seen Secretary Laird's statement in the press that this was a goal toward which we would work, but the time frame recommended by the Gates Commission appears to be much faster than could be realized as a practical matter. There are many problems in this area.

While the all-volunteer force in principle is good, we in the Navy have a very deep concern that as we go to the all-volunteer force we get the quality and quantity of people we want, and particularly the quality.

That is our reservation, if you will, on any all-volunteer-force plan. If it does not provide us quality, it won't work for us. If it does——

Mr. MINSHALL. That is your snap judgment, pending a more thorough review?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. It is not exactly snap. It has been our judgment all along.

Of course, I have been at sessions of the commission. We have tried to put the thought through to them that, whatever plan, it must produce a quality man in the Navy. We cannot run the Navy with people who are not qualified to take advanced training, for example.

WOMEN'S NAVY

Mr. ANDREWS. We have with us today Captain Lenihan, the Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel for Women, the highest ranking woman officer in the Navy.

AUTHORIZED AND ON-BOARD STRENGTH

Captain, would you discuss the status of the WAVES today, and your plans for fiscal year 1971? How many WAVES do you have on board?

Captain LENIHAN. We have 570 officers, Mr. Chairman, and 5,400 enlisted women.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that your authorized strength?

Captain LENIHAN. Our authorized strength is 600 officers, 6,000 enlisted.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, you are under the authorized strength.
Captain LENIHAN. Slightly, yes, sir. We are just about up to it.

RETENTION RATE

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the rate of turnover with the WAVES in the officer rank?
Captain LENIHAN. In the officer rank, we have no retention problem at all. The WAVES either stay in the Navy or get married.
Mr. ANDREWS. Is there any restriction against their remaining in the Navy after marrying?
Captain LENIHAN. None at all, sir. They remain in the Navy after they get married, but they may not have a dependent under 18 years of age.
Mr. ANDREWS. No children allowed.
Mr. MINSHALL. Do you have any of them marry Army or Air Force personnel?
Captain LENIHAN. A considerable number, sir.
Mr. ANDREWS. What about the retention rate in the enlisted section?
Captain LENIHAN. In the enlisted, Mr. Chairman, their obligated service is 3 years. Of course, the majority finish their obligated service. The reenlistment rate is about the same as it is for the men. After that term, I would say about 17 or 18 percent.

WAVES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any WAVES in Vietnam?
Captain LENIHAN. We have one officer in Vietnam.

DUTIES OF THE WAVES

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you tell us briefly just what the duties of the WAVES are?
Captain LENIHAN. In the officer group, the officers serve in computer programing, meteorology, personnel administration, systems analysis, and communications. All the officers are college graduates, and some have advanced degrees.
In the enlisted ranks, the WAVE, serve in 20 ratings. Twenty percent of our enlisted women are hospital corpsmen.
Mr. ANDREWS. You do not have any WAVE nurses, do you?
Captain LENIHAN. No, sir. The nurses are members of a separate corps.
Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have jurisdiction over the nurses, the female nurses in the Navy?
Captain LENIHAN. No, I do not have jurisdiction over the nurses.
Mr. ANDREWS. Only the WAVES?
Captain LENIHAN. Only the WAVES.
Mr. ANDREWS. Have they increased the authorized strength of the WAVES?
Captain LENIHAN. No, sir. The 600 officers and 6,000 enlisted is the current authorization.
Mr. ANDREWS. Last year you mentioned that there were two WAVE officers serving in Vietnam. You say you have only one there today.

Captain LENIHAN. Yes, sir. One of those, as I recall, was working on a naval history project.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many WAVES are stationed in Southeast Asia? Only that one?

Captain LENIHAN. Only that one.

WAVE RETENTION

Mr. ANDREWS. Last year you mentioned that there was no retention problem as far as WAVES are concerned. Is that still true today? You touched on it briefly. Not in the officer area, but there is a retention problem in the enlisted area?

Captain LENIHAN. Not really, Mr. Chairman, because we visualize the enlisted WAVE as serving for a certain period in the Navy as volunteers. So, our objective is a little bit different from that of the men, as we see it.

In other words, the WAVES come into the Navy to do something for their country for a period of time.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the enlisted period?

Captain LENIHAN. It is 3 years.

Mr. ANDREWS. It has been a great organization. I was here when they were created by act of Congress. I have watched them through the years. They have rendered yeoman service.

Thank you, Captain.

Captain LENIHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you any special problem you wish to discuss with the committee?

Captain LENIHAN. I think not, sir. The WAVES continue to love the Navy and are proud to serve it.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a fine statement.

Mr. MINSHALL. It's a wise woman who knows when enough has been said.

Admiral GADDIS. That is why she is a captain, Mr. Minshall.

CONTINUATION PAY FOR SUBMARINE OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. Under "Continuation pay for submarine officers," you are showing an increase from 673 officers in 1970 to 753 officers in 1971 drawing this pay. How many will be eligible for this special pay in 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not have the exact figure, but I would like to say that the reason we estimate it will go up is because as new year groups become eligible more will sign up for the continuation pay.

(The information follows:)

Nuclear submarine officers commissioned in 1967 will become eligible for continuation pay during 1971. There are 236 officers in this category. (The 753 officer figure includes the number of officers who will have previously applied for continuation pay and will be receiving their second or third payments in 1971.)

Mr. ANDREWS. For 1971, you are showing a slight increase in the number of officers to be drawing incentive pay for submarine duty. Can this increase be attributed to the continuation pay?

You may supply that for the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. No, sir. The number drawing continuation pay is not necessarily linked with those drawing incentive pay.

Mr. ANDREWS. Put something in the record to answer that question.
(The information follows:)

The incentive pay is paid to all officers serving aboard submarines, and to all qualified submarine officers in training en route to submarine assignments. The continuation pay is paid only to selected nuclear trained officers and, for those officers, is in addition to incentive pay. The slight increase in officers drawing incentive pay in 1971, therefore, results from the fact that the submarine force is still expanding. As the new nuclear submarines are built, there will be more officers serving aboard submarines and hence drawing incentive pay.

SUPPORT OF FREE WORLD FORCES

Mr. ANDREWS. Also, under the category of special pay is the item "Support of Free World Forces." What is the total amount included in the Navy budget for support of free world forces?

I wish you would tell us what countries are supported, and in what amount.

Admiral DUNCAN. We are supporting South Vietnam and the amount for fiscal year 1971 is $100,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. For the record, will you provide a schedule for the Navy showing under what activities in this budget these funds are included, broken down by country?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Free world forces, fiscal year 1971

	South Vietnam
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	$100,000
Total	100,000

NAVY OPERATIONS IN LAOS

Mr. ANDREWS I heard a newscast over television this morning that some of our Navy carrier bombers struck Laos yesterday. Has that been going on for some time, or do you know?

Admiral DUNCAN. I know that there are missions into Laos, but I am not qualified, really, to speak as to the numbers or the extent.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Navy have any personnel in Laos?

Admiral DUNCAN. The Navy has no personnel stationed there. And we do not support any free world forces in Laos.

PRISONERS OF WAR

Mr. ANDREWS. How many Navy personnel are prisoners of war?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have 144 listed as prisoners of war, and 111 missing in action. The exact determination of whether they are prisoners of war or missing in action is taken on the best information that we have. We usually lump the two because North Vietnam will not confirm.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, since the war started, the Navy has suffered 255 losses as prisoners of war or missing in action.

Are the majority of those people aviators?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

(Off the record.)

AIR STRIKES BY CARRIER-BASED PLANES

Mr. ANDREWS. Who issues the orders for Navy air strikes by carrier-based planes?

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is an area that perhaps I should defer to other witnesses. I know, of course——

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a good answer. It is out of your area, so keep your mouth shut.

REENLISTMENT RATE

The committee notes that, on page I–41 of the budget, the Navy is showing that, for 1971, 36,212 enlisted personnel will reenlist, an increase of approximately 3,100 over the planned reenlistment level of 33,084 for 1970.

In view of all the retention problems you have been having, how did you determine that you can plan on a 10-percent increase in reenlistments for 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. This determination was made on the basis of a combination of two factors. First, the projected increase is partly attributable to anticipated positive results from Navy-initiated efforts to solve our retention problem, such as the personnel management improvements committee and a more intensive career counseling program. Secondly, a larger number of our career personnel, who have higher reenlistment rates, will have enlistments expiring and will be eligible to reenlist.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE

Mr. ANDREWS. On page I–44 of the Navy budget under "Clothing Allowance," the item entitled "Advancement to Pay Grade E–7," the committee notes that the number of individuals who draw this allowance will increase from 4,000 in 1970 to 7,100 in 1971. What would cause this significant increase in the number of individuals to be drawing this allowance?

Admiral DUNCAN. Advancements are authorized to fill vacancies which are a function of both personnel losses and OSD-authorized end strength. In fiscal year 1970, force reductions, resultant OSD-authorized end strength, and projected loses permitted the advancement of only about 4,000 men to pay grade E–7. In fiscal year 1971, a combination of three factors account for the projected E–7 increase over fiscal year 1970. An OSD authorization will permit the Navy to exceed the established OSD ceiling at pay grade E–7 and thereby attain 97.3 percent of the Navy's requirements for this pay grade. Other factors are a lesser force reduction than in 1970 and the level of losses projected. Hence, the number of individuals who will draw this allowance will increase by about 3,000 in fiscal year 1971 over the level authorized for fiscal year 1970.

(Off the record.)

Admiral DUNCAN. In further answer to your last question, in advancing petty officers we are given guidance, of course, by the Office of the Secretary of Defense on the total proportion or percent that we may have in the respective pay grades.

We watch carefully to assume that we remain within the numbers authorized by OSD.

Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel

ABSENTEE RATE AT MESS FACILITIES

Mr. Andrews. For subsistence ashore and CONUS, the Marine Corps uses an absentee rate of 28.8 percent, the Army uses an absentee rate of 22 percent, but the Navy uses an absentee rate of 42 percent. Why is the absentee rate so much higher for the Navy in CONUS messes than it is for the Army and the Marine Corps?

Admiral Duncan. I would like to ask Lieutenant Commander Robinson to respond.

Commander Robinson. The only thing we can attribute that to is the nature of the installations in the United States, differing between the Army and the Marine Corps and the Navy. Most of ours are on operating-type bases with greater liberty privileges. The Marine Corps and Army camps have a more regimented type of training and in more isolated areas. Therefore, we do have a higher absentee rate.

Mr. Andrews. How much liberty does an enlisted man get?

Commander Robinson. This varies from base to base, depending on the strength of the base and, of course, the needs.

Mr. Andrews. Give us some examples.

Commander Robinson. I do not believe I could answer for any particular base.

Mr. Andrews. Do any of them get the whole weekend?

Commander Robinson. Yes, sir.

Admiral Duncan. Most bases, Mr. Chairman, are divided into watch sections. This will vary according to the requirements of the base, just as it does on the ship. We give them leeway, for example. They must be able to change according to the number of men they have aboard.

Normally, it will not get below a 3-section watch. They get two liberties out of every 3 days. On the other hand, we allow them as much as 6 sections.

Mr. Andrews. Do you still have a 4-hour watch on ship?

Admiral Duncan. Yes, sir.

NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

Mr. Andrews. On page 57 of your budget justification you are showing $179,000 for "Ration Dense" in 1970. What did you accomplish as a result of this program in 1970?

Admiral Duncan. This program in fiscal year 1970 involves acceptability testing and introduction of new food items in the "custom foods" area. This is an expansion of the program formerly known as "Ration Dense" to include food items which are processed to eliminate waste, reduce bulk, save labor, and eliminate or reduce refrigerated storage space. New items being introduced into the Navy feeding system in fiscal year 1970 include dehydrated cherries, peas, spinach, lemon and pineapple juices, and chile con carne.

Mr. Andrews. In 1971, you are also requesting $179,000 for this program. What are these funds required for?

Admiral Duncan. The $179,000 is required to continue the Navy's effort in introducing new custom foods. Dehydrated cherries and peas began to be introduced into the Navy's food service operation during fiscal year 1970 and will be carried over into fiscal year 1971.

CHANGES IN FOOD INVENTORY LEVEL

Mr. ANDREWS. On page 57 of your budget you have an entry entitled "Change in Inventory Level." Would you please explain what this entry represents?

Admiral DUNCAN. The item "Change in Inventory Level" includes the funds required to support the inventory requirements for food service operation afloat. The sum represents the net change in inventory requirements for those ships being commissioned and decomissioned during the fiscal year. Although there will be a net decrease of four ships during this period, the value of the inventory requests increases due to a greater endurance load capacity of ships being commissioned than those going out of service.

Mr. ANDREWS. What does the negative entry represent in 1970?

Admiral DUNCAN. The negative entry for "Change in Inventory Level" in fiscal year 1970 reflects the net decrease of 125 ships and the corollary decreased inventory requirements to support them.

EMERGENCY RATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. For emergency rations you are requesting $2.5 million in 1971, and your planned level for 1970 is $2.7 million. In your 1970 budget, this item was projected at $1 million for both 1969 and 1970. Why did you feel it was necessary to increase your buy of emergency rations by 150 percent?

Admiral DUNCAN. The increased buy of emergency rations is required to replenish pre-positioned reserve emergency rations actually consumed during fiscal year 1969. The fiscal year 1970 congressional budget request for this item was based on fiscal year 1968 experience.

UNIFORMED SERVICES SAVINGS DEPOSITS

INCREASE IN INTEREST PAYMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS. On page 73 of your budget you are projecting an increase of $270,000 in interest payments in connection with uniformed services savings deposits. Why will interest payments be increasing in 1971 when the number of troops deployed overseas will actually be decreasing during 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. As you know, Mr. Chairman, any man who is permanently stationed overseas may take advantage of this opportunity to deposit his pay with 10 percent interest accruing. We estimate that interest accruing on deposits already made, as well as on new deposits, will increase, even though some decrease will be experienced in overseas deployments.

You see, the drawdown in South Vietnam, for example, from the Navy is not of the magnitude it is in the other Services. Deployment will be down, as you say, but not in sufficient numbers to reverse the increasing trend of deposits and interest earned. In addition, the Congress has, in my opinion, very wisely passed a law that will permit prisoners of war to exceed the $10,000 limit. So, we think there will be an increase in interest paid.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you increased the interest that you pay on savings?

Admiral DUNCAN. It is 10 percent by law,

CHARGES OF HAVING SAVINGS PROGRAM FOR OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. Is there any truth to the charges that this is primarily a savings program for officers?

Admiral DUNCAN. I had never heard that brought up before, Mr. Chairman. Officers do receive more pay, but there are several times more enlisted than officer personnel in the Navy. In fact, approximately two-thirds of the current depositors are enlisted personnel.

Mr. ANDREWS. Put something in the record on that to explain the program.

Admiral GADDIS. On the basis of the number of accounts, in our last report, Mr. Chairman, there are well over twice as many enlisted men participating as officers, but percentagewise, it is used to a greater extent by officers.

(The information follows:)

STATUS OF SAVINGS DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS AS OF DEC. 31, 1969

	Number	Amount of principal on deposits
Officers	6,429	$17,923,67
Enlisted	14,326	16,031,40
Total	20,755	33,955,080

REPORTING OF INTEREST TO INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. ANDREWS. Why are only interest payments in excess of $600 per year reported to Internal Revenue, rather than all payments, as a bank or savings and loan is required to do?

Admiral DUNCAN. I will have to furnish that for the record.

Mr. ANDREWS. You may supply that for the record.

Mr. NUTTMANN. A possible answer is that the interest that they earn, since these men are located overseas, may be tax free.

Mr. ANDREWS. Check into that and put something in the record.

Mr. NUTTMANN. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Banks and savings and loan institutions report their interest payments in the amount of $10 or more in accordance with the provisions of section 6049 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended. Section 6049 excludes the U.S. Government from being subject to this requirement.

The Navy reports all interest payments of $600 or more under the provisions of section 6041 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended.

CASH DEPOSITS

Mr. ANDREWS. Can cash deposits be made, or are deposits a payroll deduction?

Admiral DUNCAN. They can be made either way.

Mr. ANDREWS. Can a man put outside money into the account?

Admiral DUNCAN. No.

Mr. ANDREWS. Only that earned in the service?

Admiral GADDIS. Only the unallotted current pay and allowances earned in the service.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is about all he earns, isn't it, Admiral?

Admiral GADDIS. There are allowances in addition to basic pay that may be used, reduced by allotments for dependent support, insurance, et cetera.

NAVY MORALE

Mr. MINSHALL. Admiral, what is the morale of the men presently in the Navy, enlisted and officers, especially those serving in the Vietnam area?

Admiral DUNCAN. Every report I have is that the morale in the Vietnam area is very good, indeed. I think the morale generally in the Navy is good, and there is an apparent conflict here in that, while the morale is good, we are not getting the reenlistments. We attribute this to the fact that they are busy and working hard and feel they are contributing but, for reasons we discussed yesterday, they do not decide to make the Navy a career.

One of the demotivating factors disturbing morale in the current year, which I mentioned briefly yesterday, is the fact that we have so many ships inactivating, as well as the extensive early releases, so there is a turmoil and turbulence, and personal plans are disrupted and people are shifted around to fill vacancies in remaining ships and stations. I believe this has had an adverse effect.

I still believe, in general, that the morale is very good.

Mr. MINSHALL. You have heard complaints that a lot of the men, officers as well as enlisted, want more time ashore, which is understable. How does this affect morale?

Admiral DUNCAN. Indeed, by every sounding we have taken, they certainly tire of extremely long deployments and short turnaround in the States. We feel this is one of the big retention problems. While they are actually on the ship or in squadrons their morale is good but, as I say, it is because of the lack of time ashore that we think they do not choose to make the Navy a career.

NAVAL ACADEMY

DECLINE IN APPLICATIONS

Mr. MINSHALL. You mentioned the reenlistment factor. How about candidates for the Naval Academy? Have you noticed any decline in the applications you receive?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. Over the past few years, the number of candidates has declined. Last year I think we had to use almost all of the qualified alternates to fill the Naval Academy openings.

However, this year, under Admiral Calvert, in particular, we are undertaking a campaign to make the Naval Academy opportunity known to more young men. We are sending teams out into the schools where they will be accepted. We have more nominations at this point than we had last year.

As I mentioned, the law has been changed so each Congressman can nominate 10, total, and we hope, of course, that this will be utilized to the fullest by the Congressmen.

Mr. MINSHALL. What are the other two service academies doing that you are not, and how is their rate of applications as compared to yours?

Admiral DUNCAN. I cannot speak authoritatively——.

Mr. MINSHALL. Will you supply something for the record?

Admiral DUNCAN. I will supply something for the record on that.

Mr. MINSHALL. Thank you.

(The information follows:)

The three academies have approximately the same program and maintain liaison in order to exchange ideas. The three services receive approximately the same number of applications, on the order of 6,000 each. All of the services make use of such techniques as educator visits to brief high school counselors and each uses field officers to publicize their respective academies. This year, the Navy has started an affiliate program among Naval Academy alumni as a means of promoting applications.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will you explain the new procedure whereby each Congressman is allowed to nominate 10?

Admiral DUNCAN. The law permits an increase to one principal and nine alternates, which gives us a larger field from which to choose under the qualified-alternates provision.

(Off the record.)

BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you have any new building programs in progress or planned?

Admiral DUNCAN. We certainly do have. We have a long-range academic improvement program which, frankly, is vital to bring the Naval Academy up to the proper academic standards.

We have in the 1970 MILCON program a new library.

Mr. MINSHALL. What is the status of the new library?

Admiral DUNCAN. The status of the new library is that it has been authorized and funded but it is under the construction freeze right now. In the next year's program we are asking for a start on an engineering studies complex, which is very important to us. We are trying to upgrade the whole academic status of the Naval Academy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have enough land to build these buildings?

Admiral DUNCAN. It is very crowded, but we do have.

RECLAIMING OF LAND

Mr. ANDREWS. How much land did you get out of the bay?

Admiral DUNCAN. I can supply the answer for the record.

Mr. ANDREWS. If I remember correctly, 126 acres.

Admiral GADDIS. Actually, Mr. Chairman, a total of 126.8 acres were gained by dredging.

Mr. ANDREWS. You cannot go any farther in the bay, can you?

Admiral GADDIS. Certainly not a lot farther, but remember that we have some additional land by the fact that about 18 years ago the Prince Georges school moved out to Monterey.

(The information follows:)

Since 1808 a total of 122.81 acres of land at the Naval Academy have been acquired through dredging in the Severn River. An additional 4 acres of land are now being provided through landfill operations in Dorsey Creek. This project was funded in fiscal year 1969. A chronology of landfill operations at the Academy is as follows:

Period:	Acreage
1808–1901	16.31
1902–06	26.19
1929	.62
1941	22.69
1942	1.25
1961	55.75
1970	4.00
Total	126.81

BUILDING PROGRAM

Admiral DUNCAN. May I come back to your other question about the building program? This is really very vital to the Academy. We completed and dedicated last year the Mickelson Hall Science Building, in last year's program already approved but under the construction freeze. I mentioned the library, again vital to getting us up to the library standards of a good college, not a university but a good college. We do not intend to try to get the same number of books that a university would have, but we do intend to obtain the number a good college would have.

Mr. MINSHALL. I hope to be able to go up with the Board of Visitors some time in May. That is why I would like to have a little feel for this.

There is one other thing I would like to ask you about. If you can amplify on any of these problems before I go up there, I would appreciate it.

SPLIT BETWEEN CIVILIAN AND MILITARY FACULTY

They had a lot of flak when I was on the Board 4 or 5 years ago on the faculty division between civilians and regular military. Do you remember that?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir. I believe that problem has since been rectified.

Admiral GADDIS. Very good.

Admiral DUNCAN. Generally speaking, our faculty at the Academy is evenly divided between military and civilians. There seems to be a good working relationship.

Mr. MINSHALL. There was a lot of conflict between the civilian and the military instructors or professors.

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not believe there is any substantial conflict now.

(Off the record.)

BUILDING PROGRAM

Admiral GADDIS. The single military construction project at the Naval Academy in the 1971 budget is the first increment on the engineering instruction building which will be in three increments. This is a little over one-third, and constitutes the base facility on which two additional increments will be added in the following 2 years.

Admiral DUNCAN. This building program I consider absolutely essential to upgrade the academic stature of the Academy to where it should be.

ACADEMY SUPERINTENDENT

Mr. MINSHALL. What is the tenure of the Superintendent up there now?

Admiral DUNCAN. Three years.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you think that is enough? He sort of gets his feet wet and then he has to leave the place.

Admiral DUNCAN. In 3 years you can develop programs. If we get the sort of officer we want who is interested and qualified—and we have such an officer now—he can make himself felt in 3 years.

In less than 3 years it would be difficult for him to see the fruition of programs for which he was responsible.

We always will try to select an extremely highly qualified man who is truly interested in the Academy and in the education of young men. So, as they come and make their contributions with considerable enthusiasm, I think 3 years is a reasonable period.

GRADE OF SUPERINTENDENT

Mr. MINSTALL. Does it in any way interfere with his promotion by staying any longer than that, if the term should be lengthened?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not think it would interfere with his promotion. This is considered one of the most desirable and most carefully screened positions in the Navy. It is considered an accolade.

Mr. MINSHALL. There is no in-grade limit for the Superintendent? He could have four stars if need be.

Admiral DUNCAN. There is no statutory limit. I believe under General Eisenhower it was decided the service academies would have two-star officers at the head of them. There is no law concerning this.

Mr. MINSHALL. It is just naval policy.

Admiral DUNCAN. This particular policy at that time stemmed actually from higher up. However, the Board of Visitors has recommended consistently in the past 3 years that it should be upgraded to 3 stars. We agree with this in the Navy. We think it should be a 3-star billet.

Consonant with other demands for 3 stars, we would go to 3 stars. We are engaged in discussions with the Office of the Secretary of Defense on this matter right now.

Mr. MINSHALL. Why would there be so much dispute over whether it should be a 2-star or a 3-star billet?

Admiral DUNCAN. It is a matter of controlling the number of 3-star officers.

Mr. MINSHALL. But that is just one more in a very important slot.

Admiral DUNCAN. I reiterate, sir, our position has been that we would like to see it a 3-star billet.

Mr. MINSHALL. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you provide for the record a 3-year table listing all the various assistance programs in which the Navy participates, showing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned and the estimated cost by appropriation?

(The information follows:)

	Fiscal years—					
	1969		1970		1971	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Project transition:						
Military (MPN)	41	$0.4	41	$0.4	41	$0.4
Civilian (O. & M.N.)	71	.4	71	1.0	71	1.0
Project 100,000:						
Military (MPN)	30	1.1	30	.9	30	.9
Civilian (O. & M.N.) [1]	0	1.0	0	.8	0	.8
R.D.T. & E	0	.04	0	.01	0	0
Project referral:						
Military (MPN)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Civilian (O. & M.N.)	0	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Estimated cost though not specifically budgeted.

PROJECT 100,000

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Navy done in connection with project 100,000 during the past year?

Admiral DUNCAN. During fiscal year 1969 the Navy accepted 26,960 mental group IV personnel of whom 12,009 were new standards, mental, and 4,043 new standards, physical, personnel.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many individuals will be brought into the program during fiscal year 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. Percentage quotas have not been established for fiscal year 1971 but we expect the same quotas as now assigned for fiscal year 1970, which is, of new accessions 18 percent must be mental group IV—including 9 percent new standards—mental. However, based on current personnel planning, we would expect to bring in approximately 19,000 individuals under project 100,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the Navy providing remedial reading instruction to all individuals with a reading level of fifth grade or below?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, if a recruit fails two of the tests administered weekly during recruit training he is assigned to the remedial literacy training unit. Upon arrival at the unit the recruit is interviewed and is given an oral reading test and a written comprehension test. If it is determined that poor reading ability is the cause of his difficulty the man enters Remedial Literacy Training (RLT). In RLT a test is given the recruit to determine the grade level at which remedial training should begin. At the end of a 4-week training period a test is given to measure the man's progress. If the recruit has not achieved a fifth-grade level reading ability but is making satisfactory progress, the training time is extended. If he has achieved the fifth-grade level, he goes back into the regular recruit training cycle. If he has not made any progress he is discharged.

PROJECT TRANSITION

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Navy done in connection with Project Transition during the past year?

Admiral DUNCAN. During the past year, Project Transition has made available to separating enlisted men and women services which include vocational and educational counseling; training; educational advancement opportunities; and job/training referral services. The program is strictly voluntary. For those who volunteered, over 95,000

counseling and/or referral sessions were conducted, and almost 12,000 personnel entered training programs during calendar year 1969. The expense of the training provided to transition participants was borne almost entirely by private industry, with other Federal, State, and local government agencies providing the remainder of the training and its associated expenses.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many individuals were assisted during fiscal year 1969, and what types of assistance were provided?

Admiral DUNCAN. In fiscal year 1969, approximately 50,000 personnel were counseled in either group or individual sessions. Over 10,000 personnel completed training programs.

Factors that cannot be measured include the good will and gratitude that is fostered in the separating serviceman and the excellent community relations that have been established through the efforts of the transition site officers.

PROJECT REFERRAL

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Navy done during the past year in connection with Project Referral, and what are your plans for 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. The referral program was not implemented by the Department of Defense until December 1, 1969. The only action the Navy had taken on referral up to that time was participation in planning and preparation of tentative implementation plans for the Navy Department.

Subsequent to December 1, 1969, the Navy Department has issued the necessary implementing directive to establish the program. The referral program will be implemented by utilizing existing Project Transition facilities with the first registration of prospective retirees scheduled for June 1970. Detailed guidance for the operation of the referral program will be issued upon receipt of further essential information from the Department of Defense.

HOUSING REFERRAL PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Navy done in connection with the housing referral program during 1970?

Admiral DUNCAN. The Navy has established formal housing referral offices at 67 selected sites in the United States with authorized civilian/military staffs. All other Navy installations are required to provide a housing referral service to the extent required, utilizing available resources.

During calendar year 1969, housing referral offices processed in excess of 71,000 military personnel and their families. Of this number, 55,000 requested assistance and more than 33,000 were helped by the housing referral office in locating suitable off-base housing.

Mr. ANDREWS. What are your plans for the program during 1971?

Admiral DUNCAN. During the fiscal year 1971, emphasis will be placed on improvement of the program as presently established in order to provide more effective service to military personnel who are seeking off-base housing. Plans are that 40 military personnel will be released from the program and be replaced by professional housing-oriented civilian personnel.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many military and civilian personnel were assigned to the program during 1969, and what are your plans for 1970 and 1971? Also, what is the cost, by appropriation? You may provide that for the record.

(The information follows:)

AUTHORIZED FISCAL YEAR 1969, FISCAL YEAR 1970 STAFFS AND PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 1971 STAFFS

	End-strength authorized fiscal year 1969	End-strength authorized fiscal year 1970	End-strength proposed fiscal year 1971
Personnel:			
Civilian	28	85	125
Military	132	85	45
Total	160	170	170
Costs (in thousands of dollars):			
Civilian (Family housing management account, defense)	$250	$656	$1,200
Military (military personnel appropriations)	650	758	305
Total	900	1,414	1,505

Mr. ANDREWS. Questions, Mr. Minshall?

Mr. MINSHALL. I have no more questions.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Davis?

TEMPORARY PROMOTION

Mr. DAVIS. I have some questions here that have been previously submitted. I would like to supplement them with additional questions related to the general subject of temporary promotions.

In one instance, the response that was submitted simply cited the sections of the U.S. Code. I think it is somebody else's job, rather than mine, to check those out. I would like that augmented by actually citing the relevant provisions, and not just the sections.

I would like to submit these questions and have them answered with that further amplification that I have referred to.

LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS

Cite for the record the legislation and set forth in full the provisions relating to the number of commissioned officers, by rank.

(The information follows:)

Title 10, U.S. Code. The provisions relating to the number of commissioned officers, by rank, are contained in section 5442 and 5444 which are cited below:

Section 5442. Navy: Line Officers on active duty

(a) Of the total number of officers serving on active duty in the line of the Navy in the grade of ensign and above, excluding fleet admirals and officers carried as additional numbers in grade, the number of officers who may serve in each of the grades above lieutenant may not, except as provided in subsection (b), exceed a number appropriate to the total number as set forth in the following table. If the total number of officers serving on active duty in the line of the navy in the grade of ensign and above, excluding fleet admirals and officers carried as additional numbers in grade, falls between two strengths shown in

the first column of the table, the number for each grade is determined by proportionate interpolation between the respective numbers for the two strengths.

	Rear admiral	Captain	Commander	Lieutenant commander
Total line officers serving on active duty in the grade of ensign and above, excluding fleet admirals and officers carried as additional numbers in grade:				
32,000	215	1,920	3,840	5,760
40,000	222	2,320	4,498	7,080
50,000	228	2,758	5,235	8,650
60,000	237	3,140	5,851	10,148
70,000	244	3,479	6,374	11,487
80,000	252	3,782	6,821	12,752
90,000	259	4,053	7,205	13,914
100,000	262	4,295	7,538	15,030
125,000	291	4,792	8,201	17,500
150,000	305	5,165	8,683	19,500
175,000	323	5,441	9,017	21,175
200,000	342	5,640	9,244	22,560
250,000	379	5,854	9,504	24,600

(b) The Secretary of the Navy, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of officers authorized under subsection (a) for each grade above lieutenant. The number so computed is the number of line officers on active duty excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade, prescribed for the grade concerned. However, if the Secretary determines at the time of making these computations that the nummer of officers required to meet the needs of the service in any grade above lieutenant is less than the prescribed number for that grade as computed, the lesser number becomes the prescribed number for the grade and the reduction may be applied as an increase in the prescribed number for any lower grade.

(c) Of the numbers of officers prescribed for the grades of commander and lieutenant commander, not more than the following percentages may be officers designated for limited duty: (1) Commander—3 64/100 percent; (2) Lieutenant Commander—8 62/100 percent.

(d) The Secretary of the Navy, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of officers designated for limited duty authorized under subsection (c) for the grades of commander and lieutenant commander. The Secretary shall also determine the number that will be required to meet the needs of the service during the ensuing year in each of these grades. The number so determined for each grade is the number of officers designated for limited duty prescribed for the grade concerned.

(e) At the time of making the computations required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall also determine the numbers of line officers on active duty, excluding officers carried as additional numbers in grade, that will be required to meet the needs of the service during the ensuing year in the grades of lieutenant, lieutenant (junior grade), and ensign. The numbers so determined are the prescribed numbers for these grades.

(f) The number of officers designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty serving on active duty in the grade of rear admiral may not exceed 13 percent of the number of officers prescribed for the grade of rear admiral as computed or determined under subsection (b). The Secretary, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of officers in the grade of rear admiral authorized under this subsection. The number so computed is the prescribed number of officers restricted in the performance of duty serving on active duty in the grade of rear admiral. However, if the Secretary determmines at the time of making this computation that the number of officers designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty required to meet the needs of the service in the grade of rear admiral is less than the prescribed number as computed, the lesser number becomes the prescribed number.

(g) The number of officers designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty, respectively, serving on active duty in the combined grades of captain, commander, and lieutenant commander may not

exceed the following percentages of the sum of the numbers of officers prescribed for those grades as computed or determined under subsection (b):

	Percent
(1) Engineering duty	11
(2) Aeronautical engineering duty	7
(3) Special duty	12

The Secretary, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of officers designated for engineering duty, aeronautical engineering duty, and special duty, respectively, authorized under this section for these combined grades. The number so computed for each designation is the number of officers of that designation serving on active duty prescribed for these combined grades. However, if the Secretary determines at the time of making these computations that the number of officers of any designation required to meet the needs of the service in the combined grades is less than the prescribed number as computed, the lesser number becomes the prescribed number of officers of that designation.

As amended July 5, 1968, Public Law 90–386, section 1(4), 82 Stat. 293.

Section 5444. Navy: Staff corps officers on active duty.

(*a*) The number of officers serving on active duty in the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps, the Supply Corps, the Chaplain Corps, the Civil Engineer Corps, and the Dental Corps, respectively, excluding any rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau, may not exceed, in each corps, a number appropriate to the total number of officers in that corps serving on active duty, as set forth in the following tables. If the total number of officers on active duty in any corps falls between two strengths shown in the first column of the appropriate table, the number of rear admirals is determined by proportionate interpolation between the numbers for the two strengths. If the number of officers on active duty in a corps is less than the smallest tabulated number for the corps concerned, the number for the grade of rear admiral in that corps is one-half of 1 percent of the total number of officers serving on active duty in the corps.

Medical Corps—Total number of officers in the corps on active duty:

	Number of rear admirals
3,000	15
4,000	18
5,000	19
7,000	20
9,000	21
11,000	22
13,000	23
15,000	24

Supply Corps—Total number of officers in the corps on active duty:

2,600	13
3,000	15
4,000	18
5,000	19
7,000	20
9,000	21
11,000	22
13,000	23
15,000	24
17,000	25

Chaplain Corps—Total number of officers in the corps on active duty:

500	2
1,600	3
2,800	3

Civil Engineer Corps—Total numbr of officers in the corps on active duty:

1,000	5
1,500	6
2,000	7
3,000	8
4,000	9
5,000	10
7,000	11

Dental Corps—Total number of officers in the corps on active duty:

1,000	5
2,000	6
4,000	7
7,000	8

(*b*) Repealed, Public Law 90–130, section 1(17)(A), November 8, 1967, 81 Stat. 376.

(*c*) The Secretary of the Navy, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of rear admirals authorized under this section for each corps. The numbers so computed are the numbers of officers serving on active duty prescribed for the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned. However, if the Secretary determines at the time of making any computations under this section that the number of officers required to meet the needs of the service in the grade of rear admiral in any of these corps is less than the prescribed number as computed, the lesser number becomes the prescribed number for the grade of rear admiral.

(*d*) Each officer in a staff corps who serves as a chief of bureau and who, before or during that service, is appointed to the grade of rear admiral under section 5772 or section 5781 of this title shall, upon termination of his appointment as chief of bureau, be carried in excess of the prescribed number until the next vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in his corps.

(*e*) The prescribed numbers of officers computed or determined under this section may not be varied between computations.

(*f*) For the purpose of this section, each officer is counted in the grade in which he is serving, whether under a permanent or temporary appointment. However, each officer serving under an appointment in the grade of admiral or vice admiral and each officer in a grade to which he was appointed under section 5597 or promoted under section 5787 of this title is counted in the grade he would hold had he not been so appointed or promoted.

NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED OFFICERS BY RANK

Mr. DAVIS. Translate the above into a table showing the number of authorized commissioned officers, by rank, for 1969, 1970, and 1971.

(The information follows:)

NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, BY RANK, FOR FISCAL YEARS 1969–71

Grade		Fiscal year 1969		1970		1971	
		URL + LDO	RL/staff	URL + LDO	RL/staff	URL + LDO	RL/staff
07–010	Flag	232	30/58	233	30/58	227	30/58
06	Captain	2,913	[1] 4,710	2,978	[1] 4,920	2,702	[1] 4,887
05	Commander	5,485		5,590		5,140	
04	Lieutenant Commander	9,259		9,513		8,448	
01–03	Ensign-lieutenant	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Legal ceilings are not specified in title 10, United States Code.

AUTHORIZED VERSUS BUDGETED POSITIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Compare the number of authorized officers, by rank, with the number of officers contained in your 1971 budget request.

(The information follows:)

NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED COMMISSIONED OFFICERS, BY RANK, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971 VERSUS THE NUMBER OF COMPARABLE OFFICERS CONTAINED IN FISCAL YEAR 1971 BUDGET REQUEST

Grade		Authorized fiscal year 1971		Budget request fiscal year 1971	
		URL & LDO	RL/staff	URL & LDO	RL/staff
07–010	Flag	227	30/58	227	27/48
06	Captain	2,702		[1] 2,450	
05	Commander	5,140	[2] 4,887	5,210	[2] 2,400
04	Lieutenant commander	8,448		7,500	
01–03	Ensign, lieutenant	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] Of the available 252 carry down from the captain grade, 70 numbers are being used in the commander grade as authorized by title 10, United States Code.
[2] Legal ceilings are not specified in title 10, United States Code.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TEMPORARY PROMOTION

Mr. DAVIS. What is the authorization for temporary promotion of officers?

(The information follows:)

Temporary appointments for promotion are issued under the authority contained in the following sections of title 10, United States Code:

Section 3778.—Promotions under preceding sections: temporary; permanent. Promotions under the preceding sections of this chapter of women officers' appointed under section 5590 of this title shall be made by permanent appointments. Promotions of all other officers under the preceding sections of this chapter shall be made by—

(1) Temporary appointments when sections 5442* * * * and 5444 of this title are applicable; and

(2) Permanent appointments when sections 5442* * * * and 5444 of this title are inapplicable.

Section 5784.—Navy, ensigns; * * * temporary promotion.

(a) Promotions may be made under this section only when the number of male officers serving on active duty in the grade of ensign and above in the line of the Navy exceeds the number of male officers on the active list in the line of the Navy.

(b) Officers serving on active duty in the grade of ensign in the Navy may be promoted to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

(c) Promotions under this section shall be made by temporary appointment.

(d) The President may terminate any temporary appointment made under this section.

(e) Temporary appointments under this section do not change the permanent, probationary, or acting status of members so appointed, prejudice them in regard to other promotion or appointment, or abridge their rights or benefits. A member who receives a temporary appointment under this section may not suffer any reduction in the pay and allowances to which he was entitled because of his permanent status at the time of his temporary appointment, or any reduction in the pay and allowances to which he was entitled under a prior temporary appointment in a lower grade.

(f) Women officers appointed under section 5590 of this title may not be promoted under this section.

Section 5787.—Temporary promotions in time of war or national emergency.

(a) Promotion may be made under this section only in time of war or during a national emergency declared by the President.

(b) The President may promote to a higher grade any member of the naval service serving on active duty in the Navy in the grade of ensign or above, such

*Secs. 5442 and 5444 applicable when number of officers serving on active duty in line exceeds number of officers on active list of line.

promotions shall be made under such regulations as the President prescribes and in such numbers as he determines the needs of the service require.

(c) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he prescribes, may promote to the next higher warrant officer grade any member of the naval service serving on active duty in a warrant officer grade below chief warrant officer, W–4.

(d) The grade of commodore in the Navy is established for the purposes of this section.

(e) Promotions under this section shall be made by temporary appointment. Each such appointment to the grade of commodore or above in the Navy * * * shall be made by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Each such appointment to a warrant officer grade shall be made by the Secretary, by commission. All other temporary appointments under this section shall be made by the President alone.

(f) Temporary promotions under this section to the grade of lieutenant or above in the Navy * * * may be made only upon the recommendation of a board of officers convened for that purpose. In addition to recommending officers for promotion, a board so convened shall make the report required by section 6395 of this title.

(g) Each temporary appointment under this section, unless expressly declined, is, without formal acceptance, regarded as accepted on the date made.

(h) Temporary appointments under this section, do not change the permanent, probationary, or acting status of members so appointed, prejudice them in regard to other promotion or appointment, or abridge their rights or benefits.

(i) Temporary appointments under this section are effective for such periods as the President determines However, no such appointment may be effective later than—(1) Six months after the end of the war or national emergency; or (2) The date the appointee is released from active duty; whichever is earlier.

(j) When his temporary appointment under this section is terminated or expires, each member of the naval service on active duty shall have the grade he would hold if he had not received any such appointment.

Section 5787a.—Navy; lieutenants (junior grade) in Medical and Dental Corps: temporary promotion.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, an officer in the Medical Corps or the Dental Corps may be temporarily promoted to the grade of lieutenant at any time after the first anniversary of the date upon which he graduated from medical, osteopathic, or dental school, as the case may be.

(b) The Secretary of the Navy may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section.

Section 5787b: Navy, women ensigns; temporary promotion.

(*a*) A woman officer serving on active duty in the grade of ensign in the Navy, may be temporarily promoted to the next higher grade under regulations prescribed by the President.

(*b*) The permanent appointment of a woman officer who is temporarily promoted under subsection (*a*) as not vacated by that temporary promotion.

Section 5787c: Navy . . . warrant officers: temporary promotion.

Warrant officers may be temporarily promoted to higher warrant officer grades under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

Section 5911: Promotions: temporary; permanent.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the promotion of a Reserve officer under this chapter shall be made by a temporary appointment if the promotion of his running mate is made by a temporary appointment. If the running mate's temporary appointment is terminated for reasons other than disciplinary and he reverts to a lower grade, the temporary appointment of the Reserve officer shall also be terminated and the Reserve officer reverts to the same lower grade in the same manner as his running mate and with corresponding rank. If the running mate is permanently appointed in the grade in which he is serving under a temporary appointment, the Reserve officer shall be permanently appointed in the grade in which he is serving under a temporary appointment.

NUMBER OF OFFICERS BY PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY RANK

Mr. DAVIS. Provide a table showing, by rank, the number of officers as of June 30, 1969, by permanent and temporary rank.

(The information follows:)

The following table shows the actual distribution by grade of officers serving in permanent promotions (10 U.S.C. 5778, 5769, 5772, 5773, 5780, 5781, 5782, 5783, 5787a, 5787b, 5787c, 5788, and 5793) and temporary promotions (10 U.S.C. 5787) as of June 30, 1969:

		Permanent promotions	Temporary promotions	Total
07-010	Flag officers	312	----------	312
06	Captains	4,307	----------	4,307
05	Commanders	8,609	83	8,692
04	Lieutenant commanders	13,529	1,618	15,147
03	Lieutenants	23,218	14	23,232
02	Lieutenants (j.g.)	20,412	----------	20,412
01	Ensigns	8,704	----------	8,704
	Total	79,091	1,715	[1] 80,806

[1] Total does not include warrant officers.

ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION, BY GRADE, OF OFFICERS SERVING IN TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS AS OF JUNE 30, 1969

		Permanent appointment in present grade	Temporary appointment in present grade	Total
07-010	Flag officers	184	128	312
06	Captains	2,352	1,955	4,307
05	Commanders	3,911	4,781	8,692
04	Lieutenant commanders	7,299	7,848	15,147
03	Lieutenants	9,593	16,639	23,232
02	Lieutenants (jg.)	8,723	11,689	20,412
01	Ensigns	8,283	421	8,704
	Total	40,345	40,461	[1] 80,806

[1] Total does not include warrant officers.

Mr. DAVIS. How many officers, in each category of rank, now serve in temporary ranks two or more grades above their permanent rank?

(The information follows:)

No naval officer holds a temporary appointment more than one grade above his permanent appointment grade with the exception of four star flag officers.

NEED FOR TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Why are temporary promotions required?

(The information follows:)

The tabulation in the insert for the record page 2310 following line 3 shows that, as of June 30, 1969, there were 40,345 officers serving in permanent appointments. However, a total of 80,806 officers were authorized by OSD to meet written Navy requirements. Navy officer strength above the number of permanent appointments reasonably consistent with 10 U.S.C. 5403 has been achieved by temporary appointments.

Temporary appointments made under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 5778, 5784, 5787a, 5787b, and 5787c, were cited in the insert for the record page 2309 following line 2. Temporary appointments are used to augment the number of permanent appointments until such time as vacancies occur in the permanent appointment structure. In the Navy promotion system, in contrast to those in the Air Force and Army, officers (except warrant officers and limited duty officers) are selected only once for each grade. They first receive a temporary appointment and, when a permanent vacancy occurs, a permanent appointment is tendered.

Wartime and national emergency temporary promotions made by temporary appointments are made under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5787, cited in the insert for the record page 2309 following line 2, have been required to meet the increased officer personnel requirements stemming from the Vietnam conflict, and to insure a reasonable promotion flow for limited duty officers, whose strength exceeds the strength originally contemplated in law. We had on board as of June 30, 1969, 1,715 officers who have been promoted under this authority.

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the effect of restricting temporary grades for use strictly in time of emergency declared by Congress or the President, or in time of war?

(The information follows:)

The appointment of officers to temporary grades is done under the authority of 10 U.S.C. 5787, which is effective only in time of war or national emergency. The Navy has used this authority to meet rapidly increased requirements stemming directly from the Vietnam conflict. At any time in the last few years we have had about 1,300 limited duty officers, 400 civil engineer corps officers, and 200 unrestricted line officers serving in higher grades as a result of promotions effected under this section. The Navy expects to lose temporary promotion authority under 10 U.S.C. 5787 whenever the current state of national emergency is terminated, and has not relied heavily on it.

CHANGES IN AVERAGE GRADE STRUCTURE

Mr. DAVIS. During 1970 and 1971, as the Navy reduces officer and enlisted strength, the Committee notes that the reductions do not follow a pattern that would relate to your grade structure. In other words, if you were to make a 10-percent reduction in total, each of the grades would not be reduced by 10 percent but, instead, some would increase and some would decrease. The civilian agencies of the Government operate under an average grade limitation. What would be the effect of a similar ruling if it were applied to the military?

Admiral DUNCAN. In general terms, the larger the Navy officer corps becomes the more heavily weighted it is toward junior officers. Conversely, as it contracts, the percentage of more senior officers to the whole corps becomes slightly larger. That is what has occurred in each recent war. The need for this phenomenon is dictated by wartime requirements for large numbers of reserve junior officers to man an increased number of operating forces; by the necessity for providing a reasonably equitable opportunity for advancement to the regular cadre of the Navy, while at the same time protecting them by law against involuntary release occasioned by force level fluctuations; and by the necessity for retaining middle grade officers who embody expensively obtained training and experience. Unlike the other services, the Navy maintains no significant number of Reserve officers above the grade of O–4, and only a comparatively small number in that grade. The effect of forcing the Navy to operate under an average grade limitation would be to necessitate the maintenance of large numbers of career Reserve officers in the upper grades who could be involuntarily released in the event of radical force level fluctuations. Further, the needs of the Navy do not change proportionately in all grades for changes in force levels. Adoption of the average grade limitation concept would result in the Navy's inability to fill its officer requirements outside the operating forces when overall Navy strength was at a low level. Finally, it should be pointed out that the Navy has historically and consistently maintained its prescribed number of officers in grade below the legal ceilings in title 10, United States Code, for just such an eventuality as a force reduction. We have not abused promotion laws. Because of this prudent management the Navy has maintained flexibility, and can respond to force level reductions with minimum trauma to the regular corps of officers.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Mr. ANDREWS. Now we shall take up Reserve Personnel, Navy. We will consider the fiscal year 1971 budget request for Reserve Personnel, Navy.

We will, at this point in the record, insert the appropriate pages from your justification book.

(The justification pages follow:)

Reserve Personnel, Navy

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Naval Reserve on active duty under section 265 of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law; [$131,400,000]? $144,200,000

(10 U.S.C. 683, 1475-80, 2031, 2101-11, 6081-86, 6148; 26 U.S.C. 3121; 37 U.S.C. 204, 206, 301, 305, 309, 402-4, 415-18, 427, 1002; 38 U.S.C. 701-12; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970; additional authorizing legislation to be proposed.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

07-05-1405-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program by activities:			
Direct program:			
1. Reserve component personnel	111,537	133,800	134,200
2. Reserve officer candidates	8,977	10,000	10,000
Total direct obligations	120,514	143,800	144,200
Reimbursable program:			
1. Reserve component personnel	11	20	20
10 Total obligations	120,525	143,820	144,220
Financing:			
14 Receipts and reimbursements from Non-Federal sources 1/	-11	-20	-20
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	8,636	....	....
Budget authority	129,150	143,800	144,200
Budget authority:			
40 Appropriation	129,150	131,400	144,200
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	....	12,400	....

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars) - continued

07-05-1405-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	120,514	143,800	144,200
72 Obligated balance, start of year	20,751	18,876	22,676
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-18,876	-22,676	-26,876
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-4,115	....	....
90 Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	118,274	129,400	138,200
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	....	10,600	1,800

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are derived from undeliverable checks.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, NAVY

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

07-05-1405-0-1-051	19 69 actual	19 70 estimate	19 71 estimate
Direct Obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military	98,023	116,871	116,980
12.2 Personnel benefits: Military	6,248	7,658	7,670
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	10,483	12,103	12,640
26.0 Supplies and materials	5,651	7,068	6,810
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	109	100	100
Total direct obligations	120,514	143,800	144,200
Reimbursable Obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military	11	20	20
99.0 Total Obligations	120,525	143,820	144,220

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Navy

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION
(In thousands)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
Total Direct Obligations	$120,514	$143,800	$144,200
Net Adjustments	+8,636	-	-
Proposed for later transmission	-	-12,400	-
Appropriation	129,150	131,400	144,200

The "Reserve Personnel, Navy" appropriation provides financial support for the Naval Reserve. As individually entitled, Reserve personnel and Reserve officer candidates who perform prescribed training receive pay and allowances, uniforms, clothing, subsistence in kind, travel to and from training and miscellaneous benefits authorized by law. This appropriation also provides funds for the pay and allowances and permanent change of station travel of selected Naval Reserve officers on active duty. These officers are assigned to designated headquarters locations for the training and administration of Naval Reservists.

The Naval Reserve has a twofold mission. This component of the Navy produces trained units and qualified individuals ready for instant mobilization in time of war or national emergency. It also is the source of a continuing supply of personnel for the regular Navy.

Reserve personnel are trained by drills and active duty for training. Drills are conducted at specified intervals in training centers or facilities, at air stations and aboard ships or planes. Active duty for training of two weeks duration is required of all members in a drill pay status. It is also made available to those members not in a drill pay status who have already served on active duty and desire to maintain their skills. Enlisted members being trained in certain aviation programs are provided active duty for training ranging in length from four to ten months. In addition, school and special tours of active duty for training are offered to selected personnel who wish to qualify quickly in certain rates and specialties.

Reserve officer candidates are trained to qualify for commissions in the regular Navy and in the Naval Reserve. Their training consists partly of academic courses and partly of active duty during the summer months. The Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps (NROTC) students are enrolled in colleges and universities throughout the United States. During the school year they pursue studies in acceptable curricula and in naval sciences. During summer vacations they are given ship or shore based professional naval training of eight weeks. The Reserve Officer Candidates (ROC and AVROC) are provided professional

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION - continued

naval training of eight-nine weeks during each of two summers at the Officer Candidate School, Newport, Rhode Island and the Naval School, Pre-flight, Pensacola. Women Officer Candidates (OC-WAVE) are given one period of training of eight weeks following their junior year of college at the Officer Candidate School (Women), Newport, Rhode Island. NJROTC students are enrolled in high schools throughout the country and receive training in naval sciences and orientation.

For fiscal year 1971, $144,200,000 are requested to support the personnel strengths and kinds of training indicated on the following pages.

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Navy

RESERVE PERSONNEL IN PAID STATUS

Pay group	Paid drills	Paid Days of Active Duty for Training	Off. or Enl.	Fiscal year 1969 Begin	Fiscal year 1969 Average	Fiscal year 1969 End	Fiscal year 1970 Average	Fiscal year 1970 End	Fiscal year 1971 Average	Fiscal year 1971 End
A	48	15	Off.	20,352	18,495	18,081	18,855	18,855	19,187	19,187
			Enl.	101,497	107,268	112,531	108,428	108,520	108,502	108,502
B	24	15	Off.	1,036	932	925	795	795	611	611
			Enl.	21	5	3	-	-	-	-
F	0	90-180	Enl.	1,100	1,012	1,170	922	830	700	700
Paid Drill Training Sub-Total			Off.	21,388	19,427	19,006	19,650	19,650	19,798	19,798
			Enl.	102,618	108,285	113,704	109,350	109,350	109,202	109,202
			Total	124,006	127,712	132,710	129,000	129,000	129,000	129,000
D	0	15	Off.	6,714	3,400	3,400	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800
			Enl.	311	250	250	550	550	550	550
E	0	30	Enl.	313	242	242	-	-	-	-
Paid Active Duty Training only, Sub-Total			Off.	6,714	3,400	3,400	2,800	2,800	2,800	2,800
			Enl.	624	492	492	550	550	550	550
			Total	7,338	3,892	3,892	3,350	3,350	3,350	3,350
Total Paid Status			Off.	28,102	22,827	22,406	22,450	22,450	22,598	22,598
			Enl.	103,242	108,777	114,196	109,900	109,900	109,752	109,752
			Total	131,344	131,604	136,602	132,350	132,350	132,350	132,350

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Navy

SUMMARY OF RESERVE OFFICER CANDIDATE STRENGTH
(Average numbers)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	+-Difference 1971 Compared with 1970
Senior NROTC	4,645	5,090	4,814	-276
Scholarship NROTC	4,719	4,942	4,942	-
Reserve officer candidates	1,684	1,845	1,836	-9
OC(W) college juniors	24	24	24	-
Total	11,072	11,901	11,616	-285

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

Bud. Act. No.	Budget Activity	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	+-Difference 1971 compared with 1970	Justification page
1	Reserve component personnel	$111,537	$133,800	$134,200	$+400	2-10
2	Reserve officer candidates	8,977	10,000	10,000	-	2-25
Total direct obligations		120,514	143,800	144,200	+400	
Appropriated		-	131,400	-	-	
Proposed supplemental		-	12,400	-	-	

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: RESERVE COMPONENT PERSONNEL
SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

Budget Project No.	Budget Project	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	Difference 1971 compared with 1970
1A	Reserve Personnel Training--Pay Group A	$95,520	$113,678	$114,753	$+1,075
1B	Reserve Personnel Training--Pay Group B	996	1,124	874	-250
1C	Reserve Personnel Training--Pay Group D	2,222	1,973	2,015	+42
1D	Reserve Personnel Training--Pay Group E	73	-	-	-
1E	Reserve Personnel Training--Pay Group F	1,924	2,486	1,952	-534
1F	Reserve Personnel School Training	5,472	7,675	7,627	-48
1G	Reserve Personnel Special Training	2,637	2,664	2,775	+111
1H	Reserve Personnel Administration and Support	2,693	4,200	4,204	+4
	Total Direct Obligations	111,537	133,800	134,200	+400

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Navy

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2: RESERVE OFFICER CANDIDATES

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

Budget Project No.	Budget Project	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	±Difference 1971 compared with 1970
2A	Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps	$2,484	$2,603	$2,799	$+196
2B	Scholarship Program	4,771	4,824	4,853	+ 29
2C	Junior ROTC Program	193	682	509	-173
2D	Reserve Officer Candidates	1,529	1,891	1,839	- 52
	Total Direct Obligations	8,977	10,000	10,000	-

Mr. ANDREWS. For this appropriation the Navy is requesting $144.2 million, an increase of $12.8 million over the amount currently appropriated for 1970.

The justification book does indicate, however, that the Navy will be requesting a supplemental appropriation of $12.4 million to cover increased pay costs. If the supplemental request is approved as requested, then the net result will be an increase in 1971 over the 1970 program of only $400,000.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Admiral Duncan, since you do not have a separate statement covering Reserve personnel, we will repeat in the record at this point that portion of your statement which applies to "Reserve personnel, Navy," funding request.

(The statement follows:)

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

The request for funding under the appropriation "Reserve personnel, Navy," for fiscal year 1971 is $144,200,000. This amount will provide an average reserve strength in drill pay status of 129,000. It will also provide training tours for 3,350 personnel in nondrill pay status and 12,294 tours in essential schools and special training. This estimate also provides for an average of 9,756 regular and contract enrollees in the NROTC program and for 1,860 students under instruction during the summer in the Reserve officer candidate (ROC) and Aviation Reserve officer candidate (AVROC) programs.

As we make reductions in Active Navy Forces, we plan to rely even more on a strong Reserve posture. To do this, we must bring the Naval Reserve to an even higher state of readiness. Certain significant actions in the area of reorganization and more modern equipment have been taken during the past year. These actions, which include the transfer of ships and aircraft from the Active Forces as replacements for older Naval Reserve units, have required a realignment of Naval Reserve training to accommodate their more modern equipment. The result will be a more effective Naval Reserve force with a higher degree of responsiveness when mobilized.

PAID STRENGTH AUTHORIZATION

Mr. ANDREWS. Admiral Duncan, in your statement you mention that the budget for 1971 provides for an average strength in drill pay status of 129,000, plus training tours for 3,350 personnel in nondrill pay status.

What paid strength have your requested in the authorization bill?

Admiral DUNCAN. 129,000, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. What was the paid strength request for the Navy Reserve when you submitted your budget to OSD?

Admiral DUNCAN. 129,000.

FUNDING REQUEST TO OSD

Mr. ANDREWS. What did you request of OSD in the way of funding?

Admiral GADDIS. $144 million. OSD increased our request by $200,000, which is a net of 2 items—an increase of $1.3 million to fund the per diem rate increase from $16 to $25, as authorized by the Congress in Public Law 91–187, offset by various reductions totaling $1.1 million.

READINESS POSTURE

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the readiness posture of the Navy Reserve?

Admiral DUNCAN. I would like to ask Admiral Burke to speak to that.

Admiral BURKE. The readiness posture of the Naval Reserve, of the individual reservist, is good. Seventy percent of the Reserves are individual augmentees used to flesh out the fleet or the operating forces. The other 30 percent of the selected Reserve are in combat units. These are in the category of probably C–3 to C–4 in the rating system because of their shortages of principally personnel and some equipment.

INCREASED RELIANCE ON STRONG RESERVE POSTURE

Mr. ANDREWS. In your statement you refer to the fact that as reductions are made in Active Navy Forces, we must plan to rely even more on a strong Reserve posture. How does the 1971 budget reflect an increase on Reserve posture?

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, this is principally in the area of getting better hardware in Reserve units and certain reorganization within the Naval Reserve which we have accomplished and are planning.

For example, on the surface Reserve side, ships decommissioned from the active fleet are in better condition or have more modern equipment than the ones the Reserve had and many have been transferred to the Reserve. In 1970, 15 destroyers went into the Reserve program which had been in the active fleet. These destroyers replaced older units with the result that the surface Reserve is in a more fleet-ready condition.

Similarly, in the Air Reserve, we have disestablished within the past couple of years quite a few squadrons, and those aircraft have been used to go into the Air Reserve squadrons.

In addition to that, Admiral Moorer has ordered a reorganization of the Air Reserve which will eventually result in two carrier wings which will be really a ready force, much readier than in the past. As time goes on, they will be fed aircraft that are more modern and better equipped than the ones we have had in the past.

Mr. ANDREWS. So, the story is that you will have about the same personnel.

Admiral DUNCAN. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS. But you will have newer equipment for these units to study and to work with.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir, and better organization, particularly in the Air Reserve, to make them a readier combat force.

ACTIVE NAVY EQUIPMENT TRANSFERRED TO RESERVES

Mr. ANDREWS. What equipment did the Navy Reserve receive from the Navy during calendar year 1969?

You may supply that for the record. I imagine it is a pretty good list.

Mr. MINSHALL. What did the Navy give to the Reserve in the way of ships and/or aircraft?

Admiral DUNCAN. In 1970, 16 destroyers. Naturally, they displaced ships that were there. There were gains of 339 aircraft. I have a list of them, but since the Active Force level reductions were effected as a primary result of budgetary limitations, we have our records established on a fiscal rather than a calendar year basis.

Mr. MINSHALL. What type of aircraft were they? You may put that in the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes.

(The information follows:)

RECEIPT OF SHIPS AND AIRCRAFT BY THE NAVAL RESERVE FROM ACTIVE NAVY

FISCAL YEAR 1969

Ships		*Aircraft*	
Type:	*Number*	Type:	*Number*
DD	7	S–2E	42
DE	5	SP–2H	48
MSC	9	SH–3A	43
		F–4	4
Total	21	Total	137

FISCAL YEAR 1970

DD	16	S–2E	32
MSI	2	SP–2H	62
		A–4C	130
		A–4L	13
		E–1B	4
		F–8K	27
		F–8L	56
		RF–8G	10
		F–4	5
Total[1]	18	Total[2]	339

[1] By end fiscal year 1970.
[2] As of Mar. 9, 1970.

REACTIVATION OF RESERVE TRAINING SHIPS

Mr. MINSHALL. The recent cutback on ships announced by OSD several weeks ago cut back on some of the ships that were being used for Reserve training. How will that affect the training program?

Admiral DUNCAN. The ships that were cut back in that program were ships that were not what we call mobilization assets. They were, of course, training vehicles, but they were not mobilization assets.

In the surface Reserve we are putting more ships into the destroyer program. These are mobilization assets and training platforms.

Mr. MINSHALL. How will you replace a ship of the type you had out in Cleveland, Ohio—I have forgotten the name of it, but it was about a 125 footer being used for Reserve training. How will the Reserve Navy people get their training now on ships?

Admiral DUNCAN. We will not plan to replace those. The Navy people in that area will get their training at Naval Reserve training centers. During their 2-week active duty training period, they will get duty with the fleet or wherever they are supposed to go upon mobilization.

Mr. MINSHALL. You mean either up at the Great Lakes or San Diego?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes sir; it could be Great Lakes, San Diego, or Norfolk or perhaps some shore station, according to what portion of the Naval Reserve they are in.

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN FROM THE RESERVES

Mr. ANDREWS. Did the Navy withdraw any equipment during calendar year 1969 from the Reserves?

Admiral DUNCAN. The only equipment which was withdrawn was the displaced older ships which I mentioned, which are replaced by somewhat newer ships.

Mr. ANDREWS. You are taking a real old ship that the Reserve has used through the years, putting it in mothballs or scrapping it, and replacing it with a later vintage ship?

Admiral DUNCAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral GADDIS. And generally, sir, a later vintage ship that has just recently gone through a major overhaul and been modernized.

Mr. ANDREWS. And had been used in the fleet in active service?

Admiral GADDIS. It comes direct from the active fleet.

Mr. ANDREWS. That makes sense.

DECREASE IN NROTC ENROLLMENT

On page 8 of your justification book, you are showing a decrease in your average strength of senior NROTC students of 276, from 5,090 in 1970 to 4,814 in 1971. What is the cause of this decrease?

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, this is the so-called Senior or Contract program where we have not had as good an input as we have had in the past, possibly due to lower draft pressures, and also due to the fact that we have withdrawn, of course, from certain schools.

Do you want to add anything to that, Mr. Kenyon?

Mr. KENYON. I think not.

COLLEGES WITHDRAWING FROM NROTC PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Did any colleges or universities withdraw from the NROTC program during calendar year 1969? If so, list them.

You have already discussed that, but we would like it at this point in the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes, sir. Harvard, Columbia, Brown, Tufts, and Dartmouth have signified they will not continue NROTC on Navy terms.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish you would also list the names of colleges or universities that are today considering withdrawing from the NROTC program.

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, in a sense, it is difficult to define "considering withdrawing." There are colleges that we are negotiating with who have laid down terms which I rather doubt we will meet. They would retain NROTC units if we meet their terms, but they may lay down terms we know we cannot meet.

Mr. ANDREWS. I hope you will not bow down to any terms. You have your terms. Let the Navy fix the terms under which they will operate an NROTC program.

One of the terms might be that you let your people grow hair down to their shoulders and beards all over their face. Certainly, the Navy does not want that.

Admiral DUNCAN. The colleges with which we are currently negotiating—and the negotiations are not complete—are Yale, Princeton, Virginia, Michigan, and Stanford.

Mr. DAVIS. These are negotiations for replacements?

Admiral DUNCAN. These are negotiations concerning the conditions under which we will or will not remain on campus.

Mr. DAVIS. You have lost 5?

Admiral DUNCAN. And we are negotiating with 5 more. It would be very difficult to predict, but perhaps with two of those we may be able to come to agreeable terms.

Mr. ANDREWS. I repeat my hope that you do not let them set the standards for your operating a naval ROTC program. You tell them what kind of program it is, and don't deviate from it. That is my hope. I do not know how other members of the committee feel about it.

COLLEGES ADDING NROTC PROGRAMS

Mr. DAVIS. I will reiterate your comment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you added any new schools to the program during calendar year 1969?

Admiral DUNCAN. Not during calendar year 1969.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you any applications from schools requesting NROTC programs?

Admiral DUNCAN. Yes. We have a long list of applications. If we were going to open any new ones, I am sure we would have to reexamine to see how live, if you will, these applications are. I believe there are about 100.

Mr. KENYON. Yes, sir. We have a current list today of about 29, but on file we have more than 100 older applications.

INCREASED FUNDS FOR SENIOR NROTC

Mr. ANDREWS. Page 25 of your justification book shows an increase of $196,000 for your senior NROTC program, from $2,603,000 in 1970 to $2,799,000 in 1971.

If you are planning on a decrease of 276 students in the program, why do you require an additional $196,000?

Admiral DUNCAN. That increase is due to a planned increase in our summer training program.

JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. On page 25, of your justifications, you reflect a decrease in funds for the junior ROTC program. Is the Navy phasing this program back?

Admiral DUNCAN. The Navy is not phasing the program back, Mr. Chairman. We are planning on increasing the junior NROTC this year by the number of 32 units programed for fiscal year 1971. We are going from 78 units in this fiscal year to 110 units in fiscal year 1971.

The reduction in funds to which you refer reflects the fact that uniforms have been purchased for this program since fiscal year 1967. Serviceable uniforms are reissued each year and we anticipate a requirement for fewer additional uniforms during this budget year.

HELICOPTER PILOT QUALIFICATION TRAINING

Mr. ANDREWS. Turning to school training, the details of which appear on pages 19 and 20 of your justification book, the committee notes a number of changes since your presentation of the 1970 budget.

For example, last year you programed helicopter pilot qualifications at 60 days. This year you have increased this training to 77 days. What has caused this increase of 17 days?

Admiral DUNCAN. Mr. Reed, have you the answer to that?

Mr. REED. I would like to furnish that for the record.

Mr. ANDREWS. Submit it for the record.

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

The 77-day period provides our reservists being transitioned to helicopters the same training as is provided to active-duty pilots. The 60 days of training in previous years did not include training in heavy helicopters. Prior to becoming fully qualified, reservists were ordered to an additional active-duty-for-training period. The consolidation of these two training periods provides more effective training and also produces savings in travel funds.

ENLISTED CAREER COUNSELOR

Mr. ANDREWS. In the area of enlisted training, you have added a new course entitled "enlisted career counselor." What is the nature of this course, and why do you feel it is required?

Admiral DUNCAN. We have a very vigorous program in the active service of career counseling, in which we put career men of many different ratings. It trains a man who has graduated to counsel men on the various opportunities available within the Navy.

In fact, as we have introduced these career counselors, we have had some success in persuading men to follow the Navy as a career. We have made this tool available also to the Reserves as well as to the Active Navy.

INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE COSTS

Mr. ANDREWS. In the area of subsistence of enlisted personnel while attending school training, you have increased your average subsistence costs by more than 10 percent. If subsistence costs for the Navy as a whole increased only 5 percent over 1970, why have you increased your subsistence costs by 10 percent?

(The information follows:)

The average subsistence cost for enlisted school training in this budget for fiscal year 1970, when compared to the estimate included in the fiscal year 1970 Congressional budget, reflects an increase of over 10 percent because we estimated an average daily rate increase from 87 cents to $1.01. Based on fiscal year 1969 actual subsistence costs, which were not available at the time the fiscal year 1970 budget was prepared, as well as estimated absentee rates which appeared excessive, an increase of 14 cents in the average daily subsistence rate was required. The daily ration rate specified for use in estimating reserve subsistence increased 7 cents for fiscal year 1970. The increased average daily ration rate, when combined with a more realistic absentee rate than that used in developing subsistence costs in the fiscal year 1970 budget submission, resulted in the 14 cents daily ration rate increase. The absentee rate previously utilized was based on a comparable rate for the active forces. This procedure was in-

appropriate for reserve personnel, since all schools are located at Naval installations where messes are available. The average daily ration rate estimated in this budget for fiscal year 1970 is computed to more accurately approximate the actual costs which will accrue to this appropriation.

SHORTFALL IN DRILL STRENGTH

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe you said you have 129,000 men in drill pay status in the Navy Reserve.

Admiral DUNCAN. That is the authorized number, yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have 129,000 at this time?

Admiral DUNCAN. I do not have 129,000 at this time. That is our goal and the Congressional authorized strength.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many do you have as against that 129,000? Supply it for the record.

Admiral DUNCAN. 123,219 as of December 31. We have a drive to increase the men in drill pay status.

READINESS OF RESERVE UNITS

Mr. ANDREWS. Of the 123,000 that you have in drill pay status, how many could you have ready to go within 30 days or 60 days?

Admiral DUNCAN. Most of these men could be called up immediately, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would they be ready to take over?

Admiral DUNCAN. They would be ready to fill billets in the Navy; yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, you could put him in the slot where you needed him and he could take over from there immediately?

Admiral DUNCAN. As Admiral Burke said earlier, we are divided between our hardware units, both air and surface, which can be manned immediately and would require some future training to get ready for combat duty, and the men who are in the augment part of the Naval Reserve who could go to their mobilization billets and be effective.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Minshall, questions on Navy Reserve?

Mr. MINSHALL. Thank you; no, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. That's it, gentlemen.

AFTERNOON SESSION

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. JONAS M. PLATT, U.S. MARINE CORPS, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, G–1, HEADQUARTERS OF THE MARINE CORPS

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES F. WIDDECKE, U.S. MARINE CORPS, DIRECTOR, MARINE CORPS RESERVE

REAR ADM. W. D. GADDIS, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET AND REPORTS, OFFICE OF THE NAVY COMPTROLLER

BRIG. GEN. E. H. SIMMONS, U.S. MARINE CORPS, DEPUTY FISCAL DIRECTOR, HEADQUARTERS, MARINE CORPS

F. D. ROBENHYMER, OFFICE OF THE NAVY COMPTROLLER

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); [$1,518,000,000] $1,494,200,000

(10 U.S.C. 1035, 1212, 1475-80, 2634, 5402, 5404-5, 5409-11, 5413-17, 5441, 5443, 5445-6, 5448, 5451, 5453-6, 5458, 5502-3, 5531, 5537, 6032, 6081-6, 6147-8, 6157, 6222; 12 U.S.C. 1715m; Chapters 3, 5, 7, and 9 of Title 37, United States Code; 38 U.S.C. 2101-5; 42 U.S.C. 1594d; Department of Defense Appropriation Act 1970.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

	Identification code: 07-05-1105-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct program:			
	1. Strategic forces	653	709	774
	2. General purpose forces	803,456	883,795	852,644
	3. Intelligence and communications	13,373	13,495	14,590
	5. Reserve forces	24,976	28,094	30,422
	6. Research and Development	444	477	492
	7. Central supply and maintenance	15,075	18,074	16,902
	8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities	622,744	641,337	518,919
	9. Administration and associated activities	36,033	40,551	41,672
	10. Support of other nations	17,980	17,668	17,785
10	Total direct program	1,534,734	1,644,200	1,494,200
	Reimbursable program	19,605	21,900	20,800
	Total obligations	1,554,339	1,666,100	1,515,000
	Financing:			
	Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11	Federal funds	-17,642	-17,408	-16,881

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars) - continued

Identification code: 07-05-1105-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Financing: - continued			
14 Non-federal sources 1/	-1,963	-4,492	-3,919
Budget Authority	1,534,734	1,644,200	1,494,200
Budget Authority:			
40 Appropriation	1,534,734	1,518,000	1,494,200
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	-	126,200	-
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	1,534,734	1,644,200	1,494,200
72 Obligated balance, start of year	55,657	75,595	79,795
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-75,595	-79,795	-88,995
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	-275	-	-
90 Outlays (excluding pay increase supplementals)	1,514,539	1,513,820	1,484,980
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	-	126,180	20

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are derived from sale of meals and clothing to service members (10 U.S.C. 4621)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Object Classification (In thousands of dollars)

07-05-1105-0-1-051		1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
	Direct Obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation: Military personnel	$1,063,264	$1,167,705	$1,047,093
12.1	Personnel benefits, military personnel	229,609	237,225	239,088
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	74,424	75,228	66,734
22.0	Transportation of Things	18,950	20,546	24,805
25.1	Other services	5,496	6,031	7,093
26.0	Supplies and materials	135,791	129,863	105,216
42.0	Insurance claims and indemnities	6,200	6,602	3,671
43.0	Interest and dividends	1,000	1,000	500
	Total direct obligations	$1,534,734	$1,644,200	$1,494,200
	Reimbursable obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation: Military personnel	$ 580	$ 600	$ 600
12.2	Personnel benefits: Military personnel	33	40	40
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	805	790	750
26.0	Supplies and materials	18,187	20,470	19,410
	Total reimbursable obligations	$ 19,605	$ 21,900	$ 20,800
	Total obligations	$1,554,339	$1,666,100	$1,515,000

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

PERSONNEL SUMMARY

Identification Code 07-05-1105-0-1-051	19 69 actual	19 70 estimate	19 71 estimate
Direct program:			
1. Pay and allowance of officers	280,097	310,941	288,381
2. Pay and allowance of enlisted	988,787	1,076,117	969,201
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	142,826	134,582	120,598
5. Permanent change of station travel	102,578	106,860	105,125
6. Other military personnel costs	20,445	15,700	10,895
Total direct program	1,534,734	1,644,200	1,494,200
Reimbursable program:			
1. Pay and allowance of officers	396	500	500
2. Pay and allowance of enlisted	217	200	200
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	18,187	20,200	19,100
5. Permanent change of station travel	805	1,000	1,000
Total reimbursable program	19,605	21,900	20,800
10. Total obligations	1,554,339	1,666,100	1,515,000

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION
(In thousands of dollars)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
Total Obligations	$1,554,339	$1,666,100	$1,515,000
Reimbursable Program	-19,605	-21,900	-20,800
Total Direct Obligations	1,534,734 a/	1,644,200	1,494,200
Proposed Supplemental for Military Pay Act Increases	-	-126,200 c/	-
Appropriation	1,534,734	1,518,000 b/	1,494,200

a/ Composed of original appropriations under Public Laws 90-580 and 91-31 in the amount of $1,519,000 plus a transfer of funds in the amount of $15,734 to provide for the remaining required funds for the Congressionally approved pay raise effective 1 July 1968.
b/ Reflects $59,000 reduction related to Congressional action (PL 91-171).
c/ Proposed supplemental is based on a requirement of $126,200 for the 12.6% pay raise effective 1 July 1969.

APPROPRIATION INTRODUCTION -- continued

This appropriation provides funds for the pay and allowance, subsistence in kind, travel and transportation costs related to permanent change of station and other personnel costs, as authorized by law and regulations, for Marines on active duty with the regular establishment. For the first time, the program and financing schedule for this appropriation reflects budget activity classifications which are identical to the ten major program classifications used for management purposes throughout the Department of Defense. These same classifications are also used as the budget activity structure for the Operation and Maintenance appropriation.

The tables immediately following summarize the cost of Marine Corps military personnel in terms of the personnel categories i.e., pay and allowances of officers, enlisted, etc., in terms of the major defense programs (budget activities), and in terms of the operating programs.

The remainder of this book contains material in the same form that has been used for a number of years to present the requirements for the military personnel appropriation.

Primarily, Marine Corps military personnel are engaged in programs for operation of the Marine Corps. Except for military personnel, these costs are financed by the Operation and Maintenance appropriation. Marine Corps military personnel are also engaged in Operation of Defense Agencies. In addition, a small number of Marine Corps military personnel are assigned to other Government agencies outside Department of Defense. The costs of these personnel are financed as a part of the reimbursable program for this appropriation with reimbursements received from the Government agencies to which such personnel are assigned.

Obligations for military personnel are distributed to each of the budget activities on the basis of standard rates. These rates are derived by averaging total obligations for officers and enlisted personnel. The resulting rates are multiplied by the number of personnel assigned in each activity. Obligations for permanent change of station travel and support of Free World Forces are excluded from these standard rates and entered directly in the applicable budget activity account.

The Congress appropriated $1,474,000 in the 1969 appropriation act which provided for a Marine end strength of 306,408 and a man year average of 314,904. During the year the President authorized an increase to 313,370 end strength or about 7,000 above the Congressional plan. The man years, however, have been reduced from the Congressional approved 314,904 man years to 312,370. The actual attained strengths for the year were; end, 309,748; and man year average, 311,716; a short fall of 3,622 end strength and 654 man years. Additional funds in the amount of $60,734 were provided for the Congressional approved pay raise effective 1 July 1968.

The 1970 budget request, submitted to Congress, provided for an end strength of 314,471, a man year average of 316,771, and funding in the amount of $1,577,000. This amount was later reduced to $1,518,000 during Congressional review. Corresponding strength reductions were made and are shown in the present plan as 294,082 end strength and 305,319 man years. In addition, a supplemental of $126,200 will be required to fund the military pay raise of 12.6% which became effective 1 July 1969.

The Fiscal 1971 request for $1,494,200 will provide funds for an average of 23,600 officer man years and 241,153 enlisted man years for a total of 264,753. Personnel strengths are summarized as follows:

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 18

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimates	FY 1971 Estimates
	Direct Program:			
1	Strategic Forces:			
	Officers	8	9	9
	Enlisted	141	132	132
	Total	149	141	141
2	General Purpose Forces:			
	Officers	13,803	13,194	12,067
	Enlisted	162,756	159,050	140,855
	Total	176,559	172,244	152,922
3	Intelligence and Communications:			
	Officers	262	255	253
	Enlisted	2,654	2,309	2,308
	Total	2,916	2,564	2,561
5	Guard and Reserve Forces:			
	Officers	626	530	530
	Enlisted	4,571	4,785	4,785
	Total	5,197	5,315	5,315
6	Research and Development:			
	Officers	25	22	22
	Enlisted	38	40	40
	Total	63	62	62

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
7	Central Supply and Maintenance:			
	Officers	342	366	333
	Enlisted	2,877	3,034	2,584
	Total	3,219	3,400	2,917
8	Training, Medical & Other General Personnel Support:			
	Officers	8,755	8,310	7,901
	Enlisted	106,258	95,577	62,998
	Total	115,013	103,887	70,899
9	Administration and Associated Activities:			
	Officers	1,627	1,655	1,622
	Enlisted	4,595	4,416	4,335
	Total	6,222	6,071	5,957
10	Support of Other Nations:			
	Officers	229	226	224
	Enlisted	181	172	164
	Total	410	398	388
	Total Direct Program:			
	Officers	25,677	24,567	22,961
	Enlisted	284,071	269,515	218,201
	Total	309,748	294,082	241,162

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(End Strengths)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
	Reimbursable program:			
	Officers	21	21	21
	Enlisted	2	2	2
	Total	23	23	23
	Total Military Personnel:			
	Officers	25,698	24,588	22,982
	Enlisted	284,073	269,517	218,203
	Total	309,771	294,105	241,185

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(In thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Programs			Total
			Operation of the Marine Corps	Operation of Defense Agencies	RDT&E Navy	
1	Strategic Forces	1971	$ 774	$ 0	$ 0	$ 774
		1970	709	0	0	709
		1969	653	0	0	653
2	General Purpose forces	1971	852,562	82	0	852,644
		1970	883,713	82	0	883,795
		1969	803,386	70	0	803,456
3	Intelligence and communi-cations	1971	10,432	4,158	0	14,590
		1970	9,565	3,930	0	13,495
		1969	8,485	4,888	0	13,373
5	Guard and reserve	1971	30,422	0	0	30,422
		1970	28,094	0	0	28,094
		1969	24,976	0	0	24,976
6	Research and development	1971	399	0	93	492
		1970	389	0	88	477
		1969	374	0	70	444
7	Central supply and maintenance	1971	16,497	405	0	16,902
		1970	17,662	412	0	18,074
		1969	$14,794	$281	0	$15,075

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(In Thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Programs			Total
			Operation of the Marine Corps	Operation Of Defense Agencies	RDT&E Navy	
8	Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1971	$518,710	$202	$7	$518,919
		1970	640,967	364	6	641,337
		1969	622,292	447	5	622,744
9	Administration and associated activities	1971	40,816	856	0	41,672
		1970	39,704	847	0	40,551
		1969	35,234	799	0	36,033
10	Support of other nations	1971	17,785	0	0	17,785
		1970	17,668	0	0	17,668
		1969	17,980	0	0	17,980
	Total Direct Program	1971	1,488,397	5,703	100	1,494,200
		1970	1,638,471	5,635	94	1,644,200
		1969	1,528,174	6,485	75	1,534,734
	Reimbursable Program	1971				20,800
		1970				21,900
		1969				19,605
	Total Program	1971				1,515,000
		1970				1,666,100
		1969				$1,554,339

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	Operating Program			Total	Officers	Enlisted
		Operation of the Marine Corps	Operation of Defense Agencies	RDT&E Navy			
1 Strategic Forces	1971	141	0	0	141	9	132
	1970	141	0	0	141	9	132
	1969	149	0	0	149	8	141
2 General Purpose Forces	1971	152,914	8	0	152,922	12,067	140,855
	1970	172,236	8	0	176,244	13,194	159,050
	1969	176,551	8	0	176,559	13,803	162,756
3 Intelligence and Communications	1971	1,889	672	0	2,561	253	2,308
	1970	1,888	672	0	2,564	255	2,309
	1969	1,901	1,015	0	2,916	262	2,654
5 Guard and Reserve	1971	5,315	0	0	5,315	530	4,785
	1970	5,315	0	0	5,315	530	4,785
	1969	5,197	0	0	5,197	626	4,571
6 Research and Development	1971	49	0	13	62	22	40
	1970	49	0	13	62	22	40
	1969	52	0	11	63	25	38
7 Central Supply and Maintenance	1971	2,883	34	0	2,917	333	2,584
	1970	3,366	34	0	3,400	366	3,034
	1969	3,192	27	0	3,219	342	2,877

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM

(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	FY	OPERATING PROGRAM			Total	Officers	Enlisted
		Operation of the Marine Corps	Operation of Defense Agencies	RDT&E Navy			
8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1971	70,897	2	0	70,899	7,901	62,998
	1970	103,885	2	0	103,887	8,310	95,577
	1969	115,011	2	0	115,013	8,755	106,258
9. Administration and associated activities	1971	5,880	77	0	5,957	1,622	4,335
	1970	5,996	75	0	6,071	1,655	4,416
	1969	6,136	86	0	6,222	1,627	4,595
10. Support of other nations	1971	388	0	0	388	224	164
	1970	398	0	0	398	226	172
	1969	410	0	0	410	229	181
Total Direct Program	1971	240,356	793	13	241,162	22,961	218,201
	1970	293,274	795	13	294,082	24,567	269,515
	1969	308,599	1,138	11	309,748	25,677	284,071
Reimbursable Program	1971				23	21	2
	1970				23	21	2
	1969				23	21	2
Total Program	1971				241,185	22,982	218,203
	1970				294,105	24,588	269,517
	1969				309,771	25,698	284,073

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY MILITARY PERSONNEL CATEGORY

(In thousands)

Category	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
DIRECT PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowance of officers	$280,097	$310,941	$288,381
Pay and allowance of enlisted	988,787	1,076,117	969,201
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	142,826	134,582	120,598
Permanent change of station travel	102,578	106,860	105,125
Other military personnel costs	20,445	15,700	10,895
Total direct program	1,534,734	1,644,200	1,494,200
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowance of officers	396	500	500
Pay and allowance of enlisted	217	200	200
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	18,187	20,200	19,100
Permanent change of station travel	805	1,000	1,000
Total reimbursable program	19,605	21,900	20,800
Total obligations	1,554,339	1,666,100	1,515,000
TOTAL PROGRAM:			
Pay and allowance of officers	280,493	311,441	288,881
Pay and allowances of enlisted	989,004	1,076,317	969,401
Subsistence of enlisted personnel	161,013	154,782	139,698
Permanent change of station travel	103,383	107,860	106,125
Other military personnel costs	20,445	15,700	10,895
Total obligations	$ 1,554,339	$1,666,100	$1,515,000

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	FY 1969 Actual		FY 1970 Estimate		FY 1971 Estimate	
	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1969	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1970	Man Years	End Strength 30 June 1971
DIRECT PROGRAM:						
Officers	24,858	25,677	25,477	24,567	23,600	22,961
Enlisted	286,858	284,071	279,842	269,515	241,153	218,201
Aviation Cadets	-	-	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	311,716	309,748	305,319	294,082	264,753	241,162
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM:						
Officers	21	21	21	21	21	21
Enlisted	2	2	2	2	2	2
Subtotal	23	23	23	23	23	23
TOTAL PROGRAM:						
Officers	24,879	25,698	25,498	24,588	23,621	22,982
Enlisted	286,860	284,073	279,844	269,517	241,155	218,203
Aviation Cadets	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL	311,739	309,771	305,342	294,105	264,776	241,185

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

STRENGTH, GAINS, AND LOSSES, BY IDENTITY

	Male and Women Marine Officers	Warrant Officers	Enlisted Personnel	Cadets	Total
Actual, Fiscal Year 1969:					
Begin	23,090	1,444	282,696	---	307,230
Gains	3,988	89	107,649	---	111,726
Losses	2,734	200	106,274	---	109,208
End	24,344	1,333	284,071	---	309,748
Average	23,551	1,307	286,858	---	311,716
Estimate, Fiscal Year 1970:					
Begin	24,344	1,333	284,071	---	309,748
Gains	3,389	318	104,180	---	107,887
Losses	4,481	336	118,736	---	123,571
End	23,252	1,315	269,515	---	294,082
Average	24,228	1,249	279,842	---	305,319
Estimate, Fiscal Year 1971:					
Begin	23,252	1,315	269,515	---	294,082
Gains	2,721	410	63,865	---	66,996
Losses	4,262	475	115,179	---	119,916
End	21,711	1,250	218,201	---	241,162
Average	22,343	1,257	241,153	---	264,753

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

GRADE STRUCTURE, BEGINNING, END, AND MAN-YEAR STRENGTHS BY IDENTITY

	30 June 1969	30 June 1970	30 June 1971	Man-Years FY 1970	Man-Years FY 1971
Commissioned Officers:					
Commandant of the Marine Corps	1	1	1	1	1
General	1	1	1	1	1
Lieutenant General	8	8	8	8	8
Major General	28	28	28	28	28
Brigadier General	39	39	39	39	39
Colonel	769	743	740	774	741
Lieutenant Colonel	2,086	2,020	1,788	2,093	1,972
Major	3,977	3,850	3,701	3,982	3,820
Captain	6,466	6,201	5,907	6,468	6,139
1st Lieutenant	6,389	5,807	6,246	6,482	5,691
2nd Lieutenant	4,580	4,554	3,252	4,352	3,903
Subtotal	24,344	23,252	21,711	24,228	22,343
Warrant Officers:					
W-4	103	92	85	103	95
W-3	145	132	97	128	112
W-2	821	846	900	812	841
W-1	264	245	168	206	209
Subtotal	1,333	1,315	1,250	1,249	1,257
Total Officer Personnel	25,677	24,567	22,961	25,477	23,600

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

GRADE STRUCTURE, BEGINNING, END, AND MAN-YEAR STRENGTHS BY IDENTITY

	30 June 1969	30 June 1970	30 June 1971	Man-Years FY 1970	Man-Years FY 1971
Enlisted Personnel:					
E-9	1,187	1,211	1,853	1,169	1,826
E-8	4,252	4,167	3,706	4,189	3,936
E-7	9,814	9,734	9,400	9,581	9,567
E-6	16,972	17,116	15,998	16,749	16,557
E-5	33,213	35,807	26,100	34,178	30,955
E-4	50,782	55,060	43,100	51,370	49,080
E-3	51,429	56,028	56,028	59,270	52,396
E-2	62,658	58,392	39,816	57,401	51,778
E-1	53,764	32,000	22,200	45,935	25,058
Total Enlisted Personnel	284,071	269,515	218,201	279,842	241,153
Total Officer & Enlisted	309,748	294,082	241,162	305,319	264,753
Grand Total	309,748	294,082	241,162	305,319	264,753

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS

(In thousands)

B/A No.	Budget Activity Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate	Difference 1971 Compared with 1970	Justification Page
1	Pay & Allowances of Officers	$ 280,097	$ 310,941	$ 288,381	$ -22,560	3-22
2	Pay & Allowances of Enlisted	988,787	1,076,117	969,201	-106,916	3-34
3	Pay & Allowances of Cadets	-	-	-	-	3-46
4	Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel	142,826	134,582	120,598	-13,984	3-48
5	Permanent Change of Station Travel	102,578	106,860	105,125	- 1,735	3-56
6	Other Military Personnel Cost	20,445	15,700	10,895	- 4,805	3-66
	Total Direct Obligations	$1,534,734	$1,644,200	$1,494,200	$-150,000	
	Reimbursable Program	19,605	21,900	20,800		
	Total Obligations	$1,554,339	$1,666,100	$1,515,000	$-151,100	

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

BUDGET ACTIVITY 1: PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS
SUMMARY BY PROJECTS
(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	Basic Pay	$209,313	$239,721	$221,557
B.	Incentive Pay	14,444	14,636	15,060
C.	Special Pay	5,919	4,640	2,863
D.	Basic Allowance for Quarters	19,821	20,316	18,662
E.	Basic Allowance for Subsistence	14,332	14,638	13,560
F.	Station Allowances, Overseas	586	738	729
G.	Uniform Allowances	971	880	688
H.	Family Separation Allowance	2,136	1,974	1,828
I.	Separation Payments	4,131	4,686	4,950
J.	Social Security Tax - Employer's Contribution	8,444	8,712	8,484
	Total Direct Obligations	$280,097	$310,941	$288,381
	Reimbursable Program	396	500	500
	Total Obligations	$280,493	$311,441	$288,881

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

BUDGET ACTIVITY 2, PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL, SUMMARY OF PROJECTS

(In thousands)

	Budget Project Title	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	Basic Pay	$705,211	$ 790,592	$722,843
B.	Incentive Pay	4,619	4,788	4,794
C.	Special Pay	89,321	72,645	41,883
D.	Proficiency Pay	4,403	4,886	4,821
E.	Reenlistment Bonus	18,870	23,588	34,765
F.	Basic Allowance for Quarters	64,870	67,646	63,641
G.	Station Allowances	733	908	1,003
H.	Clothing Allowances	40,183	41,791	29,766
I.	Family Separation Allowance	6,950	5,082	3,785
J.	Separation Payments	21,248	26,243	25,758
K.	Social Security Tax-Employer's Contribution	32,379	37,948	36,142
	Total Direct Obligations	$988,787	$1,076,117	$969,201
	Reimbursable Program	217	200	200
	Total Obligations	$989,004	$1,076,317	$969,401

Department of the Navy
Military Personnel, Marine Corps

BUDGET ACTIVITY 3, PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CADETS, SUMMARY OF PROJECTS

(In thousands)

Budget Project Title		1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	AVIATION CADETS			
	(1) Basic Pay	-	-	-
	(2) Basic Allowance for Quarters	-	-	-
	(3) Basic Allowance for Subsistence	-	-	-
	(4) Incentive Pay	-	-	-
	(5) Clothing Allowance	-	-	-
	(7) Social Security Tax - Employer's Contribution	-	-	-
	Total obligations	-	-	-

BUDGET ACTIVITY 4, SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL, SUMMARY BY PROJECTS

(In thousands)

Budget Project Title		1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	Basic Allowance for Subsistence	$ 31,127	$ 30,096	$ 28,989
B.	Subsistence in Kind	111,699	104,486	91,609
	Total Direct Obligations	$142,826	$134,582	$120,598
	Reimbursable Program	18,187	20,200	19,100
	Total Program	$161,013	$154,782	$139,698

BUDGET ACTIVITY 5: PERMANENT CHANGE OF STATION TRAVEL
SUMMARY BY PROJECTS

(In thousands)

Budget Project Title		1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	ACCESSION TRAVEL	$17,508	$18,907	$12,240
B.	TRAINING TRAVEL	1,086	1,266	1,383
C.	OPERATIONAL TRAVEL Between Duty Stations	5,982	6,165	14,156
D.	ROTATION TRAVEL To and From Overseas	65,568	64,325	57,596
E.	SEPARATION TRAVEL	12,434	16,197	19,750
	Total Direct Obligations	$102,578	$106,860	$105,125
	Reimbursable Program	805	1,000	1,000
	Total Program	$103,383	$107,860	$106,125

BUDGET ACTIVITY 6: OTHER MILITARY PERSONNEL COSTS, SUMMARY BY PROJECTS

(In thousands)

Budget Project Title		1959 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
A.	Apprehension of Military Deserters, Absentees and Escaped Military Prisoners	$ 725	$ 730	$ 420
B.	Interest on Uniformed Services Saving Deposits	1,000	1,000	500
C.	Payment of Death Gratuities	6,200	6,602	3,671
D.	Servicemen's Group Life Insurance Program	12,520	7,368	6,304
	Total Direct Obligations	$20,445	$15,700	$10,895
	Reimbursable Program	-	-	-
	Total Obligations	$20,445	$15,700	$10,895

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee will come to order.

We will take up this afternoon the consideration of the Marine Corps military personnel budget request.

We are glad to have with us Maj. Gen. Jonas M. Platt, Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, Headquarters, Marine Corps, and Maj. Gen. Charles F. Widdecke, Director, Marine Corps Reserve. Of course, Admiral Gaddis has been with us before. We are also pleased to have Brig. Gen. E. H. Simmons, Deputy Fiscal Director, Headquarters, Marine Corps.

The Marine Corps is requesting the appropriation of $1,494,200,000. The appropriation for fiscal year 1970 for "Military personnel, Marine Corp," is $1,518,000,000. We note that, in addition, you will be asking for a supplemental appropriation of $126,200,000 to cover Pay Act costs. If the Congress were to approve the full amount of the supplemental, then the total appropriation for 1970 would be $1,644,200,000. Therefore, your request actually reflects a decrease of $150,000,000 below the planned level for 1970.

We want to welcome all of you in your appearance before the appropriations committee.

General, I note that you have a prepared statement. Will you please proceed.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, MARINE CORPS

General PLATT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: It is a privilege to present to you the highlights of the Marine Corps' military manpower program for fiscal year 1971, and the budget estimate for the military personnel appropriation which supports it.

This year our budget estimate is characterized by a marked reduction in strength. Our total strength reached a peak of 317,000 in March of 1969—the second largest Marine Corps in history. Since that time our strength has steadily decreased as units have redeployed from Vietnam and the tempo of combat operations in Vietnam has declined.

Our manpower program for fiscal year 1971 can best be termed transitional. It provides us with the manpower we need to meet todays commitments while at the same time it moves toward a smaller Marine Corps trained and ready for the commitments of the future.

FISCAL YEAR 1970 MANPOWER PROGRAM

Before developing further the highlights of our fiscal year 1971 program let me touch on the fiscal year 1970 program which initiated the transitional phase. That program provides for a reduction in total strength of 20,400 to a strength on 30 June 1970 of 294,100 marines as contained in the fiscal year 1970 Appropriation Act. The funding amounts shown in the 1970 column of the fiscal year 1971 budget include the fiscal year 1970 pay raise supplemental and are adequate to support the approved manpower strengths.

FISCAL YEAR 1971 MANPOWER PROGRAM

Starting from the reduced fiscal year 1970 end strength, the fiscal year 1971 program provides for a further reduction of 53,000 marines to an end strength of 241,200. This is an 18 percent reduction in 12 months.

This reduction will be accomplished in two ways. First, by reduced accessions. Second, by allowing many marines to voluntarily leave the Corps prior to the normal expiration of their enlistments.

Our overall emphasis during fiscal year 1971 is to make the transition to a smaller force as economically as we can while still maintaining adequate combat readiness and striving for conditions of service which will not discourage qualified officers and men from making the Marine Corps a career.

Certain unavoidable effects of the reduction in total strength will adversely impact on the individual marine. The required large scale early release programs will generate turbulence and instability. Reduced requirements will reduce grade structures which in turn will reduce promotions as compared to recent years. Our program is designed to lessen adverse impacts wherever possible.

Certain other effects of the reduction in total strength provide us with opportunities to improve the professionalism of a smaller future force. We should be able to meet our reduced recruit accession requirements through voluntary means without recourse to the draft. Reduced new accessions should also enable us to initiate greater quality controls on initial enlistment and on reenlistment.

OFFICER PLAN

Turning to specifics, the officer plan for fiscal year 1971 provides for a reduction of 1,600 to an end strength of 23,000. The percentage of total strength in the officer ranks rises from 8.4 percent in fiscal year 1970 to 9.5 percent in fiscal year 1971. We contemplate an eventual ratio of about 9.8 percent.

The reduction in officer strength will be accomplished by two actions. First, procurement of new officers will be reduced to 2,900—700 less than the fiscal year 1970 plan. Second, we will involuntarily revert to their permanent enlisted status approximately 900 marines who were temporarily commissioned to meet wartime needs. All of these officers will have had the opportunity to compete for permanent officer status prior to such reversion and all will have served at least two years as temporary officers. Further, these marines will not be reverted to the enlisted grade that they held when they were selected to serve temporarily as officers, but to at least the enlisted grade they would have achieved had they not been selected.

Officer promotions to all grades will be less than in fiscal year 1970. Due to sharp reductions in requirements there will be no advancement to the grades of lieutenant colonel and major.

ENLISTED PLAN

Turning to our enlisted plan, it provides for a reduction of approximately 51,300 to an end strength of 218,200. Average strength will be reduced almost 39,000 over fiscal year 1970.

Again two actions will be taken to achieve this sizable decrease. First, procurement of new enlisted marines will be reduced to 44,400—the minimum new input we can afford. Second, we will expand our current early release program to the point of voluntarily releasing approximately 55,000 marines well prior to the time their enlistments expire.

Enlisted promotions will also be reduced markedly from fiscal year 1970 levels. Promotions to the grade of staff sergeant and above will decline from 4,700 in fiscal year 1970 to 1,200 in fiscal year 1971—a reduction of 74 percent. This level of promotion is significantly below pre-Vietnam experience. We were requesting slight increases in our highest non-commissioner officer grades to provide for the return to enlisted status of the temporary officers who are being reverted while still maintaining some promotion to all enlisted grades.

Because of high turnover, and the continuing requirement for junior non-commissioned officers, promotion in the first-term force is not reduced as sharply as in the career force, but drops to about 55 percent of the fiscal year 1970 level.

This enlisted promotion plan provides the minimum advancement incentives necessary to retain high-caliber combat-experienced marines.

RETENTION

We are always concerned with the retention of high-caliber marines, but the impacts of rapid force reduction make us even more concerned during this transition period. The adverse impacts of reduced promotions and the instability brought on by large-scale early release may offset any retention gains we should realize by the prospect of less frequent periods of family separation overseas, particularly in Vietnam. Current retention of enlisted marines is substantially below that we experienced prior to Vietnam—and that was inadequate in the hard skill areas where competition with the civilian sector is high. Many of the marines we are losing today are highly trained and experienced in the hard-skill areas, and all of them are combat experienced. Our retention program is aimed at retaining a substantial number of these highly qualified marines and we are particularly directing our efforts at the hard-skill group. Financial incentives such as proficiency pay and the variable reenlistment bonus are awarded to highly qualified marines possessing critical skills. Our budget request reflects adjustments made in these incentives to increase their effectiveness, and to better meet our retention goals. These incentives, of course, are only applicable to enlisted marines.

The problem of meeting officer retention goals is also becoming more severe. Fewer highly qualified young men are apparently willing to remain past their initial period of obligated service. This is indicated by a sharp reduction in the percentage of reserve officers applying for and accepted for regular commissions. This rate has dropped from 26 percent in fiscal year 1964 to 6.5 percent in fiscal year 1969.

In spite of measures taken to improve retention, large numbers of highly qualified marines will undoubtedly leave the service. We will continue to seek ways to solve this problem by means within our control; however, deficiencies in housing, deficiencies in compensation, and attitude toward a service career will continue to inhibit our efforts.

To sum up, this request for the Appropriation Military Personnel Marine Corps is $150 million less than the fiscal year 1970 total, including the cost of the fiscal year 1969 pay raise. It will adequately support our manpower requirements during fiscal year 1971. It does create some hardships that will probably adversely affect the reten-

tion of sufficient numbers of high-caliber marines to maintain a smaller force in the future. We hope, however, that these hardships are of relatively short duration.

REDUCTION IN END STRENGTH

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, General Platt.

You say your end strength at the end of fiscal 1971, July 1, 1971, will be down to 241,200.

General PLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is the lowest since when?

General PLATT. That is the lowest since some time in fiscal year 1965. We started the Vietnam war at 190,000 and built up very rapidly the first year.

Mr. ANDREWS. I notice you stated there would be no advancement to the grades of lieutenant colonel and major, that they will be frozen.

General PLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the same true of high ranking officers?

General PLATT. No; that is is not true, Mr. Chairman. It is just in those two grades.

MORALE OF MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS. What effect has this drastic reduction planned for the next 12 months and the freeze on certain promotions planned for the same period of time, had on the morale of your force, both officers and men? It is bound to have had an impact.

General PLATT. It has had no effect to date, of course, because it is in the future, not in the past.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it generally known that you plan these reductions and freezes?

General PLATT. It will be, I think after these hearings.

Mr. ANDREWS. What effect do you predict it will have on the morale of the men?

General PLATT. As I said, I think it will have some adverse impact. At the same time, it should be remembered that this has happened after after our last two wars. In expanding the Marine Corps to meet our requirements for Vietnam, promotions have been much more rapid than they would have been otherwise. This is the inevitable slowing down effect.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you able to discuss the withdrawal of Marine troops from Vietnam or do you want to leave that off the record?

General PLATT. Sir, my instructions are that I cannot discuss the figures involving strengths in Vietnam.

Mr. ANDREWS. You can't tell us the number you have there now?

General PLATT. Oh, yes, sir; I can tell you the number there now.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many do you have over there now?

General PLATT. About 52,000 as of yesterday, I believe it is, sir. I have the precise figures here.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think that is about right from what I have read.

Are all the marines leaving Vietnam coming back to the continental United States or are some going to Okinawa?

Admiral GADDIS. Both, sir.

General PLATT. And some go to Japan.

RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. ANDREWS. Evidently one of the most serious problems facing the services today is retention. You make the statement that "Current retention of both officers and enlisted marines is substantially below that we experienced prior to Vietnam." Would you please expand on the problems faced by the Marine Corps today with respect to retention problems?

General PLATT. In terms of officer retention rates my initial statement submitted to the committee was in error and I have corrected it, because insofar as officers are concerned the retention rate prior to Vietnam was about 35 percent, defined as those officers who voluntarily remain 1 year or more beyond obligated service. Our current rate for officers is just about the same figure. So, in terms of rate of officer retention we have not experienced a reduction in rate.

On the enlisted side the picture is dramatically different. The overall reenlistment rate, for the three or four years prior to Vietnam, was between 30 and 40 percent—the rate being defined as the percentage of men who reenlist of those eligible to reenlist. The current rate, defined the same way, for fiscal year 1970 to date is 13 percent.

Mr. ANDREWS. You also state that "Due to sharp reductions in requirements there will be no advancement to the grade of lieutenant colonel and major." If there are to be no promotions to major or lieutenant colonel during 1971, won't this cause further complications with respect to your retention rates?

General PLATT. It may well, yes, sir; but again I point out that these same officers have benefited by greater than normal promotion rates during the time that we have been expanding. This is the inevitable paying of the piper. It happened after World War II, and it happened after Korea. It is a little bit more accentuated perhaps in this war because we have not involuntarily mobilized any Reserve officers for this war. Consequently, we don't have large numbers of fairly senior Reserve officers going out as we did after Korea, and thus we get more of an inhibiting effect on promotions.

PLANNED REENLISTMENTS

Mr. ANDREWS. According to page 41 of your budget, the Marine Corps is planning on an almost 45 percent increase in reenlistments, from 9,938 in 1970 to 14,107 in 1971. Is this a realistic increase or does it perhaps include a little wishful thinking?

General PLATT. We believe it is realistic because for the 2 years preceding the time these men will reenlist we have had very large-scale early release programs where we have allowed thousands of veterans voluntarily to leave the Marine Corps early. We have been forced into this. During fiscal year 1971 a high number of the men who could have gone out early and elected not to will come up for the normal expiration of enlistment, and we feel it quite probable that we will have a higher enlistment rate and a significantly higher number of people reenlist in 1971 than in 1970.

Furthermore, we feel the rearrangement of the VRB's and pro pay, offering more in the higher multiples, should have a positive effect.

Finally, on the plus side of reenlistment, the prospect for the career marine of less family separation, particularly in Vietnam, should have a plus effect. On balance, we feel this is a realistic estimate.

USE OF DRAFT

Mr. ANDREWS. Are you using the draft now for recruiting?

General PLATT. Our last draft call was last month, approximately 800 men. We don't anticipate, unless the recruiting climate changes drastically, that we will have to call on the draft in the future.

Mr. ANDREWS. How long have you used the draft for recruits?

General PLATT. We started in fiscal year 1965 when we initiated our rapid expansion.

Mr. ANDREWS. Overall, how has the draft worked for the Marine Corps?

General PLATT. The capability of the individual draftee as far as the Marine Corps is concerned has been fine, Mr. Chairman.

ALL VOLUNTEER ARMY

Mr. MINSHALL. General, have you had an opportunity to study the report of the President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Army?

General PLATT. I have not had a chance to study it in all its implications, but I have read the entire report.

Mr. MINSHALL. Off the top of your head what is your personal opinion of that recommendation?

General PLATT. My personal opinion is that, provided the funding is made available, with respect to the enlisted man it certainly can be done. I have some reservations as to the feasibility of obtaining the required number of officers, particularly specialist officers, without the draft. I have even further reservations in terms of our ability to maintain a viable Reserve without the draft.

Mr. MINSHALL. What class of specialized officers are you talking about particularly?

General PLATT. Of course it is not our particular responsibility, but I was thinking specifically of doctors, and within the framework of our problem, lawyers, for example. I think you would have quite a bit of difficulty getting officers in the numbers you need with specialist qualifications.

You asked for my personal view.

Mr. MINSHALL. Yes.

General PLATT. The Marine Corps has supported the concept of an all-volunteer force—we are traditionally an all-volunteer force—provided we can get the people we need in the quantity and quality that we need. We feel it is totally feasible to get the enlisted men that we need.

Mr. WYMAN. You are speaking now, General, in the context of the Marine Corps solely, are you not?

General PLATT. Yes, I am.

Mr. WYMAN. Everyone recognizes its distinguished record as a volunteer service. You are not expressing an opinion concerning the feasibility of this suggestion in regard to the other services or with reference to the often suggested criticism that this might cause people to look upon our men as mercenaries?

General PLATT. No. I interpreted the question to be my interpretation of its impact on the Marine Corps. I have not expressed myself with regard to that particular criticism. My personal view is that that criticism is unfounded.

RECRUITMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. MINSHALL. Have you found any reaction in your enlistment program as a result of the publicity about trouble you have had at some of your training camps?

General PLATT. We can trace no difficulties in the recruiting climate to that. Since fiscal year 1968 the recruiting climate has changed rather noticeably insofar as the Marine Corps is concerned. Up until that point in time we were meeting high recruiting quotas without resort to the draft.

Mr. MINSHALL. Changed noticeably? Would you give us a better feel for that?

General PLATT. Yes. It got tough.

Mr. MINSHALL. Put some figures in the record, if you want to, or just tell us now.

General PLATT. I really can't put figures to it because two variables are involved. One is that because of our very large commitment in Vietnam in terms of total Southeast Asia at one point we had 30 percent of our total strength overseas. This required the Marine Corps to take in 8,000 recruits a month every month. Before we got into those high monthly figures we used to adjust our monthly recruiting to the recruiting climate. In other words, in June, July, and August when recruiting is good, we would go for a large monthly quota, and in the months when it was poor we would cut our quota down. We could not maintain that because of the constraint of the capacity of our ability to train. So we went to the draft initially only so we could go to a level recruit input every month. That is one variable.

Then quite soon after we did this we noticed a rather marked variation in recruiting. The only figures I could put to it really would be the percentage of mental group IV that we took in. We took in 25 percent. We were required to take in 24 percent. We actually took in 25 percent.

I think another example of it is that we began to get fewer high school graduates. I don't have the figures with me, but I know the trend was down.

Now, of course, we have been able to cut our recruit input from 8,000 a month down to 3,700. That immediately brought us out of the woods. We don't anticipate any really significant problems in meeting the 3,700 a month by purely voluntary means.

NEGROES IN THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. MINSHALL. What is the breakdown of Negro versus white of your recruit input?

General PLATT. The black population in the Marine Corps is approximately 11 percent. That is reflected about the same way in the recruiting program.

Mr. MINSHALL. Will you supply that in terms of total numbers?

General PLATT. Yes. It is 11 percent of our total strength.
Mr. MINSHALL. That is about the figure nationwide.
General PLATT. Approximately, yes.
(The information follows:)

Currently, approximately 14 percent of the Marine Corps' recruit input is Negro. The black population is approximately 11 percent of the total Marine Corps end strength. As of 31 December 1969, there were 32,403 Negro marines within a total Marine Corps strenth of 301, 675.

EFFECT OF DRAFT ON RETENTION RATE

Mr. RHODES. General, does the fact that you have been taking draftees since 1965 have anything to do with your retention rate drop?
General PLATT. Yes. As a matter of fact, that is the only significant difference that I can see between a draftee and a nondraftee. They currently reenlist at the rate of about 1.5 percent.
Mr. RHODES. Have you any figures to compare the reenlistment rate of marines who had voluntarily enlisted, with the rate prior to Vietnam of voluntarily enlisted marines? Just provide it for the record.
General PLATT. I will be glad to provide that for the record. I can give you an approximate answer.
Mr. RHODES. If you want to give an approximate answer and correct it for the record, you may.
General PLATT. Our first-term reenlistment rate now is approximately 8 percent, and prior to the war it was in the vicinity of 20 percent.
Mr. RHODES. So it is substantially lower now.
General PLATT. Yes; but I am not sure all of that is due to inductees. There are other inhibiting factors in there, too.
Mr. RHODES. Such as the war in Vietnam.
General PLATT. The length of the war.
Mr. RHODES. Separation from families.
General PLATT. Yes. National attitude, too.
(The information follows:)

VOLUNTEER/INDUCTEE REENLISTMENT RATES—COMPARISON OF RECENT EXPERIENCE TO PRE-VIETNAM

	1962	1969	1970, July to December
1st termers:			
Reenlistments (volunteers)	3,070	4,384	1,895
Rate	20.0	7.4	6.4
Reenlistments (inductees)		29	18
Rate		4.2	1.5
Total	3,070	4,413	1,913
Rate	10.0	7.4	6.2
Career:			
Reenlistments	6,730	5,080	2,376
Rate	83.1	74.5	77.3
Overall:			
Reenlistments	9,800	9,523	4,289
Rate	41.8	14.3	13.0

Mr. ANDREWS. Back to the draft, the Marine Corps traditionally has been a voluntary organization, has it not?
General PLATT. Yes.
Mr. ANDREWS. You have used the draft only in case of emergency.
General PLATT. That is correct.

REENLISTMENT OF E–1 AND E–2'S

Mr. ANDREWS. The same table shows reenlistments by grade. The Marine Corps is evidently planning on the reenlistment of 168 E–2's and 30 E–1's. If after 2 or 3 years in the Marine Corps an individual is still only an E–2, is he really Marine Corps material?

General PLATT. We have recently increased our reenlistment standards, and among the standards is that if a single marine has not achieved the grade of lance corporal, E–3, after 2 years, we will not reenlist him.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE RETENTION RATES

Mr. ANDREWS. Has the Marine Corps conducted any studies to determine why more people are not making the Marine Corps a career?

General PLATT. We don't have any comprehensive studies as such.

Mr. ANDREWS. What are some of the actions now under consideration by the Marine Corps that will attempt to improve retention rates?

General PLATT. Insofar as officer retention is concerned, I think we start right at the basic school where we provide our new lieutenants their basic training. As an example of our desire to improve their careers, we offer them a choice of military specialty and a choice of area in which to serve. We have them list their choices, and we make every effort to accommodate to what the individual wants insofar as Marine Corps requirements permit. We have done this with considerable success over the years, we think. After the officer leaves basic school, his commanding officer is the man to counsel him about the advantages of a career, and of course his commanding officer plays a vital role in this.

In may of 1968 we established at Headquarters, Marine Corps, an officers career planning section, and we established career planners at our major commands. Their primary function is to improve Officer retention. As a matter of fact, the career planners and the headquarters planners are meeting right here in Washington this week. One of the things coming out of this is improved communication between the officer and the manager back here at headquarters. We have teams that go out in the field and not only hold lectures but talk to individual officers and their wives and then communicate with Headquarters, Marine Corps, by phone to see if we can accommodate the individual officer's desires.

Those are our principal approaches in the officer area.

In the enlisted area we also have a career planning section here in Headquarters and career planners at every level from the squadron and battalion right on up. In addition to the variable reenlistment bonus and proficiency pay, with which you are familiar, we offer other incentives to retention. We offer the young man opportunity for formal schooling. We offer him the opportunity to choose a specific duty assignment when it is available, such as sea duty or duty with the State Department. We offer him a chance to transfer to the geographical area of his choice if we can accommodate him.

MARINE CORPS TRAINING

Mr. ANDREWS. Describe briefly your schooling program for these young men.

General PLATT. We have 8 weeks of recruit training. We recently increased it to 9. Upon completion of recruit training all the Marines go to individual combat training. It was 3 weeks. We recently increased it to 4. Upon completion of those 4 weeks, every Marine takes basic specialist training or formal school. This ranges from a minimum of 4 weeks, such as a mortarman, up to a whole year for an avionics technician in aviation.

Mr. ANDREWS. They are all service schools?

General PLATT. Yes, they are all service schools. Some of them are other services.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you take any young men who have not finished high school?

General PLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you do anything about helping them complete their high school education?

General PLATT. We have educational officers at all of our major commands, and we try to encourage these young men to take the equivalent of a high school diploma by correspondence means or by test in some cases. Yes, sir; we do.

Mr. ANDREWS. But you do not have any schools for that purpose.

General PLATT. No; we do not.

GRADUATE TRAINING

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you send many of your people to graduate school?

General PLATT. Over the past 4 years we have given 471 officers graduate level training.

Mr. ANDREWS. What courses do they take?

General PLATT. They take a variety of courses—I can furnish the entire list for the record—aviation engineering, ordnance engineering, financial management.

Mr. ANDREWS. Law?

General PLATT. Law.

Mr. ANDREWS. Medicine?

General PLATT. They can get law only at their own expense.

Mr. ANDREWS. How does that program operate? Here is a young man who is a captain or major or maybe lieutenant colonel. He has his undergraduate degree. He is in the Marine Corps and wants to make a career of it, but he decides he wants to study law or medicine.

General PLATT. If he wants to study medicine, sir, then of course he would separate himself from the Marine Corps.

MARINE CORPS PROGRAM FOR INDIVIDUALS DESIRING LAW DEGREE

Mr. ANDREWS. All right, let's take the law.

General PLATT. In the case of law we have a program called the excess leave program. If this officer volunteers for and is selected for such training, we will pay his way to the nearest Marine Corps activity to the law school that accepts him, and then he will pay his expenses in law school.

Mr. ANDREWS. You pay no part of the expenses he incurs by attending law school?

General PLATT. No, we don't.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does he get a salary as a Marine officer?

General PLATT. He gets a salary as a Marine officer for such time as he is not involved in school.

General SIMMONS. For 9 months of the year he would be in unpaid status. Then he might come back to Quantico and take part.

Mr. ANDREWS. As long as he is in law school, 3 years——

General SIMMONS. He is in unpaid status.

Mr. ANDREWS. You give him a leave of absence, so to speak, from the Marine Corps, and upon completion of his law school he would return to the same status in the Marine Corps as he was when he left?

General PLATT. He would advance. He would not remain static. In other words, if his peers came up for promotion he would come up for promotion.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a pretty good program for him and for the Marine Corps. Then when he returns to the Marine Corps does he have a period of obligated service?

General PLATT. Yes, he does.

Mr. ANDREWS. What is that?

General PLATT. Four years.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Marine Corps have a big need for lawyers?

General PLATT. This is a perennial problem with us.

Mr. ANDREWS. How do you get your lawyers?

General PLATT. We have a program for getting young lawyers, called the Platoon Leaders Class (LAW). While he is an undergraduate, whether he is headed for law or not, he comes to Quantico as a Reserve enlisted marine for two 6-week periods of training. Upon successful completion of that training, which is officer candidate training, he is commissioned as a second lieutenant. If he is accepted at a law school, he does not come on active duty as a nonlaw Marine officer would, but he goes and completes law school. Upon sucressful completion of law school then he comes on active duty, goes through our basic school, and goes out and occupies a lawyer billet. He is obligated for 4 years.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is that comparable to a program the Navy has called the Junior JAG?

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Is it a popular program?

General PLATT. Quite. The difficulty, of course, is that at the end of 4 years they don't stay, and this is our problem. We are seriously short of experienced lawyers in the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, and major. We are reasonably successful in getting the more junior lawyers, but we can't hold them.

Mr. RHODES. Do I understand you correctly that while they are in law school they are on pay status?

General PLATT. They are not. They are Reserve officers on inactive duty in nonpay status.

Admiral GADDIS. This is a requirement of law of which I am sure you are aware. There is an exclusion against the services from postgraduate training in law.

Mr. RHODES. The only advantage, then, is that they are not likely to be drafted while in law school.

General PLATT. That is correct.

Mr. RHODES. If they can get through law school on their own and somehow or other not get drafted, they probably could get in the Marine Corps after graduation anyway.

General PLATT. Yes. We would be glad to have them.

PLANNED REDUCTION IN END STRENGTH

Mr. ANDREWS. The Marine Corps budget for 1971 calls for a year end strength of 241,200, a reduction of 52,920 below the planned year end strength of 294,082. How did you determine that a reduction of approximately 53,000 troops would be practical in fiscal year 1971?

General PLATT. We start with the commitments we are expected to carry out in fiscal year 1971. We determined the size of the Marine Corps in two components. First, the structure we need, that is, the billets and organizations we need. We set forth our requirements for division/wing forces, special mission forces, and general support forces. Given that figure, we then compute, based on how our forces are deployed and what our input is in terms of new recruits and new officers, the number of people we will have in training during the year. We add to that the patients we will have, both battle and nonbattle. We add to that the prisoners we will have and then the transients, people who are moving and not filling a given job.

Mr. ANDREWS. I have an idea you had a little assist from the Secretary of Defense in making this determination.

General PLATT. Sir, given the requirements to start with, we got within 233 of what we asked for.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is not bad.

General PLATT. We think so. I think it was good. We were given the requirements, sir, and the 241,000 figure was actually generated and was met.

TROOP REDUCTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. I will ask this question, and you can answer it or not.

The President's budget states that very probably future reductions can be made in Vietnam. However, because of the obvious need to maintain the security of any plans of this nature, this type of information is not included in the budget. Would you please tell the committee what troop reductions are now under consideration for fiscal year 1971 in Vietnam for the Marine Corps?

General PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I can't disclose that information.

MARINE CORPS STRENGTH IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Will you please provide for the record the in-country strength of Marine Corps personnel located in Vietnam, by month, beginning with January 1969 and projecting it through June 1971. Your answer would be the same?

General PLATT. Yes, sir. I can give the strength up to the present time but not beyond that.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right.

(The information follows:)

U.S. MARINE CORPS STRENGTH—REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

	1969	1970
January	81,867	52,837
February	80,933	50,360
March	80,975	[1] 43,600
April	81,857	
May	81,025	
June	81,228	
July	78,596	
August	72,427	
September	71,477	
October	64,247	
November	56,733	
December	55,127	

[1] Preliminary

INCREASED FUNDS FOR COMMUNICATIONS AND INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee notes that the Marine Corps is increasing the activity, Intelligence and Communications, by $1.1 million, from $13.5 million in 1970 to a planned level of $14.6 million in 1971. Why is this increase of $1.1 million necessary?

General PLATT. Actually, we are reducing the numbers of marines involved in that activity by three, but the money goes up because the money is computed on an average rate. Since our reduction in strength in 1971 is much sharper than it is in 1970, you automatically get an increased average rate for the same people. That explains the dollar difference.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wish you would put in the record the number of people working in Intelligence and Communications in 1970 and the number you plan to have in that field in 1971.

General PLATT. It is 2,564 for 1970 and 2,561 for 1971.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you tell the committee what are some of the various functions included under the category entitled "Intelligence and Communications"?

General PLATT. May I furnish that for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. ANDREWS. You may.

(The information follows:)

Marines in the intelligence and communications category perform the following functions:

Marine support battalion in support of the naval security group activity.

Radio battalions.

Intelligence production activities, scientific, counterintelligence, special intelligence communications, and intelligence data handling systems.

National military command systems support center.

Naval communications.

Security for NSA Headquarters, Fort Meade, Md.

Defense Intelligence Agency Headquarters and Defense Attaché System.

Defense Communications Headquarters and field activities.

Defense Atomic Support Agency Headquarters and Field Command Headquarters.

INCREASE IN AVERAGE RATE

Mr. ANDREWS. In the case of the activity entitled "Reserve Forces," the Marine Corps is planning on an increase of almost $2.4 million, from an estimated level of $28 million in 1970 to a new level of $30.4 million in 1971. What is the basis for this increase in 1971?

General PLATT. Again the number of people involved in this case is identical, 5,315. It is the difference in average rate that accounts for the increase in dollars.

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee also notes that the activity, "Administration and Associated Activities," will be increasing from $40.5 million in 1970 to $41.7 million in 1971. In view of the fact that the personnel of the Marine Corps will be decreasing in 1971, why is it necessary for administration to increase?

General PLATT. In this activity we are reducing the personnel from 6,071 to 5,957. The reason for the increase in dollars is again due to an increase in average rate.

Mr. ANDREWS. In each of these three cases I wish you would put something in the record that would better explain the need for the increase.

General PLATT. Surely.

(The information follows:)

Costs are estimated for the MPMC budget by computing costs in each of the six traditional budget activities—officer pay and allowance, enlisted pay and allowances, subsistence, and so forth. These costs are generally proportionate to the average strength on board during the year.

The total estimated costs, so computed, are then spread to each of the new budget activities (FYDP program) according to the end strength authorized for that program. The rate that is used to assign costs is computed by dividing the total appropriation costs by the total end strength. In fiscal year 1971, the end strength is declining rapidly as compared to fiscal year 1970. Since there is such a great difference between the beginning and end year strength, the average strength is much higher than the end year strenth. This means that a rate computed as described above will be much higher in a year of significant strength reduction such as fiscal year 1971.

These rates for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, and the differences are shown below:

	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Fiscal year 1970–fiscal year 1971
Officer basic rate	$12,109.37	$11,921.95	+$187.42
Officer aviation rate	2,060.00	2,020.31	+39.69
Enlisted basic rate	4,495.77	5,003.73	+507.96

Since the enlisted rate increases significantly from fiscal year 1970 to fiscal year 1971 certain activities, in which the strength has remained the same, or only slightly decreased, will appear to increase in cost. This is not due to the fact that it is more expensive to run these activities, but the rate as applied to the end strength is simply higher.

It should be noted that if man-year averages were available by program, the problem of apparent increases in cost would not occur. At this time, however, our personnel accounting system is not able to provide these averages by program. It is anticipated that by the next budget cycle this data will be available.

INCREASE IN PERSONNEL BENEFITS

Mr. ANDREWS. On the object classification table for the Marine Corps the committee notes that personnel benefits will be increased by approximately $1.8 million in 1971. However, there is a substantial decrease in personnel compensation. Personnel benefits are essentially a function of personnel compensation. Therefore, if personnel compensation decreases, why would you require an increase in personnel benefits?

Admiral GADDIS. This is due in part, to the increase in reenlistment bonuses which you spoke to earlier when General Platt noted the increase from 9,000 to 14,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you want to add to that answer, General Platt?

General PLATT. The reason, sir, is both reenlistment bonuses and separation payments. Both go up.

INCREASED TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. ANDREWS. In 1971 the Marine Corps is requesting $24.8 million for transportation of things. In 1970 only $20.5 million was required. In light of the significant decrease in Marine Corps personnel planned for 1971, why would you require a $4.3 million increase in transportation of things?

General PLATT. For three reasons. The first is that we are reverting officers to enlisted status. This will generate movement both for them and their replacements. Secondly, people returning from overseas increase operational travel. A number of them have dependents, which increases the household goods costs. Third, the early release program generates turbulence, so there will be more movement in 1971 than in 1970. These three added together generate the additional cost.

Mr. ANDREWS. So far as this item of expense is concerned, you would say that 1971 is an unusual year and after 1971, if things quiet down a little and you get your men placed, this item should decrease?

General PLATT. Very definitely, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. In the case of other services, an increase of approximately $1 million is planned for 1971, from $6 million in 1970 to a new figure of $7 million in 1971.

General PLATT. Again, sir, the additional movement brought on by the three factors that I mentioned, including more movement of household goods, which increases packing, crating, storage, and port charges.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you think the Marine Corps has done all it can to keep this item, transportation of things, down?

General PLATT. I most definitely do, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. I serve on another committee where we were told about the amount of money that the U.S. Government pays for moving household goods and automobiles, and it is a staggering figure.

EFFECT OF SHORT TOUR ON TRANSPORTATION COSTS

General PLATT. Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons that generates this movement, of course, is that we have established that the tour in Southeast Asia without family was 13 months and now is 12 months. When you move that many people through a 12-month tour, you generate during this wartime period a large amount of movement and the expense that goes with it.

Mr. ANDREWS. We are talking about moving things, household goods and automobiles.

General PLATT. Yes. When a man goes to Vietnam he can move his family, and when he comes back he can move his family.

Mr. ANDREWS. Move them where? On the continental United States?

General PLATT. Yes, he can.

Admiral GADDIS. The legal entitlement when an officer or a man is ordered overseas on an unaccompanied tour is from the last permanent station to the home of permanent residence or to another selected site not farther away than the home of permanent residence.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, if a man is down at LeJeune, N.C., and he is ordered to Vietnam and his family is with him in a trailer at LeJeune, if his home happened to be on the west coast in California——

Admiral GADDIS. He could go to his home or any other place in the United States which is closer.

COST OF MOVING TRAILERS

Mr. ANDREWS. And the Marine Corps would pay for moving his trailer?

Admiral GADDIS. And his dependents.

Mr. ANDREWS. How do you move those trailers?

General PLATT. It is done by commercial contract. The cost is dependent upon the size of the trailer and the mileage that it is moved.

Mr. ANDREWS. They hook it on to a truck and haul it by highway across the Nation?

General SIMMONS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is pretty expensive; is it not?

General SIMMONS. It usually involves a loss to the man because the rate usually does not cover the price that he has to pay.

Mr. ANDREWS. How much does it cost to take a trailer across the continent that way?

General SIMMONS. The rate runs something like 50 cents per mile.

Admiral GADDIS. Seventy-four cents now. At 74 cents it would be over $2,000.

Mr. RHODES. He would be better off to sell the trailer.

Mr. ANDREWS. Of course, if the trailer is damaged, the Marine Corps or the contractor is responsible for the damage.

Admiral GADDIS. I think this is a tonnage commitment on the insurance as far as the Government and contractor are concerned. Any additional insurance for full value is the responsibility of the owner. This is a technical point which I will correct for the record. To amplify my statement, all costs of insurance or excess valuation over the carrier's maximum liability as stated in the carrier's tariffs are the responsibility of the carrier.

INCREASE IN AVERAGE RATE

Mr. ANDREWS. Regarding Reserve forces, the Marine Corps is showing no increase in personnel for 1971. Yet you are requesting a $2.4 million increase in funding. If you have no increase in personnel, why are the additional funds required?

General SIMMONS. Maybe a word of explanation on the average rate might help here. The pricing of the budget activities by program is being done for the first time this year, and it is being done on the average rate basis. In fiscal year 1971 this has caused dollar increases in some programs even though the number of personnel in the program has remained constant or has decreased. The dollar rate inflation over fiscal year 1970 is caused by the rapidly decreasing end strength, with

a higher man-year average. The average rate allocates total cost over the end strength. Therefore, the cost for end strength is higher in fiscal year 1971 than it is in fiscal year 1970. It is division of the end strength into the total cost.

The officer rates show a truer picture because of the less drastic drop in man-years end strength in the case of the officer structure.

CHANGE IN OFFICER-ENLISTED RATIO

Mr. ANDREWS. For training, medical, and other general personnel support, the Marine Corps is planning on a decrease of 409 officers and 32,579 enlisted personnel. Using your normal officer to enlisted ratio, if you are cutting back by 32,000 enlisted personnel, why are you not able to cut back somewhere in the neighborhood of 3,000 officers?

General PLATT. The officer-enlisted ratio varies from year to year. Really, they are managed as two separate populations. You will notice that our ratio goes up as the force comes down. It always has. That is the reason for that.

Mr. ANDREWS. It is hitting about 9.8 percent, if I remember your statement correctly.

General PLATT. That is the way we are headed. It is about 9.5.

TRAINING, MEDICAL, AND OTHER GENERAL PERSONNEL SUPPORT

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you provide for the record a listing of the various types of functions carried out under the activity entitled, "Training, Medical, and Other General Support," and also spell out in detail to which of the various functions the reduction of 32,998 personnel will be applied?

General PLATT. We would be glad to, Mr. Chairman.

(The information follows:)

The activity entitled "Training, Medical, and Other General Personnel Support" includes the following types of functions: Recruit, specialized, professional and flight training; instructors at the U.S. Naval Academy and NROTC units; patients, prisoners and transients; and recruiting and examining activities.

The reduction will be applied to the various functions as follows:

Function	Reductions, fiscal years 1970 to 1971			Remarks
	Officers	Enlisted	Total	
Training (including recruit, specialized, professional and flight)	261	22,867	23,128	Reductions in training staffs, support personnel, students, trainees, and recruits.
Patients	92	2,238	2,330	Reduction in hospitalized casualties.
Transients	56	7,474	7,530	Reduction in the number of personnel between duty assignments.
Total reduction	409	32,579	32,988	

REDUCTION IN WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. ANDREWS. The Marine Corps is showing a decrease in the number of warrant officers for 1971. Is the Marine Corps intentionally cutting back on its warrant officer program?

General PLATT. No, Mr. Chairman. That is a product of retirements during the year and reversions of warrant officers whose permanent

status is enlisted. Our new input of 200 is not sufficient in this given year to offset the abnormal loss. We are not cutting back on the program.

PLANNED ENLISTMENT FOR 1971

Mr. ANDREWS. The same table shows that enlisted Marine Corps gains for 1971 will be 63,865. How confident are you that you will be able to reach this figure without using the draft?

General PLATT. Unless the recruiting climate changes most drastically, we are very confident that we can.

PLANNED STRNEGTH BY MONTH

Mr. ANDREWS. For the record will you provide your total end strength, by month, for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the Marine Corps, as best you can with the limitations put on you by higher authority.

General PLATT. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

U.S. MARINE CORPS TOTAL END STRENGTH FISCAL YEAR 1970–71 [1]

	Fiscal year—	
	1970	1971
July	310,512	290,206
August	311,271	285,489
September	308,235	280,147
October	304,076	275,251
November	303,851	270,841
December	302,077	264,719
January	302,995	258,590
February	305,211	251,930
March	306,315	247,472
April	305,005	243,381
May	302,279	241,391
June	294,082	241,162

[1] Above strengths are those reflected in the President's budget request.

TRAINING SENIOR OFFICERS TO FLY HELICOPTERS

Mr. ANDREWS. The Army has recently announced a plan to train generals and colonels to fly helicopters. Does the Marine Corps plan on instituting a similar program?

General PLATT. Of course, you recognize, Mr. Chairman, that we already have naval aviators, general officers, who are in fact helicopter or fixed-wing pilots both. In a similar vein the Army program, all we plan is that an officer who is designated as a commanding general of one of our divisions or assistant division commander of one of our divisions would go to Pensacola for 2 weeks of helicopter flight training. Then he would go to a helicopter training group for less than a week. The intent of this program is to provide him with more familiarity with the actual capabilities of the helicopter and to give him a certain proficiency to land that helicopter when he is in the front left seat in an emergency.

TRAINING OF MARINE HELICOPTER PILOTS

Mr. ANDREWS. Who trains your helicopter pilots?

General PLATT. The Army and the Navy, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you have any preference as to who trains them?

General PLATT. I believe if the numerical capability were there, we would prefer the Navy, only because they would get instrument training and would become more familiar with the things they will encounter after they get out of flight training.

Mr. ANDREWS. What percentage of the helicopter pilots are trained by the Army for the Marines?

General PLATT. A large percentage. The precise figure I would have to furnish for the record.

(The information follows:)

The Army will train 41 percent of the Marine Corps helicopter pilots in fiscal year 1970 and 61.5 percent in fiscal year 1971.

ARMY TRAINING OF ALL MARINE HELICOPTER PILOTS

Mr. ANDREWS. I don't know whether you know it or not, but last year this committee suggested that the Army take over the training of all helicopter pilots. Have you any comment on that?

General PLATT. Since this is a matter principally of naval air training, I would prefer to let them comment on that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is a good answer.

Does the Marine Corps have any plans for training generals or colonels to fly fixed-wing aircraft?

General PLATT. No, sir; we have no such plans.

INCREASE IN FLIGHT PAY

Mr. ANDREWS. The Marine Corps is planning increases in the number of officers and enlisted personnel to be drawing flight pay in 1971. With the very sizable reductions in the total strength of the Marine Corps planned for 1971, why do you feel it necessary to increase the number of officers and enlisted personnel drawing flight pay?

General PLATT. We have a requirement for approximately 5,000 naval aviators. We have had a serious pilot shortage for a number of years. We have taken a number of pretty drastic management actions to cope with that shortage. As each year goes on we are able to get more people out of flight training and come closer to our actual requirement. That is why, even though the Marine Corps is going down, the number of pilots is going up.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you consider it necessary for a pilot to keep up his training?

General PLATT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you feel that the Marine Corps program of proficiency training is being abused?

General PLATT. No, I do not.

INCREASE IN PARACHUTE JUMPING PAY

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee also notes that the Marine Corps is planning on increasing the number of officers drawing parachute jumping pay from 133 in 1970 to 146 in 1971. What requirement exists with-

in the Marine Corps to require an increase in the number of jump qualified individuals for 1971?

General PLATT. Four of the 14 are to fill additional billets we have established in our reconnaissance battalions. Eight are to provide additional Marine instructors at the Army Special Warfare School at Fort Bragg. The final one is a special billet in Vietnam.

SUPPORT OF FREE WORLD FORCES

Mr. ANDREWS. Also under the category of special pay is the item, "Support of Free World Forces." What is the total number included in the Marine Corps budget for support of free world forces?

General SIMMONS. The MPMC appropriation provides a total of ——— million of the total of $17.8 million in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. ANDREWS. What countries are supported and in what amounts?

General PLATT. This is the Republic of Korea Marine Corps that is engaged in Vietnam.

Mr. ANDREWS. You pay in your budget the cost of keeping that brigade down in South Vietnam?

General PLATT. We pay, through the military personnel, Marine Corps, budget a significant amount of those costs.

General SIMMONS. Within this appropriation in support of the brigade ———.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many troops are supported?

General SIMMONS. The budgeted strength is ———. The actual strength is somewhat less than that at the present time.

Mr. WYMAN. Is this the same thing as item 10 at page 32, support of other nations, $17,785,000?

General PLATT. There are additional factors in there, including military assistance advisory groups, in addition to the second brigade of the Republic of Korea Marine Corps which we were addressing.

Mr. WYMAN. For the record I wonder if we could at some point have those other advisory groups appended to the response to the question to show the whole picture of support to other nations?

Mr. ANDREWS. Can you do that?

General SIMMONS. For the moment, ——— million of the $17.8 million is in direct support of the ROK brigade.

General PLATT. I was referring to the military assistance advisory groups such as in Taiwan or Thailand.

Mr. WYMAN. When you say support of the ROK, you mean that is a direct appropriation for ——— the Korean forces in Vietnam?

General PLATT. ——— I can furnish that whole breakdown for the record. It is not the total cost.

Mr. WYMAN. But it is a major element of the cost of that unit in Vietnam?

General PLATT. Very definitely, yes.

(The information was provided to the committee and is classified.)

Mr. ADDABBO. General, in breaking down the figure you mentioned ———.

General PLATT. ———.

Mr. ADDABBO. How long will the Marines pay ———? Is this a permanent thing?

General PLATT. I believe it is, but I would like to answer that for the record.

(The information follows:)

The Marine Corps is scheduled to support the ROK Marine Corps in the Republic of Vietnam through fiscal year 1971, at which time the payment ——— should terminate. There may, however, be residual costs in fiscal year 1972 based on obligations occurring in fiscal year 1971. ———.

General SIMMONS. There is ——— million in fiscal year 1970 for this purpose and ——— million in fiscal year 1971.

Mr. ADDABBO. Are you also making such payments to Australians?

General SIMMONS. ———.

Mr. ADDABBO. How about the Vietnamese?

General SIMMONS. ———.

Mr. ANDREWS. You are paying for the South Korean Marines?

General PLATT. ———.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many do they have down there?

General SIMMONS. ——— plus a rotation base of ——— in and ——— out ——— times a year.

Mr. ANDREWS. In addition to the ——— marines from South Korea, they have some Army troops down there, about two divisions if I remember correctly.

General PLATT. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Army support them?

General PLATT. ———.

Mr. RHODES. What about the South Vietnamese Marines? ———.

General PLATT. We have no expenses in this appropriation for the South Vietnamese Marine Corps.

Mr. ANDREWS. For the record will you provide a schedule for the Marine Corps showing under what activities in this budget these funds are included, broken down by country. We are still talking about support of free world forces.

(The information follows:)

The total obligations, for fiscal year 1971, in budget activity 10, are $17,785,000. Of this total [deleted] covers the personnel costs of 388 U.S. Marines assigned to military assistance and advisory groups in 16 countries, broken down as follows: Republic of Vietnam, 287 personnel; Republic of China, 16; Republic of Korea, 40; Thailand, 29; Japan, three; Dominican Republic, two; Venezuela, two; and one each in Spain, Norway, Greece, Palestine, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Columba, and Germany.

The remaining [deleted] is for the direct support of the Republic of Korea 2d Marine Corps Brigade, in South Vietnam, and is broken down as follows:

(In thousands of dollars)

Item	*Amount*
[deleted]	
Total	

This force is the only foreign force directly supported in this budget.

WOMEN'S MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you discuss the status of the women in the Marine Corps today and your plans for fiscal year 1971?

General PLATT. As of January 31, there were approximately 310 officers and 2,550 enlisted women. Marine Corps policy is that the enlisted woman marine strength will be maintained at approximately 1 percent of the total Marine Corps enlisted strength and that the

officer strength will be approximately 10 percent of the enlisted women's strength. At this time I don't know of any plans to change this policy.

Mr. ANDREWS. Last year you mentioned that the planned strength for women marines was 290 officers and 2,900 enlisted personnel. Has there been any change to this planned strength level?

General PLATT. Because women marine strength is maintained at approximately 1 percent of the total Marine Corps enlisted strength, the strength objectives do change whenever there is a change in the Marine Corps strength. For this reason the planned strength for women marines for fiscal year 1971 will be 70 officers and 700 enlisted less than the planned strength objectives which I mentioned last year. Current planned strength objectives for fiscal year 1971 are 220 officers and 2,200 enlisted.

WOMEN MARINES IN VIETNAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Last year you mentioned that there was one officer and seven enlisted women serving in Vietnam. How many do you have there today?

General PLATT. The total number of women marines serving in Vietnam is the same—one officer and seven enlisted women are in Siagon.

Mr. ANDREWS. How many women marines are stationed in Southeast Asia?

General PLATT. There are approximately 16 officers and 75 enlisted women stationed in Japan, Okinawa, and Vietnam.

REENLISTMENT RATE FOR WOMEN MARINES

Mr. ANDREWS. How is the reenlistment rate for women marines?

General PLATT. The reenlistment rate is quite good for women who are eligible for reenlistment. The overall and first-term reenlistment rate for women marines have generally been higher than for male marines. For instance, from fiscal year 1965 through December fiscal year 1970, overall women marine reenlistments have averaged 41.9 percent whereas the average for male marines is 23.2 percent. First-term reenlistment rates in fiscal year 1970 through December were 9.6 percent for women marines and 6.4 percent for males. Career reenlistment rates are somewhat similar for women and male marines. In fiscal year 1970 through December they were 73.3 percent for women marines and 77.3 percent for male marines.

Mr. MINSHALL. Will you state what the basic duties of these officers are?

General PLATT. Yes, sir. Almost 50 percent of the women officers are in the administrative occupational field. The remainder are assigned duties in approximately 15 occupational specialties such as communications, supply, disbursing, data systems, and air control. The officer in Saigon is in an administrative assignment.

BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR QUARTERS

Mr. ANDREWS. On page III–42 of the Marine Corps budget, you are showing that 57,034 enlisted personnel will be drawing basic allowances for quarters. This compares with a planned level of 61,081 to be

drawing this allowance in 1970. If the Marine Corps is reducing enlisted strength in 1971 by approximately 20 percent, why would the number of individuals drawing basic allowance for quarters only be reduced by approximately 5 percent?

General PLATT. For two reasons, Mr. Chairman. We are having this reversion of temporary officers back to their enlisted status. The great majority of them are married, with dependents.

Second, the early release program involves only first-termers, men who have many fewer dependents than the career force. This is a typical occurrence during a phasedown.

SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. ANDREWS. Under subsistence of enlisted personnel, the Marine Corps is using a daily rate of $1.31. However, the Navy, Air Force, and Army all use a daily rate of $1.39. How is the Marine Corps able to feed its enlisted personnel in the Continental United States messes for less than the other services? We are not complaining about it, but congratulating you. Won't you tell us for the record how it is done, so the other services may learn something?

General PLATT. My understanding is that we are using $1.39 a day. We used $1.31 for the first half of 1970, and then shifted, by DOD directive, to $1.39.

Admiral GADDIS. We will check that, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. It says in this budget on page 3–53, $1.31.

General PLATT. We will check that, Mr. Chairman.

(The information follows:)

The daily rates of $1.31 for the Marine Corps and $1.39 for the Navy are correct. The daily rates for the Army and Air Force are $1.35 and $1.41 respectively. The commuted ration rate (basic allowance for subsistence in lieu of subsistence in kind) of $1.39 is established by DOD and is applicable to all services.

We are aware of two factors which enable us to feed at the lower rate. First, we use more carcass beef in lieu of fabricated boneless beef. Second, we use bread from our own bakeries rather than commercial bakeries.

ABSENTEE RATE IN MARINE MESSES

Mr. ANDREWS. For subsistence ashore and in the continental United States, the Marine Corps uses an absentee rate of 28.8 percent. The Army uses an absentee rate of 22 percent. Why is the absentee rate higher for the Marine Corps in the continental United States messes than it is for the Army?

General PLATT. I cannot answer why.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have somebody look into that and put something in the record about it.

General PLATT. That is our actual experience, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. We are talking about not being present for meals.

General PLATT. Yes, I understand.

Mr. ANDREWS. There is nothing wrong with your meals, is there?

General PLATT. We do not think so. Many times that is a product of where the activity is and the proximity of other feeding activities.

Mr. ANDREWS. Hamburger joints.

General PLATT. Yes, sir. It would vary with the actual location of your people. When you redeploy from overseas, the total average absentee rate goes up.

We will try to figure out the difference between ours and the Army.

(The information follows:)

The Army absentee rate of 22 percent depicts a worldwide average. The Marine Corps rate of 28.8 percent depicts actual experience for continental United States only. The worldwide average for the Marine Corps is 20.5 percent.

OPERATIONAL RATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS. For 1971, the Marine Corps is requesting $19.2 million for operational rations, a reduction of $480,000 below the 1970 level. Since there have been significant reductions in Marine Corps troop strengths in Vietnam, why is there not a corresponding reduction in the area of operational rations?

General SIMMONS. The largest portion of that is based on requirements for Fleet Marine Corps Pacific—based on consumption within the Western Pacific. The estimates were submitted some time ago. They have gone through the review process. They are included in the budget now. It is quite possible this figure is too high in the light of reduced activity.

It is also quite possible that we will have some turnbacks from fiscal year 1970 operational rations. If this turns out to be the case at a future time, there will be a reduction in this item as there has been in previous years.

NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. On page 54 of your budget justifications, you are showing $115,000 for the new food item program in 1970. What did you accomplish as a result of this program in 1970?

General PLATT. I would have to furnish that for the record, sir.

(The information follows:)

We have tested and standardized instant lemon juice, instant pineapple juice, danish pastry mix, individually frozen whole corn, green beans, and peas. Other items which we have tested but have not been standardized are irradiated flour, dehydrated chili con carne, and pork chops in flexible packages.

Mr. ANDREWS. In 1971, you are requesting $100,000 for this program. What are these funds required for?

General PLATT. We are planning on testing a bread mix, a precooked, presliced, frozen bacon, precooked peas, and convenience entrees which basically are TV dinners. Those are the items. As you know, these are handled by all the services. Generally it is under the Army's Natick laboratory. Those are the four items we are contemplating testing.

Mr. MINSHALL. Will you describe the food program in a little more detail? I have been advised by the staff that you request funds for this program every year. Is this an experimental program?

General PLATT. It is a testing program. Basically, what happens is that the Department of the Army is responsible for furnishing the other services a procurement instrument release forecast that lists items on which successful engineering or equivalent tests have been completed, and then indicates the fiscal year in which the services may procure the new item.

Then we, in turn, select the items that we desire to test. Those items that are successfully tested in our Marine mess halls then we undertake to use.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do they do work for the Navy and the other services on this?

General PLATT. Basically, the initial research is done by the Army at their Natick laboratories. Then each service tests items that have been successful as far as Natick is concerned.

Mr. MINSHALL. What do you do with these successful items? Are they ever put in the actual ration?

General PLATT. To the best of my knowledge; yes, sir.

Admiral GADDIS. The successful items would be recommended to the Defense Supply Agency, which does the procuring of this preprepared type food item. They would be available then in standard stocks to be drawn by any one of the services.

If the test item is rejected, then it would not go on availability for standard stock.

It is the way they have of getting new items into the available standard food stocks.

Mr. ANDREWS. This is a joint venture of all the services.

Admiral GADDIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. The $100,000 for 1971 is the Marine contribution?

General PLATT. To the four items we are going to test.

Admiral GADDIS. They have offered to test four items, and they have put in their budget $100,000 to finance that.

SUPERVISION OF NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

Mr. MINSHALL. Who has overall supervision of the food program? Defense Supply?

Admiral GADDIS. The Office of the Secretary of Defense has overall supervision.

General PLATT. Army is the executive agent for Research and Development supporting the DOD food service program.

(Off the record.)

General PLATT. I have the figures for the others. The Army is $110,000; the Air Force is $100,000; and the Navy is $179,000. The number of items and the kinds of items vary.

HISTORY OF NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. How long have you had this program, General?

General PLATT. I cannot answer that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you know anything about the effectiveness of it?

General PLATT. I would have to furnish that for the record.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right, I wish you would put something in the record.

(The information follows:)

The Marine Corps entered the new item program in fiscal year 1961 for fiscal year 1962 testing. The estimate for the program is based on the price difference of the new item and the normally issued item. Production testing is normally accomplished at selected Marine Corps activities, such as Marine Corps bases at Camp Pendleton, Calif., and Camp Lejeune, N.C.

The program has been most effective. Items tested which are standardized and used in regular monthly menus include: boneless beef, boneless lamb roasts and chops, portion liver slices, boneless ham, beef patties, frozen fish portions, individually frozen green beans, peas, and corn; danish pastry mix.

Items included in the "B" ration and for overseas feeding are: dehydrated chicken, pork chops, shrimp, diced beef, beef patties, fish squares, cabbage, cottage cheese, green beans; instant orange juice, applesauce, and egg mix.

Assistance Programs

Mr. Andrews. General, would you provide for the record a 3-year table listing all the various assistance programs in which the Marine Corps participate, showing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned, and the estimated cost, by appropriation.

(The information follows:)

MARINE CORPS PARTICIPATION IN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Project and fiscal year	Personnel assigned		MPMC cost[1]	O. & M.M.C. cost	PMC cost
	Military	Civilian			
Transition:					
1971	58	38	$603	$1,035	0
1970	58	38	603	1,035	0
1969	2	38	100	300	0
100,000:					
1971	0	0	244	30	0
1970	0	0	315	63	0
1969	0	0	233	78	0
Referral:					
1971	0	0	0	0	0
1970	0	0	0	0	0
1969	0	0	0	0	0
Value:					
1971	0	0	0	0	0
1970	0	0	0	0	0
1969	0	0	0	0	0

[1] Project Transition and Project 100,000 do not appear as line items in the MPMC budget. No billets were specifically authorized by the Department of Defense. To accomplish the objectives of the programs, personnel were reassigned from other functions. No specific funds were authorized; however, the costs shown above can be attributed as indirect costs to these actions.

Project 100,000

Mr. Andrews. What has the Marine Corps done in connection with Project 100,000 during the past year?

General Platt. Basically, insofar as the project is concerned, we have implemented the Department of Defense program, which requires us to take 24 percent of our new male accessions in mental group IV, and one-half of the mental group IV in the lower 50 percent of that range. They are called the new mental standards men.

That is a quota which is levied on us by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Andrews. Will you continue to have those quota levies of that category when you are reducing your forces?

General Platt. We know of no change in the percantage at this time. We have requested that the percent of new mental standards men be 6 percent rather than 12 percent, our share.

Mr. Andrews. How many individuals will be brought into the program during fiscal year 1971?

General Platt. I would have to furnish the precise figure for the record. It would be 24 percent.

Mr. ADDABBO. Are these all draftees, or volunteers?

General PLATT. They are both.

Mr. ABDDABBO. Could you give us a breakdown?

General PLATT. The percentage inductees and the percentage volunteers—I can, yes. I do not have it here.

(The information follows:)

Mental group IV volunteer enlistments, based on the President's budget, will account for 10,368 or 24 percent of the total male recruit input quotas during fiscal year 1971. The Marine Corps does not anticipate a requirement for any inductees in fiscal year 1971.

As of December 31, 1969, 12,616 personnel or 24.9 percent of the total recruits have participated in the program so far in fiscal year 1970. Of this number, 1,256 or 10 percent were inductees.

REMEDIAL READING FOR PROJECT 100,000 INDIVIDUALS

Mr. ANDREWS. Is the Marine Corps providing remedial reading instruction to all individuals with a reading level of fifth grade or below?

General PLATT. No, sir; we are not. Our approach to the remedial reading is that if a man is having difficulty at the recruit depot, we send him to our Special Training Branch for whatever the reason. Then he is given more individual attention at that Branch. We have not initiated a remedial reading program because we are not impressed with the long-term effects of a short remedial reading program. We are not convinced that the resources it would take, which we would have to provide, are worth it.

Therefore, if he has that bad a reading problem, we would discharge him administratively.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, you could not keep him long enough to teach him to read?

General PLATT. We are not impressed with the results of the program, Mr. Chairman.

PROJECT TRANSITION

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Marine Corps done in connection with Project Transition during the past year?

General PLATT. During fiscal year 1969, sir, out of 64,000 people who were eligible, 12,800 received counseling and 4,266 received training.

PROJECT REFERRAL

Mr. ANDREWS. What has the Marine Corps done during the past year in connection with Project Referral, and what are your plans for 1971?

General PLATT. At this point in time, we are not doing anything in Project Referral, to the best of my knowledge. I would like to furnish that for the record. I do not think it has firmed up enough for us to do anything.

(The information follows:)

The Marine Corps program is scheduled to become operational in June 1970, and will provide vocational counseling and an automated employment referral service to retiring personnel on a voluntary basis. No additional resources are authorized to implement this program. The Marine Corps will support the pro-

gram by expanding the functions and operations of the existing 21 transition sites. During fiscal year 1971, it is estimated that 6,800 personnel will be eligible for the program.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Addabbo.

ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. ADDABBO. Do you have a figure at which you would be able to supply all your forces through a volunteer system rather than relying on the draft?

General PLATT. As I understand the question, you are contemplating there being no draft at all.

Mr. ADDABBO. Yes.

General PLATT. I think that is very difficult to answer, because I think many things would have to be done in order to achieve a totally volunteer force without any draft.

Mr. ADDABBO. When did the Marine Corps start drawing from the draft to fill its quota?

General PLATT. We were on the draft, of course, in World War II, during Korea, and then at the beginning of our expansion for Vietnam in fiscal year 1965 we went on the draft. Then we went off it during fiscal years 1966 and 1967. We went back on in fiscal year 1968, principally in order that we could have a level monthly input every month. We have been on it sporadically ever since that time, not only for reasons of a level input, but also because of the derogation in the recruiting climate.

EFFECT OF DRAFT ON DISCIPLINE

Mr. ADDABBO. Has any study been made relative to the discipline problem with relationship to the input from the draft?

General PLATT. Not with regard to the draft. We have made no such study.

I would make an estimate that it has not enlarged our disciplinary problems.

Mr. ADDABBO. You could determine the discipline problems for the years that you had no draftees and you could then make a comparison of the past 4 years of your disciplinary problems when you had draftees. Also, could you consider, this in connection with some of our riot problems?

General PLATT. We have related none of that to the draft.

Mr. ADDABBO. Could a study be made to see if there is a possible relationship?

General PLATT. Yes, sir, we could undertake such a study. I think probably as an exploratory measure, it might be a good idea just to check what we have in terms of the disciplinary rate for inductees and noninductees on a sample basis.

I know, for example, from talking to drill instructors at Parris Island, that the draftee performs very well, and he does also in combat.

(The information follows:)

EFFECT OF DRAFT ON MARINE CORPS DISCIPLINE

Disciplinary statistics available at Headquarters, USMC, include data on the number of volunteers and inductees receiving various punitive, general and undesirable discharges and comparative deserter statistics. Information on less serious disciplinary actions, such as non-judicial punishment is not available here.

An examination of this data reveals that, in general, there is no significant difference in disciplinary rates between inductees and volunteers, except in the case of desertions. The proportion of inductees who desert is higher than volunteers who desert. Inductees, who made up 4.1% of the total force, on the average, in 1966–69, accounted for 18.2% of the desertions during this period.

The table below portrays available disciplinary rates of inductees as compared to volunteers during the period FY66–69.

COMPARATIVE DISCIPLINARY STATISTICS VOLUNTEER AND INDUCTEE 4-YEAR AVERAGE (FISCAL YEARS 1966–69)

[Rate per thousand [1]]

	Total	Volunteer	Inductee [2]
General discharges	7.77	7.75	9.11
Undesirable discharges	4.22	4.30	2.90
Bad conduct discharges	3.58	3.61	3.45
Dishonorable discharges	.05	.03	.02
Net desertions	3.67	3.15	16.35

[1] This rate is the number per thousand of the population in each category—total, volunteer, or inductee.
[2] During this period of time, inductees composed 4.1 percent of the average enlisted strength.

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Minshall?

INCOME TAX EXCLUSION

Mr. MINSHALL. Under certain rules and regulations of the tax laws, certain members of the Military receive an income-tax exclusion. Are you familiar with that?

General PLATT. Yes.

Mr. MINSHALL. We had some amazing examples when the Air Force was up here. Rather than having actual service time in Vietnam, some servicemen just overflew Vietnam or maybe went there just for the weekend on leave, but that gave them the advantage of the income-tax exclusion.

Are you familiar with any taking advantage of the situation, as it were, in the Marine Corps? Some of these tax exclusions amounted to $5,000 or $6,000 just for a weekend in Vietnam. That is pretty good going, if you can get it.

General PLATT. We feel strongly about this. We have a Marine Corps regulation on temporary duty in Vietnam which specifies, for example, that you complete that temporary duty within a period of 1 month, and it does not carry over into a second month. Our senior commander in the Pacific requires his Chief of Staff to personally approve any temporary duty orders to extend into a second month.

Mr. MINSHALL. Let me read this to you. I would like your comment on it. I will quote from a memorandum I have here. It says:

> A "reenlistment incentive" flight had operated to carry personnel to either Bangkok, Thailand, or Danang, Vietnam. It appears that the flight normally operated between Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), Iwakuni, Japan, and Bangkok, stopping en route at the Marine Corps Air Facility (MCAF), Futema, Okinawa, and Cubi Point Naval Air Station (NAS), Republic of the Philippines. On one occasion, the flight stopped at Hong Kong en route to Danang.
>
> The enlisted career counselor at MCAF, Futema, received messages dispatched from MCAS Iwakuni which provided the itinerary for the flight and allocated a number of seats on the plane to various Marine Corps organizations on Okinawa.

In this memorandum I have, it is noted that on just one flight 14 members were authorized tax exclusions. Supposedly one of the purposes of this flight was to fly Marines to either Vietnam or Thailand for the weekend to reenlist so that their reenlistment bonus would then be tax exempt.

Are you familiar with this?

General PLATT. No, sir. I know of no such flight for that specific purpose.

Mr. MINSHALL. This is what the end result was.

General PLATT. I would be glad to look into it. I would like very much to.

(Off the record.)

Mr. MINSHALL. That is all I have.

Mr. DAVIS. Nothing at this time.

MARINE CORPS PHOTOGRAPHERS IN VIETNAM

Mr. WYMAN. General, have you any photographers in the field?

General PLATT. Yes.

Mr. WYMAN. Have you any civilian photographers?

General PLATT. You mean civilian employees of the Marine Corps?

Mr. WYMAN. Yes; in Vietnam.

General PLATT. We have no civilian employed photographers in Vietnam that I know of, paid out of Marine Corps funds.

Mr. WYMAN. Have you any experiences with photographers taking pictures when they were on duty which involved republication when they came back to the United States of pictures which they kept as in the My Lai incident?

General PLATT. I am not familiar with any as far as the Marine Corps is concerned. I know of none.

COST OF AIR TRAVEL TO VIETNAM

Mr. WYMAN. At page 364, in terms of travel of military personnel, it is indicated that rotation travel to and from Vietnam, if via commercial, is $320; and if via MAC, it is $92. By far the greatest proportion go military. Is that a fair comparison between the cost commercially and the cost of flying the individual in a military aricraft?

General PLATT. That was correct in 1970. Of course, in 1971 we find a reversal, where the MAC rate goes up to $129 and the commercial rate stays at $125.

Mr. WYMAN. Then there is another item, under D, Special Airlift, $148.12; 83,000 went that way. What was the special airlift?

General PLATT. The special airlift were flights contracted by MAC from civilian forces to meet our specific requirements.

Mr. WYMAN. Why did the MAC estimate in 1971 go up to $129 from $92?

General PLATT. That was a rate increase furnished to us by MAC.

Mr. WYMAN. And no justification was given to you?

General PLATT. No, sir. I can explain that, really. This, of course, involves travel throughout the world. As we reduce the number of people in the western Pacific, we have fewer interarea moves, which cause the aggregate rate to go up. It is not just the cost of moving one man. It is a composite rate. That is the reason for that rate going up.

The same thing would apply to commercial air. You may not be costing the same distance in making that comparison. In fact, I am almost sure you are not.

Mr. WYMAN. Your special airlift contract states the same figure, $148, would apply.

General PLATT. Yes, because of the nature of those flights, there would not be a change in the rate.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS. Now we will hear from Brig. Gen. Charles F. Widdecke, who will speak in connection with the "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps" request. At this point in the record we will insert the appropriate summary justification tables.

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 21

Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Marine Corps Reserve and the Marine Corps platoon leaders class on active duty under Section 265 of Title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law: $54,100,000
[$45,000,000]

(10 U.S.C., 683, 1475-80, 6081-86, 6148; 37 U.S.C. 204, 206, 301, 305, 309, 402-04, 415-18, 1002; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970; additional authorizing legislation to be proposed.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Program and Financing Summary (In thousands of dollars)

	Identification Code 07-05-1108-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct Program:			
	1. Reserve component personnel	34,714	46,900	52,100
	2. Reserve officer candidates	1,643	2,100	2,000
	Total direct program	36,357	49,000	54,100
	Reimbursable (total)	87	150	150
10	Total obligations	36,444	49,150	54,250
	Financing:			
	Receipts and reimbrusements from:			
11	Federal funds	-60	- 100	- 100
14	Non-Federal sources[1]	-27	- 50	- 50
25	Unobligated balance lapsing	193	....	.....
	Budget authority	36,550	49,000	54,100

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Program and Financing Summary (In thousands of dollars) - continued

Identification Code 07-05-1108-0-1-051		1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
	Budget authority:			
40	Appropriation	36,550	45,000	54,100
44.30	Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	.....	4,000	.....
	Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71	Obligations incurred, net	36,357	49,000	54,100
72	Obligated balance, start of year	2,147	4,444	5,444
74	Obligated balance, end of year	-4,444	-5,444	-7,544
77	Adjustments in expired accounts	458	.....	.....
90	Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	34,518	44,260	51,740
91.30	Outlays from military pay act supplemental	.....	3,740	260

1 Reimbursements from Non-Federal sources are derived from sale of clothing to regular Marine Corps personnel (10 USC 7601).

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
RESERVE PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

Object Classification (In thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-1108-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Direct Obligations:			
11.7 Personnel compensation: Military Personnel	27,794	35,952	38,382
12.0 Personnel benefits, Military Personnel	2,450	2,748	2,937
21.0 Travel and transportation of persons	2,566	4,516	5,595
26.0 Supplies and materials	3,518	5,728	7,130
42.0 Insurance claims and indemnities	29	56	56
Total direct obligations	36,357	49,000	54,100
Reimbursable obligations:			
26.0 Supplies and materials	87	150	150
99.0 Total obligations	36,444	49,150	54,250

Department of the Navy
Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps

Pay Groups	Paid Drills	Paid Days of Active Duty for training	Category	1969 Actual Begin	1969 Actual Average	1969 Actual End	1970 Estimate Average	1970 Estimate End	1971 Estimate Average	1971 Estimate End
A	48	15	Officer 1/	2,389	2,500	2,584	2,710	2,836	2,899	2,936
			Enlisted	43,143	40,972 2/	40,380 2/	40,920	38,519	38,815	39,136
B	24	15	Officer	160	160	162	160	160	160	160
			Enlisted	38	39	44	43	44	44	44
F	0	90-180	Enlisted	955	2,012	5,908	3,730	5,254	5,797	5,724
Paid Drill Training Sub-Total			Officer	2,549	2,660	2,746	2,870	2,996	3,059	3,096
			Enlisted	44,136	43,023	46,332	44,693	43,817	44,656	44,904
			Total	46,685	45,683	49,078	47,563	46,813	47,715	48,000
D	0	15	Officer	602	602	602	611	611	411	411
			Enlisted	41	41	41	230	230	150	150
E	0	30	Enlisted	187	187	187	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Other Paid Status Sub-Total			Officer	602	602	602	611	611	411	411
			Enlisted	228	228	228	230	230	150	150
			Total	830	830	830	841	841	561	561
Total Paid Status			Officer	3,151	3,262	3,348	3,481	3,607	3,470	3,507
			Enlisted	44,364	43,251	46,560	44,923	44,047	44,806	45,054
			Total	47,515	46,513	49,908	48,404	47,654	48,276	48,561

1/ Includes OCS/TBS Personnel
2/ Includes untrained on board personnel

Summary of Reserve Officer Candidate Strength
(Average Numbers)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
PLC	4,700	5,139	5,020
WOCC	277	277	188
TOTAL	4,977	5,416	5,208

Appropriation Introduction
(In Thousands)

	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
Total Direct Obligations	$36,357	$49,000	$54,100
Net Adjustments	+193	-0-	-0-
Proposed for later transmittal	-0-	-4,000	-0-
Appropriation	$36,550	$45,000	$54,100

The mission of the Marine Corps Reserve is to provide trained units and qualified persons for active duty in the Marine Corps in time of war or national emergency and at such other times as the national security requires. The purpose of the appropriation "Reserve Personnel, Marine Corps" is to maintain an efficient, balanced Marine Corps Reserve component responsive to the initial mobilization requirements of the Marine Corps to expand to a full mobilization force level.

The Fiscal Year 1970 total direct obligations shown include the anticipated supplemental appropriation of $4.0 million due to increased pay costs. The estimated end strength for FY 1970 is 46,813 and the average strength is 47,563.

The FY 1971 budget supports an end strength of 48,000 and an average strength of 47,715. The end strength includes approximately 5,724 at Initial Active Duty for Training.

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS
(In Thousands)

Budget Activity Number	Budget Activity	1969 Actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
1	Reserve Component Personnel	$34,714	$46,900	$52,100
2	Reserve Officer Candidates	1,643	2,100	2,000
	Total Direct Obligations	$36,357	$49,000	$54,100

RPMC SUMMARY - ALL COSTS

	Number	FY 1970 Av Rate	Amount	Number	FY 1971 Av Rate	Amount
1A - Training PGA	42,116	$ 773.65	$32,583,000	40,335	$ 796.16	$32,113,000
1B - Training PGB	203	1,605.91	326,000	198	1,616.16	320,000
1C - Training PGD	841	891.80	750,000	561	937.61	526,000
1D - Training PGF	7,460	1,506.56	11,239,000	11,594	1,476.02	17,113,000
1E - School Training	2,003	817.77	1,638,000	1,617	1,000.00	1,617,000
1F - Special Training	554	312.27	173,000	554	339.35	188,000
1G - Administration & Support			191,000			223,000
Sub-Total Act 1			$46,900,000			$52,100,000
2C - Junior ROTC	3,500	35.14	123,000	4,200	39.28	165,000
2D - Platoon Leaders Class or Reserve Officer Candidates	5,416	365.03	1,977,000	5,208	352.34	1,835,000
Sub-Total Act 2			$2,100,000			$2,000,000
Total Direct Obligations			$49,000,000			$54,100,000

Mr. ANDREWS. For this appropriation the Marine Corps is requesting $54.1 million, an increase of $9.1 million over the amount currently appropriated for 1970. In addition to the $45 million currently appropriated, the justification book indicates you will be requesting a supplemental appropriation of $4 million to cover increased pay costs. If the Congress were to approve the full amount of your supplemental request, then the total appropriation for 1970 would be $49 million.

General Widdecke, have you a statement?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. ANDREWS. We will be glad to have you read it.

GENERAL STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR, MARINE CORP RESERVE

General WIDDECKE. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am Maj. Gen. Charles F. Widdecke, Director, Marine Corps Reserve, and am pleased to appear before you in support of the fiscal year 1971 budget for the appropriation "Reserve personnel, Marine Corps."

The appropriation provides for the pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, per diem, travel and other related costs for Reserve personnel of the Marine Corps, including Reserve officer candidates, Reserve officers assigned to active duty under section 265 of title 10, U.S. Code, and the Marine Corps junior ROTC program.

The current strength of the Organized Marine Corps Reserve is approximately 48,000 officers and men. In addition, we have approximately 159,000 individual reservists available for service in the class III Ready and Standby Reserve. Our total Reserve manpower resources are now approximately 207,000 compared to 162,000 last year.

For fiscal year 1970 we will attain, based on current projections, an end strength of approximately 48,000 and an average strength slightly below the authorization of 49,489. I assure you that every effort is being made to achieve the highest possible average strength.

The fiscal year 1971 plan provides for an average strength of 47,715. While this average strength provides an excellent readiness posture, we will still have to depend in part on class III reservists to fill out our Organized Reserve mobilization requirements. We would eventually like to have the total manpower readily available in the Organized Reserve to further increase our readiness.

The enacted budget for fiscal year 1970 was $45 million. Subsequent to this, it was necessary to submit supplemental requests in the amounts of $4 million for the military pay raise effective on July 1, 1969, for a total of $49 million.

The fiscal year 1971 budget request is for $54.1 million. This is 5.1 million greater than the revised fiscal year 1970 budget. The major portion of the 5.1 million is attributable to an increased average number of new Reserve recruits undergoing their initial active duty for training.

The mission of the Marine Corps Reserve is to provide trained units and qualified individual marines available for active duty in time of war or national emergency and at such other times as the national security requires. In the fulfillment of this mission, the key element in the Organized Reserve is the IV Marine Expeditionary Force. This

Expeditionary Force is a fully structured air/ground team, similar to an active force Marine Expeditionary Force. It is composed of the 4th Marine Division, the 4th Marine Aircraft Wing, and Combat Support and Combat Service Support units.

Equipment for the 4th Marine Division and units which support the Division/Wing Team is on hand or under procurement. During the past year we have made progress in upgrading our equipment posture, in such fields as engineer and motor transport.

The 4th Marine Aircraft Wing continues to have some equipment deficiencies in the capabilities, obsolesence and number of its jet aircraft and helicopters. However, during the past year the Wing has received its full complement of UH–34 helicopters and OV–10A reconnaissance aircraft.

The CH–46 helicopter will be received during the second half of Fiscal Year 1970 as they become available from the active wings. The CH–53 and UH–1E helicopters will be received at a later date as they become available. These new aircraft will make a significant increase in the lift capability available to the IV Marine Expeditionary Force.

Insofar as our current organized reserve posture is concerned, in terms of organization, training and overall preparations for mobilization, it is at its highest state of readiness in history. This state of readiness is the result of our training programs and our continually improving equipment posture.

The Marine Corps Reserve is considered ready and we have the fullest confidence that our Division/Wing Team, along with supporting units, can be deployed to combat within 60 days after mobilization.

Gentlemen, this completes my preparation statement. I will be pleased to endeavor to answer any questions you have about this budget or our programs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, General Widdecke.

I conclude from your statement that you feel good about the posture of the Marine Reserves.

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir, we do feel good about it and feel confident about it.

SHORTFALL IN MARINE CORPS STRENGTH IN 1970

Mr. ANDREWS. In your statement you say that in 1970 you will attain an average strength slightly below the authorized strength of 49,489. What is your latest estimate of average strength level you will attain in 1970?

General WIDDECKE. Our current projection of average strength for fiscal year 1970 is 48,329.

Mr. ANDREWS. Why, in your opinion, will you be unable to attain your authorized strength in 1970?

General WIDDECKE. The authorized strength for 1970, of 49,489, was based on a beginning strength for fiscal year 1970 of 51,000, or a directed end strength for fiscal year 1969 of 51,000. We did not attain that end strength for fiscal 1969 or the beginning strength of 1970 for several reasons.

We were short 2,207. The reasons for our shortage in 1969, which impacted adversely on our beginning 1970 strength, were, first of all,

we received funding assurance for fiscal year 1969 on December 7, 1968, to increase our end strength to 51,000. Based on our projected losses and projected inputs, we would have had to input into the recruit training system 7,400 new recruits, in 2 short months, January and February 1969, to attain not only the 51,000 end strength but also the authorized average strength for fiscal 1969.

Rather than do that, which was an infeasible requirement, 7,400 in 2 months, we elected to have a relatively even input the last 6 months of fiscal 1969. This, coupled with an unforeseen but necessary reduction in the system of new Reserve recruits, 500 each in April, May, and June, resulted in the shortfall of 2,207 in fiscal year 1969 and an adverse impact on beginning 1970.

MARINE CORPS STRENGTH IN 1971

Mr. ANDREWS. If you are unable to attain your authorized strength in 1970, how can you be certain that you will be able to attain your authorized strength for fiscal year 1971?

General WIDDECKE. That is a result primarily of two things, sir.

First, we believe we will end fiscal year 1970 with the proper end strength. Hence, we will be beginning 1971 with the proper beginning strength, which was not the case in the beginning of 1970.

Secondly, the budgetary support in the budget as submitted, $54.1 million, supports the average strength of 47,715 which we have requested, with an end strength of 48,000.

AUTHORIZED PAID STRENGTH

Mr. ANDREWS. Your 1971 budget provides for an average strength in drill pay status of 47,715, plus training tours for 561 personnel in nondrill pay status.

What paid strength have you requested in the authorization bill?

General WIDDECKE. In the authorization bill we have requested an average strength of the Organized Reserve of 47,715, and an end strength of 48,000.

MARINE CORPS REQUEST TO OSD

Mr. ANDREWS. What was the paid strength of the Marine Corps Reserves when you submitted your budget to the Office of Secretary of Defense?

General WIDDECKE. The fiscal 1971 requested authorized strength was 47,715.

Mr. ANDREWS. So you got what you asked for.

General WIDDECKE. Exactly, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. What did you request of OSD in the way of funding?

General WIDDECKE. Our request to OSD in the way of funding was for $54 million. The OSD review provided for a markup of $100,000 for increased per diem. Hence, the submission today is $54.1 million.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, you got more than you requested of OSD?

General WIDDECKE. By $100,000.

Mr. ANDREWS. I don't care what it was, you did get more from OSD?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. You have established a record around here, General, that we have not seen before in many, many years. Congratulations.

(Off the record.)

READINESS POSTURE OF MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Mr. ANDREWS. What is the readiness posture of the Marine Corps Reserves?

General WIDDECKE. Mr. Chairman, in terms of the personnel training and logistics posture, we think it is in the highest state in its history. If I may, I would like to address briefly each of those categories.

Mr. ANDREWS. All right.

General WIDDECKE. Insofar as our personnel in the Organized Reserve, we are now at approximately 48,000 officers and men. Some 14 months ago our strength was 43,873. So, within the past 14 months we have increased the strength approximately 4,000, or 10 percent.

Our training is, we think, effective. This past summer each of the infantry regiments conducted regimental exercises, and these exercises were carefully planned and we have, of course, the normal air-ground participation which is traditional in the Marine Corps.

Mr. MINSHALL. Where did you conduct these exercises?

General WIDDECKE. At Camp LeJeune, N.C., and on the west coast at Camp Pendleton and at Twenty-nine Palms. For example, our artillery regiment, the 14th Marines, was at Twenty-nine Palms for a full 2 weeks of training on essentially an artillery regiment exercise.

We have similar plans for regimental-size and larger exercises this coming summer in June, July, and August, and those will be conducted in accordance with our capabilities at regimental level or above. They will be air-ground exercises as they have been in the past.

These exercises are being essentially planned and will be conducted by the Reserves.

Our equipment posture is improving. On the ground side, for example, we have introduced a program of motor transport equipment replacement which will be completed approximately at the end of this fiscal year, where some 1,400 items of motor transport equipment, on a one-for-one replacement basis, will go into the ground Reserve.

One hundred and seventy-six new, modern pieces of engineer equipment are going into the ground Reserve under this program to be completed this summer.

Insofar as the air side is concerned, as I mentioned in my statement we have in the wing the full authorization of the OV–10A reconnaissance aircraft, which is the same reconnaissance aircraft that the First Marine Aircraft Wing in Vietnam is using.

We have our full authorization of UH–34 helicopters. The authorization is 105, and we have those on hand now.

So, progress is being made in all of these fields.

RESERVISTS WITH ACTIVE DUTY EXPERIENCE

Mr. ANDREWS. What percentage of your reservists have served in the Marine Corps, the Regular Corps?

General WIDDECKE. In our Reserve program we have approximately 12 percent who have had prior service. Also serving with the Regu-

lars in our Reserve program we have another 6 percent of Regular officers and enlisted personnel who are with the Inspector-Instructor and the Marine Air Reserve Training Command Detachment. So, we have approximately 12 percent prior-service personnel connected in the program as an organic part of it, and another 6 percent Regulars on active duty.

Mr. ANDREWS. All your personnel have had prior service?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir, either in the program or connected with it.

EXPLANATION OF MARINE CORPS RESERVE PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Now tell us briefly about your program. A young man volunteers in the Marine Reserve and you accept him. What happens to him?

General WIDDECKE. The new recruit in the Organized Reserve comes under our 6-month training program. He has enlisted for duty in a particular unit. He is sent to one of the recruit depots in either Parris Island, S.C., or the Marine Corps Recruit Depot at San Diego.

He undergoes the same recruit training that members coming into the Regular Marine Corps do.

Mr. ANDREWS. You give him the Parris Island treatment?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir. He is not separated in any way. He is indistinguishable. He is mixed in with the Regular platoons.

Upon completion of that recruit training, which is identical to the Regular Establishment, if he is going into the ground Reserve he goes to infantry training just as a member of the Regular Establishment. If he is going into aviation, he will go from recruit training to an aviation specialist school.

In the case of ground, those who are going to specialist training continue on through whatever the required course is. In some cases the training is completed in 5½ months. In other cases it extends beyond 6 months. In those cases, the man, of course has to volunteer for the additional time of active duty for training beyond 6 months.

Some of that training, as in the case of the Regular Establishment which General Platt mentioned, lasts up to a year.

Mr. ANDREWS. In other words, when he goes in as a reservist, the Marine Corps gives him all the training that a Regular Marine would receive?

General WIDDECKE. It is essentially the same training for his specialty.

Mr. ANDREWS. For all of of them?

General WIDDECKE. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Then special schooling for whatever length of time it takes?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. ANDREWS. When he finishes his schooling, he is released from active duty?

General WIDDECKE. When he finishes his schooling, he is released from active duty, he returns to his unit, and there he participates in what we call in the Reserve the multiple-drill training, four drills once a month, given on one weekend, for a total of 48 drills. He participates in 2 weeks' active duty each year, usually in the summer but not always. That training is exclusive of the travel time.

Mr. ANDREWS. When he finishes the training and goes into the weekly drill program, how long does he serve an obligated tour of duty in the Reserve?

General WIDDECKE. His total obligation, including everything is for 6 years.

WEEKEND DRILLS

Mr. WYMAN. You said four drills a month on one day?

General WIDDECKE. No, sir; one weekend.

Mr. WYMAN. What kind of drills are those on one weekend?

General WIDDECKE. Previously, in the Organized Reserve training, the training was conducted possibly two or four times a month on the weekends. You had the man for a very short time, but you had him more often.

Now we in the Marine Corps, as in the other services, accomplish the training on one full weekend, that is, Saturday morning until Sunday evening. That counts as four drills.

Mr. WYMAN. That complies with the statutory requirement of 48 drills.

General WIDDECKE. Yes.

Mr. WYMAN. What does he do in those four drills, just generally?

General WIDDECKE. Whatever particular training his unit is involved in. For example, In December I was visiting an artillery unit in Spokane, Wash. That particular weekend they were on a field exercise. On that particular weekend another unit in the Pacific Northwest, a tank unit, for example, was on an overnight exercise. The following drill period, a month later, they may well have it on the maintenance of equipment or any other military subject.

Mr. WYMAN. If they go on an overnight exercise, how do you get four drills out of that overnight exercise?

General WIDDECKE. The reason we have the multiple drills is so we can go on overnight training on Saturday night.

Mr. WYMAN. Is there any specified hour limitation to an individual drill?

General WIDDECKE. The four drills normally encompass 16 hours.

QUALITY OF RESERVE TRAINING

Mr. MINSHALL. I sometimes wonder about the Reserve training. Maybe yours is top-drawer and doing a good job, but I know of some units in the other services where they are supposed to be doing all this training and learning so much, but they sit around and read magazines.

How much do you oversee your Reserve training from the Regular end of it?

General WIDDECKE. For each Reserve unit we have a published training schedule. Our Reserve units are inspected for proficiency, not only in training, but in several other ways, such as administration and logistics. They are inspected by their own local commanding officer. They are inspected by our district representatives. They are inspected by Major General Keller, Commanding General of the Fourth Marine Air Wing at Glenview. They are inspected by the staff of Major General Robertson, the Commanding General of the 4th Marine Division Headquarters at Camp Pendleton.

Our Reserve units are inspected on the same basis as Regular units by the Inspector General of the Marine Corps.

Mr. MINSHALL. How frequent are these inspections?

General WIDDECKE. I cannot say a unit is inspected every weekend, but they are given close scrutiny.

In addition to that inspection system, each of the host units for summer training is required to submit to the commandant a training readiness report after the completion of the summer training, to give the full spectrum of their deficiencies as well as their capabilities.

Mr. MINSHALL. Have you ever gone out into the field and talked to some of your reservists, the enlisted type, and asked how they like the training program and what they think of it? You probably scare them into a good answer.

General WIDDECKE. I have talked to a lot of them.

Mr. MINSHALL. I do not know whether they would level with you, with all respect to you. You know how it is with a private talking to a two-star general. Sometimes he does not say what he would like to say.

General WIDDECKE. I think for the most part the Marine, if you approach him right, will level with you. I visited units in training in the 25th Marines in the New England area, our reconnaissance units in the San Antonio area, our 24th Marines who are up and down the Midwest, our tank and artillery units in the Pacific Northwest, and our other infantry regiment on the West Coast, in the field.

Additionlly, our Assistant Commandant, General Walt, when he has the opportunity, visits Marine units. He has visited many of them.

UNITS REQUIRING ADDITIONAL TRAINING

Mr. MINSHALL. You say these units usually grade pretty well. Do you have any units that ever come through unsatisfactory and need additional work, or where you feel the training program has not been just what it should be?

General WIDDECKE. We have had such units, yes.

Mr. MINSHALL. That would be normal. I wonder how many you have had.

General WIDDECKE. That require additional work and that do have training deficiencies and that have personnel deficiencies?

Mr. MINSHALL. How frequent is that in the Marine Corps?

General WIDDECKE. I cannot give you a percentage of the number of units they have reported like that, but there definitely have been some, and we take immediate corrective action. Those reports of deficiencies come from all of the sources that I mentioned to you.

For example, in my visits I have found minor equipment deficiencies which we correct as soon as we can. This is true of anyone who visits Reserve units. Sir, they are not hesitant to report deficiencies.

QUALITY OF RESERVE TRAINING

Mr. MINSHALL. That is all well and good. The reason I ask this question of you is that as I came back from Ohio several months ago, we picked up a passenger at Pittsburgh who sat down next to me, a young reservist. I won't say what kind of unit he was in.

He said, "I just caught this plane. I had to stay here to go to a Reserve class for training." He said, "Boy, is that a waste of time." He

went through and described to me some of the things this unit was not doing.

I had to agree with him.

He never knew who I was.

It worries me that some of these Reserve types are not really doing the job they are supposed to. Maybe you just think they are doing the job.

General WIDDECKE. I do not want to give you the impression that we are not concerned and are not improving our training methods.

Let me give you two examples from each end of the spectrum.

We have a plan now which we are implementing in the Organized Reserve, air and ground, to go on a 5-year training cycle in the Organized Reserve which will formalize even more our control.

At the other end, we are making all the attempts we can to make our training more interesting and more meaningful to the individual reservist so we will get greater participation. Any new or different type equipment that we can put into the program for their use, we do.

Mr. MINSHALL. I will say this about the Marine Corps, your performance here today is outstanding, and you are to be commended for presenting such a fine program.

I do not doubt that, if any of the Reserve programs are good, it would be the Marines'.

(Off the record.)

EQUIPMENT RECEIVED DURING 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. General, what equipment did the Marine Corps Reserve receive from the Marine Corps during calendar year 1969?

General WIDDECKE. If I may, sir, I would like to supply a list of the major items of equipment received in the Organized Reserve, air and ground, for the record.

(The information follows:)

During calendar year 1969, the Marine Corps Reserve (ground) received from the Marine Corps 132 major items of engineer equipment, and 1,191 major items of motor transport equipment for a total of 1,323 new major items of ground equipment as follows:

	Quantity
Engineer items:	
Compressor, 250 CFM	20
Crane, truck mounted	13
Generator, PU–668	20
Generator, PU–669	32
Scoop loader, Euclid	12
Tractor, tracked, Euclid	35
Sub-total	132
Motor transport items:	
Semitrailer, low-bed, 25-ton	22
Semitrailer, low-bed, 60-ton	7
Trailer, ¼-ton, M416B	308
Truck, 2½-ton, M35A2C	449
Truck, 2½-ton, M36A2C	25
Truck, 5-ton, M54A2C	172
Truck, 5-ton, M51A2	58
Truck, ½-ton, platform, M274A2	81
Truck, 2½-ton, tank F, M49A2C	8
Truck, tractor, 5-ton, M52A2	25
Truck, van, 2½-ton, M109A3	2
Truck, wrecker, 5-ton, M543A2	34
Sub-total	1,191
Grand total	1,323

4TH MARINE AIRCRAFT WING

As concerns the aircraft posture, the 4th Marine Aircraft Wing showed considerable improvement during calendar year 1969 as follows:

Type aircraft	Quantity	
	Increased	Replaced
UH-34 helicopter	50	
OV-10A observation	11	
RF-8G reconnaissance	4	
A-4C attack (replace A4A/B)		80
F-8K/L fighter (replace F-8A/B)		75
RF-8G reconnaissance (replace RF-8A)		6
Total	65	161

EQUIPMENT WITHDRAWN DURING 1969

Mr. ADDABBO. Will you also supply, for the record whether or not the Marine Corps withdrew any equipment from the Reserves and, if so, what equipment?

General WIDDECKE. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

During calendar year 1969, the Marine Corps withdrew from the Marine Corps Reserve, 14 major items of engineer equipment, and 17 major items of ordnance equipment, for a total of 31 items as shown below. However, the withdrawal of this equipment had no adverse impact on the training capability or mobilization readiness of the Marine Corps Reserve.

Item	*Quantity*
Engineer:	
Forklift attachment with scooploader	4
Forklift attachment with tractor	2
Compressor (105 CFM)	8
Subtotal	14
Ordnance:	
Howitzer, medium towed—105 millimeters	12
Howitzer, medium towed—155 millimeters	5
Subtotal	17
Grand total	31

INCREASED TRAVEL COSTS

Mr. ADDABBO. On page 4 of your justification, you are showing an increase of $1 million for travel and transportation of persons, from $4,516,000 in 1970 to $5,595,000 in 1971. Comparing your 1971 figure with your 1969 actual, the increase is over $3 million. Why do you require such a substantial increase in travel funds?

General WIDDECKE. Sir, the increase of approximately $3 million is directly related to three factors: The first is the increased average strength of 3,785 new Reserve recruits into the 6-month training program to undergo initial active duty for training. Upon completion of this training the recruit returns to his home Reserve unit to fulfill his military obligation; second, is the travel cost related to the carryover of 5,254 Reserve recruits from fiscal year 1970 who must be re-

turned to their home Reserve unit during fiscal year 1971; and third, are costs related to travel and per diem increases associated with the other programs of the Marine Corp Reserve.

INCREASED COST OF SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS

Mr. ADDABBO. A similar increase holds true in the case of supplies and materials. Your 1969 actual was $2.6 million, your 1970 estimate is $5.7 million, and your 1971 request is $7.1 million. Why is your cost of supplies and materials increasing at such a rapid rate?

General WIDDECKE. The increased cost of supplies and materials is directly related to clothing and subsistence requirements due to the increased average strength of new Reserve recruits, 1,718 in fiscal year 1970 over fiscal year 1969 and 2,067 in fiscal year 1971 over fiscal year 1970, into the 6-month training program. Also, there are increased clothing and subsistence costs within the other programs of the Marine Corps Reserve.

RESERVE ENLISTMENT PROGRAM

Mr. ADDABBO. The increase in the Marine Corps Reserve budget in 1971, can be attributed directly to the increase in pay group F, the Reserve enlistment program. In 1969 you put 6,509 recruits through this training, in 1970 you plan to increase this number to 7,633, and in 1971 you plan to increase the program to 11,055. Would you please explain how this program works?

General WIDDECKE. Planned input to the 6-month training program, pay group F, is governed by the requirement to meet the authorized average and end strengths. Attrition is determined by the number of personnel whose obligated service in our Reserve units will be completed during the fiscal year. An estimate is made of the number of these personnel who will reenlist and of the number of personnel who will join our Reserve units from class III. If an increase or decrease in end strength is required that figure is also included. Based on these figures, our input is determined.

Mr. ADDABBO. Why do you feel it is necessary to increase your input into this program in 1971 by 45 percent?

General WIDDECKE. The planned increase in input for fiscal year 1971 is necessary to meet our planned and programmed authorized average strength of 47,715 and end strength of 48,000. These increases are based on our projected attritions and accessions.

Mr. ADDABBO. Since the active forces are cutting back on the number going through basic training, will your input result in keeping open some training facilities that could otherwise be closed?

General WIDDECKE. No, sir. Reserve recruit training is conducted at the two Marine Corps recruit training facilities, Parris Island and San Diego. Since these two recruit depots will be maintained to train regular Marine Corps recruits, Reserve Marine recruit input will not result in keeping open training facilities that could otherwise be closed.

Mr. ADDABBO. Rather than recruiting nonprior service personnel and then training them, would it be possible to recruit veterans who have already received this training?

General WIDDECKE. The Marine Corps Reserve has had a program for enlistment/retention of prior service personnel for a number of years and has maintained an enlistment/retention rate of 10% to 15% of these personnel. A program continually emphasized and monitored by headquarters, Marine Corps, these prior service personnel have proved invaluable to the Reserve Establishment, not only from their past experiences, but equally importantly, from the vast amount of knowledge these individuals are able to impart to other unit members.

SHORTAGE OF JUNIOR OFFICERS

Mr. ADDABBO. On page 21 of your budget justification, you state that within the IV Marine Expeditionary Force there is a requirement for 1,576 lieutenants, but currently you only have 208. How does this shortage of lieutenants impact on your readiness posture?

General WIDDECKE. The critical shortage of junior officers in the Organized Marine Corps Reserve is recognized and, as set forth in the budget, we are increasing our input into the Organized Marine Corps Reserve Commissioning program from 97 to 150 in fiscal year 1971.

To fill this critical requirement in our units we are utilizing highly qualified staff noncommissioned and noncommissioned officers and, in some cases, officers recently promoted to captain.

Further, we have identified our shortages and in the event of mobilization, will fill these shortages with class III prior service personnel.

Mr. ADDABBO. There being no further questions, General and Admiral, we appreciate your appearance.

THURSDAY, MARCH, 5, 1970.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM W. BERG, DIRECTOR OF MANPOWER AND ORGANIZATION; DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES

MAJ. GEN. EDWARD A. McGOUGH III, DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL PLANNING; DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PERSONNEL

MAJ. GEN. ANDREW S. LOW, JR., DIRECTOR OF AEROSPACE PROGRAMS; DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM F. PITTS, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE AIR FORCE

COL. JEANNE M. HOLM, DIRECTOR OF THE WAF; DCS/PERSONNEL

COL. PERCY JONES, CHIEF, PROGRAMS DIVISION; DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING, DCS/PERSONNEL

COL. CONRAD S. ALLMAN, CHIEF, POLICY DIVISION; DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING, DCS/PERSONNEL

COL. MICHAEL N. PARKER, CHIEF, CENTRAL OPERATING ACTIVITIES BRANCH; DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING, DCS/PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements) and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; [$5,823,000,000] $6,096,000,000.

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

		FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct program:			
	1. Strategic forces	1,410,625	1,415,993	1,336,780
	2. General purpose forces	1,662,008	1,779,155	1,672,934
	3. Intelligence and communications	699,277	742,087	721,741
	4. Airlift and sealift	400,044	393,116	388,221
	5. Guard and reserve	20,688	21,192	19,468
	6. Research and development	183,065	190,942	177,964
	7. Central supply and maintenance	101,422	111,305	108,487
	8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities	1,425,461	1,477,968	1,482,008
	9. Administration and associated activities	171,961	181,262	176,496
	10. Support of other nations	12,653	12,480	11,901
	Total direct program	6,087,204	6,325,500	6,096,000
	Reimbursable (total)	44,430	42,300	42,300
10	Total obligations	6,131,634	6,367,800	6,138,300
	Financing:			
	Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11	Federal funds	- 20,054	- 19,089	- 19,089
14	Non-Federal sources 1/	- 24,376	- 23,211	- 23,211
25	Unobligated balance lapsing	6,396	....	....
	Budget authority	6,093,600	6,325,500	6,096,000

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources are derived from sale of meals and clothing to service members (10 U.S.C. 4621).

		FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	Budget authority:			
40	Appropriation	6,093,600	5,823,000	6,096,000
44.30	Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	....	502,500	....
	Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71	Obligations incurred, net	6,087,204	6,325,500	6,096,000
72	Obligated balance, start of year	150,311	204,803	210,303
74	Obligated balance, end of year	- 204,803	- 210,303	- 225,303
77	Adjustments in expired accounts	- 2,279	....	....
90	Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	6,030,433	5,817,630	6,080,870
91.30	Outlays from military pay act supplemental	....	502,370	130
	Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)			
	Direct obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation:Military personnel	3,886,106	4,038,497	3,891,259
12.2	Personnel benefits:Military personnel	1,695,435	1,761,234	1,697,610
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	164,137	171,616	163,994
22.0	Transportation of things	219,718	227,664	220,560
25.0	Other services	24,319	24,664	23,907
26.0	Supplies and materials	82,916	86,006	83,336
41.0	Grants, subsidies, and contributions	9	9	9
42.0	Insurance claims and indemnities	3,476	4,427	4,291
43.0	Interest and dividends	11,088	11,383	11,034
	Total direct obligations	6,087,204	6,325,500	6,096,000
	Reimbursable obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation:Military personnel	9,632	9,170	9,170
12.2	Personnel benefits:Military personnel	2,110	2,009	2,009
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	67	63	63
22.0	Transportation of things	102	97	97
26.0	Supplies and materials	32,519	30,961	30,961
	Total reimbursable obligations	44,430	42,300	42,300
99.0	Total obligations	6,131,634	6,367,800	6,138,300

Personnel Summary

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
Direct program:			
1. Pay and allowance of officers	$ 1,752,459	$ 1,859,943	$ 1,779,831
2. Pay and allowance of enlisted	3,513,670	3,678,900	3,545,889
3. Pay and allowance of cadets	9,300	11,107	11,915
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	331,798	322,500	310,355
5. Permanent change of station travel	431,477	418,150	414,760
6. Other military personnel costs	48,500	34,900	33,250
Total direct program	6,087,204	6,325,500	6,096,000
Reimbursable program:			
1. Pay and allowance of officers	8,741	7,600	7,600
2. Pay and allowance of enlisted	6,230	5,500	5,500
4. Subsistence of enlisted personnel	29,191	29,000	29,000
5. Permanent change of station travel	268	200	200
6. Other military personnel costs	....	....	....
Total reimbursable program	44,430	42,300	42,300
10. Total obligations	$ 6,131,634	$ 6,367,800	$ 6,138,300

INTRODUCTION

This appropriation finances the cost of the active duty military personnel of the Air Force. For the first time, the program and financing schedule for this appropriation has budget activity classification which are identical to the ten major programs used in the Force and Financial Program for management of the Department of Defense.

Pages 5 through 13, immediately following, provide strength and cost details. Military personnel costs have been allocated to the programs on the basis of the overall average cost per officer manyear and airman manyear. The total costs of Permanent Change of Station Travel are included in the "Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities" program. Costs for the Support of Allies are not separately identified.

Historically, the estimate has been presented in terms of pay, allowances and other costs of the total military personnel program. The associated budget activity structure and the detailed justification demonstrate how the military personnel program is managed and controlled in terms of entitlements, policies and other characteristics. This management responsibility encompasses a wide range of individual items, e.g., grade structure, promotions, gains and losses, flight status, subsistence, PCS travel and other related costs. This extensive data will be found in pages 14 through 98 of this estimate.

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL BY BUDGET ACTIVITY
(End Strengths)

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
Direct program:			
1. Strategic forces:			
Officers	29,855	27,363	27,525
Enlisted	185,221	165,768	160,366
Total	215,076	193,131	187,891
2. General purpose forces:			
Officers	33,683	32,032	29,765
Enlisted	232,635	223,576	201,805
Total	266,318	255,608	231,570
3. Intelligence and communications:			
Officers	14,265	13,632	13,523
Enlisted	97,573	91,536	90,475
Total	111,838	105,168	103,998
4. Airlift and sealift:			
Officers	7,771	7,395	7,653
Enlisted	50,588	48,351	47,506
Total	58,359	55,746	55,159
5. Guard and reserve:			
Officers	840	732	727
Enlisted	1,852	1,600	1,535
Total	2,692	2,332	2,262
6. Research and development:			
Officers	7,641	7,119	6,994
Enlisted	16,095	13,925	13,410
Total	23,736	21,044	20,404

	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
7. Central supply and maintenance:			
Officers	3,601	3,711	3,477
Enlisted	10,287	10,375	9,895
Total	13,888	14,086	13,372
8. Training, medical and other general personnel activities:			
Officers	29,339	30,335	30,474
Enlisted	112,689	104,237	110,701
Academy cadets	3,941	4,151	4,417
Total	145,969	138,723	145,592
9. Administration and associated activities:			
Officers	7,135	6,689	6,621
Enlisted	14,539	14,709	14,265
Total	21,674	21,398	20,886
10. Support of other nations:			
Officers	577	527	541
Enlisted	813	742	723
Total	1,390	1,269	1,264
Total direct program:			
Officers	134,707	129,535	127,300
Enlisted	722,292	674,819	650,681
Academy cadets	3,941	4,151	4,417
Total	860,940	808,505	782,398
Reimbursable program:			
Officers	478	478	478
Enlisted	644	644	644
Total	1,122	1,122	1,122
Total military personnel:			
Officers	135,185	130,013	127,778
Enlisted	722,936	675,463	651,325
Academy cadets	3,941	4,151	4,417
Total	862,062	809,627	783,520

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating Programs				Total
		Operation of the AF	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D AF	R&D Defense Agencies	
1. Strategic Forces	1971	$1,336,780	-	-	-	$1,336,780
	1970	1,415,993	-	-	-	1,415,993
	1969	1,410,625	-	-	-	1,410,625
2. General Purpose Forces	1971	1,672,934	-	-	-	1,672,934
	1970	1,779,155	-	-	-	1,779,155
	1969	1,662,008	-	-	-	1,662,008
3. Intelligence & Communications	1971	682,556	$ 37,280	-	$ 1,905	721,741
	1970	704,388	35,374	-	2,325	742,087
	1969	666,678	30,559	-	2,040	699,277
4. Airlift & Sealift	1971	388,221	-	-	-	388,221
	1970	393,116	-	-	-	393,116
	1969	400,044	-	-	-	400,044
5. Guard & Reserve	1971	19,468	-	-	-	19,468
	1970	21,192	-	-	-	21,192
	1969	20,688	-	-	-	20,688
6. Research & Development	1971	-	-	$177,964	-	177,964
	1970	-	-	190,942	-	190,942
	1969	-	-	183,065	-	183,065

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL OBLIGATIONS
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating Programs				Total
		Operation of the AF	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D AF	R&D Defense Agencies	
7. Central Supply & Maintenance	1971	103,129	5,344	-	14	108,487
	1970	105,824	5,467	-	14	111,305
	1969	96,402	5,007	-	13	101,422
8. Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities	1971	1,482,008	-	-	-	1,482,008
	1970	1,477,968	-	-	-	1,477,968
	1969	1,425,461	-	-	-	1,425,461
9. Administration & Associated Activities	1971	168,084	8,031	-	381	176,496
	1970	172,229	8,634	-	399	~~188,262~~
	1969	163,680	7,954	-	327	171,961
10. Support of Other Nations	1971	11,901	-	-	-	11,901
	1970	12,480	-	-	-	12,480
	1969	12,653	-	-	-	12,653
Total Direct	1971	5,865,081	50,655	177,964	2,300	6,096,000
	1970	6,082,345	49,475	190,942	2,738	6,325,500
	1969	5,858,239	43,520	183,065	2,380	6,087,204

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating Programs: Operation of the AF	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D AF	R&D Defense Agencies	Total	Officer	Enlisted
1. Strategic Forces	1971	187,891	-	-	-	187,891	27,525	160,366
	1970	193,131	-	-	-	193,131	27,363	165,768
	1969	215,076	-	-	-	215,076	29,855	185,221
2. General Purpose Forces	1971	231,570	-	-	-	231,570	29,765	201,805
	1970	255,608	-	-	-	255,608	32,032	223,576
	1969	266,318	-	-	-	266,318	33,683	232,635
3. Intelligence & Comm	1971	99,292	4,539	-	167	103,998	13,523	90,475
	1970	100,363	4,591	-	214	105,168	13,632	91,536
	1969	107,470	4,161	-	207	111,838	14,265	97,573
4. Airlift & Sealift	1971	55,159	-	-	-	55,159	7,653	47,506
	1970	55,746	-	-	-	55,746	7,395	48,351
	1969	58,359	-	-	-	48,359	7,771	50,588
5. Guard & Reserve	1971	2,262	-	-	-	2,262	727	1,535
	1970	2,332	-	-	-	2,332	732	1,600
	1969	2,692	-		-	2,692	840	1,852
6. Research & Development	1971	-	-	20,404	-	20,404	6,994	13,410
	1970	-	-	21,044	-	21,044	7,119	13,925
	1969	-	-	23,736	-	23,736	7,641	16,095
7. Central Supply and Maintenance	1971	12,966	405	-	1	13,372	3,477	9,895
	1970	13,669	416	-	1	14,086	3,711	10,375
	1969	13,477	410	-	1	13,888	3,601	10,287

ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL MANPOWER
BY BUDGET ACTIVITY (FYDP PROGRAM) AND BY OPERATING PROGRAM
(End Strengths)

Budget Activity (FYDP Program)	Fiscal Year	Operating Programs: Operation of the AF	Operation of Defense Agencies	R&D AF	R&D Defense Agencies	Total	Officer	Enlisted
8. Training, Medical and Other General Personnel Activities	1971	145,592	-	-	-	145,592*	30,474	110,701
	1970	138,723	-	-	-	138,723*	30,335	104,237
	1969	145,969	-	-	-	145,969*	29,339	112,689
9. Administration and Associated Activities	1971	20,114	740	-	32	20,886	6,621	14,265
	1970	20,626	740	-	32	21,398	6,689	14,709
	1969	20,819	823	-	32	21,674	7,135	14,539
10. Support of Other Nations	1971	1,264	-	-	-	1,264	541	723
	1970	1,269	-	-	-	1,269	527	742
	1969	1,390	-	-	-	1,390	577	813
Reimbursable Program	1971	1,122	-	-	-	1,122	478	644
	1970	1,122	-	-	-	1,122	478	644
	1969	1,122	-	-	-	1,122	478	644
Total Program	1971	757,232	5,684	20,404	200	783,520*	127,778	651,325
	1970	782,589	5,747	21,044	247	809,627*	130,013	675,463
	1969	832,692	5,394	23,736	240	862,062*	135,185	722,936

* Includes U.S. Military Academy Cadets as follows:

1971	4,417
1970	4,151
1969	3,941

MILITARY PERSONNEL END STRENGTHS BY GRADE

	FY 1969	FY 1970	FY 1971
Officers:			
General	13	13	13
Lieutenant General	43	43	42
Major General	162	158	158
Brigadier General	215	218	217
Colonel	6,613	6,523	6,396
Lieutenant Colonel	16,349	16,085	16,144
Major	29,271	27,833	26,072
Captain	45,289	44,464	44,970
1st Lieutenant	20,601	17,820	17,889
2nd Lieutenant	15,562	16,206	15,467
Sub-total - Commissioned Officers	(134,118)	(129,363)	(127,368)
W-4	1,065	649	409
W-3	2	1	1
Sub-total - Warrant Officers	(1,067)	(650)	(410)
Total Officers	135,185	130,013	127,778
Airmen:			
E-9 - Chief Master Sergeant	7,238	6,752	6,513
E-8 - Senior Master Sergeant	14,495	13,505	13,026
E-7 - Master Sergeant	46,724	48,145	48,000
E-6 - Technical Sergeant	87,967	86,971	87,010
E-5 - Staff Sergeant	158,270	160,369	157,006
E-4 - Sergeant	183,772	176,643	163,260
E-3 - Airman First Class	148,074	128,490	108,965
E-2 - Airman	58,310	41,435	55,100
E-1 - Airman Basic	18,086	13,153	12,445
Total Airmen	722,936	675,463	651,325
Academy Cadets	3,941	4,151	4,417
Total Program	862,062	809,627	783,520
Less Reimbursables	- 1,122	- 1,122	- 1,122
DIRECT PROGRAM	860,940	808,505	782,398

GAINS AND LOSSES BY TYPE FOR OFFICER, AIRMEN AND CADETS

OFFICERS:	FY 1969	FY 1970	FY 1971
Beginning Strength	139,600	135,185	130,013
Gains:			
Regulars from Academies	691	756	718
Officer Training School, Airmen Education and Commissioning Program	4,760	5,449	4,646
Call to Active Duty	7,144	7,512	7,686
Gain Adjustment	184	306	-
Total Gains	12,779	14,023	13,050
Losses:			
Separation of Medical Officers	3,376	3,194	2,436
Contract and Obligation Termination	4,453	4,120	5,876
ANG & Reserve Call-up	1,845	-	-
Early Release	(1,135)	(1,145)	-
Separation of Career Reserves	1,388	1,298	944
Retirements (Over 20 Years)	4,362	8,383	4,271
Normal Attrition	1,107	1,266	1,151
Promotion Passovers	400	924	607
Berry Medical Plan	153	-	-
Loss Adjustments	110	10	-
Total Losses	17,194	19,195	15,285
End Year Strength	135,185	130,013	127,778

GAINS AND LOSSES BY TYPE FOR OFFICER, AIRMEN AND CADETS

	FY 1969	FY 1970	FY 1971
AIRMEN:			
Beginning Strength	761,507	722,936	675,463
Gains:			
Enlistments			
Prior Service	1,010	1,560	7,358
Non-Prior Service-Male	112,970	68,588	90,064
WAF	3,894	4,380	4,000
Officer Training School Program	5,046	5,070	4,501
Recall - Reserves	145	192	195
Reserves - USAFA Prep. School	128	173	130
Returned from Dropped from Rolls	539	318	300
Adjustment - Reserve Call-up	17	-	-
Gain Adjustments	4,706	843	-
Total Gains	128,455	81,124	106,548
Losses:			
Separation or Expiration of Term of Service or Normal Early Release	43,919	33,788	87,191
Programmed Early Release	62,820	48,215	-
To Commissioned Officers	4,761	5,449	4,646
Retirements (Over 20 Years)	16,595	19,269	19,692
Attrition	22,865	21,482	19,157
Air National Guard and Reserve Demobilization	12,178	-	-
Loss Adjustments	3,888	394	-
Total Losses	167,026	128,597	130,686
End Year Strength	722,936	675,463	651,325
ACADEMY CADETS:			
Beginning Strength	3,652	3,941	4,151
Gains:			
Input	1,400	1,359	1,359
Losses:			
Graduates	679	741	677
Attrition	432	408	416
Total Losses	1,111	1,149	1,093
End Year Strength	3,941	4,151	4,417

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY BUDGET PROGRAM
(In Thousands of Dollars)

TITLE (1)	FY 1969 Actual (2)	FY 1970 Estimate (3)	FY 1971 Estimate (4)
DIRECT PROGRAM			
Pay and Allowances of Officers	$ 1,752,459	$ 1,859,943	$ 1,779,831
Pay and Allowances of Enlisted	3,513,670	3,678,900	3,545,889
Pay and Allowances of Cadets	9,300	11,107	11,915
Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel	331,798	322,500	310,355
Permanent Change of Station Travel	431,477	418,150	414,760
Other military personnel costs	48,500	34,900	33,250
Total direct program	$ 6,087,204	$ 6,325,500	$ 6,096,000
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM			
Pay and Allowances of Officers	$ 8,741	$ 7,600	$ 7,600
Pay and Allowances of Enlisted	6,230	5,500	5,500
Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel	29,191	29,000	29,000
Permanent Change of Station Travel	268	200	200
Total reimbursable program	$ 44,430	$ 42,300	$ 42,300
TOTAL PROGRAM			
Pay and Allowances of Officers	$ 1,761,200	$ 1,867,543	$ 1,787,431
Pay and Allowances of Enlisted	3,519,900	3,684,400	3,551,389
Pay and Allowances of Cadets	9,300	11,107	11,915
Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel	360,989	351,500	339,355
Permanent Change of Station Travel	431,745	418,350	414,960
Other military personnel costs	48,500	34,900	33,250
Total Obligations	$ 6,131,634	$ 6,367,800	$ 6,138,300

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 23

SUMMARY OF MILITARY PERSONNEL STRENGTH

	FY 1969 Actual		FY 1970 Planned		FY 1971 Planned	
	Man-Years	End Strength 30 June 1969	Man-Years	End Strength 30 June 1970	Man-Years	End Strength 30 June 1971
DIRECT PROGRAM						
Officers	137,186	134,707	132,569	129,535	128,622	127,300
Enlisted	744,158	722,292	700,316	674,819	661,956	650,681
Academy Cadets	3,449	3,941	3,724	4,151	3,974	4,417
Subtotal	884,793	860,940	836,609	808,505	794,552	782,398
REIMBURSABLE PROGRAM 1/						
Officers	474	478	478	478	478	478
Enlisted	644	644	644	644	644	644
Subtotal	1,118	1,122	1,122	1,122	1,122	1,122
TOTAL PROGRAM						
Officers	137,660	135,185	133,047	130,013	129,100	127,778
Enlisted	744,802	722,936	700,960	675,463	662,600	651,325
Academy Cadets	3,449	3,941	3,724	4,151	3,974	4,417
TOTAL	885,911	862,062	837,731	809,627	795,674	783,520

1/ Military personnel assigned to agencies outside of Department of Defense on a reimbursable basis under the provisions of 10 USC 8230 (Air Force).

PROGRAM: Pay and Allowances of Officers

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Basic Pay	$ 1,240,919	$ 1,347,510	$ 1,300,626
Incentive Pay	162,079	152,306	145,727
Special Pay	28,913	28,778	29,064
Basic Allowance for Quarters	135,467	128,473	123,194
Basic Allowance for Subsistence	79,094	76,444	74,176
Station Allowances, Overseas	12,822	11,412	10,851
Uniform Allowance	3,073	3,541	3,177
Family Separation Allowance	7,330	6,443	6,132
Separation Payments	34,170	51,849	35,001
Social Security Tax - Employer's Contribution	47,800	49,121	47,701
Missing in Action & Prisoner of War (80 Stat. 625)	9,533	11,666	11,782
Total Obligations	$ 1,761,200	$ 1,867,543	$ 1,787,431
Less Reimbursements	8,741	7,600	7,600
Total Direct Obligations	$ 1,752,459	$ 1,859,943	$ 1,779,831

PROGRAM: Pay and Allowances of Enlisted Personnel

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Basic Pay	$ 2,520,071	$ 2,726,973	$2,614,124
Incentive Pay	33,566	30,543	29,879
Special Pay	80,861	73,991	65,431
Proficiency Pay	44,923	51,235	46,714
Reenlistment Bonus	76,976	89,471	104,267
Basic Allowance for Quarters	402,943	370,338	359,130
Family Separation Allowance	23,034	19,858	18,329
Station Allowances, Overseas	39,770	33,587	30,998
Clothing Allowances	81,261	66,641	68,204
Separation Payments	100,152	90,856	83,939
Social Security Tax - Employer's Contribution	115,943	130,477	129,936
Missing in Action & Prisoner of War (80 Stat. 625)	400	430	438
Total Obligations	$ 3,519,900	$ 3,684,400	$3,551,389
Less Reimbursements	6,230	5,500	5,500
Direct Obligations	$ 3,513,670	3,678,900	$3,545,889

PROGRAM: Pay and Allowances of Cadets

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Academy Cadets.....	$ 9,300	$ 11,107	$ 11,915
Total Direct Obligations	$ 9,300	$ 11,107	$ 11,915

PROGRAM: Subsistence of Enlisted Personnel

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Basic Allowances for Subsistence.....	$ 249,095	$ 227,845	$ 219,824
Subsistence in Kind.....	82,703	94,655	90,531
Total Direct Obligations.....	331,798	322,500	310,355
Plus: Reimbursements.....	29,191	29,000	29,000
Total Obligations.....	360,989	351,500	339,355

PROGRAM: Permanent Change of Station Travel

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title (1)	FY 1969 Actual (2)	FY 1970 Estimate (3)	FY 1971 Estimate (4)
Accession Travel	$ 14,013	$ 11,154	$ 13,018
Training Travel	17,983	20,817	22,724
Operational Travel Between Duty Stations	41,431	47,653	42,636
Rotational Travel to and from Overseas	300,756	289,218	288,861
Separation Travel	50,044	44,907	41,883
Travel of Organized Units	7,518	4,601	5,838
Total Obligations	$ 431,745	$ 418,350	$ 414,960
Less: Reimbursements	268	200	200
Total Direct Obligations	$ 431,477	$ 418,150	$ 414,760

PROGRAM: Other Military Personnel Costs

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT
(In Thousands of Dollars)

Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Apprehension of Air Force Deserters, Absentees, and Escaped Military Prisoners.....	$ 175	$ 175	$ 175
Interest on Uniformed Services Savings Deposits.....	11,088	11,024	10,595
Death Gratuities.....	3,476	3,685	3,479
Servicemen's Group Life Insurance.....	33,761	20,016	19,001
Total Direct Obligations	$ 48,500	$ 34,900	$ 33,250

Mr. MAHON. I have asked a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Frank Evans, to chair the committee today, as I will be in and out of the committee room.

Mr. Evans, you may proceed.

Mr. EVANS. This morning we begin consideration of the Air Force's military personnel budget request.

For this appropriation, the Air Force is requesting $6,096 million.

The appropriation for fiscal year 1970 for "Military Personnel, Air Force" is $5,823 million. We note that, in addition, you will be asking for a supplemental appropriation of $502,500,000 to cover pay act costs. If the Congress were to approve the full amount of the supplemental, then the total appropriation for 1970 would be $6,325,500,000. Therefore, your request actually reflects a decrease of $229,500,000 below the planned level for 1970.

We are pleased to have with us this morning to discuss this request Major General Berg, director of manpower and organization, and Major General McGough, director of personnel planning.

We welcome you and all of your supporting witnesses.

General Berg, I note that you have a prepared statement. Will you please proceed.

STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR, MANPOWER AND ORGANIZATION

Mr. BERG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is a privilege to appear before this committee again to discuss the Air Force manpower program. Since my appearance here last year, sizable and dramatic reductions in manpower have been made in fiscal year 1970; and more are programed for fiscal year 1971. These changes have had an impact on our force structure, our organization, our bases, and on all of our major programs.

As the director of manpower and organization, it is my responsibility to translate the approved Air Force program into manpower requirements and to allocate the manpower resources which are made available to us to accomplish the Air Force mission. As you know, our manpower program is the basis for computing personnel costs in the annual budget.

The budgetary constraints which have caused the rapid drawdown of our manpower resources have presented us with some unique and pressing challenges in manpower management.

Although this hearing is concerned principally with military personnel, as in the past, my statement will cover our total manpower program—civilian as well as military.

I will begin by reviewing the fiscal year 1970 program presented last year and discuss some of the major adjustments which have been made since that time. Then, from the revised end of fiscal year 1970 position, I will cover the program for fiscal year 1971.

Following my statement, General McGough will discuss the effect of the manpower program on the personnel budget.

FISCAL YEAR 1970 MANPOWER PROGRAM

Last year I reported that the fiscal year 1970 budget was based on a manpower program that would decrease from 1,219,365 at the end of fiscal year 1969 to 1,207,997 at the end of fiscal year 1970. Table I

shows the fiscal year 1970 total program presented to you last year. This represented a decrease of 7,400 military and 3,968 civilian authorizations totaling 11,368. The differences were programed primarily as a result of reductions in B–52 squadrons, European support forces, air defense ground environment, and military training as well as a percentage reduction in civilian strength based on increased productivity of employees.

TABLE I.—FISCAL YEAR 1970 MANPOWER PROGRAM PROJECTIONS PRESENTED DURING HEARINGS ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 BUDGET

	End fiscal year 1969 projection	End fiscal year 1970 projection	Net fiscal year 1970 change
Military:			
Officers	133,800	135,000	+1,200
Airmen	730,926	722,049	−8,877
Cadets	3,874	4,151	+277
Total military	868,600	861,200	−7,400
Civilian:			
Direct hire	325,930	322,088	−3,842
Indirect hire	24,835	24,709	−126
Total civilian	350,765	346,797	−3,968
Aggregate	1,219,365	1,207,997	−11,368

(a) Direct hire includes both U.S. and non-U.S. citizens who are paid by the United States directly.

(b) Indirect hire are non-U.S. personnel hired by contract with foreign governments. Determination as to whether we will use direct hire is made by agreement with host country.

The next table, table II, shows the adjustments made to the fiscal year 1970 program. The first column shows the projection for end fiscal year 1970 that was made last year. The middle column shows the current projection for end fiscal year 1970. The aggregate indicates an end authorized strength of 1,139,739. Of this number, 809,627 are military and 330,112 are civilian. The reduction of 51,573 military and 16,685 civilians represents broad and varied changes. In an effort to meet the constraints of the fiscal year 1970 budget, a manpower reduction of approximately 15 percent in most of our command elements above the wing level was made. This action was taken to minimize to the greatest extent possible the impact upon our operational forces. As a result of the declining level of conflict in Southeast Asia, we made adjustments in the continental U.S.-based general purpose forces. We will maintain these forces at a sufficient level to support our overseas requirements and to meet contingency situations.

Extensive adjustments were made in our strategic defensive forces. Over 14,000 total authorizations were reduced in this area. Other significant changes were made in our force structure including the accelerated phaseout of the B–58 and the withdrawal of the last C–124 aircraft from the active airlift squadrons. We realined, consolidated, and reduced in many additional activities throughout the Air Force.

This included some base closures and some major organizational changes.

TABLE II.—MANPOWER PROGRAM PROJECTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

	End fiscal year 1970 projected in fiscal year 1970 budget	Current end fiscal year 1970 projection	Net change to fiscal year 1970 program
Military:			
Officers	135,000	130,013	−4,987
Airmen	722,049	675,463	−46,586
Cadets	4,151	4,151	
Total military	861,200	809,627	−51,573
Civilian:			
Direct hire	322,088	309,396	−12,692
Indirect hire	24,709	20,716	−3,993
Total civilian	346,797	330,112	−16,685
Aggregate	1,207,997	1,139,739	−68,258

FISCAL YEAR 1971 MANPOWER PROGRAM

Table III summarizes the Air Force manpower program for fiscal year 1971. The authorized military strength will be about 783,520, which is an additional reduction of 26,107 from the adjusted fiscal year 1970 strength. The civilian authorizations of 319,089 reflect a decrease of 11,023. These reductions totaling over 37,000 are chiefly attributable to planned reductions in Southeast Asia and to general support level reductions in the United States.

TABLE III.—MANPOWER PROGRAM AND PROJECTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1971

	Current end fiscal year 1970 projection	End 1971 projection	Net fiscal year 1971 change
Military:			
Officers	130,013	127,778	−2,235
Airmen	675,463	651,325	−24,138
Cadets	4,151	4,417	+266
Total military	809,627	783,520	−26,107
Civilian:			
Direct hire	309,396	299,372	−10,024
Indirect hire	20,716	19,717	−999
Total civilian	330,112	319,089	−11,023
Aggregate	1,139,739	1,102,609	−37,130

Table IV summarizes the transactions by program which account for the net changes in military manpower between the fiscal year 1970 and the fiscal year 1971 programs.

TABLE IV.—ESTIMATED CHANGES IN THE MILITARY MAN POWER PROGRAM BETWEEN END OF FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

	Current end fiscal year 1970 projection	End fiscal year 1971 projection	Net change
Strategic forces	193,131	187,891	−5,240
General purpose forces	255,608	231,570	−24,038
Intelligence and communications	105,168	103,998	−1,170
Airlift and sealift	55,746	55,159	−587
Guard and reserve forces	2,332	2,262	−70
Research and development	21,044	20,404	−640
Central supply and maintenance	14,086	13,372	−714
Training, medical and other general personnel activities	138,723	145,592	+6,869
Administrative and associated activities	22,520	22,008	−512
Support of other Nations	1,269	1,264	−5
Total Air Force	809,627	783,520	−26,107

I shall cover briefly, some of the most significant adjustments in these programs.

STRATEGIC FORCES

As in the past several years, manpower for our strategic forces continues to decline. There is a net reduction of approximately 4,000 military authorizations in strategic offensive forces. Principal actions accounting for the reductions are changes in our force structure for B–52 aircraft, reduced flying hours for the KC–135 and decreases in base operating support.

In strategic defensive forces, there is a net decrease of approximately 1,300 military spaces resulting primarily from the phase out of additional defensive radars.

GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES

The greatest net reduction is in our general purpose forces. There is a decrease of over 24,000 military authorizations in this program. Manpower losses associated with the phase out of some F–100, F–105, F–102, C–123, and EC–121 units are offset somewhat by manpower increases for A–7 and F–111 units. There are additional reductions in other activities including extensive decreases in base operating support.

INTELLIGENCE, COMMUNICATIONS, WEATHER AND RESCUE

Net reductions of about 1,200 military authorizations occur in this program. There are increases for air traffic controllers and in manpower associated with the transfer of C–130B aircraft from general purpose forces. There are reductions in cryptologic and mapping and charting activities, in SEA communications support and as a result of the sale of the Alaskan Communications Systems to RCA.

TRAINING, MEDICAL AND OTHER PERSONNEL ACTIVITIES

This program is the only one in which manpower adjustments result in a net increase. The net increase is approximately 6,800 spaces. There are reductions in specialized training, professional education, and base operating support. Other actions which added military spaces are increases in recruit training and in the authorized cadet strength of the Air Force Academy. In addition, the Secretary of Defense approved the establishment of a transient account of 7,896 spaces for the Air Force. The transient account is defined as the number of manpower spaces which equate to work-time lost due to travel, leave, and temporary duty during permanent change of station (PCS) moves. The spaces authorized for fiscal year 1971 represent partial funding of the requirement to offset work-time lost due only to travel during PCS moves.

RATED OFFICER REQUIREMENTS

Table V depicts the Air Force pilot and navigator requirements for fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971. It also includes our requirements for flight surgeons. Changes in force structure based on budget decisions have reduced our requirements for pilots. The increase in navigator requirements is based on a crew composition for the F–4/F–111 of one pilot and one navigator in fiscal year 1971 and thereafter.

TABLE V.—RATED OFFICER REQUIREMENTS (LIEUTENANT COLONEL AND BELOW) FISCAL YEARS 1970 AND 1971

Fiscal year	Pilots	Navigators	Flight surgeons	Total
1970	36,249	14,109	968	51,326
1971	35,380	14,237	967	50,584

Comments on our rated officer inventories and training will be made by General McGough.

IMPACT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA ON MANPOWER PROGRAM

Southeast Asia operations continue as a predominant influence on our manpower program. The interplay between combat operational requirements, the accelerated Vietnamization program, and our efforts to withdraw Air Force personnel in keeping with national policy, make for a dynamic and fluid manpower environment at the present time.

In fiscal year 1971, sizeable Air Force reductions will be made in Southeast Asia. The quantity and time-phasing will hinge on the rate of Vietnamization and the level of enemy activity. We are prepared to respond in a timely manner to force structure and basing adjustments in Southeast Asia to insure the most judicious allocation of our manpower resources.

EXTERNAL MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS

Our manpower commitment to activities outside the Air Force is in two categories. First, we have approximately 16,000 military authorizations primarily in other Defense Department activities. Second,

we have approximately 1,100 military authorizations in other governmental agencies such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Agency. Funds for personnel in the latter category are reimbursable. Authorizations in both categories are in our manpower ceilings.

ORGANIZATION

We endeavor to standardize our organizational structure as much as possible consistent with mission requirements, new weapon systems and varying contingencies. Our policy is to organize units during peacetime which can support wartime operations with minimum changes required. We are constantly reviewing our organizational structure to provide for optimum command and control.

One vital consideration in our efforts to reduce manpower this past year was how we are organized. During fiscal year 1970 we have eliminated a number of intermediate headquarters throughout the Air Force. A reduction in our tactical and support forces as a result of an austere budget has made this reduction possible.

In the Strategic Air Command (SAC), we are inactivating the 8th Air Force with headquarters at Westover AFB, Mass. The name of this illustrious unit will be kept on the active status by redesignating the 3d Air Division in Guam as the 8th Air Force. The remaining two numbered Air Force headquarters in SAC are assuming more specialized roles as they absorb the forces previously under 8th Air Force. Fifteenth Air Force will be responsible for all missile and reconnaissance forces while 2d Air Force will have the majority of the bomber and tanker forces.

We have had a major reorganization of the Aerospace Defense Command, eliminating the headquarters of the 1st, 4th, and 10th Air Forces and five air divisions. Six air division headquarters, collocated with the sixth newly created NORAD region headquarters now provide the command and control of our strategic defensive forces.

Three air divisions in the Tactical Air Command and one in Pacific Air Forces were inactivated. We have made other changes of varying size and significance in our continuing evaluation of organizational structures and concepts.

MANPOWER MANAGEMENT

The accelerated reduction of our manpower ceilings has emphasized the essentiality of effective management of our resources. Critical and thorough analyses have been made of our missions and workloads including our forces and our commitments. There is a major effort at all levels to reduce costs and to improve efficiency.

In past years, we have stressed the importance of our management engineering program. This program uses the latest industrial engineering techniques to make accurate determinations of the quantities of manpower and skills required to perform the workloads in the many functions of the Air Force. Because of this program, we have increased confidence in our stated manpower requirements for specific workloads. This, in turn, has facilitated the price-out of manpower costs to be considered in the evaluation of relative priorities.

Except in some instances of arbitrary percentage reduction, such as in headquarters staffs, we have reduced manpower primarily by adjusting or eliminating missions or workloads. This allows us to continue to support effectively our approved forces and to continue to allocate the manpower essential to high priority missions.

We are increasing our efforts in management advisory services. There is a growing need to develop further operating improvements in an era of declining resources.

We are using all the tools and techniques available to us to attain the optimum utilization of our manpower resources.

CONCLUSION

I wish to assure you that the Air Force is dedicated to achieving the maximum mission effectiveness with the minimum cost. In terms of manpower dollars, we will continue to pursue this objective which we realize is imperative especially in this period of greater economic pressures.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement on the Air Force manpower program.

EFFECT OF BUDGET REDUCTION ON NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. WYMAN. May I ask one general question?

General, these are pretty substantial reductions. At page 4 of your statement you refer to a declining level of conflict in Southeast Asia. Did these reductions result from recommendations of the Air Force, or from budgetary restrictions that are imposed on you, regardless of what you think is the best defensive posture for the country?

General BERG. I think the proper answer to that is that the impetus for the reductions came from budgetary restraints.

Mr. WYMAN. Do you think these reductions are compatible with the national security mission of the Air Force?

General BERG. Frankly, I do not feel qualified to answer that question, because when the force reductions are made, my role is simply to price out how many people are saved and what the dollar implications of those savings are.

Mr. WYMAN. When we get to that point, can you tell me who would be qualified to answer that question?

General PITTS. Would you please repeat the question?

Mr. WYMAN. There are a lot of reductions. Do they come from something that the Air Force and the Strategic Air Command tell us they can live with, without relation to the defense posture of the country and without hurting it, or is this something which has been imposed upon you as a part of budgetary cutbacks that you think are perhaps straining the capability of the Air Force to defend the United States of America in both its domestic and overseas role?

General PITTS. As General Berg stated, Mr. Wyman, the reductions are basically from budgetary constraints. The Chief of Staff and the Secretary testified before this committee that there is a degree of risk in any budget because you cannot have all of the money you want, given expenditure ceilings imposed on the Government and competing national priorities within that ceiling.

In this connection, then, you accept a certain degree of risk in any budget, and when that budget is squeezed a little bit, you increase the risk a little bit more.

I do not believe we are constrained to the point that we are endangering national security at this point.

Mr. WYMAN. You do not think at this point the 15-percent force reduction is an unacceptable degree of risk, considering the world situation at this hour?

General PITTS. This was not a 15-percent reduction in the total Air Force. This percentage reduction was limited to various Air Force headquarters.

Mr. WYMAN. To whatever segment it applies, you do not think it is an unacceptable impairment of your capability in terms of the national security at this time? I want to get this clear, because I have to go back to people, and they want to know the answer to this question.

General PITTS. Not at this time; no, sir.

Mr. WYMAN. Thank you.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, General Berg.

BIOGRAPHY OF MAJ. GEN. EDWARD A. MCGOUGH III

General McGough, I believe this is your first appearance before the committee, therefore, at this point in the record we will insert your biographical sketch.

Maj. Gen. Edward A. McGough III, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., on October 3, 1918. He graduated from Towson High School, Towson, Md., in 1936 and served in the U.S. Navy from 1936 to 1939. He attended the Army Air Corps Flying School in 1942 as a USMA cadet and received his pilot wings in December 1942. He graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1943 and entered fighter pilot training. In January 1944, he went with the 474th Fighter Group to the European Theater of Operations where he became a P–38 Fighter Squadron Commander. For combat in the European area he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross with one oak leaf cluster and the Air Medal with 11 oak leaf clusters. In 1945, he attended the Army Command and General Staff School and was subsequently assigned as Operations Officer of the 33d Army Air Force Base Unit where he planned and implemented the establiment of Military Flight Service Centers throughout the United States. He received his master's degree in business administration from Stanford University in 1949 and was subsequently assigned to the Officer Assignment Branch, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Headquarters, USAF.

In 1951, he was selected to attend the Air Command and Staff School. He was next assigned to the 50th Tactical Fighter Wing (F–86) and as a squadron commander deployed the squadron and aircraft from New Mexico to Hahn Air Base, Germany. In December 1954, he became commander of the 36th Fighter Group (F–100) at Bitburg, Germany. He led a gunnery team and was twice selected as the outstanding captain at U.S. Air Forces in Europe gunnery meets. In 1957, he returned to CONUS as Chief of the Fighter Division and Director of Operations at Headquarters, Tactical Air Command (TAC). He was instrumental in the continued development of the F–105 aircraft and other tactical weapon systems. In 1958, he was made Deputy Director of Requirements at Headquarters, TAC. General McGough attended the Industrial College of the Armed Forces in 1960 and in 1961 was assigned as commander, 4510th Combat Crew Training Group, Luke Air Force Base, Ariz. In 1963, he assumed command of the 355th Tactical Fighter Wing (F–105) at George Air Force Base, Calif. He deployed his entire force to McConnell Air Force Base, Kans., while remaining combat ready. He assumed command of the 835th Air Division in June 1965. He planned and directed the rapid deployment of personnel and equipment of a combat-ready tactical fighter wing to Southeast Asia. For exceptionally meritorious service, he was awarded the Legion of Merit. In July 1966, he was assigned as Deputy

Director, Tactical Air Control Center, Headquarters, 7th Air Force, Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) where he was responsible for the out-of-country operations. In August 1966, he was promoted to brigadier general. For exceptionally meritorious service in Southeast Asia, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. Returning to Headquarters, USAF, in August 1967, he was assigned as Deputy Director of Aerospace Programs where he was promoted to major general. General McGough became Director, Personnel Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel, Headquarters, USAF in March 1969.

Mr. EVANS. General McGough, do you have a statement?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVANS. You may proceed.

STATEMENT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL PLANNING

General MCGOUGH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to present the Air Force Military Personnel Appropriation (MPA) request and to report on the progress, accomplishments and problems of the past year.

First I would like to discuss a matter which causes us great concern. The Air Force is making significant reductions in personnel strength during fiscal year 1970 and further reductions are planned for fiscal year 1971. Our concern is for the adverse effect which large, rapid reductions may have upon our ability to attract and retain quality personnel. The most important factor in our national defense is a force of professional, dedicated people.

We can effect reductions in reasonable numbers by control of procurement and by early release of personnel who have indicated a desire to leave the Air Force. These methods have disadvantages however, and are limited in scope. If there are further large reductions in fiscal year 1971 and in the next year, we may be compelled to separate sizable numbers of personnel involuntarily.

To manage sizable force reductions properly, the Air Force needs additional legislative authority. A proposal has been submitted to Congress which, if enacted, would authorize the services to require early retirement of as much as 20 percent of all permanent lieutenant colonels and colonels who have been twice deferred for promotion to the next higher grade. It is important that this authority be granted in the near future.

I will now discuss the fiscal year 1970 program.

MILITARY PERSONNEL PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1970

The program submitted to this committee last year indicated a beginning strength of 868,600 and an end strength of 861,200. This represented a reduction of 7,400.

The fiscal year 1970 program now in operation shows an actual beginning strength of 862,062 and an end strength of 809,627 or a decrease of 52,435. This is the result of the reduction actions that were previously covered in the manpower program presentation.

MILITARY PERSONNEL PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1971

Fiscal year 1971 will also be a year of declining strength with a beginning strength of 809,627 and an end strength of 783,520 for a further decrease of 26,107.

For your convenience, table I portrays in detail the military strengths for fiscal year 1970 and 1971.

TABLE I.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, TOTAL MILITARY STRENGTHS

	Fiscal year 1970, President's budget strengths		Fiscal year 1970, current estimate strengths		Fiscal year 1971, President's budget strengths	
	Beginning	End	Beginning	End	Beginning	End
Officers	133,800	135,000	135,185	130,013	130,013	127,778
Airmen	730,926	722,049	722,936	675,463	675,463	651,325
Cadets	3,874	4,151	3,941	4,151	4,151	4,417
Total	868,600	861,200	862,062	809,627	809,627	783,520

The estimated cost of the current fiscal year 1970 military personnel program is $6.325 billion. The estimated cost for fiscal year 1971 is $6.096 billion. Fiscal year 1971 was computed at the same basic rates used for fiscal year 1970 but makes no provision for any pay raise that might be forthcoming.

I will now cover the individual elements of this appropriation request beginning with the officer program.

The Officer Program

The current fiscal year 1970 officer end strength is programed to be 130,013. This is a reduction of 5,172 from the beginning strength.

For fiscal year 1971 there is an additional decrease of 2,235 bringing us to an end strength of 127,778.

LOSSES

To meet the fiscal year 1970 strength reductions, induced losses were necessary. These were achieved through the following management actions: (1) Voluntary early release of young officers prior to the expiration of their initial periods of obligation; (2) Separation of captains who had twice failed promotion selection to the grade of major; and, (3) Retirement of selected reserve officers.

Table II outlines losses for fiscal years 1969 through 1971.

TABLE II.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OFFICER LOSSES

Type of loss	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 estimate
End of obligation	[1] 6,298	4,120	5,876
Career separation	1,388	1,298	944
Retirements (20 years plus)	4,082	7,968	4,032
Attrition	1,083	1,261	1,150
Medics (all types)	3,376	3,194	2,436
Other losses	857	1,354	847
Total	17,084	19,195	15,285

[1] Includes release of 1,865 ANG and Reserve personnel.

DEFINITION OF TERMS FOR TABLE II

End of obligation: Includes losses at the end of initial service commitment. Six years' service or less.

Career separation: Losses occurring (resignation and request for release) over 6 years of service and less than 20 years of service.

Attrition: Death or physical disability, board action, etc.

Other losses: Includes promotion passovers and warrant officers.

GAINS

The Air Force ROTC program is an important source of officers for the Air Force. We have programed approximately 4,500 officers annually from this source, and we expect to achieve this goal in fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971. However, there has been a decline of approximately 30 percent in the basic course enrollment this academic year. This decline has reduced the selection base from which the academic year 1970–71 junior class must be selected. We believe the decline in enrollment is a result of revision in selective service policies, publicity concerning an all-volunteer force, a number of institutions converting from a compulsory to an elective basic course and the student unrest on college campuses.

Other important parts of our accession program are the officer training school (OTS) program and the opportunity for deserving young airmen and career noncommissioned officers to obtain commissions through our college education and commissioning program. Our total officer procurement, by source, is indicated in table III.

TABLE III.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OFFICER GAINS

	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 estimate
Academies	691	756	718
AFROTC	4,114	4,500	4,500
OTS	4,760	5,449	4,646
Airmen education and commissioning program	(400)	(400)	(400)
Bootstrap commissioning program	(200)	(200)	(200)
Recall and direct appointment	162	200	236
Line officers	(69)	(118)	(101)
Legal officers	(7)	(3)	(15)
Chaplains	(86)	(79)	(120)
Medics	2,868	2,812	2,950
Total	12,595	13,717	13,050

Parentheses indicate inclusion in preceding amounts.

PROMOTIONS

Public Law 89–606, enacted on September 26, 1966, provides increased ceilings in the grades of major through colonel. This law, which is effective through June 30, 1972, has made possible for this period of time a predictable officer promotion pattern and provided a more reasonable promotion opportunity.

Officer promotions for fiscal years 1969 through 1971 are shown in table IV.

TABLE IV.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, OFFICER PROMOTIONS

Promotions to	Fiscal year—		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
General	57	86	59
Colonel	923	1,431	1,005
Lieutenant colonel	2,374	5,339	2,720
Major	3,552	6,378	2,596
Captain	9,434	13,094	10,902
1st lieutenant	14,299	10,452	10,836

Table V shows projected fiscal year 1971 promotion phase points for active duty officers, their promotional opportunities in the primary zone and the earliest phase points for promotion from the secondary zone.

TABLE V.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—OPPORTUNITIES AND PHASE POINTS, FISCAL YEAR 1971

Grade	Opportunity	Primary zone points	Secondary zone points
1st lieutenant	Fully qualified	18 months.	
Captain	do	3 years.	
Major	90 percent [1]	11 years	7th year.
Lieutenant colonel	75 percent [1]	17 years	10th year,
Colonel	50 percent	21 years	12 thyear.[2]

[1] Fully qualified for dental and veterinary promotion categories.
[2] To be promoted to colonel in the 12th year, an officer would have to receive secondary zone promotion to major and lieutenant colonel upon first consideration.

RATED OFFICER PROGRAMS

Table VI shows the actual inventory of rated officers for fiscal year 1969 and the programed inventories for fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

TABLE VI.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—RATED OFFICER INVENTORIES

	Fiscal year—		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Active inventory:			
Pilots	36,611	35,242	35,583
Navigator/observers	14,822	14,108	14,029
Flight surgeons	697	902	852
Total	52,130	50,252	50,464

During fiscal year 1970 we expect to lose some 5,700 pilots and 2,100 navigators from the inventory of those rated officers below the grade of colonel. Over one-half of these losses will be retirements and promotions to colonel which will take these officers out of the rated inventory. We are in a period when retirements of our older rated officers are at a high rate. This high rate will last for the next 3 to 4 years. Our voluntary losses have reduced slightly this year. The navigator inventory, however, will continue to decline even though the production rate is up from fiscal year 1969. We plan to request an increase in navigator production of 200 per year (from 1,000 to 1,200 per year) for the future.

Table VII shows the total Air Force pilot and navigator production for fiscal years 1969 through 1971.

TABLE VII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 estimate
Undergraduate jet pilot production:			
USAF	3,216	3,535	3,867
USMC	118	173	225
ANG	142	145	145
AFRES	0	0	8
MAP (FWMAF) [1]	75	120	120
NASA	7	1	0
Total	3,558	3,974	4,365
Undergraduate navigator production:			
USAF	827	1,000	1,000
ANG	64	60	60
MAP	24	32	50
Total	915	1,092	1,110

[1] Includes free world military armed forces.

Action in Southeast Asia is still causing turbulence in the rated officer force, but it has been reduced this year. The Southeast Asia tour has been maintained at 1 year. In this regard, we are now moving toward compliance with the congressional directive to discontinue by December 31, 1970 prior fixed-wing training of helicopter pilots. The leadtime associated with maintaining a constant flow makes it necessary to request that we continue to train some fixed-wing pilots in helicopters to preclude second Southeast Asia tours for current helicopter pilots.

One of the primary tools in the management of our rated officer resource is the judicious use of the flight waiver provisions of section 614, Public Law 89–213. We are requesting that the waiver provision be continued without change in the fiscal year 1971 Appropriation Act. This provision applies to a group comprised primarily of pilots and navigators who are 45 years of age or over with 22 or more years of rated service and who are performing managerial rather than cockpit duties. These waiver officers remain a viable rated resource as evidenced by the return of many of them to active flying duties to accommodate active rated losses. We are continuing to employ a part of the waivered group in combat operations, supervision, and other rated staff positions. Others are occupying middle and upper management positions in the support and technical fields equally as essential to the Air Force mission. Table VIII indicates the number of flight waivers.

TABLE VIII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FLIGHT WAIVERS

	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 estimate
Flight waivers:			
Pilots	4,857	3,832	3,280
Navigator/observers	1,596	1,185	993
Flight surgeons	59	48	48
Total	6,512	5,065	4,321

VOLUNTARY LOSSES

Last year we spoke of our concern about voluntary losses prior to retirement eligibility. We are continuing to give direct personal assistance to individual officers in developing visible career patterns which show progression through a full career. We are particularly concerned about the voluntary losses of young officers in whom we have a costly training investment. We are troubled about the future and how young officers may react to the phase-down of activity in Southeast Asia, the changes in the draft law, and the attitude in the Nation as pertains to the military. We have been studying actions to be taken to offset a rapid increase in voluntary losses and assure recruitment and retention of high caliber new officers. These actions may involve changes in commitments, revision to the current procedures in management of the regular officer force and pay and allowance entitlements. Some of these actions may involve legislative changes and when the need arises, we will present them to you with the hope of favorable consideration.

This completes the officer program; I will now cover the airman portion of the presentation.

The Airman Program

I will first discuss events that have happened in fiscal year 1970 to the airman program. The current fiscal year program has a reduction of 47,473 from the beginning strength to reach an end strength of 675,463. This was achieved by reducing procurement. The top six grade authorization is 72.9 percent of the total airman strength; consequently, any reduction in total strength has a major impact upon promotions. I will cover this later in my statement.

Fiscal year 1971 will also reflect declining airman strength. We are programed to drop an additional 24,138 airmen to reach an end strength of 651,325. Table I portrays detailed strengths for both fiscal years.

WOMEN IN THE AIR FORCE (WAF)

The number of women in the Air Force is programed to increase and the numbers of career fields and assignments open to them are increasing. This is consistent with equal employment opportunity and the concept of an all-volunteer force. By the end of fiscal year 1971, we have programed an end strength of 9,700 enlisted women. To date 146 out of 340 career ladders are open to the WAF. This is an increase of 69 since fiscal year 1968.

LOSSES

We anticipate losing 128,597 airmen in fiscal year 1970 and 130,686 in fiscal year 1971. Table IX shows our airman losses for 3 fiscal years.

TABLE IX.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—AIRMAN LOSSES

	1969 actual	Fiscal year— 1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Total losses	167,026	128,597	130,686
Attrition	22,865	21,482	19,157
Retirement	16,595	19,269	19,692
To officer status	4,761	5,449	4,646
Other losses [1]	3,888	394	
Non-reenlistment	104,739	82,003	87,191
1st term	(94,500)	(71,320)	(73,868)
Career	(12,239)	(10,683)	(13,323)
ANG/AF Reserve recall	12,178		

[1] Includes adjustment.

GAINS

The bulk of our airman gains is in first term or nonprior service airmen. Table X shows gains by source for 3 fiscal years.

TABLE X.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—AIRMAN GAINS

	Fiscal year—		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Total gains	128,455	81,124	106,548
Nonprior service	112,970	68,588	90,064
WAF	3,894	4,380	4,000
Prior service	1,010	1,560	7,358
OTS	5,046	5,070	4,501
Academy prep	128	173	130
Other [1]	5,245	1,161	300
ANG/AF Reserve recall	162	192	195

[1] Includes returned from dropped from rolls and adjustments.

REENLISTMENTS

Reenlistment rates of first-term airmen for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 were affected by the early release of 37,000 airmen in fiscal year 1969. These were airmen whose normal dates of separation would have been in fiscal year 1970. Table XI shows airman separations and reenlistments.

TABLE XI.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—AIRMAN SEPARATIONS AND REENLISTMENTS

	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Percent	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Percent	Fiscal year 1971 estimate	Percent
Total airmen separated:						
1st term	135,259		117,676		115,041	
Career	114,078		82,150		80,836	
Total	249,337		199,826		195,877	
Separations eligible to reenlist:						
1st term	101,255		78,217		84,318	
Career	77,906		60,173		52,826	
Total	179,161		138,390		137,144	
Reenlistments:						
1st term	15,378	15.2	19,540	25.0	19,813	23.5
Career	66,933	85.9	51,689	85.9	45,378	85.9
Total	82,311	46.0	71,229	51.4	65,191	47.5

Reenlistments are directly influenced by three major incentive programs, these are: Promotions, regular and variable reenlistment bonuses, and proficiency pay. I will discuss these programs beginning with promotions.

PROMOTIONS

We had anticipated promoting about 195,000 airmen to or within the top six grades in fiscal year 1970; however, due to strength reductions, a loss of over 35,000 promotions was sustained. At the time of the reduction, promotion quotas had been issued for the first half of fiscal year 1970; therefore, the full impact was felt in the second half of the fiscal year. To offset promotion stagnation, the Air Force requested and received a change in the DOD mix of top six grades E–4 through E–7. This action resulted in 3,500 more promotions within the grades and somewhat lessened the adverse impact.

During fiscal year 1971, we have programed 134,065 airman promotions to or within the top six grades. This program will provide a promotional opportunity that will be near the level attained in fiscal year 1970.

On June 1, 1970, the Air Force will make its first promotions under the new Weighted Airman Promotion System (WAPS). This system is designed to provide more visibility in the airman promotion selection process and is proceeding on schedule. The majority of eligible airmen completed their required promotion testing. Announcement of the first selections under the WAPS will be made about May 15, 1970.

Table XII indicates the top six grade promotion history and promotions by grade.

TABLE XII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—TOP 6 GRADE PROMOTIONS

PROMOTION HISTORY

	Fiscal year—					
	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970 [1]	1971 [1]
Grade ceilings (thousands)	437.8	469.2	481.2	504.5	492.4	474.8
Percent top 6	58.2	61.8	64.5	69.0	72.9	72.9
Promotions	165.0	157.7	173.6	233.4	160.9	134.1

[1] Previous years actual, fiscal years 1970 and 1971 estimated.

ESTIMATED PROMOTIONS BY GRADE

	Current estimate	
	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
E9	1,221	1,270
E8	2,649	2,840
E7	10,638	8,578
E6	15,867	15,726
E5	37,902	27,392
E4	92,611	78,259
Total	160,888	134,065

VARIABLE REENLISTMENT BONUS (VRB) AND PROFICIENCY PAY

Variable reenlistment bonus and proficiency pay are used as retention incentives in high training cost skills which have inadequate career force manning. VRB is the principal method of attaining career manning goals in designated specialties. Proficiency pay is used when VRB proves to be an insufficient incentive. Both programs are evaluated in detail, as required, and are realined as necessary to insure the most efficient use of dollars devoted to the incentives. The impact of our financial incentives can be seen in reenlistment rates last year. Airmen eligible for variable reenlistment bonuses and proficiency pay reenlisted at double the rate of those who were ineligible for these incentives. This is significant in view of the lucrative civilian employment opportunities available to these highly skilled men.

Before I leave the airman program, I will discuss two projects of general interest—Projects Transition and 100,000.

PROJECT TRANSITION

The House report on the DOD appropriation bill for fiscal year 1970 expressed concern about the value of this project. The report stated there were indications that few eligibles participated; those who did received little training and overseas returnees for discharge had no opportunity to participate in the program.

We have reviewed our project in view of this report and I will cover current and planned Air Force participation in Project Transition.

We have determined that the Air Force does not have a significant training and education problem. Approximately 96 percent of Air Force technical skills have a relationship to civilian occupations and about 95 percent of our airmen have a high school education. Our

major effort, consequently, is devoted to career counseling and job placement assistance.

During the 1-year period ending July 1969 approximately 77,600 airmen were eligible to participate. Of this group about 62,600 enrolled in the program. They received either career advisory service, education, job placement assistance or training.

Overseas returnees for discharge are provided career counseling and job placement assistance by correspondence approximately 6 months prior to their return. They are advised and assisted in analyzing and developing their educational requirements and plans. This includes plans for postservice formal training or training with industry.

Fiscal year 1971 costs for Project Transition are estimated to be $3.5 million. This includes $2.4 million under the Military Personnel, Air Force appropriation, and $1.1 million under the Operation and Maintenance, Air Force appropriation.

PROJECT 100,000

In line with the committee's recommendation in the fiscal year 1970 appropriation bill, we have closely reviewed this program for costs and results.

The Armed Forces Qualification Test (AFQT) classifies all servicemen into five mental categories. Men who score betwen 10 and 30 are in category IV. New standards men (project 100,000) are those who score in the lower half of category IV (AFQT 10–20). For the period October 1, 1966 to December 31, 1969 we enlisted 52,109 category IV personnel. Of this number 21,951 were new standards men. In addition, another 4,812 were medical remedials. Our quota for category IV personnel for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 is 18 percent of our total nonprior service accessions. Of this quota one-half will be new standards men and in addition, 2 percent of the total accessions will be medically remedial personnel. Our quota based upon programed nonprior service procurement for fiscal year 1970 is 6,200 new standards personnel, and 1,372 medical remedials. For fiscal year 1971 the quota is 8,100 and 1,801, respectively.

Performance standards have not been lowered for these men. We are prepared to spend a reasonable amount of extra time and effort in helping them achieve satisfactory performance levels. A key factor to their success has been our remedial reading program. During the period August 1, 1968 to November 30, 1969, some 3,029 new standards men took this course with an 88 percent completion rate. The average grade reading leveling increased to 6.14 from 4.69.

Comprehensive data is collected on all men accepted under reduced standards. We also maintain data on a control group of airmen in higher mental categories who enlisted during the same period of time. By so doing we are able to compare the progress of one group with the progress of the other group.

An analysis of those who enlisted between January 1967 and June 1969 revealed that new standards men are performing better than an-

ticipated. Their 2 percent disciplinary rate is not considered a significant problem. Additional results with the program follow:

	Percent	
	Project 100,000 personnel	Control group
Successfully completed basic training	91.0	97.0
Eliminated in technical training	11.3	5.0
Attain 5 skill level	35.6	43.1
Promotion to E-4 or higher	7.5	9.0

Our estimated fiscal year 1971 costs are approximately $2.1 million. Of this amount $1.8 million is under the Military Personnel, Air Force appropriation and $0.3 million is under the Operation and Maintenance, Air Force appropriation.

In summary, the Air Force will continue to give both these programs close attention.

I will now cover the cadet program.

The Air Force Academy Cadet Program

There has been no change from the 4,151 cadet programed end strength for fiscal year 1970 since our presentation to this committee last year. A 4,417 end strength is programed for fiscal year 1971 which represents an increase of 266.

For your information, Table XIII shows cadet strength data for 3 fiscal years.

TABLE XIII.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, AIR FORCE ACADEMY STRENGTHS

	Fiscal year		
	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Graduates	679	741	677
New entries	1,400	1,359	1,359
End strength	3,941	4,151	4,417

We will now look at the Permanent Change of Station program.

Permanent Change of Station (PCS) Program

The PCS program continues to be responsive to Southeast Asia activities. Management actions implemented in fiscal year 1969 to reduce personnel turbulence and expenditures were continued in fiscal year 1970. The voluntary oversea tour extension program will result in an estimated savings of 20,552 moves. Close supervision of major air command PCS moves will insure a reduction of at least 10,000 moves in fiscal year 1970, the same number that was saved in fiscal year 1969. These programs will continue in fiscal year 1971.

PCS MOVE PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1970

The current fiscal year 1970 program forecasts 55,894 less moves than were presented to you in last year's fiscal year 1970 program. The primary reasons for this reduction were the previously mentioned management actions plus personnel strength reduction and force changes. These actions reduced accession, training and oversea rotational moves but increased operational, separation, and unit moves.

Table XIV reflects a comparison of moves by type for fiscal years 1969 through 1971.

TABLE XIV.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, COMPARISON BY TYPE OF PCS MOVES

Type of move	Fiscal year 1969 actual	Fiscal year 1970 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 estimate	Fiscal year 1971 compared to fiscal year 1970
Accession	137,188	94,815	121,060	+26,245
Training	141,706	146,438	170,048	+23,610
Operational reassignment	76,952	87,549	78,011	−9,538
(Individual)	(63,356)	(62,652)	(57,894)	(−4,758)
(Unit action)	(13,596)	(24,897)	(20,117)	(−4,780)
Overseas rotational	338,390	333,461	329,681	−3,780
Separation	167,136	140,723	140,387	−336
Organized units	12,598	11,958	14,601	+2,643
Total	873,970	814,944	853,788	+38,844

PCS MOVE PROGRAM—FISCAL YEAR 1971

As indicated in table XIV, military moves for fiscal year 1971 are programed to increase by 38,844. Compared with fiscal year 1970, accession and training moves are programed to increase due to greater airman procurement. Operational, rotational and separation moves will decrease as a result of the economy actions taken in fiscal year 1970 and by the continuation of personnel management actions. The increase in organized unit moves is a result of more units programed to move within the CONUS.

CONCLUSION

We realize we will be facing difficult times which will be a challenge to all of us. We will continue to manage our military personnel resources in the best interest of our national defense.

This concludes my statement. I am prepared to answer your questions.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you very much, General McGough.

We have some questions we would like to pose to you first, General Berg.

HEADQUARTERS REDUCTION

You state that during 1970 the Air Force made "a manpower reduction of approximately 15 percent in most of our command elements above the wing level."

Were these people actually dropped from the rolls, or were they transferred to other assignments?

General BERG. The reductions I spoke of, Mr. Chairman, were authorization reductions. In the case of military people, the actual incumbents of those particular jobs were not necessarily dropped. The programs that General McGough runs separately, early release of officers and retirement of some people, affect the people. It does not necessarily effect separation of the incumbents of the jobs.

Mr. EVANS. You are talking about the difference between authorized strength and actual strength?

General BERG. Yes, sir.

BUDGET REQUEST TO OSD

Mr. EVANS. General McGough, the Air Force budget for 1971 calls for a year-end strength of 783,520, a reduction of 26,107 below the planned yearend strength for 1970 of 809,627. In that regard, what beginning and end strength did you request of OSD for 1971?

General MCGOUGH. I will ask General Berg to answer that.

General BERG. We went in with a program of 809,000, and we ended up with 783,000.

Mr. EVANS. What type of reductions did OSD make?

General BERG. Some of them were specific reductions. One that comes to my mind, for example, is that they felt, in looking at the installations budget, we had too many people in real property maintenance, and they suggested it be reduced by a certain number of people in that area.

We replied with a reclama and restored some of them. We ended up finally with a number lower than we had originally requested.

The same thing happened in supply.

Mr. EVANS. Would it be possible for you to supply that for the record?

General BERG. Yes, sir. Would you like it by major program?

Mr. EVANS. I would think so, by category.

(The information follows:)

MANPOWER REDUCTIONS/OSD

	Air Force request	OSD approval	Difference
Officers	131,068	127,778	−3,290
Airmen	674,494	651,325	−23,169
Cadets	4,417	4,417	
Total military	809,979	783,520	−26,459

Reduction summary

	Military
Strategic Offensive Forces: Deletion of augmentation no longer required for KC–135 forces and cut of increases requested for the Strategic Air Command command and control system and SR–71 program	—615
General Purpose Forces:	
Reduction in aeromedical squadrons, aerial ports, tactical air control system and associated base operating support	—14,633
Reduction in base operating support levels in Japan, Okinawa, Philippines, and Guam	—786
Increases to adjust for slippages in implementation of European cost reductions (REDCOSTE) and to support defense communications planning group activities plus transfer of Johnston Atoll from the Defense Atomic Support Agency	+1,962
Communications: Reduction in air communications net authorizations plus miscellaneous minor communications program adjustments	—379
Intelligence/crypto: Reductions in intelligence and cryptologic programs, including Air Force authorization supporting Defense Intelligence Agency and National Security Agency	—1,888
Central supply and maintenance: Deletions based on programed flying hour and sortie reductions, consolidation of the Ground Electronics Engineering Installation Agency with Air Force Communications Service and depot maintenance contractor supervision overhead savings resulting from increased organic (in-house) capability	—813
Real property maintenance: Deletions based on General Accounting Office findings concerning Pacific Air Forces non-SEA manpower requirements, together with an anticipated general decline in new maintenance and repair work	—244
Base operating support: General support level reductions affecting base operating support in most programs	—8,000
Miscellaneous: Net effect of other small increases and reductions, primarily in administration, Air Force authorizations supporting Defense agencies, and reimbursables	—1,063
Total reduction	—26,459

Mr. Evans. General Berg, how much money did you request of OSD for 1971?

General Pitts. The Air Force request was for $6.209 billion, sir. OSD approved the $6.096 billion that you quoted at the beginning of the session, a reduction of some $113 million.

Mr. Evans. Does the money reduction relate directly and exclusively to the people reduction?

General Pitts. No, sir. There were adjustments also to the proposed entitlement levels such as proficiency pay and variable reenlistment bonuses.

SOUTHEAST ASIA REDUCTIONS

Mr. Evans. On page 5 of your statement, General Berg, you mention that the reduction in 1971 of 26,000 military and 11,000 civilian spaces are chiefly attributable to planned reductions in Southeast Asia and to general support level reductions in the United States.

What activities will you be cutting back in Southeast Asia during 1971?

General BERG. The reduction there resulted from one specific program budget decision which simply effected a reduction in ceiling and did not specify the particular units. We have not yet made the determination of what specific units will come out.

Mr. EVANS. The units were not specified?

General BERG. No. There was simply a ceiling reduction.

Mr. EVANS. The activities were not specified?

General BERG. No, sir, they were not. We have a ceiling for end fiscal year 1971.

General PITTS. I might shed additional light on that. It will be reflected mainly in decreased activities of such things as B–52 and tactical fighter sorties. That will be brought out in the O. & M. hearings when that appropriation is addressed.

PERSONNEL STATIONED IN VIETNAM

Mr. EVANS. How many Air Force personnel are now stationed in Southeast Asia, and how many are now stationed in South Vietnam?

General PITTS. As of right now, sir?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

General PITTS. As of right now, we have a total of 87,040 Air Force personnel in Southeast Asia. Of that total, 55,023 are in South Vietnam. ——— officers and ——— enlisted.

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS IN VIETNAM

Mr. EVANS. Would you please tell the committee what reductions in Air Force personnel are now under consideration for fiscal year 1971 in Vietnam?

General MCGOUGH. That is the same question that was just posed, I think, Mr. Chairman. We have not really specifically indicated who those people will be or what units they will be.

Mr. EVANS. It is just a matter under consideration now, and no final decision has been made?

General LOW. The influences are external to the Air Force. That is our problem. We just make assumptions in our programs.

Mr. EVANS. Subject to the operation of external influences?

General LOW. That is right, sir.

General PITTS. The President stated in discussing this matter: "Estimates are not shown for either the size or the timing of our future actions. Because of the need to maintain the security of this plan, certain information included in recent budgets does not appear this year."

That means the total fiscal year 1971 end strengths for Southeast Asia.

Mr. EVANS. Will you please provide for the record the in-country strength of Air Force personnel located in Vietnam, by month, beginning with January 1969 and projecting it through June 1971? If you can do this for the record, it would be helpful.

General PITTS. We would be constrained by that policy, sir.

(The information follows:)

PERSONNEL REDUCTIONS IN VIETNAM

Listed below are Air Force in-country strengths by month beginning with January 1969 and projected through April 15, 1970. The projection through April 15 is in response to the President's announced phase III withdrawal of 50,000 personnel authorizations. The Air Force portion of this is 5,607. Estimates of strengths beyond April 15, 1970 cannot be provided until executive decisions are announced. This policy is in keeping with the President's statement relevant to this matter, "Estimates are not shown for either the size or the timing of our future actions. Because of the need to maintain the security of this plan, certain information included in recent budgets does not appear this year."

AIR FORCE INCOUNTRY STRENGTHS

	1969	1970
January	59,706	57,384
February	60,113	55,481
March	60,576	[1] 55,200
April	60,917	[2] 53,792
May	60,689	
June	60,785	
July	60,758	
August	60,293	
September	59,993	
October	59,804	
November	58,820	
December	58,630	

[1] As of Apr. 2, 1970, preliminary.
[2] Apr. 15 estimated.

SALE OF ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

Mr. EVANS. Under the activity Intelligence and Communications, there will be reductions resulting from the sale of the Alaska Communications Systems. How many spaces will be saved as a result of this action?

General BERG. According to my figures, it is 910.

Mr. EVANS. Is that military and civilian?

General BERG. Yes, sir. One hundred forty-one military and 769 civilian.

TRANSIENT ACCOUNT

Mr. EVANS. Under training, medical and other personnel activities, the Secretary of Defense approved the establishment of a transient account of 7,896 spaces. This transient account is defined as the number of manpower spaces which equate to work-time lost due to travel, leave, and temporary duty during permanent change of station moves.

This situation has existed for as long as the Air Force has been in business. Why do you suddenly require additional funding and spaces?

General BERG. Ever since about 1954, the Department of Defense in its manpower guidance has recognized the fact that there are permanent change of station moves internally in the work force, and has authorized as a manpower entry a transient account. In 1954, all the services had them, including the Air Force.

In 1957—obviously, I have dug all this information up, so some of it reflects my opinion of what transpired—in an effort to fund some programs that we were unable to obtain the spaces for, the Air Force went forward with a proposal to the Office of Secretary of Defense

and said that we would like to fund a specific program—I think in this case it was some of the missiles that were coming in—with the spaces that were authorized in the transient account. We had at that time somewhere in the neighborhood of 22,000 spaces authorized in the transient account.

So, in the period of time from 1957 until the last couple of years, we have simply borne that transient account expense in all of the organizations in the Air Force. In other words, if you were a commander of a base and you were authorized to have 1,300 people and on your books you had 1,300 assigned, on any one day if you went out and counted them you would not have that many. Some of them would be getting ready to leave the station or would have left the station, or some would be on the books but would not have reported in.

All during this period of time, the other three Services continued to utilize the transient account.

Several years ago, we became concerned and OSD did, too, with the fact that this was having a particularly deleterious effect on our operations now in connection with the activities in Southeast Asia, because when you have a situation where you have a 1-year tour of duty, the turnover problem is accentuated.

So, we frankly went up to OSD and said we made a mistake in giving up the transient account, and we would like to provide for one again.

We ran into considerable opposition. They said, "You have been getting along without it all this time, and why can't you continue to do it?" It is our considered opinion that it is much better for the whole operation of the Air Force, even if we have to cut out certain missions that provide those particular spaces, to have them and to utilize them in the way in which they are utilized by the other Services.

Obviously, since we had them at one time and used them in some other fashion, the Department of Defense said, if you want them you have to come up with them from your own internal resources.

So, when we were preparing our budget for this year, we reduced certain support areas in order to provide 7,896 spaces which equate to the actual travel time that transpires when a man is transferring from base A to base B.

Mr. EVANS. What was the number of spaces provided last year?

General BERG. Last year we did not have any.

Mr. EVANS. You had none?

General BERG. This is the first time.

Mr. EVANS. You had none in fiscal 1968, either?

General BERG. No, sir.

Mr. EVANS. Have the other Services been authorized funding and spaces to offset work time lost during permanent change of station moves?

General BERG. Yes, sir; they have. For instance, in the fiscal year 1971 budget submission for the other services which either have been or will be presented to you, there are transient accounts of this magnitude. The Army's is 73,000. The Navy's is 29,000. The Marine Corps' is 19,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO OTHER ACTIVITIES

Mr. EVANS. On page 11 of your statement, you mention the Air Force has 16,000 military personnel assigned to other Defense Department activities, and 1,100 assigned to other governmental agencies.

Would you provide for the record a chart showing the assignment of these individuals similar to the one appearing on pages 77 and 78 of last year's military personnel hearings?

General BERG. We will; yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZED TO ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS, JUNE 30, 1971

	Department of the Air Force	
	Officer	Enlisted
Office Secretary of Defense Staff	230	87
Joint Chiefs of Staff	342	218
Military Assistance Groups	329	448
Mission & Attache Staffs	165	81
Unified and Specified Commands	1,704	2,874
International Military Activities	483	1,198
Defense Atomic Support Agency	274	873
Defense Communications Agency	184	336
Defense Intelligence Agency	537	536
Defense Supply Agency	379	44
Joint Defense Colleges	64	89
Other Military Departments	213	74
Atomic Energy Commission	17	1
Federal Aviation Agency	31	14
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	186	154
Selective Service System	41	----
Veterans Administration	----	----
Other Government Agencies and Special Activities	861	3,851
Total	6,040	10,878

MANAGEMENT ENGINEERING PROGRAM

Mr. EVANS. General Berg, on page 13 of your statement you mention your management engineering program. During last year's hearings we discussed this program in considerable detail. For the last several years, the number of positions covered by determinants has remained at approximately two-thirds. Has there been any change in the percentage during the past year?

General BERG. The percentage two-thirds that was referred to previously, was actually 618,000 for the previous year. The figure as of October of 1969, this past October, had increased to 660,000, or an increase of roughly 42,000 during this time period.

Mr. EVANS. Do you anticipate any changes during 1971?

General BERG. We are now beginning to reach the place where it is pretty hard to come up with too many more, because there are certain areas that simply do not lend themselves to management engineering techniques. In addition, we expect lower levels in the number of authorizations covered by determinants as a result of the reduction in the number of our total authorizations.

STANDARDS FOR AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE PERSONNEL

Mr. EVANS. Has there been any change in the number of Intelligence positions covered by standards?

General BERG. Yes, sir. Last year we indicated that there were some 14,883 spaces covered by standards in the Intelligence career field. We indicated that we hoped to go up to about 19,000 in the following year. We actually exceeded that a little bit. We now have about 72 percent of the measurable population covered, or 20,899 spaces.

Mr. EVANS. How much higher do you think you might be able to go from 72 percent?

General BERG. In the Intelligence area, again, we are faced with peripheral organizations in a lot of cases, such as headquarters activitives where you have a level of effort as contrasted with specific major workloads.

Mr. EVANS. It would not be possible for you to make a prediction?

General BERG. That is correct, sir.

Mr. EVANS. On page 380 of last year's hearings, the statement was made that by December 31, 1969, an additional 4,129 Intelligence positions would be covered by standards. Was this increase accomplished?

General BERG. Yes, sir; it was accomplished, and we actually exceeded it.

Mr. EVANS. Further, General, an additional 4,188 Intelligence spaces were to be covered by standards by December 31, 1970. Do you still plan on accomplishing this objective?

General BERG. According to my information, sir, we actually will beat that and have them covered by standards by July 1, 1970, as contrasted with December 31, 1970.

RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. EVANS. General McGough, you mention the Air Force's ability to attract and retain qualified personnel. How serious a problem is retention within the Air Force today?

General MCGOUGH. We are very concerned about it, Mr. Chairman. We haven't any indications immediately today that we will not be able to meet our recruitment goals or accession requirements. The recruiting service has a sufficient manpower pool available at the present time to satisfy our requirements in 1970 and 1971.

The draft lottery did have an impact. However, we still believe we have a sufficient manpower pool available at this time.

EFFECT OF DRAFT LOTTERY ON RECRUITMENT

Mr. EVANS. Could you give us some idea of your measurement of the impact of the change in the draft law upon recruitment?

General MCGOUGH. I can put it this way, Mr. Chairman: The indications that we have from our recruiters, who of course obtain the required personnel, are that, in their opinion, as long as the draft quota is larger than our requirements, then we in the Air Force will not have any difficulty. When this shifts, then we may incur difficulties.

Mr. EVANS. Has there been any noticeable decline in the number of young men coming in to sign up with the Air Force?

General McGough. There has been some, but it is not significant. The problem has not been in obtaining qualified people, but that we meet our selective programs assuring that we have certain types of individuals.

To sum it up, I would not say we have had any difficulty yet.

Mr. Wyman. If you did not have the draft hanging in the background, do you think they would be volunteering?

General McGough. That is a different question, sir. We have studies that we are currently conducting to determine what the outcome would be. It is very difficult to determine exactly how an individual is motivated and what motivates him. He may state one thing, but perhaps it is something else that really engendered his voluntary enlistment or his recruitment.

We are concerned about that. As I say, we are looking into it.

In the airman area, we feel that the impact will be less than it would be in our officer area. We are deeply concerned about the officer area in the absence of a draft.

Of course, in the medical area, I am sure we will have a very difficult time, and we will not be able to support our requirements without some type of nonvolunteer program.

Mr. Wyman. There is a little bit of difference between the general question of whether enough would volunteer and whether enough would volunteer in terms of your requirements with the necessary skills and backgrounds to meet the needs of the Air Force. Isn't that a fact?

General McGough. It is our concern, yes, sir, to see that we maintain the quality particularly.

Mr. Wyman. This relates very directly to the question of an all-volunteer armed force, does it not?

General McGough. Yes, it does.

ACTIONS TO OFFSET PERSONNEL LOSSES

Mr. Evans. You state that you are studying actions to be taken to offset increases in voluntary losses. What are some of the actions now under consideration?

General McGough. In the officer area, we have established a motivation division at the Military Personnel Center, Randolph Air Force Base, Tex. Through this service the young officer can ascertain what his future assignments may be. The lack of career visibility is one of the factors that has been stated by many of our young officers who voluntarily resign, as a factor that precluded them from staying in the service.

Mr. Evans. Can you make their future assignments more sure so a year or a year and a half or 2 years before they are assigned, they will know what their direction will be?

General McGough. We can give them a better idea of what the future portends for them. They can actually sit down with the individuals who advise them on their career and ascertain what their future assignments will be in terms of schooling or, if they are a rated officer, in terms of cockpit assignments or other areas.

We have found this is well received by the young officer.

Mr. EVANS. You are talking more in terms of training and operational assignments than you are geographic location?

General MCGOUGH. It includes geographic preference, too. In both our airman and officer programs, we solicit from them their desires as to geographic preference and, wherever feasible, we do assign them accordingly.

I do not have the percentages, but I think we are being rather effective in the number who actually get their desires.

Mr. EVANS. I would ask whether you have any ability to measure the success of these new moves that you are taking.

General MCGOUGH. Yes, we do have. We find in terms of our young airmen, the retention is improving slightly, in spite of the reduction in force.

Mr. EVANS. How about among the officers?

General MCGOUGH. In the officers, we are just about holding level at this point as far as retention is concerned.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

CRITERIA FOR CERTIFYING POSITION FOR GRADUATE EDUCATION

Mr. MINSHALL. General, the GAO recently released a draft report on Improvements Needed In Determining Graduate Education Requirements for Military Officer Positions. The report points out the criteria for identifying military officer positions which require graduate level education are so broad and permissive that almost any officer position could be certified for such education. Would you give us your ideas on that?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. Although we do not necessarily agree with that assessment of the criteria, we recognize there has been a problem in establishing requirements for advanced degree education. We have established within the Air Force an Educational Requirements Board. This Board reviews the requirements of all positions for education either at the advanced degree or baccalaureate level. Each major command submits to the headquarters their requirements as they see them. Then we have panels of experts from the various functional areas that review these requirements and make recommendations to a board chaired by general officers, which reviews them to determine whether the requirement is valid or not.

After it has passed this scrutiny, then it is considered as a valid requirement.

Mr. MINSHALL. Why is the Air Force placing so much emphasis on this program?

General MCGOUGH. On education?

Mr. MINSHALL. On graduate education. You will have to have a master's and doctorate in addition to your wings. Is that about what it amounts to?

General MCGOUGH. No, sir; that is not quite correct. We have made tremendous technological advances in the Air Force, which is true of the military services across the board. We find that in order to keep abreast of the scientific field, we have a requirement for advanced degrees in order to be able to evaluate the weapons proposals, and also to establish the weapon system requirements.

In other areas, in the administrative area, in order to keep pace with management techniques involved, there, too, we need people with such a background.

HISTORY OF OFFICER GRADUATE PROGRAMS

Mr. MINSHALL. Would you supply for the record the numbers of officers who at the present time have taken graduate programs, their rank, and so forth?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MINSHALL. Is the time perhaps coming when you will deemphasize officers getting a graduate degree on their own and, instead, send them to school full time?

General MCGOUGH. No, I do not think we will ever get to the point that we will send them all under an Air Force or military program.

Mr. MINSHALL. When you put in the record what I requested a moment ago, will you also put in at what point these people who go to the War College and various other duly established military schools get their degrees, whether they go from that to graduate work, and so forth, a history of what you are doing?

General MCGOUGH. I would be happy to.

(The information follows:)

EDUCATIONAL HISTORY OF OFFICERS GRADUATE PROGRAMS

The number of Air Force line officers (not including legal officers) with advanced degrees as of December 31, 1969, is given below. The totals include all line officers with advanced degrees, whether the education was obtained at the individual's own expense, or with partial or full Air Force funding.

	Master's degree	Master's plus 30 semester hours	Doctorate degree	Totals
Generals	111	11	9	131
Colonels	1,445	119	96	1,660
Lieutenant Colonels	3,092	186	180	3,458
Majors	4,225	190	187	4,602
Captains	3,917	147	164	4,228
1st Lieutenants	1,392	92	131	1,615
2d Lieutenants	843	22	19	884
Total line	15,025	767	786	16,578

Based on the group of officers selected to enter Air Force Institute of Technology programs during fiscal year 1970, approximately three-fourths of the officers attending graduate schools had less than 10 years service at time of entry (in grades of captain and below). Professional military education (PME) at the level of the Air Command and Staff College (10 months duration) is scheduled for highly qualified majors at about the 10th through 14th year of commissioned service. Normally, highly qualified lieutenant colonels receive Air War College level schooling (10 months duration) at about their 17th through 20th year of service. PME and graduate academic education are integrated over the full career patterns of officers. The aim is to select the most qualified officers and assure their effective use in compatible assignments for the balance of their careers. Toward this end, the Air Force (based on 2 years effort) has recently published a manual on officer career management (Air Force Manual 36–23).

The number of line officer positions requiring master's degrees is 11,725 and the number requiring doctorates is 1,001. Analysis of master's degrees by major academic field (as of June 30, 1969) reveals that 9,403 officers had major academic fields which match numerical requirements by major academic field. At the

doctorate level, 513 officers had doctorates that match numerical requirements by major academic field. The Educational Manning and Guidance Document (Dec. 31, 1969) was used to compare the number of advanced degree requirements in each major command (by Air Force specialty and grade) with the number of officers with advanced degrees assigned to that command (in the required specialty and grade). The results show that 5,024 officers are assigned with master's degrees and 452 with doctorates.

The Air Force entered 1,389 line officers in full-time Air Force Institute of Technology graduate degree programs during fiscal year 1969. We plan to enter 1,405 during fiscal year 1970 and 1,427 in fiscal year 1971.

CERTIFYING POSITIONS TO FIT THE INCUMBENT

Mr. MINSHALL. The report also points out that in some cases positions are validated to fit the educational backgrounds of the incumbents. When the incumbent leaves the position, the validation remains, thereby creating a requirement for additional officers with graduate education.

General MCGOUGH. That may have been true of some particular position in the past. We are attempting to prevent such occurrences by the Educational Requirements Board review I mentioned previously. Also, the incumbent will move on to another position requiring a similar education in a different career area or a different command. We have established within the Air Force a monitoring office at the Military Personnel Center that will monitor, for instance, all the officers who possess a doctor's degree. They are being monitored to assure proper utilization.

We have a plan being developed within the Air Force, in-house, at the present time—we have discussed it with the Defense Department—which will provide a similar type of monitoring for all officers including those who possess a master's degree. We will have a more orderly pattern for these officers to follow as far as utilization of their educational skills is concerned.

We feel we are moving in the direction of better control of educational skills.

NONUTILIZATION OF OFFICERS WITH GRADUATE DEGREES

Mr. MINSHALL. The report also points out that in some instances officers with graduate degrees are not utilized in validated positions.

General MCGOUGH. We do have some officers who have acquired, prior to entering the service, educational degrees, some advanced degrees, who are in an occupational area where they have acquired considerable experience; they have developed their real expertise in this occupational area. As a consequence, we continue them in that area.

COST OF GRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM

Mr. MINSHALL. How much is included in the 1969, 1970, and 1971 budgets in support of the graduate education program, including all appropriate pay and allowances and travel costs? Can you give us that now?

General PITTS. I would like to supply that for the record.

Just in passing, and on the graduate degree issue, I might add the fact that the utilization of a person with a master's degree in a nonvalidated position occurs in the conduct of the Southeast Asia war.

I am sure you are familiar with that. We send personnel with a master's degree to Southeast Asia in order to preclude second involutary tours.

(The information follows:)

GRADUATE EDUCATION PROGRAM BUDGET

The budget figures for the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) advanced degree programs (for both the AFIT resident school and civilian institutions) are listed below:

[Dollars in millions]

	Fiscal year—		
	1969	1970	1971
Appropriation:			
Military personnel	29.7	33.4	32.2
Operation and maintenance	4.0	4.0	4.0
Total cost of Air Force Institute of technology advanced degree programs	33.7	37.4	36.2

Student pay and allowances comprise approximately 83 percent of the total cost. The remaining 17 percent is used for tuition, travel pay, staff pay, and other support costs.

ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. MINSHALL. One question the committee has been asking the other Services about is the matter of the all volunteer force in view of the recent Gates Commission Report.

We would like your comments on that, if you can do it in bobtail fashion now, and then amplify it for the record if you wish.

General MCGOUGH. I will give it to you in bobtail fashion now.

We have seen the Gates Report. We have not officially commented on it to OSD nor have we been required to—up to the present time.

We are aware of some of the facets of it as it was developing. We agree in general with the principles of the Commission Report. However, we have some concern about the time schedule. We have some concern about our ability to acquire the quality of personnel that we will need to continue to man our Air Force.

Mr. MINSHALL. Do you think it is a workable program as far as the Air Force is concerned?

General MCGOUGH. From my personal viewpoint, it can be accomplished.

Mr. MINSHALL. It can be?

General MCGOUGH. It can be. But there will be certain requirements that have to be provided in terms of various incentives and bonuses and entitlements in order to continue to attract and retain high quality people.

Mr. MINSHALL. Have you been requested by DOD or OSD or any of them to submit your views on it as far as the Air Force official position is concerned?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. We have discussed this with OSD. We have not been requested yet to submit an official position insofar as the Gates Report is concerned.

CIVILIANIZATION AS A PART OF AN ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

General BERG. There is one aspect that bothers me in my particular job. There is an indication, as there has been in previous attempts, that one of the ways you can achieve a volunteer force is by reducing the size of the military force, and one way to do part of that is further civilianization. In other words, take a specific military position and say you do not need a military man in it but can use a civilian

It was indicated that this could be achieved to the greatest degree in the Air Force. The magnitude in the report was some 91,500 spaces.

This has a particularly distasteful flavor for us, because we went through this "mix-fix" operation in the Air Force in which over a 2-year period we were required to identify some 36,000 military spaces to be replaced by civilians. It was very agonizing to identify the spaces. By a sheer bizarre set of circumstances, the second year after we identified the spaces and gave them up and received civilian authorizations, Public Law 90–364 was enacted which permitted us to rehire only 3 civilians for every 4 we lost. As a result, we lost many of the spaces which had been converted or were to be converted to civilian.

It is very unappealing to us.

Mr. MINSHALL. One of your contemporaries in the Pentagon is quoted in a recent magazine article as saying that he would be amazed if it works. Maybe that was one of you, I do not know.

General MCGOUGH. I would like to amplify the remarks I made, if I may.

When I was talking about incentives, I was speaking in terms of pay, comparability pay. We have younger airmen that, the report points out, have to be brought up to equitable salaries. Housing, in particular, is an item which we feel is very important to our people.

AIR FORCE POSITION ON AN ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. MINSHALL. When you put this together for the permanent record, include what your objections are and what you think the good points are, so we have the feeling of the Air Force.

(The information follows:)

ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

The Air Force is and always has been a volunteer force and we support extension of this principle to the entire military establishment. However, we are aware that draft pressures have facilitated our all-volunteer posture. We believe that elimination of the draft could create serious problems for the services in attracting the desired quantity and quality of enlistees, especially while the Vietnam conflict continues. We therefore feel that a phased transitional program which emphasizes reduced reliance on the draft, rather than its arbitrary elimination, is the proper approach. The success of efforts to reduce draft reliance will depend on our ability to make service life more attractive to young men entering the service and to those making career decisions at the end of their initial commitment. Among the more important steps in this direction are the following:

(1) Military pay must be made comparable with pay in the civilian sector if we are to successfully compete in the labor market. This is especially true for first-term personnel whose pay has seriously lagged behind in recent years.

(2) Housing for bachelor and married personnel is currently inadequate. The disparity between military and civilian living conditions will become even more significant in a volunteer force era. Housing allowances have not kept up with rising living costs and fail to reflect widely varying costs around the country.

(3) Expanded AFROTC scholarships will be necessary to maintain the officer corps. It may also be desirable to extend the college scholarship concept to other officer procurement programs.

(4) In-service and post-service educational benefits have traditionally been a highly significant incentive to military service. While the Air Force currently has a very attractive program, further expansion and improvement will be desirable in a volunteer era.

(5) Recruitment efforts must be greatly expanded if draft pressures are reduced. This includes both increased advertising and increased recruiting staff.

The viability of reserve forces will be an extremely pressing problem in a volunteer era. The reduced force levels incumbent in a volunteer force will make reserve forces highly important to national security as the chief emergency surge resource. In the past, draft pressures have been even more significant in manning reserves than manning the active force.

While the Air Force supports the concept of an all-volunteer force, we believe that steps toward its realization must be careful and measured. Inadequate national security is not an acceptable trade-off for elimination of the draft.

COST OF ALL VOLUNTEER FORCE

Mr. WYMAN. Just one comment. It will cost an awful lot more money to go to an entirely volunteer force.

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. There is no question about it.

Mr. WYMAN. In terms of billions of dollars additional each year?

General MCGOUGH. I believe that is correct, yes, sir. I think the Commission Report reflects that, also.

Mr. MINSHALL. I think they said $3 billion, but it might go up as high as $8 billion.

General PITTS. There is an offsetting action through increased revenue from taxes. Certainly, in the net, it will be an increase, however.

Mr. WYMAN. Where is this increased revenue coming from, General?

General PITTS. Taxes, sir. As you know, part of our pay now contains allowances which are nontaxable. This new program would call for all salary to be taxable, and that would increase revenues.

General LOW. It might have a training impact, too, in an all-volunteer force. You would not have so many transients.

Mr. WYMAN. If the total salary is taxable, then the net take-home pay of the inidividual being enticed to come on a volunteer basis comparable with the civilian alternatives, will have to increase, too.

General PITTS. Yes, sir.

EARLY RETIREMENT OF COLONELS TWICE DEFERRED FOR PROMOTION

Mr. EVANS. General McGough, why do you feel you need authority to require early retirement of as much as 20 percent of all permanent lieutenant colonels and colonels who have been twice deferred for promotion?

General MCGOUGH. We feel this legislation is required. Currently we have officers who become permanent colonels and permanent lieutenant colonels and thus acquire tenure. In a period of reduction in the past 2 years, we have used the management tools available to us, and most of these have been voluntary tools. The burden has been borne by the Reserve officers on active duty.

In order to be more equitable with youngsters on active duty, Reserve and Regular, it is necessary to consider the quality of all our

officers. There are some officers who have acquired the tenure which I mentioned in terms of permanent lieutenant colonels and colonels, who have not been as productive as some of the Reserve officers or other Regular officers.

This is intended to emphasize quality, and also, at the same time, be equitable to others in the Service.

Mr. EVANS. What is the law which pertains to lieutenant colonels and colonels?

General MCGOUGH. The law now is that if they acquire regular rank of lieutenant colonel, then they can stay aboard until 28 years. If they acquire the permanent rank of colonel, then they have tenure for 30 years in service.

Mr. EVANS. They can just stay whether you want them there or not.

General MCGOUGH. That is right. Of course, there are means available to separate ineffective people through administrative actions; but these officers are not ineffective. They are good officers, but not quite as competitive as some of the others.

DECLINE IN ROTC ENROLLMENT

Mr. EVANS. Would you discuss the decline in ROTC enrollments?

General MCGOUGH. As I indicated, we do not feel we will have any problem in 1970 and 1971 because the classes are already aboard, and they are sufficient to meet our requirements. We do not envision any severe problem subsequent to that. However, the situation is becoming somewhat tenuous.

For instance, in the last year, we had about a 36-percent reduction in those who entered freshman class ROTC, and approximately a 30-percent reduction in those in their sophomore year in ROTC programs.

This, of course, is the source that we have to support our advanced courses in our ROTC colleges.

Mr. EVANS. On page 5 of your statement, General, you state, "However, there has been a decline of approximately 30 percent in the basic course enrollment this academic year." Yet you state for fiscal 1970 and 1971 you have programed 4,500 officers and "we expect to achieve this goal in fiscal years 1970 and 1971."

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. We are speaking of the freshman and sophomore classes. Those who graduate in 1970 and 1971 are in our junior and senior classes. Even with these reductions in percentages that I indicated, we still feel we will be able to make good our requirements in fiscal years 1972 and 1973. We are watching it very closely at this point.

COLLEGES DROPPING ROTC PROGRAM

Mr. EVANS. Have you lost any colleges around the country?

General MCGOUGH. Sir, we have 174 institutions now. We are terminating four colleges for low production between 1970 and 1972. By mutual agreement we are disestablishing four others in 1970–1971 because of problems involving academic rank, academic credit, and departmental status. These are some of the problems we have encountered in these schools.

We still have a reserve of institutions that are interested in obtaining ROTC. We are studying it at the present time in view of the problems that exist.

Mr. EVANS. You anticipate the loss of four because of disagreement between the Air Force and the particular institution in regard to the relationship of your unit to the academic community in that college?

General MCGOUGH. That is correct.

Mr. EVANS. Are these lost or in the process of being lost?

General MCGOUGH. They are in the process of being lost. They will terminate, as I have indicated, some in 1970 and some in 1971. Those students who are in the ROTC program may complete it. If they wish to continue, we are trying to make arrangements for them to continue.

Mr. EVANS. Have you lost any ROTC program because of student protest and because of college decision that it is best not to continue it?

General MCGOUGH. I would think that may have a bearing on the disagreements which have come up between the Air Force and the schools. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EVANS. Are you speaking of the four that you have lost?

General MCGOUGH. In regard to the four that I referred to, where termination is due to a disagreement.

Mr. EVANS. I wonder if you would supply for the record the names of the colleges and universities leaving the ROTC program, and those that you are having a disagreement with at the present time. Would you also supply the reason why they are leaving and the date they will be out of the program?

General MCGOUGH. I would be happy to.

(The information follows:)

AFROTC TERMINATIONS

AFROTC will be terminated at eight schools by June 30, 1972.

The Air Force is terminating at the following four schools because of low production.

Schools:	*Scheduled termination*
Kenyon College, Ohio	June 1970
Occidental College, California	June 1970
Grinnell College, Iowa	June 1972
Tufts University, Massachusetts	June 1972

We are terminating AFROTC at the following four schools by mutual agreement because negotiations have not resulted in contracts acceptable to both the Air Force and the schools concerned: These schools are:

Schools:	*Scheduled termination*
Colgate University, New York	June 1970
Harvard University, Massachusetts	June 1971
Brown University, Rhode Island	June 1971
Dartmouth College, New Hampshire	June 1971

The Air Force is negotiating current contracts with four schools at the present time. The major issues are academic rank of ROTC instructors, academic credit for ROTC courses and departmental status of ROTC. These schools are Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Massachusetts; University of Michigan, Michigan; Stanford University, California; and Princeton University, New Jersey.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE ROTC PROGRAM

Mr. EVANS. Does the Air Force have any actions under consideration that will attempt to reverse this trend?

General McGough. You are referring to the ROTC program now?

Mr. Evans. Yes.

General McGough. Yes, sir. In conjunction with the other Services and DOD, we have contact and consultation with the various college presidents and administrators to determine the causes and how we can realine our program to satisfy the requirements.

Mr. Evans. How is this received by the colleges and universities?

General McGough. In most cases, according to my understanding, it is very cordial. They are trying to work the problems out with us mutually. That is not true of all institutions, but I would say preponderantly that is true.

COLLEGES WITH ROTC PROGRAM BEING TERMINATED

Mr. Minshall. Where do you still have the problem?

General McGough. I cannot answer that, sir.

Mr. Minshall. Does anyone here know?

General McGough. The institutions I referred to earlier are Colgate, Harvard, Dartmouth, and Brown, which will be terminating in 1970 and 1971.

Mr. Minshall. What was the reason for terminating them, then?

General McGough. Disagreement over academic rank, academic accreditation, and departmental status of the ROTC element itself, whether it would be on the same professional basis as the education departments.

Mr. Minshall. It was not under pressure of the dissidents?

General McGough. I am sure the pressure had some part in the disagreement between the schools and the Air Force; how much, I do not know.

General Low. It goes back to your concern about graduate degrees. That is a good example. The academic community argued that our officers did not have advanced degrees. We have a very vigorous program. I would guess just about everybody in the ROTC system now has a master's degree, and there are quite a number of doctorates.

ROTC FLIGHT TRAINING

Mr. Minshall. You do not have any flight training in any of these ROTC units, do you?

General McGough. We do have a flight instruction program at 169 schools. Selected ROTC students receive 36½ hours' instruction in light aircraft.

Mr. Minshall. What kind of ticket do they get when they finish this course in flying?

General McGough. The complete program leads to an FAA private pilot's license.

Mr. Minshall. Why would you give them a private pilot's license?

General McGough. Its primary purposes are motivational and screening for those who are to enter Air Force pilot training after they are commissioned.

General Low. It lets you know their prospects for the future and might save time, rather than to introduce them into a course in a more

expensive airplane and lose them. I think we have found it is also a motivator.

Mr. MINSHALL. An attractor.

General Low. Yes, both a motivator and an attractor.

OFFICER PROMOTIONS

Mr. EVANS. On page 7 of your statement you have included a table on officer promotions. Why were officer promotions significantly greater in 1970 than in either 1969 or 1971?

Colonel ALLMAN. Officer promotions for 1970 were greater than 1969 or 1971 due to the fact that larger than normal numbers of officers were moved into the zone for promotion. A portion of this increase was caused by our efforts to adjust certain promotion phase points in an attempt to more nearly equate our programs with the Army and Navy.

WEIGHTED AIRMAN PROMOTION SYSTEM (WAPS)

Mr. EVANS. General McGough, would you discuss the New Weighted Airman Promotion System (WAPS) which you mention on page 15 of your statement?

In preface to that question, you used to have the whole man concept. Many of us are concerned that the whole man you were thinking of was not well seen by the airmen themselves; that they did not understand why they did not get promoted and did not know how they were doing.

It is my understanding this new program is designed to give better visibility to the airmen in regard to where they are and how they are doing and what their chances are. Is that correct?

General MCGOUGH. That is absolutely correct, Mr. Chairman. That was one of our primary purposes in establishing the new promotion system.

As you stated, our airmen indicated they did not understand the system, and they desired more visibility. Also, they were not aware of the outcome or why they were not promoted.

This system will provide the visibility, and also will be a specific indication of how airmen not selected fared insofar as the cutoff line is concerned.

As you know, each of the airmen takes a test in his technical specialty and a promotion fitness examination. Each factor used in selection is given a certain weight—so many points for time in service, time in grade, decorations, and performance reports. These scores are all tabulated, computerized, and put in an order of priority by grade and specialty.

Then, based upon the availability of quotas within these specialties, the cutoff point is determined. Those below the cutoff, of course, are not promoted. Those not selected are advised of their score on each factor, their total score and the total score required for selection. They are aware that they had not achieved a sufficiently high point to be promoted.

Mr. EVANS. A young man who has not made it gets the report, and he can see how he did in regard to these various weight factors. Does he also have the opportunity of counseling with his commanding officer?

General McGough. Yes, sir. Airmen at all times have that option of counseling with their noncommissioned officers, with their other superior officers, and, of course, there is always the appeal to the Inspector General himself in the event they feel they have not received sufficient help.

Mr. Evans. When do these examinations occur?

General McGough. They have been taking these examinations since September of this past year. It takes a period of time to accomplish them. All scheduled testing has been completed.

Mr. Evans. They will be through by what, April, and the first promotions will be in June?

General McGough. The first promotion selections will be announced in May and score notices will be sent to non-selectees shortly thereafter.

MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO REDUCE PERSONNEL TURBULENCE

Mr. Evans. On page 19 of your statement, you refer to management actions implemented in fiscal year 1969 to reduce personnel turbulence and expenditures.

Would you provide for the record a statement detailing these management actions?

General McGough. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Management Actions/Personnel Turbulence, Etc.

The management actions implemented in fiscal year 1969 and continued in fiscal year 1970 to reduce personnel turbulence and expenditures were the voluntary oversea tour extension program and the continued restriction on the PCS moves of the major air commands.

The voluntary oversea tour extension program was implemented on June 29, 1968. Officer and airman personnel completing a standard oversea tour of 18 months or longer except those eligible for a Southeast Asia assignment were authorized and encouraged to extend their oversea tour. The response to this policy produced 14,758 fewer PCS moves in fiscal year 1969. There will be an estimated 20,552 fewer moves in fiscal year 1970.

Major air commands were instructed on July 17, 1968 to critically examine the need for each PCS move they direct and to limit moves to those absolutely essential to satisfy basic operational requirements. To achieve desired objectives, each major air command was advised to appoint an official who was capable of distinguishing which moves are operationally required and who would personally approve each PCS move. This action through the use of a quota system resulted in a savings of some 10,000 moves in fiscal year 1969. Each major air command was also allocated a quota of PCS moves for fiscal year 1970. This will insure that at least the same reduction accomplished in fiscal year 1969 will be effected in fiscal year 1970. These programs will continue in fiscal year 1971.

TRANSIENT ACCOUNT

Mr. Evans. The committee notes the Air Force is increasing the activity "Training, Medical, and Other Personnel Activities" by approximately $4 million. If all of your direct activities will be decreasing during 1971, why is it necessary that a support activity be increased?

General Berg. As I indicated in my statement, the program "Training, Medical, and Other Personnel Activities," the one you are addressing, is the area in which the transient account is accounted for.

You will recall the transient account was 7,896 spaces, which caused a net increase in that particular program of 6,869. They were taken from other programs and placed there. That is what caused the increase. It is not an increase in training or an increase in medical. It is in "Other Personnel Activities" accounting for the transient account itself.

CHANGE IN OFFICER-ENLISTED RATIO

Mr. EVANS. On your table entitled "Active duty military personnel by budget activity," which appears on page 5 of your budget document, the committee notes that for the activity Strategic Forces, even though you are decreasing your total strength assigned to this activity, you are increasing the number of officers. When comparing 1971 to 1970, we note that your officer strength will increase by 162, whereas your enlisted strength will decrease by 5,402.

In determining your planned requirement for fiscal year 1971, how did the Air Force determine that for strategic forces you would require an increase in the number of officers, but yet you could provide for a significant decrease in the number of enlisted personnel assigned to this activity?

General BERG. In the overall statement we state we are decreasing by some 26,000 military. This is a net decrease of about 23,800 airmen and some 2,200 officers. As this balances out across the 10 programs, there are some cases where there is a greater decrease in officers and some where there is a net increase.

The reason for the small increase of 162 in officers in the strategic forces is primarily the fact that we inactivated one B–52 unit, for example, and had offsetting increases due to Minuteman conversions and modernization.

We also have the activation of a couple of FB–111 squadrons and the combat crew training that goes along with it, which has a high density of officers.

There were also some specific actions, such as reduction in ARC LIGHT sorties and a couple of base closures in which there was a high concentration of enlisted as contrasted with officers, because when you reduce sortie rate, you really reduce the maintenance function.

Mr. EVANS. The committee notes a similar situation for the activity entitled "Airlift and Sealift." Will you comment on that?

General BERG. Again, it is the same sort of situation. The specifics in this case are that although we lost 100 officers for the crews of 10 C–133's which were cut out of the airlift forces, there is an increase of 400 officers associated with the crews for the 35 C–5's that come in during this particular year.

On the other end of the spectrum, we supply our manpower for the maintenance function based upon how many people it takes to provide certain flying hours for the various aircraft. In the C–141, the primary weapons system of the airlift forces, there is a reduction of some 4,500 airmen in the maintenance function.

This is a particularly severe reduction in airmen, but the same reduction did not occur because we do not have officers in the maintenance function to the same degree that we have airmen.

Mr. EVANS. Could you provide for the record a tabulation of just what these ins and outs are?

General BERG. Yes, sir.
(The information follows:)

TABULATIONS OF INS AND OUTS

Primary actions causing officer increases and airman decreases in strategic forces (program I) and in airlift (program IV) between fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971

	Officer	Airman
Strategic forces:		
B–52 aircraft	−253	−1,228
FB–111 aircraft	+82	+359
KC–135 aircraft	−15	−68
Titan missile	+58	
Minuteman	+471	
SAC Command and control network		−9
Command, support, and training	−241	−3,890
F–101 aircraft	−2	−131
F–106 aircraft	+6	+242
BOMARC missile	+1	
Radar surveillance	−60	−1,177
Defense support program (classified)	+115	+500
Total	+162	−5,402
Airlift and sealift:		
Inactivation of C–133 unit	−101	−496
C–141 maintenance man-hour change	+21	+21
Activation of C–5A units	+427	+2,357
En route services support of force changes	−2	−2,504
Elimination of 2 U–4's from SAM	−5	−11
Aeromedical evacuation	−1	−1
Aerial port reduction	−1	−26
Support of force changes	−46	−417
Training	−28	+296
Headquarters reduction	−6	−64
Total	+258	−845

TRANSIENT ACCOUNT

Mr. EVANS. Under the activity "Training, Medical, and other General Personnel Activities," which we mentioned earlier, we note that you plan to increase the total strengths assigned to this function from 138,723 in 1970 to 145,592 in 1971, for an increase of 6,869.

Aside from the increase of 266 for Academy cadets, why do you require 139 additional officers and 6,464 additional enlisted personnel for this activity?

General BERG. Again, that relates to the transient account. It is lodged in there. Of the 7,896 people in the transient account, 7,700 are enlisted and 196 are officers.

SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS

Mr. EVANS. Under "Support of Other Nations," we again notice the switch in your officer-enlisted ratio. Here, once again, you are increasing the number of officers while at the same time decreasing the number of enlisted personnel.

How did you determine, in the case of this budget activity, that you would require additional officers in 1971 but fewer enlisted personnel?

General BERG. In this particular program there is an increase of 14 officers and a decrease of 19 airmen. I am not able to address precisely what those changes are, because these authorizations are covered by what we call the JTD, the Joint Table of Distribution, that are approved by the JCS for the MAAG's and missions and the military groups.

I will have to go back and find out.

Mr. EVANS. Will you supply that for the record?

General BERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. You might also break down the number 1,264 into military attaches, et cetera.

General BERG. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. Also, support of South Vietnamese advisers.

General BERG. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

SUPPORT OF OTHER NATIONS/CHANGES IN PERSONNEL

The fiscal year 1970 officer requirements reflect a directed reduction in manpower in JCS areas to reduce our balance of payments. These reductions were all taken in this program. Subsequent review indicated that a more proportionate distribution among the other programs was appropriate, therefore, a number of the officer positions deleted from this program were restored in fiscal year 1971. This action will not upset our balance of payments.

There are no military attachés in the budget activity, "Support of Other Nations." The Air Force has 254 military authorizations in the Defense Attaché System which is under the supervision of the Defense Intelligence Agency in Intelligence and Communications budget activity.

The 1,264 military authorizations in the budget activity, "Support of Other Nations" consists of:

In the International Headquarters of SEATO, CENTO, NATO	40
In MAAGs, missions and military groups	1,116
For maintenance of aircraft in support of the above organizations	108
Total	1,264

There are 1,109 military authorizations, by direction of JCS in the Air Force Advisory Group, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam and the Field Advisory Elements, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam. These authorizations, however, are contained in the budget activity "Administration and Associated Activities."

INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. EVANS. On page 7 of your budget under the activity entitled "Intelligence and Communications," the committee notes that in 1971 you will be increasing the funds in connection with Operation of Defense Agencies from $35.4 million in 1970 to $37.3 million in 1971, an increase of almost $2 million.

Yet, on page 9 of your budget, the number of people to be assigned to Operation of Defense Agencies decreases from 4,591 in 1970 to 4,539 in 1971. If you have a decrease of 52 people assigned under Intelligence and Communications to the Defense Agencies, why do you require an additional $2 million?

General PITTS. May we supply that for the record, please?

(The information follows:)

INTELLIGENCE AND COMMUNICATIONS/RELATION OF PERSONNEL TO DOLLARS

The additional $2 million is related to an increase of 189 military man-years which will occur during fiscal year 1971:

[Dollars in millions]

	Strength			
	Begin	End	Man-years	Cost
Fiscal year 1970	4,161	4,591	4,376	$35.4
Fiscal year 1971	4,591	4,539	4,565	37.3
Difference	+430	−52	+189	+1.9

The chief reason for the man-year increase between fiscal year 1970 to fiscal year 1971 is the lower strength of 4,161 at the beginning of fiscal year 1970 and buildup to 4,591 at end year. In fiscal year 1971, the beginning and end strengths exceed 4,500 which results in a higher average strength.

PHASEOUT OF WARRANT OFFICERS

Mr. EVANS. On page 11 of your budget justification there is a table entitled "Military Personnel End Strengths By Grade." On this table under the heading of "Warrant Officers," the committee notes that the W–4 warrant officers are decreasing from 1,065 in 1969 to 649 in 1970, and in 1971 down to 409.

Is the Air Fore deliberately phasing out the warrant officer program?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. We have indicated in previous appearances here that the Air Force has elected to phase out the warrant officer program. As you know, we have established the E–8 and E–9 positions as opportunity for a young airman to advance, and have replaced warrant officers with E–8's and E–9's. As a result, we are phasing the warrant officers out.

In the near future all the warrant officers will be phased out of the program.

Mr. EVANS. Are the other services doing this, too? The Army has a warrant officer. They all do.

General MCGOUGH. I do not believe the other services are phasing their warrant officer program out.

Mr. EVANS. You might also put a brief statement in the record at this point as to why you are doing this.

General MCGOUGH. All right, sir.

(The information follows:)

DELIBERATE PHASEOUT OF WARRANT OFFICER PROGRAM

The Air Force felt that the additional layering of supervision between the noncommissioned officer and the commissioned management structure was unnecessary. Jobs formerly designated as suitable for warrant officers were identified for the E–8 and E–9 grades, and these supergrade airmen are now filling those positions.

CHANGES IN OFFICER AND ENLISTED GRADE STRUCTURE

Mr. EVANS. On this same table that I referred to, the committee notes that your changes in officer and enlisted grade structure between fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971 do not appear to follow a pattern that would relate directly to your grade structure. In other words, if you were to take a 10-percent reduction in total, each of the grades would not be reduced by 10 percent but, instead, some increase and some decrease.

The civilian agencies of the Government all operate under an average grade limitation. Is there any such ruling that applies to the military?

General MCGOUGH. No, sir; to my knowledge there is none. Our reductions in end strength usually are based upon mission requirements. When we have a reduction in end strength, we try to apply it in the most equitable manner that we can.

In the officer area, we try to maintain the promotion flow that we have talked about, and at the same time be equitable as far as losses are concerned.

In the past, we have reduced our strength voluntarily if we could, but where we could not, we have a RIF. We try to avoid that.

One means of reducing strength is to be selective in the officers that we separate. If we did it on an average basis, I am not sure we would come up with the proper proportion of officers to support our requirements.

Mr. EVANS. For the record, General, if such a limitation were to be imposed on the Air Force, what effect would it have on your personnel management system?

(The information follows:)

EFFECT OF IMPOSITION OF AVERAGE GRADE LIMITATION ON MIL PERS

Such a limitation would have far reaching effects on the management of the officer force and would probably require substantial modification of existing law. For example, under law, regular officers enjoy tenure. We cannot release or retire them involuntarily; only for cause. Thus, the only way to reduce the grade structure, as well as the total strength, would be to demote regular officers in the controlled grades and place the burden of the total strength cut upon nonregular officers.

A limitation on the airman force would also cause problems of major significance to all facets of the force. Involuntary separations and retirements would be required to provide reasonable promotion flow. Legislation would be desired to provide severance pay to those career airmen separated prior to attainment of retirement eligibility.

PLANNED INCREASE IN ENLISTMENTS DURING 1971

Mr. EVANS. On page 13 of your budget justification, you have a table on gains and losses. On this table you show that your enlistments for 1970 were approximately 70,000. For 1971, you are projecting enlistments of 97,000.

How do you plan to increase your enlistments in 1971 by 27,000 enlistees? Do you have a sufficient backlog of people waiting in the wings to assure you of this ability?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. As I indicated earlier, the recruiting service has determined that we have a sufficient manpower pool available, waiting in the wings, if you will, for 1970 and 1971, against the pressure of the draft, that provides us with that capability.

General PITTS. I would like Colonel Jones to amplify that answer, please.

Colonel JONES. Sir, the number of people being recruited is very closely related to the losses. You not only have strength reductions, but the normal numbers of people who are finishing enlistments and leaving the force.

We have no difficulty in recruiting now, and there is no immediate concern about getting enough to replace our losses in 1971.

Mr. EVANS. Would this also be true if the draft quotas in the months ahead were to fall significantly?

Colonel JONES. We might have some trouble, sir, but so far the Air Force has been very fortunate. We have always been able to get high-quality people.

Mr. EVANS. But assuming draft calls went down, what plan, if any, do you have to meet that contingency?

Colonel JONES. Our recruiters are alerted and waiting for trouble, shall we say. We would anticipate that we will be able to get what we need in 1971.

TRAINING SENIOR OFFICERS TO FLY HELICOPTERS

Mr. EVANS. The Army has a plan whereby they will be training generals and full colonels to be flying helicopters. Does the Air Force have any plan now underway with respect to training generals or colonels to become helicopter pilots?

General MCGOUGH. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, we do not have any program to train generals or colonels in helicopters. We do have a few commanders who, in support of their mission are required to get some helicopter training for indoctrination. They are already rated pilots, however.

For instance, General Catton, who is Commander of Military Air-Lift Command, has checked out in the helicopter and is familiar with it for that purpose.

Mr. EVANS. How much indoctrination training do you give them?

General MCGOUGH. In this case, the general officer type?

Mr. EVANS. Yes.

General MCGOUGH. It would vary, depending upon his skill and familiarity with it. In the case of General Catton, I happen to know he has flown a helicopter before, once or twice. It was just a matter of becoming familiar with the equipment during his visit to the installation that he now commands.

So, it varies, depending upon what the background is.

Mr. EVANS. Do you have any plans now under way with respect to training generals or colonels in fixed-wing aircraft?

General MCGOUGH. Again, I can only answer that I have no knowledge of it at the present time.

I might point out that, generally speaking, we have a 27-year age restriction on pilots who are entering training for the first time. We have many pilots who convert from one aircraft to another—for instance, those going to Southeast Asia.

General PITTS. I think you were referring to entry into fixed-wing training for initial aeronautical rating. I would say this does not apply to the Air Force. We have a 27-year age limit, and beyond that we do not enter people into fixed-wing training.

Mr. WYMAN. How many waivers do you grant on the age limit? Would you supply that for the record?

General MCGOUGH. I will supply it for the record.

Mr. WYMAN. And for what reason.

General MCGOUGH. All right, sir.

Mr. WYMAN. Thank you.

(The information follows:)

REASON FOR WAIVERS OF AGE LIMIT OF PILOTS

The Air Force has granted eight waivers to the maximum age limit (27½) for pilot training from January 1, 1968, through December 31, 1969. All officers waivered were in the grade of captain. Two of the waivers were the result of a delay in determining medical qualification. Four were waived because duty in Southeast Asia precluded their availability for an earlier class. Two were waived because of administrative delays over which the individual had no control.

INCREASE IN GENERALS DRAWING FLIGHT PAY

Mr. EVANS. On page 20 of your budget justification is a table spelling out the number of officers to be drawing flying pay. The committee notes that in 1971 you are planning on an increase in the number of brigadier generals to be drawing flight pay.

Since the number of officers, by grade, from most other ranks decrease, why will the number of brigadier generals drawing flight pay increase?

General MCGOUGH. I would think that would be the result of our promotions, Mr. Chairman. I will submit an answer for the record, but I am sure what happened here is that a colonel was promoted who was on rated flying status, to brigadier general.

General PITTS. I might add, again, these people were already drawing flight pay as colonels prior to being promoted.

(The information follows:)

INCREASE NUMBER OF BGS DRAWING FLIGHT PAY

The increase in brigadier generals on flying status, on page 20 of the budget justification, is an increase in man-year average. The following breakout of the two man-year numbers and a comparison of fiscal years 1970 and 1971 shows that the increase is in pilots only.

Man-year average for—	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971	Increase
Pilots	179	190	+10
Navigators	1	1	0
Flight surgeons	10	10	
Total	190	201	+11

The following table shows the status of pilots on flying status, in the grade of brigadier general from the start of fiscal year 1970 to the end of fiscal year 1971.

	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971
Starting strength	175	185
Losses	−28	−27
Promoted to Major General	−39	−18
Promoted to Brigadier General	+77	+54
Ending strength	185	194

The higher strengths in fiscal year 1971, both at the start and at the end of the year causes the man-year average for fiscal year 1971 to exceed the fiscal year 1970 level.

DECREASE IN FLIGHT MEDICAL OFFICERS

Mr. EVANS. On page 21 of your budget justification, you are showing a decrease in the number of flight medical officers to be drawing flight pay from 438 officers in 1970 to 300 officers in 1971. To what is this decrease in the number of flight medical officers drawing flight pay attributable?

Colonel ALLMAN. Sir, it is basically that the flight medical officer moves into the system as a flight surgeon. This reflects the reduced requirement for flight surgeons.

SPECIAL PAY FOR PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS, AND VETERINARIANS

Mr. EVANS. Under "Special pay for physicians and veterinarians," there is very little difference between 1970 and 1971 in the number of physicians and dentists and veterinarians to be drawing this special pay. Does this mean that, to a large degree, you have solved any retention problems you may have had for any of these three types of individuals?

General MCGOUGH. I would not interpret it that way, Mr. Chairman. We still have retention problems with our physicians and dentists.

Mr. EVANS. Apparently you are satisfied with what you are spending here to get what you need. Is that correct?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir.

I misunderstood what you were talking about here. I would like to clarify the special pay that the laws now provide for physicians, dentists, and veterinarians. Physicians and dentists draw from $1,200 to $4,200 per year, depending upon years of active service. Veterinarians draw $1,200 per year regardless of years of service. In addition, physicians with over 8 years' active duty draw continuation pay which was authorized in December 1967. These amounts vary from an approximate low of $2,800 to an approximate high of $6,100 per year, depending upon rank and years of service. We have found continuation pay has been helpful in retaining our doctors. About 86 percent of those officers who are offered continuation pay have accepted it. This coupled with other incentives, has resulted in a decrease, I believe, of about 40 percent in numbers of resignations during the last 2 years.

Mr. EVANS. You are satisfied with the level of spending?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir.

RETENTION RATE/MEDICAL PERSONNEL

Mr. EVANS. Would you supply for the record what the retention rates are today for doctors, dentists, and nurses?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

RETENTION RATES/MEDICAL PERSONNEL

The retention rates for initial active duty physicians, dentists, and nurses are as follows:

PHYSICIANS

Initial entry on active duty	Gains	On board as of June 30, 1969	Percent retained
Fiscal year:			
1962	1,241	92	7.4
1963	883	100	11.3
1964	1,195	135	11.3
1965	1,106	143	12.9
1966	1,330	180	13.5
Total	5,755	650	11.3

DENTISTS

Initial entry on active duty	Gains	On board as of June 30, 1969	Percent retained
Fiscal year:			
1962	618	53	8.6
1963	552	49	8.9
1964	420	53	12.6
1965	526	36	6.8
1966	406	70	17.2
Total	2,522	261	10.3

NURSES

Initial entry on active duty	Gains	On board as of June 30, 1969	Percent retained
Fiscal year:			
1962	675	138	20.4
1963	690	180	26.1
1964	623	157	25.2
1965	732	174	23.8
1966	873	171	19.6
Total	3,593	820	22.8

RECRUITMENT OF NURSES

Mr. EVANS. Are you having any better results these days in recruiting nurses?

General MCGOUGH. I do not know whether we are having any better results. We are not having any difficulties at this time in acquiring nurses.

General PITTS. I would like Colonel Holm, our Director of the WAF, to expand on that question, Mr. Chairman.

Colonel HOLM. I discussed this with the Director of Nursing only this week, and she said there historically has been no problem recruiting nurses for the Air Force. She feels this is primarily due to the fact that there is always the prospect of being a flight nurse, which is very attractive.

Also, our requirements for nurses in the Air Force are lower. Our demand is lower than the Army's. The Air Force has 4,000 nurses, and the Army has a requirement for something like 5,000.

AIR FORCE NURSES IN VIETNAM

Mr. EVANS. How many nurses does the Air Force now have serving in Vietnam?

Colonel HOLM. There are about 158 male and female nurses in South Vietnam.

Mr. EVANS. How does this compare with the number serving there 1 year ago?

Colonel HOLM. There were 195 male and female nurses in South Vietnam this time last year.

Mr. EVANS. How many nurses are assigned to Southeast Asia?

General MCGOUGH. I think we should supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

NUMBER OF NURSES SERVING IN SEA

At this time there are 195 male and female nurses stationed in Southeast Asia. This does not include the flight nurses who are medical crewmembers of air evacuation aircraft flying in to pick up patients.

WOMEN IN THE AIR FORCE

Mr. EVANS. Colonel Holm, would you discuss the status of the women in the Air Force today, and your plans for fiscal year 1971?

Colonel HOLM. At the present time, the WAF program—I am excluding nurses from this—is expanding as a result of the expressed desire of the President a number of years ago to put greater reliance on volunteers. At the present time our strength is 9,542, including officers. Of that number, 1,078 are officers.

At the end of this fiscal year, we expect to have a strength of 10,006. Of these, 1,106 would be officers.

By the end of the budget year, we expect to have a strength in the neighborhood of 10,900. Of these, 1,200 will be officers.

Mr. EVANS. You anticipate no difficulty in filling these strength levels?

Colonel HOLM. No, sir. Our recruiting has never been better, really, in terms not only of quantity but of quality, both in the officer and enlisted programs.

About 28 percent of our officer strength serves overseas, and right now 22½ percent of our enlisted permanent party force is overseas.

Mr. EVANS. Last year you mentioned there were 27 WAFs serving in Vietnam. How many do you have there today?

Colonel HOLM. Today we have a total of 32 serving in Vietnam, with 126 serving in Southeast Asia as a whole.

Mr. EVANS. Last year you mentioned that the reenlistment rate for WAFs was getting better every year. Is this still holding true?

Colonel HOLM. The reenlistment rate is very good. It is around 30 percent for the first-term airmen who complete their first 4 years. It is close to 88 percent for what we call the career airmen who finish more than one tour.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Davis?

TEMPORARY PROMOTION

NUMBER OF COMMISSIONED OFFICERS BY RANK

Mr. DAVIS. Cite for the record the legislation and set forth in full the provisions relating to the number of commissioned officers, by rank.

General MCGOUGH. I will be happy to do so.

(The information follows:)

Section 8202, title 10, United States Code. Air Force: Officers in certain commissioned grades

(a) The authorized strength of the Air Force in officers on active duty in each of the following grades on the last day of each fiscal year, exclusive of officers on active duty for training only and officers serving with other departments or agencies on a reimbursable basis, is, except as provided in subsections (e) and (f), based on the actual strength of the Air Force in those officers, as follows:

If the actual strength is [1]—	The authorized strength in grade is—			
	For general officers	For colonels	For lieutenant colonels	For majors
50,000	312	3,133	6,065	9,455
60,000	324	3,540	6,822	11,298
70,000	336	3,857	7,427	13,125
80,000	349	4,107	7,920	14,936
90,009	363	4,299	8,316	16,740
100,000	380	4,440	8,620	18,530
110,000	398	4,750	9,350	20,295
120,000	416	5,020	10,056	22,056
130,000	434	5,273	10,725	23,803
140,000	452	5,484	11,368	25,536
150,000	470	5,665	12,000	27,255
160,000	478	5,842	12,608	28,976
170,000	486	5,974	13,175	30,685
180,000	495	6,075	13,716	32,328

[1] As determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

If the actual strength is determined to be between two of the figures named in the first column of the table, the corresponding authorized strengths in grade are determined by mathematical interpolation between the respective authorized strengths named in the table. If it is determined to be more than 180,000, the Secretary shall fix the corresponding authorized strengths in grade in general conformity with the table.

(b) Not more than one-half of the general officer strength may be in grades above brigadier general.

(c) A vacancy in any grade may be filled by an appointment in any lower grade.

(d) In time of war, or of national emergency declared after May 5, 1954, by Congress or the President, the President may suspend the operation of any provision of this section.

(e) The authorized strengths of the Air Force in officers who are designated as medical or dental officers of the Air Force in grades below brigadier general shall be based on the needs of the Air Force, as determined by the Secretary under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(f) In determining the authorized strength of the Air Force under subsection (a), the strengths authorized from those who are designated as medical or dental officers of the Air Force shall be excluded.

PUBLIC LAW 89-606

AN ACT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, beginning with the date of enactment of this Act through June 30, 1972, the columns under the headings "For colonels" and "For lieutenant colonels" contained in the table in section 8202(a) of Title 10, United States Code, are suspended. For such period such columns shall read as follows:

"For colonels	For lieutenant colonels
3,500	6,500
3,859	7,706
4,218	8,911
4,577	10,116
4,936	11,321
5,295	12,527
5,654	13,732
6,013	14,937
6,372	16,142
6,730	17,348
7,089	18,533
7,449	19,758
7,807	20,963
8,166	22,169"

SEC. 2. For a period of six years after the effective date of this Act, the authorized strengths prescribed by section 8202 of title 10, United States Code, may be exceeded (1) by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel, and (2) by the following numbers for the grade of major:

Fiscal year following enactment:	*Number to exceed authorized strength*
First	9,500
Second	7,917
Third	6,334
Fourth	4,751
Fifth	3,168
Sixth	1,585

However, the authority to exceed the authorized strengths by 1,000 for the grade of lieutenant colonel, and 1,500 for the grade of major authorized by this section may be used only in the event that drastic reductions or increases in the authorized strength of the commissioned officers on active duty in the Air Force occur within a short period of time and that such changes seriously impede promotions to the grade of major and lieutenant colonel as determined by the Secretary of the Air Force, who shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and of the House of Representative not later than 60 days following the utilization of any of the numbers covered in this sentence.

Approved September 26, 1966.

AUTHORIZED OFFICERS BY RANK

Mr. DAVIS. Translate the above into a table showing the number of authorized commissioned officers, by rank, for 1969, 1970, and 1971.

(The information follows:)

AUTHORIZED STRENGTHS[1]

	Fiscal year—		
	1969	1970	1971
General	441	432	429
Colonel	6,289	6,132	6,057
Lieutenant Colonel	15,863	15,313	15,074
Major	28,232	25,852	23,923
Captain	(2)	(2)	(2)
1st Lieutenant	(2)	(2)	(2)
2d Lieutenant	(2)	(2)	(2)

[1] The above entitlements are based on the legislative ceilings for commissioned officers after excluding physicians and dentists from the end strength.
[2] Not available.

NUMBER OF AUTHORIZED OFFICERS VERSUS 1971 BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. DAVIS. Compare the number of authorized officers, by rank, with the number of officers contained in your 1971 budget request.

(The information follows:)

Grade	Programed fiscal year 1971 President's budget	Nonchargeable to statutory limitation[1]	Chargeable to statutory limitation	Statutory limitation, 10 U.S.C. 8202
General	430	[2] 5	[2] 425	429
Colonel	6,396	445	5,951	6,057
Lieutenant Colonel	16,144	1,070	15,074	15,074
Major	26,072	2,149	23,923	23,923

[1] Includes reimbursables and officers designated as medical or dental officers (10 U.S.C. 8202(a)(f)).
[2] Refers to Senate Armed Services Committee limitation.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TEMPORARY PROMOTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. DAVIS. What is the authorization for temporary promotion of officers?

(The information follows:)

Air Force Reply.—The authorization for temporary promotion of officers is contained in 10 USC 8442 and 10 USC 8447(b) as follows:

8442. Commissioned officers; regular and reserve components: appointment in higher grade.

(a) Whenever the number of officers of the Regular Air Force in any regular grade above second lieutenant is less than the number authorized, the vacancies may be filled by the appointment of qualified officers, as prescribed in subsection (c).

(b) Whenever, under authorization by Congress, the number of commissioned officers of the Regular Air Force on active duty plus the number of other commissioned officers of the Air Force ordered to active duty for a period of more than 30 days is more than the authorized strength of the Regular Air Force in commissioned officers on the active list, the Secretary of the Air Force shall determine the additional number of officers needed in each of the commissioned grades based upon the number of officers serving on active duty and the tasks being performed by the Air Force. Vacancies resulting from that deter-

mination may then be filled by the appointment of qualified officers, as prescribed in subsection (c).

(c) Subject to subsections (a) and (b), a regular commissioned officer, or a reserve commissioned officer who is serving on active duty, may be appointed in a temporary grade that is equal to or higher than his regular or reserve grade, without vacating any other grade held by him. Under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, appointments made under this subsection shall be made on a fair and equitable basis. Selections shall be based upon ability and efficiency with regard being given to seniority and age.

8447. Appointments in commissioned grade: how made; how terminated.

(b) Temporary appointments of commissioned officers in the Air Force shall be made by the President alone in grades below brigadier general, and by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in general officer grades.

OFFICERS BY PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY RANK

Mr. DAVIS. Provide a table showing, by rank, the number of officers as of June 30, 1969, by permanent and temporary rank.

(The information follows:)

NUMBER OF OFFICERS/RANK/PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY, JUNE 30, 1969

CURRENT GRADE IN WHICH SERVING

Permanent grade	General	Lieutenant general	Major general	Brigadier general	Colonel	Lieutenant colonel	Major	Captain	1st lieutenant	2d lieutenant	Total
Major general	13	43	99								155
Brigadier general			65	94							159
Colonel			1	113	4,457	623	2				5,196
Lieutenant colonel			1	9	1,926	7,163	824	21			9,944
Major				1	285	8,565	18,165	1,825			28,841
Captain					5	56	10,244	21,943			32,248
1st lieutenant							48	19,183	1,985	6	21,222
2d lieutenant								2,472	18,616	15,556	36,644
Total	13	43	166	217	6,673	16,407	29,283	45,444	20,601	15,562	134,409

OFFICERS IN TEMPORARY RANK TWO OR MORE ABOVE PERMANENT RANK

Mr. DAVIS. How many officers, in each category of rank, now serve in temporary ranks two or more above permanent rank?

(The information follows:)

Temporary grade and numbers of officers:

General: 25.
Colonel: 293.
Lieutenant colonel: 77.
Major: 47.
Captain: 1,446.
First lieutenant: —.
Second lieutenant: —.

NEED FOR TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Why are temporary promotions required?

General MCGOUGH. Primarily for two reasons. Since 1950 the commissioned officer force has historically exceeded the authorized strength for commissioned officers in the Regular Air Force. That authorization is now 69,425 as compared to a total strength of 129,363 programed for 30 June 1970. The section of law I previously cited—title 10 United States Code, section 8442—contemplated this situation and permits us to make temporary promotions to meet actual active duty grade re-

quirements for expanded commissioned officer strengths. So the cardinal function of the temporary promotion system is to meet our active duty grade requirements. The temporary promotion system has a second and equally important function. This system is the prime avenue for the career progression of our officers on active duty, both regular and nonregular.

EFFECT OF RESTRICTING USE OF TEMPORARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the effect of restricting temporary grades for use strictly in time of emergency declared by Congress or the President, or in time of war?

General MCGOUGH. Without extensive changes to current statutes, I don't think it possible. As long as we continue to maintain relatively large forces we must have a promotion system that is responsive to our actual grade requirements as well as providing incentive to our officers. The permanent promotion systems—assuming this to be the alternative—as they exist today would not satisfy these conditions. In any event, Congress provided the means for controlling temporary grades through the Officer Grade Limitation Act of 1954. Through this act, the Congress sets limits on the number of officers that can serve on active duty in the grades of major through general officer. At the same time, the Congress also intended through this act to provide each service a long-range promotion planning capability. As I said previously, any substitute would have to meet these same conditions.

AFTERNOON SESSION

AIR FORCE ACADEMY CADETS

Mr. ANDREWS. The committee will come to order.

We will continue our discussion of the Air Force request for its personnel budget.

In the case of Academy cadets you are requesting an end strength for 1971 of 4,417, an increase of 266 over the planned end strength for 1970. How do you plan on recruiting these additional cadets?

General MCGOUGH. We don't envision any difficulty at the present time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Have you had any problem getting the required number of cadets?

General MCGOUGH. No, sir; we have not had any difficulty in the past.

Mr. ANDREWS. I assume, like us Congressmen, you have more applicants than you have positions.

Mr. EVANS. Will you have to lower your entrance standards in any way in order to gain this higher cadet input?

General MCGOUGH. No, sir; we do not anticipate lowering the entrance qualifications at this point.

Mr. EVANS. Are the facilities now available to handle these additional cadets?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir; the facilities are available at this time as far as dormitory and messing facilities are concerned.

DECREASE IN OTHER SPECIAL PAY

Mr. EVANS. Pages 23 and 46 show the category, Other Special Pay for Officers and Enlisted Personnel. In 1970 you estimate that you will have 78,150 man-years of special pay and in 1971 you estimate that you will have 69,600 man-years of special pay. Is this decrease of 8,550 man-years directly attributable to planned force level reductions to take place in Vietnam during fiscal year 1971 or does it represent the annualization of reductions which occurred in fiscal year 1970?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, special pay involves many of our people who are not stationed in Vietnam. For example, the bomber and other air crews who fly over hostile areas, plus persons on temporary duty of short duration.

Mr. EVANS. Does it represent annualization of reductions which occurred in fiscal year 1970?

Colonel PARKER. I can't answer that, sir. I can provide it for the record.

Mr. EVANS. If you would I would appreciate it.

(The information follows:)

FISCAL YEAR 1970 ANNUALIZATION OF REDUCTIONS

The decrease of 8,550 man-years for other special pay in fiscal year 1971 is a combination of annualization of fiscal year 1970 reductions and of anticipated fiscal year 1971 reductions in Southeast Asia.

Mr. EVANS. Of this 68,000 man-years, how much is included for combat pay for individuals stationed outside of Vietnam?

General MCGOUGH. I think we would have to submit that for the record.

Mr. EVANS. If you would, please.

(The information follows:)

COMBAT PAY—PAID TO THOSE OUTSIDE VIETNAM

Approximately ——— is paid for personnel engaged in air operations within the combat zone but who are stationed outside of Vietnam.

SUPPORT OF FREE WORLD FORCES

Mr. EVANS. How much is included in this budget for support of free world forces?

General PITTS. We do not include any specific funds in the fiscal year 1971 estimate for this cost. However, in fiscal year 1969 we had costs totalling some $200,000 for this purpose. There is no way to program for these costs which occur in relatively small amounts. We anticipate that such costs could occur in fiscal year 1971, but only in the range of $200,000 and we would absorb the cost.

Mr. EVANS. What countries might be supported and in what amounts?

General PITTS. We have supported the Republic of Korea, the Republic of the Philippines, and Thailand, plus South Vietnam itself.

Mr. EVANS. What troops have been supported, by country?

General PITTS. We don't have that type of detail, sir. If you are talking about pay of troops, we do not pay the troops from those countries. I understand that U.S. AID does provide overall economic assistance to these countries, but we don't handle those funds.

Mr. EVANS. You don't have that in your budget.

General PITTS. No, sir.

Mr. EVANS. If you would, detail for the record what type of cost you might incur.

General PITTS. Yes, sir. I can give you a general idea. It is for overseas allowances, one time family separation allowances, and things like that.

(The information follows:)

SUPPORT OF FREE WORLD FORCES

Possible types of costs by country are as follows:

Korea: Overseas station allowances, death-disability gratuities.

Thailand: Overseas station allowances, family relocation allowances, one-time family separation allowances, and death-disability gratuities.

South Vietnam: Subsistence for trainees assigned to USAF organizations.

FAMILY SEPARATION ALLOWANCE

Mr. EVANS. On pages 36 and 55 of your budget justification you have provided for 1,460 officers and 3,732 enlisted personnel to be drawing a housing allowance when assigned overseas as a result of having to maintain two homes. What are some of the various places around the world where Air Force personnel would be required to maintain a second home as opposed to living in a BOQ?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, this would occur at some of the overseas locations where Government quarters are not available, as at some MAAG's and missions, any place a man would be required to procure quarters at his own expense and at the same time provide quarters for his family remaining back in the United States.

Mr. EVANS. In what countries would this occur?

Colonel PARKER. I don't have specific reference to the countries, Mr. Chairman.

General PITTS. We can supply that for the record.

Mr. EVANS. Just some examples, if you will.

General PITTS. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

HOUSING ALLOWANCE—PLACES WHERE PAYMENT REQUIRED

Some examples of the countries overseas where Air Force personnel are required to maintain a second home are: Alaska, Italy, England, Greece, Germany, Netherlands, Thailand, Japan, Taiwan, and South Vietnam.

SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

OVERSTATED ESTIMATES

Mr. EVANS. On page 72 of your budget justification under the section on subsistence of enlisted personnel your budget for 1970 shows an estimate of 86,308 as the number to be entitled to be subsisted in messes overseas. Your original budget estimate was based on 139,728 to be subsisted overseas. Since your costs are higher and your absentee rate lower overseas, this would have caused a rather sizable surplus of funds in this account. What caused your estimates to be off by so much and to what use were these funds diverted?

If that will be difficult to answer here, you may supply the answer for the record.

Colonel PARKER. Very well, sir; either way.

Mr. EVANS. Why don't you provide it for the record.

(The information follows:)

ESTIMATES FOR SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL AND DIVERSION OF FUNDS

There have been a number of fiscal year 1970 changes in the subsistence area since the President's budget was submitted:

(*a*) As a result of the reduction from 139,728 to 86,308 in the number entitled to subsist overseas, there was a reduction (after applying the 25 percent absentee factor) of 40,065 man-years. This results in a net savings of $19,504,000 after the offset of raising the ration rate from $1.42 per day (in last year's fiscal year 1970 budget) to $1.47.

(*b*) CONUS subsistence increased by 15,104 man-years. CONUS rates per day increased from $1.32 to $1.41. The foregoing results in an increase of $10,779,000.

(*c*) The number authorized to mess separately or receive a basic allowance for subsistence increased by 17,756 from 375,332 to 393,088. The rate per day increased from $1.32 to $1.35. These combine to cause an increase of $13,535,000.

The net result is a series of cost offsets within the total of the original estimate. These offsets, primarily those in man-years, result from unpredictable factors which either induce or result in enlisted personnel receiving basic allowances for subsistence rather than subsistence-in-kind. Other factors are the sizable personnel reductions which can change subsistence patterns; i.e., moves of organizations from overseas to CONUS and base closures.

SPECIAL RATIONS

Mr. EVANS. On page 73 of your budget you have an item entitled "Special rations" which has a yearly cost of approximately $4 million. What are special rations and under what circumstances are they used?

Colonel PARKER. These would be snack meals, sandwich meals, in-flight meals, special rations prepared in a flight kitchen as distinguished from regular meals prepared in a dining hall.

Mr. EVANS. Are these contracted for or prepared in-house?

Colonel PARKER. They are prepared in-house by Air Force cooks.

OPERATIONAL RATIONS

Mr. EVANS. Turning to operational rations, each year in your budget you project a requirement for 18,000 units of food packet in flight and 4,300 units of food packet abandon aircraft. With the scale back of the level of operations, why do you continue to require the same quantity of these items?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, this is a fairly level requirement. It is not directly related to the size of the force.

Mr. EVANS. How often do you have to replace your stocks? What is the age factor that you crank into it?

Colonel PARKER. It ranges from 18 months up to 4 years. I could give you additional data for the record concerning the replacement of stock.

Mr. EVANS. Would you say it has nothing to do with your level of operations?

Colonel PARKER. It is not directly related to troop strength.

Mr. EVANS. Is it related to the number of aircraft or to the number of flights?

Colonel PARKER. It is related to the function that uses this type rations.

Mr. EVANS. The same appears to be true in the case of survival rations. Why do you have a continuing requirement for 61,000 units?

Colonel PARKER. I would give the same answer. It is based on rotational requirements and the overall level of activity.

General MCGOUGH. We can amplify that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

(The information follows:)

OPERATIONAL RATIONS

Operational rations are required for wartime, emergency support, and contingency operations. All echelons review these types of rations semiannually or more often as necessary to change quantitative requirements. Requirement changes are necessary when there are changes in strategic posture and contingency plans.

To insure maximum utilization and to reduce the loss through spoilage, operational rations are rotated over a 2- to 5-year period dependent upon the items, climate, and amounts on hand. To attain maximum benefit from these rations, food service officials make an effort to serve older rations along with fresh foods and still present a well-balanced and attractive menu to our airmen.

AUGMENTATION RATIONS

Mr. EVANS. Under the category augmentation rations why do you require the same quantities each year?

Colonel PARKER. We get this requirement from the using commands, and they did not change significantly.

Mr. EVANS. We are having difficulty understanding why you have the same level of these rations when your strength and number of aircraft and number of flights are reduced. Your whole scale or level of operations is being reduced and, that being the case, it is interesting that these items are not reduced.

General MCGOUGH. We can supply the answer for the record.

Mr. EVANS. If you would, please.

(The information follows:)

EXPLANATION OF ANNUAL REQUIREMENTS

Augmentation rations are a function of certain specialized Air Force missions which require additional amounts for subsistence due to the relatively small number of persons subsisted at any one place. As a result, economies which normally result from the purchase of quantity food containers, i.e., gallon containers versus pint size, do not accrue in smaller dining halls.

The personnel reductions from fiscal year 1970 through fiscal year 1971 have not reduced the missile forces which receive augmentation for crew feeding. A level program continues in this area.

Cold climate augmentation relates to remote and isolated sites and this area also has a level program for both fiscal years.

Combat alert crew feeding involves a variety of alert facilities including SAC bombers, airborne command posts and air defenses. Although force changes have occurred over the past several years and more are forecast for fiscal year 1971, our requirement for small dining halls remains substantially unchanged.

INCREASE IN MEDICAL AUGMENTATION RATION

Mr. EVANS. In the 1970 column of your 1970 budget submission you projected 8,369 man-years for augmentation rations for medical. However, in the 1970 column of your 1971 budget the man-years associated

with this item have increased to 16,849. First, what type of augmentation is "medical"?

Colonel PARKER. The Surgeon General of the Air Force determined that the overall rations served in the hospital dining halls should be augmented 4 percent to augment the special dietary rations required. This augmentation is in addition to the regular Air Force ration that is provided for elsewhere in the budget justification book.

Mr. EVANS. Then this would be strictly a money augmentation and not a food augmentation.

Colonel PARKER. It is a money augmentation to the hospitals to to enable them to buy additional food to serve in the hospital dining halls.

Mr. EVANS. Why was your original estimate for 1970 off by 100 percent? To state it another way, why was it decided to increase the augmentation 100 percent?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, if I may, I would like to supply that for the record.

Mr. EVANS. If you would.

(The information follows:)

AUGMENTATION RATIONS/REASON FOR 100 PERCENT INCREASE

The original fiscal year 1970 budget used estimated numbers of patients rather than estimated numbers of medical rations served as a basis for computing the augmented value of medical rations. This value is 4 percent of rations served. This rate of augmentation was increased from 3 percent to 4 percent effective July 1, 1969 and was not included in the original 1970 budget. The overall result of the 1970 column in the 1971 budget estimate is the correction of the number of rations to be served and the reflection of the 1 percent increase in the augmentation rate.

HOLIDAY MEALS

Mr. EVANS. How do you provide in your budget for the extra cost of the Thanksgiving and Christmas meals? The Army carries this extra cost in its budget as a line item.

Colonel PARKER. Under Secretary of Defense regulations, Mr. Chairman, each service is authorized an additional 25 percent for these two holiday meals, 25 percent over and above the regular ration. The total cost is averaged in our subsistence in kind budget that is before you. We do not have a separate line item for that.

NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAMS

Mr. EVANS. On page 74 of your budget justification you are showing $135,000 for the new food item program in 1970. What did you accomplish as a result of this program in 1970?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, of course the program is incomplete. I could get a progress report from the food service people on what they have accomplished so far.

(The information follows:)

NEW FOOD ITEM PROGRAM

The following items have been tested during fiscal year 1970: Dehydrated, flexible-packed chili con carne; irradiated potatoes; danish pastry mix; individually, quick-frozen vegetables; dehydrated, flexible-packaged pork chops; and irradiated flour.

Instant pineapple and lemon juice are proposed for testing in the near future.
The estimated cost of the program to date is $90,000.
The new food item program is the responsibility of the U.S. Army Natick Labs in Massachusetts under the overall guidance of the DOD Food Product Evaluation Committee.

Mr. EVANS. In 1971 you are requesting $100,000 for this program. What are these funds required for?

Colonel PARKER. These are principally for irradiated foods—chicken, ham, and pork.

Mr. EVANS. You mean for preservation of these foods?

Colonel PARKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. What is done with them then?

Colonel PARKER. These particular items, as I understand it, have yet to be proven safe for human consumption. It is contemplated they will be in fiscal year 1971, at which time they will be introduced into the food inventory.

Mr. EVANS. This is a program you are experimenting with, is that correct?

Colonel PARKER. Yes, sir, that is the nature of the new food item program.

EXAMPLES OF NEW FOOD DEVELOPMENTS

General PITTS. For the record I might amplify and give a couple of examples: Irradiated potatoes, for example don't sprout and, therefore, last longer. Another is irradiated flour, in which the irradiation not only kills weevils in the flour but also kills the eggs. Fumigation, the normal method, doesn't kill eggs. Therefore, irradiated flour is pest-free. We are experimenting with this kind of thing, as Colonel Parker said, and we hope to prove that by irradiating foods we can preserve them longer and make economies. Other types of new food items are meant to save costly shipping by conserving space. Others are convenience foods which save time and reduce preparation time.

Mr. EVANS. Is yours the only investigation being carried on in the Department of Defense?

General MCGOUGH. No. I think the Department of Defense allocates to each of the Services certain responsibilities, and this happens to be the Air Force portion of this program.

Mr. EVANS. You don't know whether the Department of Agriculture is doing a similar study, do you?

General MCGOUGH. The Department of the Army carries out the R. & D. in coordination with the Department of Agriculture. Our tests which are basically consumer acceptance do not duplicate Agriculture tests.

Mr. EVANS. In 1971 do you anticipate actually feeding with these moneys or just simply research?

Colonel PARKER. Sir, this is for the additional cost of these items. If acceptable they will be introduced into the Air Force subsistence program and any additional cost will be borne in regular subsistence costs.

Mr. EVANS. In other words, if the program is successful we can look forward to an increase in the cost of processing such foods for your use, is that correct?

Colonel PARKER. Not necessarily, many of these items will reduce other costs such as storage and preparation.

Assistance Programs

Mr. Evans. Turning now to the assistance programs, would you provide for the record a 3-year table listing all the various assistance programs in which the Air Force participates, showing the number of military and civilian personnel assigned and the estimated cost by appropriation.

General Pitts. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

AIR FORCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Project and fiscal year	End strength		Operation and maintenance (thousands)	Military personnel (thousands)
	Military	Civilian		
Transition:				
1969	453	178	$2,600	[1] $1,500
1970	379	135	1,200	2,533
1971	379	135	1,100	2,358
100,000:				
1969	270	0	246	1,431
1970	319	0	290	1,844
1971	319	0	290	1,844
Value:				
1969		35	137	
1970			218	
1971 [2]				
Hire:				
1969				
1970		100	640	
1971		100	710	
Referral:				
1969				
1970			155	
1971			3	

[1] Partial year only.
[2] Project terminates.

Project 100,000

Mr. Evans. What has the Air Force done in connection with Project 100,000 during the past year? I notice you alluded to that in your statement. Are you pleased with it? Do you think it has an acceptable position within the Air Force? What has been your experience?

General McGough. In my statement I made reference to Project 100,000. I indicated at that time that the program is a lot better than we anticipated. We have been able to produce quality airmen and they have been effective in their job application.

Mr. Evans. As I recollect it, this is simply a matter of DOD policy, not statute.

General McGough. DOD policy, that is correct.

Mr. Evans. Is that policy the same today, sir?

General McGough. The policy is the same today. As I indicated, we have a quota for 1970 and 1971.

Mr. Evans. Is that 100,000 for the Air Force, 100,000 for the Army, and 100,000 for the Navy?

General McGough. That is 100,000 for DOD. Our portion for 1970 was 6,200 New Standards; for 1971 it will be 8,100.

Mr. Evans. As far as you know, the policy will continue for the next fiscal year.

General McGough. I think it will. There may be some adjustment. There will not necessarily be 100,000. It will reflect the reduction in end strength; we will have a constant percentage.

REMEDIAL READING FOR PROJECT 100,000 ENROLLEES

Mr. EVANS. Is the Air Force providing remedial reading instruction to all indivduals with a reading level of fifth grade or below?

General MCGOUGH. We do have a remedial course available not only to the New Standards people that you are talking about in Project 100,000 but also to others who may need assistance in that area. Between September 1967 and November 1, 1969 we have had 3,562 personnel participate in this program.

Mr. EVANS. Is that in addition to your Project 100,000 people?

General MCGOUGH. That includes them. Other than Project 100,000 we have had 533 in the program.

PROJECT TRANSITION

Mr. EVANS. What has the Air Force done in connection with Project Transition during the past year? I notice your statement referred to job placement, counseling, and that sort of thing. Will that be your policy for the next fiscal year as well?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir. We anticipate continuing. As I indicated, we intend to increase the service we give to those returning from overseas. We contact them some 6 months prior to their return, providing them the necessary information and making an inquiry as to what their goals and desires are and assist them in any manner that we can. I think approximately 3,000 people have actually received training. Most of the people receive counseling and advice pertaining to a field of endeavor they should enter upon leaving the service.

I would like to correct the figure. It is 3,820 who entered into training.

Mr. EVANS. Did you undertake any new types of training programs in connection with Project Transition? Did you contract with private sources for special kinds of training or was the training done in-house?

General MCGOUGH. Most of the training was accomplished through companies that provided it near the port of debarkation and at the local vicinities. Very few actually received training provided by the military while on the job. Most of it is done on off-duty time. It has had very little impact on the mission capabilities.

Mr. EVANS. Have you had any additions to the companies that participate in the training?

General MCGOUGH. Yes, sir, we have had some in the last year. Most of the problem is blue collar type activities. For service station operators Humble Oil is a good example; office machinery repair, IBM; automotive repair, General Motors. The Post Office Department is quite active. Computer skills were provided by Univac. These were all done at no cost to the Air Force.

Mr. EVANS. In other words, these services were donated by the various companies involved.

General MCGOUGH. That is correct.

PROJECT REFERRAL

Mr. EVANS. What has the Air Force done during the past year in connection with Project Referral and what are your plans for 1971?

General MCGOUGH. Sir, the referral program was established in December 1969, and its purpose is to provide counseling and automated employment referral for all retirees on a voluntary basis. The referral program will be administered through our transition program with existing resources at base level. It is to be implemented by beginning registration of retirees in June 1970. We have not implemented it yet.

Mr. EVANS. After registration what will you then do with them?

General MCGOUGH. We will provide them with a service making available to them the opportunities that exist in the civilian environment for jobs and, conversely, making known to industry candidates who are retiring and have skills and technical backgrounds that industry might desire.

Mr. EVANS. Do you do this with the Department of Labor?

General MCGOUGH. It is in conjunction with the Department of Labor.

Mr. EVANS. Is it nationwide or in regard to just certain geographic areas.

General MCGOUGH. I believe it will be nationwide. If that is incorrect I will straighten out the record.

METROPOLITAN COUNCIL FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. EVANS. The Air Force is participating in a program called the Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunities—METCO—at Hanscom Field and Otis Air Force Base. In this program local high school students are bused out to the base for 4 hours per week for tutoring. Is this a local project or is it a pilot project with possible implementation at other Air Force bases?

Colonel WHITE. It is a local project, sir. It comes under the aegis of DOD domestic action programs only in that some Air Force personnel have volunteered to tutor students from inner-city schools. The students are bused to suburban schools and not to Air Force bases. It is a locally initiated program with, to my knowledge, no implication for other locations. However, we do have a program whereby ideas that appear good and work well in one area are made known to commanders and community leaders in other areas so they might be emulated, if appropriate.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Andrews.

Mr. ANDREWS. No questions.

Mr. EVANS. Gentlemen?

Mr. RHODES. No questions.

Mr. DAVIS. No questions.

Mr. WYMAN. No questions.

Mr. EVANS. That is all, then. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1970.

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE
AND
NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

WITNESSES

MAJ. GEN. TOM E. MARCHBANKS, JR., CHIEF, AIR FORCE RESERVE, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE
MAJ. GEN. WINSTON P. WILSON, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU
MAJ. GEN. ANDREW S. LOW, JR., DIRECTOR OF AEROSPACE PROGRAMS, DSC/PROGRAMS AND RESOURCES
MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM F. PITTS, DIRECTOR OF BUDGET, COMPTROLLER OF THE AIR FORCE
COL. ORLANDO P. LORETTI, COMPTROLLER, OFFICE OF AIR FORCE RESERVE, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE
MAJ. HAROLD L. MAXWELL, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION DIVISION, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL TRAINING AND EDUCATION, DCS/PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air Force Reserve on active duty under sections 265, 8019, and 8033 of title 10, United States Code, or while undergoing reserve training, or while performing drills or equivalent duty, and for members of the Air Reserve Officers' Training Corps, as authorized by law; ~~[$81,200,000]~~ $86,200,000.

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

		FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct program:			
	1. Reserve component personnel	56,233	78,100	76,200
	2. Reserve officer candidates	9,987	10,200	10,000
	Total direct program	66,220	88,300	86,200
	Reimbursable (total)	18	20	20
10	Total obligations	66,238	88,320	86,220
	Financing:			
14	Receipts and reimbursements from: Non-Federal sources 1/	-18	-20	-20
25	Unobligated balance lapsing	5,579	.....	.....
	Budget authority	71,800	88,300	86,200
	Budget authority:			
40	Appropriation	71,800	81,200	86,200
44.30	Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	.....	7,100	.....
	Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71	Obligations incurred, net	66,220	88,300	86,200
72	Obligated balance, start of year	7,178	6,350	14,650
74	Obligated balance, end of year	-6,350	-14,650	-20,850
77	Adjustments in expired accounts	-1,193	.....	.....
90	Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	65,855	73,640	79,260
91.30	Outlays from military pay act supplemental	.....	6,360	740

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources derived from sale of meals to officers from enlisted messes (10 U.S.C. 9621).

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

		1969 actual	1970 Estimate	1971 Estimate
	Direct obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation: Military personnel	45,518	62,041	59,798
12.2	Personnel benefits: Military personnel	9,638	11,275	10,982
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	5,730	8,953	9,535
22.0	Transportation of things	10	72	49
25.0	Other Services	16	36	63
26.0	Supplies and materials	5,271	5,874	5,724
42.0	Insurance claims and indemnities	37	49	49
	Total direct obligations	66,220	88,300	86,200
	Reimbursable obligations:			
26.0	Supplies and materials	18	20	20
99.0	Total obligations	66,238	88,320	86,220

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS (In Thousands of Dollars)

Program No.	Title	FY 1969 (Actual)	FY 1970 (Estimate)	FY 1971 (Estimate)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
720	Reserve Personnel	$ 56,251	$ 78,120	$ 76,220
780	Reserve Officer Candidates	9,987	10,200	10,000
	TOTAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (OBLIGATIONS)	$ 66,238	$ 88,320	$ 86,220
	Less Actual/Anticipated Reimbursements	18	20	20
	Total Direct Obligations/Appropriation	$ 66,220	$ 88,300	$ 86,200

PROGRAM 720: RESERVE PERSONNEL

SUMMARY REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT (In Thousands of Dollars)

Project No.	Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
721	Training, Pay Group A	$ 36,858	$ 48,035	$ 48,178
722	Training, Pay Group B	3,621	4,773	4,812
723	Training, Pay Group D	1,601	2,391	2,428
724	Training, Pay Group E	54	-0-	-0-
725	Training, Pay Group F	4,050	5,972	5,594
726	School Training	3,481	8,235	6,270
727	Special Training	5,283	6,716	6,575
728	Administration and Support	1,303	1,998	2,363
	TOTAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (OBLIGATIONS)	$ 56,251	$ 78,120	$ 76,220

PERSONNEL SUMMARY

Pay Group	Authorized Paid Drills	Authorized Paid Days of Active Duty for Training		FY 1969 (Actual) Begin	FY 1969 (Actual) Average	FY 1969 (Actual) End	FY 1970 (Current Program) Average	FY 1970 (Current Program) End	FY 1971 (Budget Request) Average	FY 1971 (Budget Request) End
A	48	15	Off	7,188	7,140	7,631	7,891	8,187	7,915	7,885
			Enl	31,126	30,211	31,721	32,985	34,753	33,605	33,545
B	24	15	Off	2,326	2,366	2,422	2,449	2,455	2,449	2,455
			Enl	1,697	1,866	1,926	1,992	2,015	1,997	2,015
F	-0-	4 mos. min	Enl	710	933	1,226	2,105	1,535	1,955	1,700
Pay Drill + Non-Prior Service			Off	9,514	9,506	10,053	10,340	10,642	10,364	10,340
			Enl	33,533	33,010	34,873	37,082	38,303	37,557	37,260
			TOTAL	43,047	42,516	44,926	47,422	48,945	47,921	47,600
D	-0-	15	Off	2,427	2,166	2,166	2,356	2,356	2,356	2,356
			Enl	179	133	133	244	244	244	244
E	-0-	30	Off	37	35	35	-	-	-	-
			Enl	48	41	41	-	-	-	-
Other Paid Status			Off	2,464	2,201	2,201	2,356	2,356	2,356	2,356
			Enl	227	174	174	244	244	244	244
			TOTAL	2,691	2,375	2,375	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
Total Paid Participants			Off	11,978	11,707	12,254	12,696	12,998	12,720	12,696
			Enl	33,760	33,184	35,047	37,326	38,547	37,801	37,504
			TOTAL	45,738	44,891	47,301	50,022	51,545	50,521	50,200

AIR FORCE RESERVE SECTION OFFICERS

Air Force Reserve officers performing full time active duty under Sections 265, 8019, and 8033 of Title 10, U.S. Code:

	FY 1969 (Actual)			FY 1970 (Current Year)		FY 1971 (Budget Request)	
	Begin	Average	End	Average	End	Average	End
Section 265 Officers	38	44	55	75	92	97	116
Section 8019 Officers	-	1	1	1	1	1	1
Section 8033 Officers	9	8	7	7	7	7	7
Total	47	53	63	83	100	105	124

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, clothing, subsistence, gratuities, travel, and related expenses for personnel of the Air National Guard on duty under sections 265, 8033 or 8496 of title 10 or section 708 of title 32, United States Code, or while undergoing training or while performing drills or equivalent duty, as authorized by law; [$97,300,000]✓ $108,500,000 Provided, That obligations may be incurred under this appropriation without regard to section 107 of title 32, United States Code.

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

		FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	Program by activities:			
	Direct program: Reserve component personnel	86,355	107,600	108,500
	Reimbursable (total)	113	115	115
10	Total Obligations	86,468	107,715	108,615
	Financing:			
	Receipts and reimbursements from:			
11	Federal funds	- 10	- 10	- 10
14	Non-Federal sources 1/	-103	-105	-105
25	Unobligated balance lapsing	1,645	.....	.....
	Budget Authority	88,000	107,600	108,500
	Budget Authority:			
40	Appropriation	88,000	97,300	108,500
44.30	Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	.....	10,300	.....
	Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71	Obligations incurred, net	86,355	107,600	108,500
72	Obligated balance, start of year	7,091	6,956	11,556
74	Obligated balance, end of year	-6,956	-11,556	-14,056
77	Adjustments in expired accounts	- 87	.....	.....
90	Outlays, excluding pay increase supplemental	86,405	93,450	105,250
91.30	Outlays from military pay act supplemental	.....	9,550	750

1/ Reimbursements from non-Federal sources derived from sale of meals to officers from enlisted messes (10 U.S.C. 9621).

Object Classification (in thousands of dollars)

		FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	Direct obligations:			
11.7	Personnel compensation: Military personnel	69,367	85,078	87,890
12.2	Personnel benefits: Military personnel	7,366	9,021	8,498
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	3,865	6,760	5,814
22.0	Transportation of things	150	329	338
26.0	Supplies and materials	5,356	6,273	5,816
42.0	Insurance claims and indemnities	251	139	144
	Total direct obligations	86,355	107,600	108,500
	Reimbursable obligations:			
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	10	10	10
26.0	Supplies and materials	103	105	105
	Total reimbursable obligations	113	115	115
99.0	Total obligations	86,468	107,715	108,615

Program 520: National Guard Personnel

SUMMARY OF REQUIREMENTS BY PROJECT (In Thousands)

Program No.	Title	FY 1969 Actual	FY 1970 Estimate	FY 1971 Estimate
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
521	Training, Pay Group A	$ 66,045	$ 85,360	$ 86,629
522	Training, Pay Group F	9,512	10,084	8,085
523	School Training	6,106	7,159	6,433
524	Special Training	2,925	3,019	5,343
525	Administration and Support	1,880	2,093	2,125
	TOTAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS (OBLIGATIONS)	$ 86,468	$ 107,715	$ 108,615

PERSONNEL SUMMARY

Pay Group	Authorized Paid Drills	Authorized Paid Days of Active Duty for Tng.		FY 1969 (Actual) Begin	FY 1969 (Actual) Average	FY 1969 (Actual) End	FY 1970 (Current Year) Average	FY 1970 (Current Year) End	FY 1971 (Budget Request) Average	FY 1971 (Budget Request) End
A	48	15	Off	9,292	9,519	10,281	10,560	11,000	11,162	11,324
			Enl	62,521	64,383	69,514	73,288	75,559	74,104	72,983
F	-0-	4 mos minimum	Enl	3,448	3,501	3,619	3,198	2,087	2,612	2,803
Total Paid Status			Off	9,292	9,519	10,281	10,560	11,000	11,162	11,324
			Enl	65,969	67,884	73,133	76,486	77,646	76,716	75,786
			Total	75,261	77,403	83,414	87,046	88,646	87,878	87,110

AIR NATIONAL GUARD SECTION OFFICERS

Air National Guard officers performing full time active duty under Sections 265, 8033 and 8496 of Title 10, and Section 708, Title 32, U.S. Code:

	FY 1969 (Actual) Begin	FY 1969 (Actual) Average	FY 1969 (Actual) End	FY 1970 (Current Year) Average	FY 1970 (Current Year) End	FY 1971 (Budget Request) Average	FY 1971 (Budget Request) End
Section 265 Officers	39	39	39	49	50	50	50
Section 8033 Officers	8	8	8	6	6	6	6
Section 8496 Officers	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
Section 708 Officers	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Total	77	77	77	85	86	86	86

Mr. EVANS. We will now begin consideration of the fiscal year 1971 request for Reserve and Guard personnel, Air Force.

We have before us today, Maj. Gen. Tom E. Marchbanks, Jr., Chief of Air Force Reserve, to present the request for the Reserve, and Maj. Gen. Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, to present the request for the Air Guard.

The request for Reserve personnel for 1971 is $86,200,000, an increase of $5 million over the amount currently appropriated. The budget document indicates that a supplemental covering Pay Act costs of $7.1 million will be requested for fiscal year 1970. If this supplemental is approved as requested, then the 1971 request would actually result in a decrease of $2.1 million below the 1970 program.

The request for the Air Guard for 1971 is $108.5 million, an increase of $11.2 million over the amount currently appropriated for 1970. The Guard is also requesting a supplemental of $10.3 million to cover Pay Act costs. If that request is approved, then the 1971 request would only result in an increase of $900,000 over the planned program for 1970

General Marchbanks, would you please proceed with your statement.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE

General MARCHBANKS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is again a pleasure to appear before this committee to discuss the 1971 budget estimates for the Air Force Reserve personnel appropriation.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We appreciate your interest in the Air Force Reserve and the support you have given us. I am sure that you will be pleased to know that during this past year the Air Force Reserve flying units compiled an enviable record—flying more than 150,000 accident free hours. This achievement is especially noteworthy when we consider the diversity of the Reserve flying mission and the unique circumstances of the citizen airmen.

Our units that were demobilized in June, after being called to active duty in January and May 1968, compiled an impressive record in service around the world and in combat. The 11 Air Force outstanding unit awards and 1,661 individual decorations and awards are evidence of the reservists' professional performance while on active duty.

During this past year, our crews flew over 11,800 productive missions in all parts of the world, including Southeast Asia. Our C–119 and C–130 tactical airlift units and C–124 military airlift organizations airlifted 23,459 tons of cargo for more than 52,296,000 ton-miles. We airdropped 185 tons of cargo and equipment. Our aircraft carried over 46,700 passengers and logged more than 27 million passenger-miles. More than 111,000 troops were airdropped from Reserve aircraft during 1969. I must again emphasize, as I did last year, the fact that these accomplishments, while of a great value to the active Air Force, were accomplished primarily as a byproduct of the training so essential to keep our Reserve units combat ready.

MAJOR OPERATIONS AND JOINT EXERCISES

Air Force Reserve units participated in four major operations during 1969, three joint exercises and an Air Force mobility exercise.

"Ember Dawn," a small scale, joint Army-Air Force exercise was conducted in the Alaska area during early July 1969. Ten USAFR C–119 aircraft, aircrews, and support personnel deployed from CONUS bases to Alaska. These aircrews flew 106 sorties, 452 hours and airlifted 78.5 tons of cargo, 526 passengers and dropped 59 troops.

Our military and tactical airlift units transported more than 270 tons of equipment to Seymour Johnson AFB, N.C., in support of Air Force Operation "Coronet Bare," which was a mobility deployment exercise conducted in October.

During September, 10 of our C–119's flew 32 missions airdropping men and equipment during "Cabaret Ahmed." This was a joint service exercise at Fort Bragg, N.C., involving 9,000 men of the Army's 82d Airborne Division, as well as active Air Force units.

Our units participated in another joint exercise, "Exotic Dancer," which took place in Puerto Rico during May and June. Our aircraft logged over 3,400 flying hours and flew 516 sorties in support of that joint exercise.

OPERATION "COLD SHAKY"

The Military Airlift Command (MAC) experienced a shortage of C–124 pilots. The Air Force Reserve responded to a MAC request and provided 51 USAFR pilots who volunteered for short tours of active duty, ranging from 30 to 179 days. These pilots took leave from their civilian occupations to fly C–124 aircraft in the MAC System. From April through October 1969 this operation netted 3,196 man-days of augmentation to the active force.

AEROSPACE RESCUE AND RECOVERY

Air Force Reserve rescue units flew over 200 active missions and logged over 1,200 aircraft hours in direct support of MAC during 1969, as a byproduct of aircrew training programs. These missions included active search and rescue, precautionary orbit operations and strip alerts. The annual figures do not include missions and hours flown during the first half of the year by the 305th Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron, while in an active duty status.

ASSOCIATE PROGRAM

We have experienced continued growth and improvement of the "associate unit" concept which we established in fiscal year 1968. As I reported to you last year, under the associate program, reservists fly and maintain modern active force equipment. Our crewmembers can individually augment active duty crews, or fly as an all-reserve crew. At present, we have nine C–141 associated airlift units operating, compared with four in 1968. During the period from July through November 1969, our associate unit personnel flew a total of 87,951 individual flying hours in the C–141, of which 71,979 hours were productive. Converting this to aircraft flying hours based on six crewmembers

per aircraft, reservists contributed more than 11,990 productive aircraft flying hours to MAC during the 5-month period.

C–9A ASSOCIATE PROGRAM

A new approach in the Reserve medical picture is the C–9A aeromedical evacuation associate program. This new Reserve unit which was activated in July 1969, maintains and operates the most modern aircraft available for patient evacuation and is performing actual missions while assisting the Military Airlift Command to fulfill the aeromedical evacuation requirements within CONUS. The 73d Aeromedical Airlift Squadron has already compiled an impressive record. Its nurses have flown 762 hours on air evacuation missions, while the medical technicians have flown a total of 850 hours. These hours represent the time an active duty person would have been utilized, had not the Reserve personnel been available.

HURRICANE CAMILLE

The Third Air Force Reserve region at Dobbins, AFB, Ga., coordinated all Air Force disaster assistance for Hurricane Camille last August and September. During the 3-week operation, Air Force Reserve C–119's and C–124's airlifted 339 passengers and more than 1,231 tons of cargo and equipment on 144 flights into the hurricane-ravaged area. Also the Air Force reservists rendered other assistance, including water purification, medical care and supplies, body recovery, and numerous other tasks. We are continuing to assist in rebuilding efforts in the storm damaged areas. Several weeks ago we were called upon to airlift construction workers from Barksdale Air Force Base to New Orleans.

TRAINING SUPPORT

The Air Force Reserve operates a C–130A Combat Crew Training Squadron (CCTS) and a C–119 CCTS which train active as well as Reserve forces. During the first half of fiscal year 1970, the C–130 CCTS graduated 69 qualified pilots and 16 flight engineers of which 60 pilots and 14 flight engineers were from the Active Force. The projection for the entire fiscal year 1970 is 181 pilots and 72 flight engineers. In addition, the C–130A field training detachment has trained 150 maintenance personnel with a total projection of 340. The C–119 CCTS has graduated 66 pilots, 19 flight engineers, and 67 navigators for the Active Force. The total fiscal year 1970 projection is for 126 pilots, 49 flight engineers, and 127 navigators.

OPERATIONAL READINESS

The operational capability of our total force is lower now than it was this time last year due to the many changes in the force structure during this year. However, one area should be noted and that is the C–141 associate units. These units are upgrading according to the MAC schedule, and one unit attained operational readiness status, well ahead of schedule. Aggressive training is being continued for all units in order to upgrade our combat ready status to the levels we had previously attained.

FISCAL YEAR 1970 REVISED PROGRAM

The Air Force Reserve personnel appropriation request presented to you last year included a funding requirement of $76.9 for the Air Force Reserve program which supported an average drill pay strength of 50,775, and an end year strength of 50,060. This drill strength was based on 100 percent manning of flying units, with the exception of the C–119 groups which were authorized 90 percent, and a minimum of 82 percent of all other units. The revised program includes an average drill pay strength of 47,422 and an end strength of 48,945. These strengths provide for an average of 93 percent manning in our flying units and 81 percent in our nonflying units. The strength reduction was due to a variety of programing actions and unforeseen recruiting problems, including a smaller than anticipated number of personnel retained in the units demobilized in June 1969.

However, be assured that other Air Force officials share with me an earnest desire to attain the manning floor established by Congress. All Air Force Reserve commanders and responsible staff officers are keenly aware of the urgency of this matter, and an extensive, recruiting program is in progress. Units are redirecting the recruiting efforts with special emphasis on personal contact with individuals scheduled to leave the active service or those who have been recently separated. New approaches to recruiting, more effective counseling by the Active Force, and restudy of our retention program are being thoroughly reevaluated. Everything possible is being done within the limits of sound management to achieve the desired manning. To assure that these objectives are met as soon as possible, Air Force Reserve strength levels and programs are being continuously monitored at the highest level in the Air Force as well as intermediate levels in the Reserve command structure.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

I would also like to point out that the Office of Air Force Reserve took the first steps during 1969 in what will be a continuing program, to increase the level of Negro manning in our units.

In an attempt to increase Negro manning, we initiated a test program at six selected locations in January. We selected these six areas because of mission assignment, recruiting potential, and status of the areas' nonprior service waiting list.

The program is directed at the graduating high school senior in predominantly Negro institutions and will include presentation highlighting training opportunities in the Air Force Reserve.

FISCAL YEAR 1970 DOLLAR REQUIREMENTS

The revised fiscal year 1970 dollar requirement for the Air Force Reserve personnel appropriation is $88.3 million. Of this amount $78.1 million is for the Air Force Reserve program based on the revised average drill strength of 47,422. Included in the total dollar requirement is a proposed supplemental request of $7.1 million associated with the military pay increase and per diem rates effective during fiscal year 1970.

FISCAL YEAR 1971

The fiscal year 1971 Reserve personnel appropriation of $86.2 million includes $76.2 million for the Air Force Reserve program which is $1.9 million less than the revised fiscal year 1970 requirement. This request will provide the military personnel costs for an average drill strength of 47,921 reservists, 2,600 reservists who are paid only for their annual active duty tour, and for a man-year average of 105 officers performing full time active duty. This program provides for an average of 90 percent manning in all Reserve units, with an average of 92 percent in our flying units and 82 percent in the nonflying units.

FLYING UNITS

Apprixamtely 62 percent of the drill strengths are required to support the flying units which are reflected in table I.

TABLE I.—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE—AIR FORCE RESERVE UNIT FORCE STRUCTURE

Flying units	End fiscal year 1969	End fiscal year 1970	End fiscal year 1971
Equipped units:			
C–119 tactical airlift groups	10	3	0
C–124 military airlift groups	19	16	15
C–130 tactical airlift groups	1	3	3
C–130 tactical airlift squadron (CCTS)	1	1	1
O–2 tactical air support	3	5	5
Aerospace rescue and recovery squadrons	5	5	5
AC–119 special operations group	1	3	3
Total	40	36	32
Associate (groups/squadrons):			
C–9 aeromedical evacuation	0	1/1	1/1
C–141 military airlift	5	6/10	7/14
Total groups	5	7	8
Total groups	45	43	40

As reflected in the above table, the following force structure changes are programed during fiscal year 1971.

(*a*) Three of the C–119 tactical airlift groups are scheduled for inactivation during the first quarter of fiscal year 1971 with no follow-on mission.

(*b*) One of the C–124 military airlift groups will convert to an associate C–141 military airlift group, and

(*c*) Three additional associate C–141 military airlift groups will be activated. In addition to the force structure reflected above we will have 195 nonflying units in fiscal year 1971, which consist of aeromedical evacuation squadrons and flights, medical service units, aerial port squadrons, military airlift support, maintenance and supply squadrons, air postal groups and censorship squadrons. These nonflying units, which have represented approximately 23 percent of our assigned drill strength, have a wartime mobilization assignment to major air commands, and receive the same supervision, training, and inspections as the active force units.

Summarizing the requirements for the Air Force Reserve program, the average strength required in fiscal year 1971 for the manning of all Air Force Reserve units will be 40,594. In addition to providing

funding support for reservists assigned to units, the request also includes funding requirements for:

(*a*) 8,020 Air Force Reservists in the individual program including 2,600 who are paid only for their annual active duty tour.

(*b*) An input of 4,700 non-prior-service personnel into our active duty for training program.

(*c*) Approximately 277,000 training days for special and school tours for transitional, proficiency training, and special support activities.

(*d*) Man-year average of 105 Air Force Reserve officers on extended active duty who are responsible for Reserve affairs as authorized by title 10, United States Code.

AIR FORCE RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Also included in this appropriation request are military personnel type costs associated with the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps. These funds will provide for uniforms, subsistence allowances, and pay while attending field training, and associated travel costs.

The mission of the senior division of the Air Force ROTC program is to commission carrier-oriented second lieutenants in response to Air Force requirements through a college campus program. In fiscal year 1971 the Air Force ROTC program will be offered in 171 colleges and universities, with a programed beginning enrollment of 47,355 AFROTC cadets. Of this total, 36,850 will be in the general military (basic) course and the remaining 10,505 in the professional officers (advance) course. Included in this total enrollment are approximately 5,500 cadets in the financial assistance or scholarship program. It is estimated that 4,500 officers will be commissioned from this enrollment.

A separate division of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps is the junior program. The mission of this program is to acquaint secondary school students with the aerospace age, to develop informed citizens, strengthen character, and to motivate students for careers in the Air Force. We have included in our estimate 19,800 cadets, from 165 units, to be enrolled in the Junior ROTC program in fiscal year 1971.

The fiscal year 1971 estimate for the AFROTC program is $10 million, including $300,000 for the Junior AFROTC.

SUMMARY

In summary, the fiscal year 1971 estimate for the Reserve personnel appropriation is $86.2 million of which $10 million is required for the AFROTC program. The balance of $76.2 million will provide training for the Reserve personnel assigned to 40 flying units, 195 nonflying units, 8,020 individual augmentees, and supporting schools, special tours, and administration type costs.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I will be happy to answer any questions the committee may have.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you, General Marchbanks.

General Wilson, you may present your statement.

STATEMENT OF THE CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

General WILSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, again, it is a privilege to appear before this committee to give you a report on the activity and progress of the Air National Guard and to present the Air National Guard requirements for the coming fiscal year.

This past year was another good one for the Air National Guard. Individuals and units continued to excel in their primary role of a ready force for employment alongside their active counterparts. They also contributed substantial aid to both the civilian and military community in secondary roles.

The 14 Air National Guard units mobilized in 1968 and demobilized in 1969 brought home an outstanding record of performance which has been well publicized since their return. They are now in the process of rebuilding and retraining to combat ready status. Of the 14 units, 12 could be mobilized again today and provide a significant combat capability limited of course by factors such as the number of assigned aircraft. The F-100 units were authorized 100 percent manning prior to the time of recall, making them available for overseas deployment within 36 hours. The 100 percent authorization for these units was ended in 1969. We are now authorized 93 percent manning which is considered to be an absolute minimum. While this will not provide the same response time and performance we achieved under the 100 percent manning concept, it will be adequate during the rebuilding phase.

Our primary mission is to provide combat ready forces immediately upon mobilization. Our efforts are expended in training for this purpose. In the process our people volunteer for and we perform a large variety of productive tasks as a welcome byproduct of training. We make our training dollar do double duty whenever possible. Examples will be apparent as I point out some of our activities in the many mission areas of the Air National Guard.

AEROMEDICAL EVACUATION PROGRAM

Our aeromedical evacuation program, in business since 1965, consists of four C-121 aeromedical airlift groups, four aeromedical evacuation squadrons and 19 aeromedical evacuation flights. These units have been integrated with the active program and fly both ZI near offshore and worldwide missions on a regular and routine basis. Crews are volunteers who adjust their civilian pursuits to permit their participation in this important function. They carried 2,474 patients in calendar year 1969.

AIRLIFT SUPPORT

The 17 airlift units hauled nearly 25,750 tons of cargo and passengers during calendar year 1969 for a total of 69,886,850 ton miles. Over half was revenue cargo for the Military Airlift Command, with a significant portion for Southeast Asia. The remainder represents domestic airlift for annual National Guard field training, special exercises, Hurricane Camille relief, Strategic Air Command satellite base

support, and other requirements. Nearly 1,000 tons and over 2,300 passengers were carried for Camille relief alone.

OPERATION CREEK PARTY

Operation Creek Party, air refueling support to USAFE, has been in existence since May of 1967. The crews and support personnel continue to serve on a voluntary basis and are rotated as necessary. During 1969, our KC-97 aerial refueling tankers flew 659 sorties, off-loading almost 15 million pounds of fuel.

ADC ALERT

Since 1955, the fighter interceptor units have continued to provide an air defense alert force. The entire ANG aerospace defense force, with the exception of three units converting to new aircraft, is currently providing 5-minute alert 24 hours per day in the continental United States, and Hawaii. In Puerto Rico the same status is maintained from dawn to dusk. This supplements or replaces alert duty by the active force.

TACTICAL FORCES

The forces gained by Tactical Air Command—our fighter, reconnaissance, and special operations groups—have performed a number of functions during the past year.

The reconnaissance units photographed large areas after Hurricane Camille. They also kept a continuous training program going for active duty pilots scheduled for Southeast Asia duty in B–57 aircraft.

During 1969 the TAC fighter units, not on active duty provided tow target sorties for active duty F–4 air-to-air gunnery training until the active units become self-supporting.

The special operations units supported Army Special Forces training concurrently with their own training missions.

The Air National Guard is in the process of reorganizing its tactical units to more closely conform to those of the Tactical Air Command. This reorganization should simplify the mobilization process.

WESTACS

The Air National Guard planned and conducted a large scale training maneuver in August of 1969. The purpose was to obtain realistic training in deploying, installing, and operating a tactical air control system in a true tactical environment with air and ground elements. It took place in western Utah and Idaho, and involved the following ANG aircraft units; two tractical fighter groups, one reconnaissance group, one special operations group, and one air refueling group.

Also involved were 39 ANG communications and electronics units from 19 different States. A complete tactical air control system (TACS) was established by using one tactical control group and two mobile communications groups with headquarters at Wendover Auxiliary Air Force Base, Utah.

Radar and communication networks were extended over a wide area of the mountain States in support of tactical ANG flying units, and Army National Guard helicopters provided logistical support to iso-

lated radio relay locations. Approximately 5,000 Air National Guardsmen were deployed to the maneuver area with thousands more directly supporting the exercise from home stations.

JCS EXERCISES

In 1968 and 1969 we supported eight JCS directed exercises, both at home and overseas. However, all JCS exercises involving Air National Guard participation in fiscal year 1970 have been canceled. This makes the conduct of our training maneuvers such as WESTACS even more important if we are to maintain completely ready forces. We are tentatively scheduled to participate in four JCS exercises in fiscal year 1971.

LOGISTICAL SUPPORT OF MAC

On October 8, 1969, the Air National Guard assumed C–124 enroute logistical support responsibility for the Atlantic from the Military Airlift Command. A primary supply point was established at the Air National Guard Facility, Dobbins Air Force Base, Ga. It is responsible for providing aircraft spares, serviceable engines, and components to forward supply points located in: South Carolina; Delaware; the Azores; Spain; England; and Germany. This support is provided for the Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard aircraft transiting MAC Atlantic routes. It will entail the buildup of approximately 180 engines and the repair of approximately 12,000 aircraft components in calendar year 1970.

COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS UNITS

The Hawaii Air National Guard units, continued to maintain an air defense system for the islands area and provide requalification/proficiency training for weapons controllers assigned to active Air Force units in PACAF, and in support of SEA.

New England based ANG tactical radar units participated in training programs on weekends with the Marine and Naval Reserve Air units. The ANG provided support for the bombing/gunnery range and radar guidance training.

The ANG C–97 Flying Command Post (Talking Bird) was deployed to SEA for 30 days in support of the White House communications requirements. It also supported the Tactical Air Command in an operation in Turkey (Deep Furrow) and the Air Force Communication Service (AFCS) in South America. In January and February of 1970 it assisted the Army in Project Red Hat; This involved planning for the rail movement of chemicals on the west coast.

Air National Guard ground electronics engineering installation agencies (GEEIA) units continued to support the Active Air Force by providing volunteers to assist in the removal of C. & E. equipment from Turkey. More than 300 guardsmen volunteered for this exercise (operation "Turkey Realinement") in lieu of summer field training.

ANG weather flights provided weather support to 21 ANG flying units at field training locations.

In addition, five flights augmented the active Air Force at USAF

bases, eight flights provided staff weather services to the ARNG division headquarters, operational field services to the aviation battalion and two mobile combat crews for battalion support.

DOMESTIC ACTIONS

The Air National Guard has enlarged its participation in the DOD domestic actions program and we encourage our units to make maximum use of their facilities for this purpose. Initial ventures include establishing an Explorer Scout program for dependents of active duty personnel and underprivileged children in the surrounding community, participation in the President's youth opportunity program, and participation in a program to develop disadvantaged young people to a level which would give them the capability of serving in the Armed Forces.

EFFECTIVENESS OF UNITS

Our units are evaluated by the same standards that apply to like active units. The two primary inspections are the operational readiness inspection (ORI) and the general inspection. During calendar year 1969, we had 33 ORI's with an 88 percent pass rate. Our percentage compares favorably with the active force in all mission areas. The performance of our units that were recalled testifies to the validity of the inspection results.

ADDITIONAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This list of accomplishments is long. I have given you some examples to indicate that nearly every mission area of the Air National Guard is involved in a role which provides some benefit to the active military or civilian community. It's time now to discuss what changes occurred, or will occur, in the force structure during fiscal year 1970 and those scheduled for the coming fiscal year.

FISCAL YEAR 70 FORCE STRUCTURE

At the end of fiscal year 1969 we had 22 units in the Air Defense force, and at the end of fiscal year 1970 we will have 18 units. During fiscal year 1970 eight conversions will take place in the ANG Air Defense force: two F–102A units and one F–89 unit to F–101B aircraft; two F–102A units to F–100 aircraft; one F–102A unit and one F–89 unit to F–84F aircraft; and one F–102A unit to a combat crew training unit.

Four modernization changes occur in the tactical fighter force in the last quarter of this fiscal year. Two F–84 units will convert to F–100's. One F–86 unit will receive A–37's, and one F–100C group acquires F–105 aircraft. The aircraft from the F–100C unit will be distributed to the remaining F–100 units to relieve the aircraft shortage problem allowing them to attain a higher combat ready status. Our TAC fighter end strength is 26 units—a gain of one unit from the beginning of the year. This includes the new mission of tactical training in F–100 aircraft at Tucson, Ariz.

Our tactical reconnaissance units remain unchanged—12 units of RB–57, RF–84 and RF–101 aircraft.

The same is true of our four special operations groups which are equipped with U–10 and either C–119 or HU–16 aircraft.

We have a total of three tactical air support groups. Although now equipped with the interim U–3 light aircraft, we are beginning to receive enough O–2 mission aircraft to fully equip two units and partially equip the third by the end of this calendar year.

Our tactical electronic warfare unit continued in operation, gaining additional mission equipped aircraft this year.

We added two refueling units by converting two of our C–97 airlift groups. We are modifying 23 aircraft (previously in storage) to bring all seven units up to strength.

In the airlift area, we have one major change with two C–97 units converting to C–130's late this spring. Our airlift end strength will be 21 units, which include the four aeromed airlift units.

That completes the 92 unit flying force. For fiscal 1971, we have a similar 92 unit force. I'll briefly review the planned changes or conversions in the mission areas before leaving the force structure subject.

FISCAL YEAR 1971 FORCE STRUCTURE

In the tactical fighter area, four units are scheduled to convert to a newer type aircraft. Two units will receive F–100's and two the A–37's. The total TAC force will remain at 26 units, the same as fiscal year 1970. The reconnaissance units will remain at 12.

One unit will modernize by converting from the RF–84 to the RF–101.

Special operations, tactical air support, electronic warfare, and refueling units have no programed changes. Aeromedical evacuation will remain stable at four units.

With a limited number of changes occurring in fiscal year 1971, we will have an increased number of combat ready units available for employment.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

The programed end strength for the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1971 is 87,110 with an average of 87,878. This compares to an average strength of 87,046 and ending strength of 88,646 programed in fiscal year 1970. We are requesting $108.5 million in the National Guard personnel, Air Force appropriation to support the drill strength that I have just mentioned. This will provide pay and allowances of officers and airmen on active duty training, unit training assemblies, basic military training, school training, special tours of active duty in support of active force exercises, clothing subsistence, travel and other personnel expenses. The fiscal year 1971 appropriation request of $108.5 million compares with $107.6 million in fiscal year 1970; a difference of $.9 million.

I will next discuss the scope of the Air National Guard activity to include an explanation of the differences in costs between fiscal year 1971 and fiscal vear 1970.

ANNUAL FIELD TRAINING/UNIT TRAINING ASSEMBLIES (P521)

Fifteen days of annual field training and 48 unit training assemblies each year are, of course, legislative in nature. Further, each

guardsman on current flying status performs 36 additional flying training periods each year. During these training periods the guardsman increases his proficiency which contributes to the overall combat effectiveness of his unit. This program is $1.4 million higher in fiscal year 1971 than in fiscal year 1970 to support an average Pay Group A drill strength which is 1,418 greater than the average strength that is programed in fiscal year 1970. This is due to the rebuilding phase which took place after demobilization. This manning level will permit the Air National Guard to program essentially the same number of high-priority combat ready flying units with a lesser manning level in lower priority flying units and in nonflying units.

NON-PRIOR SERVICE BASIC AND TECHNICAL TRAINING PROGRAM (P522)

The air guardsman receives his initial basic training at Lackland Air Force Base along with recruits of the regular establishment. About 75 percent of the recruits enter technical training schools immediately upon completion of basic military training. The remainder are required to complete their active duty through home station "on the job training."

During fiscal year 1970, we will enter 8,871 non-prior service individuals into training. For fiscal year 1971, we will enter 8,880 into training. There is a net decrease of $2.0 million in the program, accounted for by a change in the phasing of non-prior service individuals into training. Non-prior service inputs into basic military training during fiscal year 1970 are primarily in the first three quarters enabling most of the basics to complete their training prior to fiscal year 1971. The result will be a nominal manday carryover into fiscal year 1971.

SCHOOL TRAINING (P523)

During fiscal year 1970, we will enter approximately 2,781 officers and airmen into school training. We expect to enter 2,627 during fiscal year 1971, with a decreased cost of $.8 million. This program is designed to enhance the skills of air guardsmen through attendance at formal courses of instruction offered by Air Training Command. These courses include flight training, service schools, and technical schools.

SPECIAL TRAINING (P524)

This program provides the air guardsmen with training not included in field training, unit training assemblies, basic military training nor formal schooling. It includes, but is not limited to, overwater training flights for personnel in our airlift units, readiness training, simulator training, physiological training, and ADC alert duty for ANG pilots. The net fiscal year 1971 increase of $2.3 million in this program is primarily associated with the transfer of financing for ANG pilots who perform aerospace defense alerts from the regular Air Force to the National Guard.

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT (P525)

This program provides for the pay and allowances of ANG officers serving under Sections 265, 8033, 8496 of title 10, United States Code,

as well as Section 708 of title 32, United States Code; death gratuities paid to Air Guard survivors; disability pay; and the employer's contributions to the Service Group Life Insurance program. Fiscal year 1971 and fiscal year 1970 costs are comparable.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I have covered the current activities of the Air National Guard and the requirements for the forthcoming fiscal year. The performance of our units has substantiated the faith of the people and justified our past approved programs. We hope our future posture can continue this fine precedent. I'm prepared to answer questions you may have concerning the proposed Air National Guard requirements for fiscal year 1971.

Mr. ANDREWS. Thank you, General Wilson.

AUTHORIZED STRENGTH REQUEST—RESERVES

Mr. SIKES. General Marchbanks, in your statement you say that the budget for 1971 provides for an average drill strength of 47,921 reservists, 2,600 reservists who are paid only for their annual active duty tour, and for a man-year average of 105 officers performing full-time active duty. What paid strength have you requested in the authorization bill?

General MARCHBANKS. The authorization bill contained an average paid drill strength of 47,921, with an end strength of 47,600. During the House Armed Service Committee hearings the Air Force proposed certain program revisions which would result in a net increase in average paid drill strength of 1,005, with an increased end strength of 1,422.

This would adjust the authorization request to 48,926 average paid drill strength with an end strength of 49,022.

This proposed revision in program would result in an increase in funding requirements of $2.5 million in the Reserve Personnel, Air Force, appropriation and $10.7 million in the Air Force Reserve account, Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, appropriation.

Mr. SIKES. What program revisions were proposed to the House Armed Services Committee?

General MARCHBANKS. The 913th Tactical Airlift Group at Willow Grove Naval Air Station, Philadelphia, was programed to convert to a C–141 reserve associate unit at McGuire AFB. The Air Force has proposed a program change which would retain a C–130A airlift unit at Willow Grove and also establish the associate unit at McGuire.

The Tactical Air Support Group, which was to have been organized at Dobbins AFB, Ga., upon the move of the 928th TAG from O'Hare IAP, would be activated in fiscal year 1/1971 rather than fiscal year 3/1970, and the 928th will convert to a C–130A airlift unit and remain at Chicago.

The proposal also includes two tactical airlift augmentation units, each with some 230 reserve personnel. The units would be located at Kelly AFB and O'Hare IAP. The Kelly unit would be in lieu of the 922d TAG and the O'Hare unit in lieu of the 933d TAG at Milwaukee, Wis., both of which inactivate in fiscal year 1/1971.

Mr. SIKES. Each of these was requested by the Air Force?
General MARCHBANKS. Yes, sir.

AFROTC TERMINATION AT CERTAIN COLLEGES

Mr. ANDREWS. General Marchbanks, from how many universities and colleges, if any, have you been invited to remove the ROTC?
General MARCHBANKS. I would like to refer this question to Major Maxwell, from the Directorate of Personnel Training and Education.
Major MAXWELL. Sir, we have not been invited to remove ROTC from any of the schools where we are terminating, we are leaving three schools at the end of this year, because of either low production or mutual agreement.
Mr. ANDREWS. Name them.
Major MAXWELL. Kenyon College, Colgate University, and Occidental College.
Mr. ANDREWS. Are any more planned for termination because of these reasons?
Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir. We have three more scheduled to go out at the end of fiscal year 1971.
Mr. ANDREWS. Name them.
Major MAXWELL. Harvard, Brown, and Dartmouth at the end of fiscal year 1971—in addition Grinnell and Tufts at the end of fiscal year 1972.
Mr. ANDREWS. Don't you associate the low production with the turbulence that is going on on certain campuses?
Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir, that is one of the factors, but it is not the only factor.
Mr. ANDREWS. Are any universities or colleges trying to dictate to you and tell you what type ROTC to run?
Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir. At the present time we are negotiating with some universities as to the type of contract that we would have with them.
Mr. ANDREWS. Would you name those?

ROTC NEGOTIATION AT FOUR UNIVERSITIES

Major MAXWELL. At the present time there are only four that we are negotiating with in earnest: M.I.T., Stanford, the University of Michigan, and Princeton.
Mr. ANDREWS. How long have you operated in those schools with an ROTC unit?
Major MAXWELL. Sir, I could not answer the question specifically, but for a number of years.
Mr. ANDREWS. What changes are they demanding that you make in your program?
Major MAXWELL. The major issues at all of the institutions concern departmental status, whether we are an integral part of the academic environment of the university or whether we should be an extracurricular activity; the academic rank of the officers who teach the program, whether they should in fact be faculty members or staff members; and also whether the courses that are being taught should receive academic credit in the university.

Mr. RHODES. Let us have the names again of the schools where you are terminating.

Major MAXWELL. The ones where through mutual agreement we are scheduled to leave are Colgate, Harvard, Brown, and Dartmouth.

Mr. RHODES. Those are where you were invited to leave?

General PITTS. Those four colleges—Colgate, Harvard, Brown, and Dartmouth—are the ones where he have had a contract negotiation dispute as to the academic credit for the course, departmental status and faculty position for the Air Force ROTC professors and have agreed to terminate the units.

Major MAXWELL. These we have already agreed to terminate for those reasons, yes, sir.

TERMINATION OF ROTC CONTRACTS

Mr. WYMAN. Would you also for the record indicate how these negotiations are conducted, what type of contract has been the case with respect to each of these institutions, and how many officers in the past have been derived from participation in the programs at the several institutions? Frankly, I am at a loss here. I realize these are private institutions, privately owned and endowed, but I am at a loss to understand why this is a negotiable subject. Is this a situation where they can tell you to get out or is this a case where you had a contract and the contract is expiring and the question of renewal of the contract is a question for negotiation every time, whether or not there has been trouble on the campus?

Major MAXWELL. Sir, the contract is an indefinite contract which states that either party may terminate the contract with 1 year's notice to the other party or sooner if mutually agreed.

Mr. WYMAN. Did the determinations to terminate the contract at these institutions result from a vote of the faculty or how has it been handled? Is it a decision of the trustees? Do you know the answer to that?

Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir. Our contract is signed with the administrative official of the university. How he arrives at his decision I do not know, sir.

Mr. WYMAN. Are there no sanctions available to you directly or indirectly, either by way of unilateral action on your part or by way of recommendation to superiors within the Air Force, that could be applied to persuade these colleges to continue with this program?

Major MAXWELL. This is the basic reason for the negotiations that we have with the universities.

Mr. WYMAN. Are you concerned at the discontinuance of this program at some of these institutions in relation to the preparedness posture of the country?

Major MAXWELL. The number of officers produced from the institutions that are presently scheduled to be disestablished is extremely small, sir. It will not have an adverse effect upon the overall production of the ROTC program.

Mr. WYMAN. In other words, if you do not get them here, you will probably get them somewhere else?

Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

ROTC NEGOTIATION

The Air Force uses a standard contract for all AFROTC host institutions. The contract is for an indefinite period with either party being able to terminate after 1 year's notice. The contract may be terminated earlier if it is mutually agreed between the parties.

The Air Force recognizes that each school is different and that a standard contract may not be acceptable to all schools. Therefore, we are willing to negotiate on any issue involved in the contract in an effort to arrive at a mutually agreeable contract. However, we must negotiate within the guidelines of Public Law 88–647, ROTC Vitalization Act of 1964, October 13, 1964. The Air Force will not operate an AFROTC unit in a configuration that degrades the program or the Air Force as a profession.

The contract is consummated between the Secretary of the Air Force and the administrative official of the institution. The decision making policy of the institution is not an Air Force matter and we do not become involved.

The four AFROTC units that are scheduled to be disestablished because the Air Force and school cannot agree on the terms of a contract and the annual production of each school are shown below:

PRODUCTION

	Fiscal year—			
	1966	1967	1968	1969
Colgate University [1]	7	19	11	8
Brown University [2]	4	14	14	15
Harvard University [2]	4	6	13	15
Dartmouth College [2]	7	4	5	11

[1] Termination date, June 1970.
[2] Termination date, June 1971.

NEED FOR THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. EVANS. I notice with great interest that the Air National Guard is bigger than the Air Reserve. I had never realized this before. This is very interesting.

From the history of the country, I can see and understand having had an Army National Guard for use within the State, but I will be darned if I see where the Air National Guard provides a useful arm to a Governor within a State.

General WILSON. I would like to say that when the Air National Guard or the Army National Guard is used by the Governor of a State, he needs trained, fully qualified people, who are disciplined, who can lead.

The Governor no more needs to have an Honest John rocket for a State mission than an air bomb, but he needs trained individuals, and that is what he has. In fact, the Air National Guard has been in operation in the States since 1916. That was when the first Air National Guard unit was formed in New York.

Mr. EVANS. This was part of the Army National Guard?

General WILSON. We were all part of the Army before they separated the Air Force. In fact, I was in the Army Air Corps and the Guard since 1928.

Mr. EVANS. How does it come that you overshadow the Air Reserve in terms of budget? It violates logic, in my lack of knowledge. I will place my ignorance on the table and ask the question.

General WILSON. All I can say is that for the number of years the Air National Guard has been in operation—it has been going steadily

since before World War II—we had 22 units prior to World War II, 1940, and in 1941 grew to 29 units. I do not think you had too many Air Force Reserve units before World War II.

General MARCHBANKS. Not until after Korea.

General WILSON. It was not until really after Korea.

We have been in business in the Guard, both the Army and the Air Guard, ever since the beginning.

NEED FOR BOTH GUARD AND RESERVE

Mr. EVANS. Are you are doing the same thing with two outfits that could be done with one?

General WILSON. Let's put it this way: I can remember back in 1948 when it was determined that they were going to do away with the Air Guard and put it in the Air Force Reserve, under one Pete Quesada and one now Senator Symington from Missouri.

That came all the way to the White House. The White House said, "No, you are going to have both."

Mr. McNamara tried it in 1964 just the other way, and it was decided that we would have both components. I think that question has been pretty well resolved by Congress.

Mr. EVANS. It hasn't been in my mind, so I asked the question.

General WILSON. I would say, too, if we were starting all over again, we probably would have one Reserve component in the Army and one Reserve component in the Air, whichever it may be. Unless you came up with something else, it would have to be the Guard, depending on the requirements of the States. You have to have a force available to the State, under our way of doing things, which dates clear back to the time of the militia.

Mr. EVANS. Let's not belabor it further.

REASON FOR GUARD BEING LARGER THAN RESERVES

General MARCHBANKS. I think we had better belabor it a little more so we get a complete record. Your question, why we have a larger Guard, is not answered yet.

I think you might go back to the administration of the Guard under the National Guard Bureau, which is a very capable organization formed away back when General Wilson was a young man. It has been entirely successful.

In the area of programing, they more or less have dominated the Air Force Reserve picture. Public Law 90–168, which was passed and put into effect in January of 1968, created an Office of Air Force Reserve which gave within the Air Force structure, then, that flavor and empathy which is necessary for programing the Reserve structure.

In the past, this was an active duty matter, and it was handled in the overall programing of the Air Force. Now the programs that are suggested, not the ones that are bought, particularly, but the ones that are suggested, are always born within the structure of the Air Force Reserve under the Office of Air Force Reserve as established by law.

So, in short, we have a lot of catching up to do in that we have not been organized along the lines the Guard has for many years. So I would think you would see maybe in the out years, away out there

when none of us will be around, that we will have two forces, and they will be very similar in the mission area and very similar in size.

This would be my hope. This is the direction I am pushing the Air Force Reserve in at present.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you very much, both of you.

General MARCHBANKS. It was very pleasant. I enjoyed it.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE GUARD AND THE STATES

General LOW. I think there is one last point from the standpoint of the Air Force program. There is a relationship between the Guard and the number of States.

Mr. EVANS. What is that relation?

General LOW. As long as you have 50 States, there is that relationship, too, which must be considered.

General MARCHBANKS. I might say there will never be less than 50 Guard units.

General LOW. The Reserve is a function of where is your Reserve-eligible population as opposed to physical location of the States.

Mr. EVANS. Thank you very much.

AIR FORCE RESERVE REQUEST TO OSD

What was the paid strength of the Air Force Reserve when you first submitted your 1971 budget to OSD?

General MARCHBANKS. You mean actually on board?

Mr. EVANS. Paid strength on board.

General MARCHBANKS. 44,893.

Mr. EVANS. What did you request of OSD in the way of funding?

General MARCHBANKS. Our request to OSD for 1971 was $89.1 million, which included $10 million for the ROTC.

This request was adjusted by OSD and BOB as follows:

Early inactivation of three C–119, minus $1.5 million.

Reduced manning of units, 96 to 90 percent, minus $2.1 million.

Reduced schools and special tours, minus $2 million.

For a total of minus $5.6 million.

In the area of increases, we increased the rate of per diem from $16 to $25 per day for a plus of $2.7 million.

The total adjustment was a decrease of $2.9 million for a revised estimate of $86.2 million.

RESERVE READINESS POSTURE

Mr. EVANS. You state that the operational capability of your total force is lower now than it was at this time last year due to the many changes in the force structure during the year.

What is the readiness posture of the Air Force Reserve?

General MARCHBANKS. Air Force Reserve units can be mobilized on a "no notice" basis. Historical information indicates in excess of 98 percent of the assigned personnel being placed within 24 hours.

Reserve units are capable of deployment and utilization as like units of the Active Force reporting the same status 24 hours after initial mobilization notice.

The capability of these Reserve units to generate aircraft flying hours and sorties compares with like Active Force units 24 hours after mobilization.

The Reserve units comply with the operational readiness inspection criteria for like units of the Active Force with ORI criteria established by our gaining commands. Units which are C–2 or better are considered available for effective deployment.

On the 1st of March, 17 Reserve units were C–2 or better. All of those that were not C–2 have experienced recent moves or conversions, changes in criteria, or demobilization, and we expect upgrading to C–2 or better soon, except where the airframes are a criteria factor.

In the most recent "no notice" mobilization, which was January 26, 1968, in the *Pueblo* crisis, two military airlift wings and five military aircraft groups, one air rescue and recovery squadron and various air medical evacuation and medical service units, were mobilized with better than 98 percent of the personnel on board 24 hours after notice.

RESERVE CHANGES AFFECTING OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES

Mr. EVANS. What changes were made during the past year that affected your operational capabilities, and why were these changes made?

You may supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

CHANGES TO RESERVE AFFECTING OPERATIONAL CAPABILITIES

During the past year, nine major unit conversions were made within the Air Force Reserve program: Six C–119 tactical airlift units converted to new missions due to planned phaseout of the C–119 aircraft from the USAF inventory. In addition, three C–124 military airlift units were converted to C–141 military airlift associate units and to a C–9A aeromedical evacuation associate squadron. These conversions augment the active force by providing a capability to increase the aircraft utilization during periods of war and/or emergency.

The conversions downgrade the operational capability of the units for a period of time due to retraining of aircrew and maintenance personnel.

AUTHORIZED STRENGTH REQUEST—GUARD

Mr. EVANS. General Wilson, in your statement you mention that the programed end strength for the Air National Guard in fiscal year 1971 is 87,110, with an average of 87,878. What paid strength have you requested in the authorization bill?

General WILSON. We have requested an average strength of 87,878.

Mr. EVANS. That is what you are asking for in paid strength?

General WILSON. An average; yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. What was your average paid strength request to OSD?

General WILSON. It was the same, sir.

Mr. EVANS. You got what you asked for?

General WILSON. We got what we asked for; yes, sir.

READINESS POSTURE OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. EVANS. What is the readiness posture of the Air National Guard?

General WILSON. Right now, 12 of the units are C–1, or fully combat ready; 44 units are C–2, which is substantially combat ready; 34 units

are C–3 or C–4, which means they are marginally ready or not ready. Most of these are because of conversions. Twelve of the units that came back just last year are being built up. Other than those units that are in conversion programs or have a shortage of aircraft, they are in good shape, sir. Two units are not required to be rated due to the nature of their mission, which is crew training.

GUARD REQUEST TO OSD

Mr. EVANS. What was the dollar figure of your request to OSD?

General WILSON. We originally requested $103 million. Actually, due to some changes in the program, we came up with $108.5 million. In other words, $2.8 million was added to our program due to a transfer from the Active Air Force of the funding for active days for our air defense units that were standing air defense alert and had been paid out of Active Air Force funds.

OSD made the determination that this should be paid out of our funds, and it was transferred over.

We have an additional $1.5 million which is an increase in paid strength for the units.

Also, $1.2 million was added for the per diem rate increase.

CHANGES TO THE GUARD STRUCTURE AND THEIR EFFECTS

Mr. EVANS. For the record, numerous changes were made to the Guard structure during 1970. What effect did these changes have on your readiness posture?

General WILSON. We will be glad to put that in the record.

(The information follows:)

CHANGES TO GUARD STRUCTURE/EFFECT

Nine ANG units changed missions or aircraft in the first 6 months of fiscal year 1970. Eight of these units are still C–4, or not ready. Seven more units will convert to newer aircraft during the last half of fiscal year 1970 and cause a temporary increase in the number of units in C–4 status. However, we expect only minor changes in overall Air National Guard readiness since the units that were demobilized in 1969 are already assuming a ready posture. Those units which began conversion early in fiscal year 1970 will replace those which drop to C–4 later in the year. As of January 31, 1970, 12 units were C–1, fully combat ready; 44 were C–2, substantially ready; 20 were C–3, marginally ready; and 14 were C–4, not ready. Two units converted to combat crew training missions and are not included in the readiness inspection requirements. Notwithstanding these aircraft conversions, 62 percent of the Air Guard's flying force can be immediately employed with a high degree of combat capability.

RESERVE RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. EVANS. General Marchbanks, on page 7 of your statement you mention that the Reserves are restudying their retention program. Is retention a serious problem within the Reserves now?

General MARCHBANKS. Retention of our non-prior-service personnel is always a serious problem, because most of these people are obligated to a 6-year term, and at the end of that period they evaluate very critically whether they should continue their participation.

Our prior-service retention has always been pretty level. We are finding, though, that the veteran returning from Vietnam is a different

type of individual. He is not participating to the percent we thought he would. Possibly in the future we will have an additional retention problem that we do not foresee at the present time. Our prior-service personnel retention rate has been very good and very level all through the program.

Mr. EVANS. Of the men coming back from Vietnam, are fewer of them wanting to go into the Reserve?

General MARCHBANKS. Yes, sir. You realize, many of these people were recalled or mobilized three or four times with quite a severe disruption to their civilian life. So, to the extent they can incorporate this further into their lives, we are retaining them. To the extent, through pressures of employers, family, occupation, they cannot logically remain in the program; we are losing some of them.

Mr. WYMAN. When you say you are losing them, if they decide they are going to get out and they leave, you have no more strings on them at all?

General MARCHBANKS. No, sir. When a prior-service man has completed his enlistment, we have no strings on him, other than the fact that he can be recalled during a mobilization through the direction of Congress.

Mr. WYMAN. In the event of general mobilization.

General MARCHBANKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WYMAN. In terms of the personnel for which the appropriations that are being discussed here today are sought, is there any backup in numbers of personnel that are available to you for call without general mobilization? Is there such a thing as a standby Reserve?

General MARCHBANKS. There is such a thing, but standby Reserve cannot be mobilized without general mobilization.

GUARD RETENTION PROBLEMS

Mr. EVANS. General Wilson, is the Air National Guard faced with a retention problem?

General WILSON. We are all faced with a problem of retention. We have an ongoing program to encourage prior-service personnel getting out of service after 4 years in the active service, to come into the Guard, and to retain people who have completed their 6-year military obligation.

We used to be able to maintain a ratio of about 60 percent career personnel and about 40 percent new enlistees. That ratio has declined to about 40–60 now.

We are doing everything we can to increase it. In fact, we have a program that we kicked off on February 22, "Muster Day," which is quite a day in the Guard. It has been used for many years as a day of starting recruiting drives. We started this program, trying to retain people who have completed their 6 years and to enlist prior-service people, to increase and maintain our strength. We have had very good luck in some instances.

We call this "try one" in the Guard. In other words, "You have finished this 6 years. How about trying another one? We need you for another year." We usually find if we can get him over the first year, we can keep him longer.

For example, in a 6-month period in 1963, we had a similar program going, "try one," and recruited some 7,000. We got people either to extend or prior-service people to come into the Guard and, surprisingly enough, many of them stayed 3 or 4 years, and some of them are still in the Guard.

Mr. WYMAN. What do they get out of that for staying 1 year?

General WILSON. They get nothing more than their normal pay and their normal program that we have for them, which is 48 drills plus their 15 days' active duty.

Mr. WYMAN. For the average individual at the average rate, what would that mean?

General WILSON. Take a staff sergeant; about $800 or $900 a year.

REENLISTMENT BONUSES FOR RESERVE PERSONNEL

Mr. WYMAN. No bonus or anything else?

General WILSON. No. A lot of people feel retention could be helped if we had some kind of reenlistment bonus for Reserve personnel. In fact, there are several bills in Congress now on that. We think it probably would save money if we could get a reenlistment bonus for an additional 6 years, 4 years, or 3 years.

Mr. WYMAN. Have you taken a position on that?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, we have taken a position. I think the Department of Defense has also taken a favorable position on it.

Mr. WYMAN. In respect to an amount?

General WILSON. They are discussing the amount right now. Some of them say $100 a year for a 3-year enlistment, paid $100 upon completion of each year. Some people on the Hill feel that is not enough really to attract them, and maybe you should talk about a larger percentage.

I do not think it has been decided just what it would be.

This is one means by which we could probably save money. Every time you get non-prior-service men filling jobs, it costs about $1,400 a year to train each of them. If you could extend them, you could keep three extensions for the cost of one. This is what we are trying to do.

AIR RESERVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Mr. EVAN. General Marchbanks, for the record, would you answer this question: In your statement you refer to the Air Reserve equal opportunity program through which you are attempting to increase the level of Negro maning in your units. You have initiated a test program at six selected locations to implement this program.

How will you operate this test program? Supply that for the record.

General MARCHBANKS. I will.

(The information follows:)

OPERATION OF AIR RESERVE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

As part of the equal opportunity program in the Air Force Reserve, a special program to increase the level of Negro manning in USAFR units is being implemented at six locations. They are: Charleston AFB, S.C.; Dover AFB, Del.; Dobbins AFB, Ga.; Homestead AFB, Fla.; Maxwell AFB, Ala.; and McGuire AFB, N.J. These sites were selected because of Reserve units' missions and manning plus recruiting potential in the areas.

The special recruiting program is directed at the Negro high school senior. Only high schools with predominantly Negro populations will be selected. Emphasis will be placed on informing the students about the technical training they can receive in the Air Force Reserve which can teach them a skill which can be used in civilian life, thus enabling them to improve their economic status.

A special slide/tape recorded presentation is being prepared which will highlight such specialties as medical technicians, aircraft and vehicle maintenance, communications electronics, et cetera. The presentation will also cover the entire Reserve obiligation of the individual from enlistment, to basic training to the activity with his Reserve unit of assignment and enumerate the benefits of Reserve participation. The presentation will be introduced on tape by Senator Edward W. Brooke of Massachusetts. A Washington Negro television personality will do the narration.

A copy of the presentation will be provided each of the six USAFR units involved in the test program. Their recruiting teams will arrange to present the program to the seniors and will answer questions at the conclusion of the slide/tape presentation.

The equal opportunity officer of the Office of Air Force Reserve visited the headquarters of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to inform officials of the test program and secured their approval and support. The NAACP office of veteran affairs has consented to send letters to each branch in the special recruitment areas requesting full support of the program.

The slide/tape presentations will be made to the seniors beginning in April. At the conclusion of the special test program, results will be evaluated to determine whether the program should be expanded.

CENSORSHIP SQUADRONS

Mr. EVANS. General, on page 10 of your statement you discuss the nonflying units. One of the nonflying units you mention is the censorship squadrons.

Would you please tell the committee what a censorship squadron is?

General MARCHBANKS. A censorship squadron are Reservists that train in the area of censorship. They are kept abreast of all the pertinent regulations, postal and otherwise, which would affect security of the mails during time of mobilization. At time of mobilization they would be assigned to the U.S. Army, which has the overall responsibility for censorship.

Mr. EVANS. This is censoring mail, basically?

General MARCHBANKS. That is one of their functions, yes.

Mr. EVANS. What other function might they have?

General MARCHBANKS. Classifying documents that are handled by courier or anything that travels throughout the communication media.

Mr. EVANS. Are they the ones carrying out the regulations?

General MARCHBANKS. They are, but they are not to be confused with the Security Service people or the security function of the Air Force.

Mr. EVANS. They handle the classification of documents?

General MARCHBANKS. They check for the proper treatment of them within the mails.

GUARD PARTICIPATION IN DOMESTIC ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. EVANS. General Wilson, in your statement you mention that this Air National Guard has enlarged its participation in the DOD domestic action programs. What programs are you participating in and what types of assistance are you providing?

General WILSON. We have gone to the States and asked them to participate with the local community. The OEO and many other

agencies have youth programs to get them better trained, and so forth. We feel we have a chance to assist in that. We have to do it within the State authority.

We have gone to each of our units and asked them to work with the State people and come up with a program to get them better acquainted. We are doing it for the purpose of trying to get them interested in coming into the Guard later on, but it is also doing a job for them.

For example, here in the District of Columbia they have a youth program in which the Army and Air Guard in the District of Columbia take about 120 Negro youths for a 2-week period of training. It has been a real eye-opener. We have been able to get football players from the Redskins to act as TAC officers. We get donations from the local community in the way of food, clothing, and other things. We take them up there and try to make youth leaders out of them.

NEGRO PARTICIPATION IN THE GUARD

Mr. EVANS. Do you have a program similar to that which General Marchbanks described for the Reserve in regard to the treatment of Negroes within the Reserve?

General WILSON. We have worked on that program very hard for many years. In 1960, 10 States by law or custom precluded blacks from being members of the National Guard. All those laws have been changed, and the bars are down.

We have been trying to interest the minority race in getting into the Guard. We feel—and it is my personal opinion—that we are not truly representative of the community unless we have both the majority and the minority.

Mr. EVANS. Could you for the record give us a little summary of what you have been able to do in this regard?

General WILSON. We haven't done very well. In fact, I am very much disappointed, because as of the 30th of January of this year, only about 1.2 percent of our total strength of 480,000 in the Army and Air Guard are Negro.

It is one thing we have not been able to get a handle on as to why. We cannot get them on the waiting list. We have a requirement from DOD that a man has certain priorities. From 17 to 18½ is priority 1 for getting into the Guard; from 18½ to 20 is priority 2; and above 20 is priority 3. People come down and we have to maintain waiting lists, first come, first served.

At the end of January of this year, we had a total of 132,167 people trying to get in the Army and Air National Guard. Of that number, there were 1,548 blacks. We have not been able to find out why.

EFFORTS TO INCREASE NEGRO PARTICIPATION

Mr. EVANS. Did you go to the black community and their leaders to ask?

General WILSON. In fact, I have been to many black leaders myself to find out what I have to do to get them to encourage their people to join or come out and get on the waiting list.

Mr. EVANS. Are they working with you in this regard?

General WILSON. They are willing to work with us if we pay the expenses. In other words, I can get little or no public service radio or television time. If I get it, I pay for it. It is is not like in the other communities. We have a very hard time.

They give you many reasons. For one reason, I don't think they really believe the publicity that we put out. For example, our last TV commercials, 30- and 60-second spot announcements, have been done by Flip Wilson, who is pretty much a leader in the Negro community. He has been disappointed in what he has been able to do. He has been really working with us. We have not made the progress we want.

Mr. EVANS. I appreciate your discussing it, General.

COST OF GUARD PARTICIPATION IN DOMESTIC ACTION PROGRAMS

Would you please supply for the record the cost of the various domestic action programs?

General WILSON. There is no Federal cost for these. They are all paid either by the State or other Federal agencies outside the Department of Defense.

RESERVE DOMESTIC ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. EVANS. General Marchbanks, are the Reserves participating in the domestic action programs?

General MARCHBANKS. Yes, sir; we are.

Mr. EVANS. Will you supply a statement for the record on this? What benefits do you feel the Reserves will derive from participating in these programs?

General MARCHBANKS. I will.

Mr. EVANS. Would you also supply for the record the cost of these programs, if any?

General MARCHBANKS. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

RESERVE/DOMESTIC ACTION PROGRAM/COST/BENEFITS

Historically the Air Force Reserve has responded to domestic action. This response encompasses all aspects of the concept. In the area of domestic emergency actions the Air Force Reserve has provided emergency air evacuation of patients, dropped hay to starving cattle, airlifted surplus equipment in support of the national summer youth program, assisted snowbound Indian communities in Arizona and New Mexico, and provided airlift emergency assistance in hurricane disasters such as Camille.

The Air Force Reserve has also participated in centrally directed programs such as Project Value and the summer aid program under the provisions of DOD support of the President's youth opportunity program.

Several locally initiated activites by Air Force reservists have been identified as domestic action programs. The 911th Military Airlift Group located at Greater Pittsburgh Airport has participated in a vocational program with a local high school. The program is designed to provide the students with training in aircraft maintenance and clerical work. The program is directed in part to disadvantaged students who in all probability would not receive formal schooling beyond high school.

Reservists from the 913th Tactical Airlift Group, Willow Grove, Pa., formulated a program which provides activities for the disadvantaged youth of the Willow Grove area. The activities include base tours, transportation to recreation activities, zoological parks, ball games, et cetera. The unit also participates in a "show and tell" program for the local Headstart program.

Air Force reservists were responsible for showing a film on drug abuse to over 3,000 people in Pittsburgh, Pa., Louisville, Ky., Philadelphia, Pa., Cleveland, Ohio, and New York, N.Y. These presentations were made in cooperation with local law enforcement officials at high school assemblies. Other presentations were made individually to summer civic groups.

The Air Force reservists at Dobbins AFB, Ga., have been extensively involved in support of and cooperation with the Boy Scouts of America by stimulating interest and providing leadership for the scouting movement. The local Boy Scout district in cooperation with the Air Force Reserves developed a 10-mile-long nature trail on Dobbins AFB.

The Air Force Reserve has recently taken measures to encourage each of its units to adopt at least one domestic action program. This action by the Office of Air Force Reserve is in accordance with the recent Department of Defense emphasis on locally initiated domestic action programs.

Unit-initiated domestic action programs are undertaken at no cost to the Government. Actions such as disaster and hurricane relief flights are performed as a part of Reserve training.

INCREASED RESERVE TRAVEL COSTS

Mr. EVANS. On the object classification table which appears on page 2 of the Air Force Reserve budget justification, the committee notes that personnel compensation decreases from $62 million in 1970 down to $59.8 million in 1971. However, during this same period both travel and transportation of persons and other services increase.

If your compensation decreases, why would your support costs increase?

General MARCHBANKS. I will supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

RESERVE, REASONS FOR INCREASE OF SUPPORT COSTS

The decrease in total personnel compensation from $62 million in fiscal year 1970 to $59.8 million in fiscal year 1971 does not necessarily bear a direct relationship to other support costs.

The "Travel and transportation of persons" is greater in fiscal year 1971 due to the authorized per diem rate for military personnel being increased from $16 to $25 per day, effective December 30, 1969, thereby causing per diem to be paid at the higher rates for a full year in fiscal year 1971 versus one-half year in fiscal year 1970.

Due to the conversion of units within the Air Force Reserve, base closures, and transfer of training locations, it is estimated that a greater number of personnel will be required to be fed through issuance of meal tickets or contract feeding for a period of time until the force is more stable. These increases are reflected in "Other services."

DECREASE IN PERSONNEL BENEFITS—GUARD

Mr. EVANS. On page 2 of the budget for the Air National Guard, the committee notes that in 1971, personnel compensation will increase by $2.8 million, but personnel benefits will decrease by $500,000. Personnel benefits would seem to be a function of personnel compensation. Why would benefits decrease when compensation increases?

General WILSON. The $500,000 decrease in personnel benefits is due to a decreased phasing of basics into training, a reduction in the school training program, and a reduction in the special training program. Benefits will be reduced because less people will be called to active duty.

Mr. EVANS. Those have been phased out?

General WILSON. Because they are not on duty.

RESERVE OFFICERS ON ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. EVANS. The number of Air Force Reserve officers on active duty will increase from 92 in 1970 to 116 in 1971. Why is this increase required?

General MARCHBANKS. Under the new reorganization of the Air Force Reserve, we are incorporating the 40–60 mix in some of our substructures. We will increase the number of officers percentagewise, Reserve versus Regular, on extended active duty.

That will be a requirement of our extended manning structure.

SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

Mr. EVANS. Turning to "Subsistence of enlisted personnel," the Reserves are using an absentee rate of 54 percent for pay group A, and 30 percent for pay groups B and D. How are these absentee rates computed?

General MARCHBANKS. We will supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

RESERVE ABSENTEE RATES—SUBSISTENCE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The absentee rate of 54 percent for pay group A, and 30 percent for pay groups B and D are based upon prior years experience. To determine the absenteeism percentage factor, the total training days accomplished are compared with the days for which subsistence is paid.

Mr. EVANS. For pay group F, in computing your subsistence requirements, both the Reserve and Guard use the absentee rate experienced in Air Force messing facilities. What would this rate be?

General MARCHBANKS. We will supply that, also, for the record.

(The information follows:)

RATES OF ABSENTEE—RESERVE

The Air Force messing facilities experienced absentee rate is 33 percent. Pay group F subsistence requirements for Air Force Reserve airmen are computed on a 33 percent absenteeism factor, with consideration being given to those who receive a cash allowance while in further technical training prior to return to their unit of assignment. This is based on past years experience.

RESERVE SCHOOL TRAINING/ABSENTEE RATES

Mr. EVANS. For school training, the Reserves use an absentee rate of 96 percent. Why is the absentee rate for school training so high?

General MARCHBANKS. We will supply that for the record, also.

(The information follows:)

RESERVE SCHOOL TRAINING/ABSENTEE RATES

The pay and allowances, active duty for training, enlisted in Project 726, includes funds for approximately 76 percent of the airmen in the school program to receive a cash allowance.

The absence factor of 96 percent is used solely as a means of computing the net man-days for which subsistence-in-kind will be required. This is based upon prior years experience, where approximately 4 percent of the Air Force Reserve airmen school program training days are reported as having been charged against the Reserve personnel appropriation.

SUBSISTENCE ABSENTEE RATE, GUARD

Mr. EVANS. For subsistence of Guard personnel assigned to Pay Group A, an absentee rate is not mentioned. What absentee rate do you use in computing your subsistence requirements for Pay Group A?

General WILSON. I would like to supply it for the record.

(The information follows:)

An overall absentee rate is not applied in Pay Group A. Subsistence requirements for ANG personnel consist of two separate programs, active duty and inactive duty. Active duty subsistence is programed for all ANG units which perform annual training away from home station. Of these, 88 percent will perform training at ANG permanent field training sites where Government messing facilities are available. Based on experience from previous years, all individuals will eat the noon meal at the unit messing facility, and 95 percent will eat breakfast and evening meals in the facility. Contract feeding is required for other units training at locations away from home station where Government messing is not available. Units performing year-round training at home station are authorized an allowance in lieu of subsistence since it is not feasible to operate a messing facility on a year-round basis. Inactive duty subsistence is computed on the total number of enlisted personnel attending UTA training periods of 8 or more hours duration in any one calendar day.

Mr. EVANS. The daily rates used in your computations seem to differ from the rates used by the Air Force and by the Reserve. How were these rates developed?

General WILSON. This year it is all on the basis of actual experience.

ABSENTEE RATE—SCHOOL TRAINING

Mr. EVANS. For school training, the Guard uses an absentee rate of 45 percent. Why would your absentee rate be 45 percent when the absentee rate for the Reserves is 96 percent?

General WILSON. May I supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

GUARD/ABSENTEE RATE SCHOOL TRAINING VERSUS RESERVE

The ANG absentee factor for school training subsistence is based on fiscal year 1969 actual experience. This rate includes individuals who receive cash allowances in lieu of subsistance. The difference in rates between the ANG and the AF Reserves is associated with the availability of subsistence at locations where training was, or will be, performed. Whereas 76 percent of the AF Reserves overall 96 percent absentee rate is associated with cash allowances, only 33 percent of the ANG rate is applicable to such allowances. The 12 percent balance of the ANG absentee rate is for nonutilization of available messing facilities by personnel actually authorized the use of these facilities.

PROJECTED ROTC ENROLLMENT

Mr. EVANS. On page 26 of your budget justification, you have a table showing actual and projected enrollment for ROTC. For aerospace studies 100, you are showing a projected enrollment for 1970 and 1971 of 24,500. How realistic is this estimate in light of the recent difficulties the ROTC program has been experiencing?

General MARCHBANKS. We will supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

The fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971 estimates are based upon projected enrollment reports from each school. In the past the estimates have been accu-

rate. However, the academic year 1969–70 enrollment figures are approximately 30 percent below the estimated fiscal year 1970 figures. The reduction is attributed to the trend from compulsory aerospace studies 100 to elective status, the change in the Selective Service System, the publicity concerning an all-volunteer force, and the student unrest. The fiscal year 1971 estimates were submitted prior to the final enrollment reports for fiscal year 1970 and therefore did not consider the drop in enrollments in the first 2 years of the program. Therefore, we relied upon the data that was available to us. There is little or no impact in the funding area because of aerospace studies 100 and 200 enrollments. These students only get some clothing. There is no subsistence allowance or other costs associated with it.

SHORT FALL IN ROTC ENROLLMENT

Mr. EVANS. What is the current actual enrollment in aerospace studies 100?

Major MAXWELL. As of October 31, 1969, which is the beginning of the school year, sir, it was 16,833 for aerospace studies 100.

Mr. EVANS. That would make you about 8,000 off your estimate?

Major MAXWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. What will be consequence of that?

Major MAXWELL. Sir, really in the ROTC program the key to the number of officers produced is those enrolled in the third year of the program; the junior year. The reduction in the first 2 years reduces our selection base. It may cause us to select a lower qualified individual.

In fiscal year 1970 and 1971, we do not anticipate any problem meeting our programed production.

Mr. EVANS. And in 1972?

Major MAXWELL. In 1972, we could have a problem; yes, sir.

Mr. EVANS. What about the effect on funding requirements?

Colonel LORETTI. There is actually no significant impact in the funding area, because in the aerospace studies 100 and 200, the only costs included in the estimate is a clothing allowance. There are no subsistence or any other costs associated with them if they are not enrolled in the financial grant program. So, it would be a very insignificant amount of money.

INCREASE IN ROTC FIELD TRAINING

Mr. EVANS. Senior ROTC students, excluding scholarship students, attending field training will increase in 1971. Yet your enrollment in the program will actually decrease. You have more students attending training than you have enrolled in the program.

Major MAXWELL. May I supply that for the record.

(The information follows:)

ROTC FIELD TRAINING VERSUS DECREASE IN ENROLLMENT

We program approximately 6,000 AFROTC cadets to attend field training each summer. Some of the students begin training in June and finish in July. This means that we have to program moneys in two different fiscal years for these students. The number of days training in each fiscal year is determined for each student in order to insure that the funds are requested in the correct fiscal year.

The 1,500 nonscholarship students attending 4-week field training in July 1970 actually began in fiscal year 1970 and 17 days of this training is programed for fiscal year 1970 and only 11 days for fiscal year 1971. If you total all the students listed in a fiscal year, you will actually have students beginning in one fiscal year and ending in another. Our fiscal year 1971 program is based upon 6,000 AFROTC cadets attending field training, 4,400 are for 4 weeks and 1,600 for 6 weeks.

AEROSPACE DEFENSE ALERT

Mr. EVANS. Now in the area of pay for aerospace defense alerts, for special training the Guard is requesting an increase of $2.3 million in 1971, an increase of approximately 75 percent in 1 year. The committee notes that this activity would actually decrease in 1971 if it were not for this new item of training. In 1971 you will have 593 officers performing aerospace defense alerts. What type of activity is this, and why do you feel it is required?

General WILSON. In each one of our aerospace units they have a 5-minute alert commitment under the control of the Air Defense Command. This is the same amount of money I was talking about that was originally in the Air Force budget which paid these officers when they were ordered to active duty for 1 day up to 179 days to stand alert under the control of the Air Defense Command. That $2 million-plus was transferred to us. It is exactly the same pay that we had before, sir.

Mr. EVANS. Each of these 593 officers will receive approximately 120 days of active duty.

General WILSON. That is correct. That is about the time they will spend on active duty in the unit standing alert for the Air Defense Command.

Mr. EVANS. Are these officers ordered to active duty voluntarily?

General WILSON. It is voluntary.

Mr. EVANS. What will be the total cost of these aerospace defense alerts?

General WILSON. The cost should run $2.799 million.

Mr. EVANS. Does that include salaries?

General WILSON. Yes, sir; that includes all pay and allowances.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE MINORITY GROUP PARTICIPATION IN THE GUARD

Mr. EVANS. A few moments ago I inquired with reference to your efforts in regard to Negroes. I wonder if you would provide a similar statement with regard to other minorities.

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

In responding to your inquiry on our efforts to recruit Negro personnel into the Guard, that statement is also applicable for all minority groups. As I stated previously, we have gone to the States and asked them to participate with the local community in supporting youth programs sponsored by OEO and other Government agencies so that the youth of today will know what the Guard can do for them and what they can do for the Guard. By supporting the community programs we hope to make the local Guard units truly representative of the community where they are located and serve.

Mr. MINSHALL. No questions.

Mr. DAVIS. No questions.

Mr. WYMAN. No questions.

Mr. EVANS. We have run out of questions, gentlemen.

General WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General MARCHBANKS. Thank you.

TUESDAY, MARCH 3, 1970.

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

WITNESSES

LeROY J. SPENCE, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY)
COL. M. P. DiFUSCO, U.S. ARMY, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY)
CARL M. DETWYLER, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER) (MILITARY PERSONNEL DIRECTORATE)

APPROPRIATION LANGUAGE

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, including the Reserve components thereof, retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve, and payments under chapter 73 of title 10, United States Code: [$2,735,000,000] $3,194,000,000. (Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1970.)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-0030-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Program by activity:			
1. Nondisability	1,716,724	2,029,188	2,289,664
2. Temporary disability	46,654	58,011	73,722
3. Permanent disability	382,199	434,454	472,292
4. Fleet reserve	288,355	326,954	346,520
5. Survivors' benefits	9,009	10,393	11,802
10 Total obligations (object class 13.0)	2,442,941	2,859,000	3,194,000
Financing:			
25 Unobligated balance lapsing	7,059	.....	.....
Budget authority	2,450,000	2,859,000	3,194,000
Budget authority			
40 Appropriation	2,450,000	2,735,000	3,194,000
44.30 Proposed supplemental for military pay act increases	.....	25,000	.....
44.40 Proposed supplemental for increased retired pay costs	.....	99,000	.....

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RETIRED PAY, DEFENSE

Program and Financing (in thousands of dollars)

Identification code 07-05-0030-0-1-051	1969 actual	1970 estimate	1971 estimate
Relation of obligations to outlays:			
71 Obligations incurred, net	2,442,941	2,859,000	3,194,000
72 Obligated balance, start of year	6,880	6,354	8,354
74 Obligated balance, end of year	-6,354	-8,354	-9,354
77 Adjustments in expired accounts	604	.....	.....
90 Outlays excluding pay increase supplemental	2,444,071	2,733,000	3,193,000
91.30 Outlays from military pay act supplemental	.....	25,000	.....
91.40 Outlays from increased retired pay costs	.....	99,000	.....

42-563 O - 70 - pt. 2 -- 30

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JUSTIFICATION OF ESTIMATES, FY 1971

APPROPRIATION TITLE: Retired Pay, Defense

Appropriation Introduction

	(In Thousands of Dollars)		
	FY 1969	FY 1970	FY 1971
Appropriation or Estimate	$2,450,000	$2,735,000	$3,194,000
Proposed supplemental for military pay increases, P. L. 90-207	--	25,000	--
Proposed supplemental for increased costs, including Consumer Price Index	--	99,000	--
Unobligated balance of appropriation	7,059	--	--
Total Obligations	$2,442,941	$2,859,000	$3,194,000

This appropriation provides for the pay, as authorized and at rates prescribed by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force and provides for payments to survivors pursuant to the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection Plan. These expenses include the pay of retired officers, warrant officers, enlisted personnel, female nurses and members of the women's medical specialist corps, Philippine Scouts, and authorized personnel of the reserve components, including retainer pay of the inactive Fleet Reserve.

The estimate excludes payments to individuals who elect to receive compensation for physical disability from the Veterans Administration. The amount requested is also exclusive of any administrative expense. The estimate provides for military pay increases effective July 1, 1969 under the provisions of P. L. 90-207, and increased retired pay costs including amounts related to increases in the Consumer Price Index.

SUMMARY OF OBLIGATIONS BY BUDGET ACTIVITY

(Dollars in Thousands)

Activity	1969 (Actual) Dollars	1969 (Actual) Percent	1970 (Estimate) Dollars	1970 (Estimate) Percent	1971 (Estimate) Dollars	1971 (Estimate) Percent
1. Nondisability.....	$1,716,724	70.27	$2,029,188	70.97	$2,289,664	71.68
2. Temporary Disability.....	46,654	1.91	58,011	2.03	73,722	2.31
3. Permanent Disability.....	382,199	15.65	434,454	15.20	472,292	14.79
4. Fleet Reserve.....	288,355	11.80	326,954	11.44	346,520	10.85
5. Survivors' Benefits.....	9,009	.37	10,393	.36	11,802	.37
Total	$2,442,941	100.00	$2,859,000	100.00	$3,194,000	100.00

Mr. SLACK. Gentlemen, the next item to which we shall direct our attention is retired pay for the Department of Defense.

We have with us today Mr. LeRoy J. Spence, of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy.

You have appeared before this committee before, have you not, Mr. Spence?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLACK. We welcome you this morning, together with your supporting witnesses.

The request for retired military personnel is $3.194 billion. The committee notes that this year for the first time retired pay will exceed the $3 billion mark. This year's request represents an increase of $459 million over the amount currently appropriated for fiscal year 1970.

However, the budget document indicates that a supplemental covering increased pay costs of $124 million will be requested for fiscal year 1970. If this supplemental is approved as requested, then the net increase of 1971 over 1970 will be $335 million. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Spence, do you have a prepared statement?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir; I do.

Mr. SLACK. Will you please proceed.

Mr. FLOOD. If you will yield at this point, I would like, for the purpose of the record, to direct your attention to page 37 of the bill, Title II: Retired Military Personnel, Retired Pay, Defense. There I see the following:

Estimate, 1961, $775 million. Appropriation, 1961, $775 million.

Estimate, 1971, $3,194 million. Appropriation, 1970, $2,735 million.

Those figures speak eloquently for themselves.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir; they do.

Mr. SLACK. Anything further at this point?

Mr. FLOOD. No.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. SLACK. Please proceed with your statement.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee in behalf of the Department of Defense to discuss the appropriation for retired pay for fiscal year 1971.

The appropriation requested is a consolidation of the estimates of the military departments for retired pay of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; retainer pay for members of the Fleet Reserve of the Navy and Marine Corps; and payments to survivors of retired military personnel under the retired serviceman's family protection plan.

The appropriation request for fiscal year 1971 is $3,194 million compared with $2,735 million appropriated for fiscal year 1970 plus supplemental funds of $124 million, for a total of $2,859 million. The amount requested for fiscal year 1971 will provide for payments to an average of 825,124, an increase of 72,548 over our current estimate for fiscal year 1970.

The supplemental funds for fiscal year 1970 are required to provide for the additional retirement costs resulting from two cost-of-living increases, an increase in the military pay of military personnel retiring during the year, and a net increase resulting from an increase in the average rates which was partially offset by a decrease in the previously estimated number of personnel expected to be on the rolls during the year. Under law, when the Consumer Price Index (CPI) increases by 3 percent over the last adjustment to retired pay and sustains that level for 3 consecutive months, retired pay is adjusted to the highest percent of increase in that 3-month period, plus 1 percent, to be effective on the first day of the third month following that period. The 1 percent "add on" was authorized by Public Law 91–179. Thus, two increases have occurred since the fiscal year 1970 budget estimate was submitted to the Congress; an increase of 4.3 percent effective November 1, 1969, and an additional increase of 1 percent also effective November 1, 1969, under the provisions of Public Law 91–179 which was mentioned before. The increase in military pay was authorized by Public Law 90–207 and became effective July 1, 1969.

Major Categories of Personnel

NONDISABILITY

This category includes personnel who were retired for age or length of service.

It is estimated that $2,289.7 million or 71.7 percent of the total appropriation request will be required to provide for an average of 544,714 annuitants in the nondisability category in fiscal year 1971. This compares with an average of 491,731 annuitants now estimated for fiscal year 1970.

TEMPORARY DISABILITY

The temporary disability category is an interim classification for disabled personnel where there is some doubt as to the degree or permanence of their disability. Personnel are placed on the temporary disability list for a period not to exceed 5 years in accordance with title IV of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, which has now been codified as chapter 61 of title 10, United States Code. During this 5-year period, physical examinations are required at least once every 18 months to determine whether such individuals (*a*) have recovered from their disability and can be returned to active duty; (*b*) should be discharged; or (*c*) should be transferred to the permanent disability rolls.

It is estimated that $73.7 million or 2.3 percent of the total appropriation request will be required to provide for an average of 28,120 annuitants in fiscal year 1971, as compared with 21,915 now estimated for fiscal year 1970.

PERMANENT DISABILITY

This category is composed of personnel whose disability has been definitely established as "permanent." Persons may be placed on the permanent disability rolls immediately following the termination of their active duty or by transfer from the temporary disability rolls. It is estimated that $472.3 million or 14.8 percent of the total appro-

priation request will be required in fiscal year 1971 for an average of 128,426 permanently disabled retired military personnel. This compares with an average of 119,348 now estimated for fiscal year 1970.

FLEET RESERVE

The Fleet Reserve category is composed of Navy and Marine Corps enlisted personnel having 20 but less than 30 years of service who elect to transfer from active duty to the Fleet Reserve. Upon completion of 30 years of combined active service and service in the Fleet Reserve or upon being found physically unfit for further military service, such personnel are transferred to the regular retired rolls. It is estimated that $346.5 million or 10.8 percent of the appropriation request will be required in fiscal year 1971 to provide for an average of 115,347 Fleet Reservists. This compares with an average of 111,946 now estimated for fiscal year 1970.

SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

The survivors' benefits category includes the amounts estimated to be required to make payments to survivors of retired personnel pursuant to the retired serviceman's family protection plan. This is a self-supporting plan which permits members of the uniformed services to receive a reduced amount of retired pay in order to provide one or more annuities specified in the plan for his survivors. The amount of the reduction in each member's case is computed by the actuarial-equivalent method; that is, the total amount of reduced retired pay received by the member and the benefits made to his survivors will, on the average, not exceed the total amount of retired pay the member would have received had he not participated in the program plus interest on the amounts so withheld.

It is estimated that $11.8 million or 0.4 percent of the total appropria request will be required to provide for an average of 8,517 in fiscal year 1971. This compares with an average of 7,626 now estimated for fiscal year 1970.

SUMMARY

The amounts included for each of the categories are mathematical computations of averages of the rates presently prescribed by law applied to the best available projections of the number of personnel to be carried on the rolls in fiscal years 1970 and 1971.

Payments under this appropriation are required by law and any funds not required revert to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. Chairman, Col. M. P. DiFusco, US Army, the Director of Compensation Affairs of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, and Mr. Carl M. Detwyler, Director of the Military Personnel Directorate of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), are with me today. We will attempt to answer any questions the chairman or committee members may have.

(The tables follow:)

NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY, OBLIGATIONS, AND UNOBLIGATED BALANCE
Fiscal Years 1950-1969

Fiscal Year	New Obligational Authority (In Thousands of Dollars)	Obligations (In Thousands of Dollars)	Unobligated Balance (In Thousands of Dollars)
1950	$306,016	$304,376	$1,640
1951	342,000	324,089	17,911
1952	345,000	330,598	14,402
1953	357,000	356,385	615
1954	387,000	386,298	702
1955	423,500	422,102	1,398
1956	495,000	478,932	16,068
1957	515,000	510,784	4,216
1958	567,000	560,962	6,038
1959	640,000	634,542	5,458
1960	715,000	692,922	22,078
1961	789,500	787,806	1,694
1962	920,000	895,854	24,146
1963	1,029,000 1/	1,014,775	10,925
1964	1,228,000	1,211,215	16,785
1965	1,399,000	1,385,578	13,422
1966	1,600,000	1,592,352	7,648
1967	1,839,000	1,831,159	7,841
1968	2,095,000	2,093,478	1,522
1969	2,450,000	2,442,941	7,059

1/ $3.3 million transferred to "Claims, Defense"

NET INCREASES BY CATEGORY IN YEAR-END STRENGTHS FROM THE PREVIOUS FISCAL YEAR
FOR THE FISCAL YEARS 1969, 1970 AND 1971

	Fiscal Year 1969		Fiscal Year 1970		Fiscal Year 1971	
	Actual	Percent	Estimate	Percent	Estimate	Percent
Nondisability	44,166	10.54%	50,416	10.88%	53,923	10.50%
Temporary Disability	4,139	27.00	4,546	23.35	7,062	29.41
Permanent Disability	7,352	6.85	8,749	7.63	9,230	7.48
Fleet Reserve	6,242	6.06	5,211	4.77	1,681	1.47
Survivors'Benefits	726	11.21	837	11.62	919	11.43
TOTAL	62,625	9.61	69,759	9.77	72,815	9.29

ACTUAL AND ESTIMATED OBLIGATIONS FOR MILITARY
RETIRED PAY, FISCAL YEARS 1950-1975

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Fiscal Year	Obligations
Actual	
1950	$304,376
1951	324,089
1952	330,598
1953	356,385
1954	386,298
1955	422,102
1956	478,932
1957	510,784
1958	560,962
1959	634,542
1960	692,922
1961	787,806
1962	895,854
1963	1,014,775
1964	1,211,215
1965	1,385,578
1966	1,592,352
1967	1,831,159
1968	2,093,478
1969	2,442,941
Estimate	
1970	2,859,000
1971	3,194,000
1972	3,426,000
1973	3,658,000
1974	3,890,000
1975	4,123,000

END STRENGTHS, OBLIGATIONS AND EXPENDITURES
JULY - DECEMBER 1969
FY 1970
(Dollars in Thousands)

	End Strengths	Obligations	Expenditures
July	716,867	$214,681	$212,456
August	727,826	221,453	221,176
September	736,552	224,212	223,718
October	740,963	226,750	226,535
November	744,931	237,330	236,913
December	750,712	239,417	238,885

ACTUAL AND PROJECTED NUMBER OF RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL
AND RETIRED PAY OBLIGATIONS FISCAL YEARS 1958-1975

Fiscal Year	Average Number 2/	Actual and Estimated Obligations
Actual		
1958	208,570	$560,962,000
1959	222,545	634,542,000
1960	242,904	692,922,000
1961	275,914	787,806,000
1962	313,436	895,854,000
1963	358,830	1,014,775,000
1964	410,853	1,211,215,000
1965	462,463	1,385,578,000
1966	508,566	1,592,352,000
1967	564,280	1,831,159,000
1968	624,496	2,093,478,000
1969	691,688	2,442,941,000
Estimated		
1970	752,576	2,859,000,000
1971	825,124	3,194,000,000
1972	885,000	3,426,000,000
1973	945,000	3,658,000,000
1974	1,005,000	3,890,000,000
1975	1,065,000	4,123,000,000

ACTUAL AND PROJECTED NUMBER OF RETIREMENTS AMONG MILITARY PERSONNEL
ON ACTIVE DUTY, FYs 1958-1975

Fiscal Year	By Category			By Type of Retirement	
	Total	Officer	Enlisted	Nondisability	Disability 1/
Actual					
1958	21,180	6,563	14,617	13,674	7,506
1959	21,290	5,778	15,512	14,029	7,261
1960	29,353	6,823	22,530	22,626	6,727
1961	42,034	12,886	29,148	35,198	6,836
1962	40,929	10,153	30,776	34,110	6,819
1963	57,629	14,319	43,310	49,166	8,463
1964	57,384	13,609	43,775	48,900	8,484
1965	55,772	13,872	41,900	46,635	9,137
1966	54,032	11,852	42,180	43,334	10,698
1967	67,003	12,880	54,123	54,404	12,599
1968	69,086	11,927	57,159	53,066	16,020
1969	71,344	12,333	59,011	48,986	22,358
Projected					
1970	62,892	15,584	47,308	51,928	10,964
1971	69,498	14,833	54,665	58,496	11,002
1972	69,571	15,396	54,175	58,465	11,106
1973	67,710	14,747	52,963	56,808	10,902
1974	68,553	13,485	55,068	57,732	10,821
1975	65,620	12,468	53,152	55,030	10,590
Normal for an active force of present size with current retention rates:	59,209	8,676	50,533	49,646	9,563

1/ Projected numbers do not include combat disabilities.

2/ The substantial increase in the number on the retired rolls can be directly attributed to the fact that a large number of the personnel who entered the Armed Forces during the World War II period have attained eligibility for retirement after twenty or more years of active military service.

TITLE III, PUBLIC LAW 810, RETIREMENTS -- FISCAL YEARS 1969, 1970 AND 1971
(10 U.S.C. 1331)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1969 Actual			FY 1970 Estimate			FY 1971 Estimate		
	Year-End Number	Avg. Number	Oblig Amount	Year-End Number	Avg. Number	Oblig Amount	Year-End Number	Avg. Number	Oblig Amount
Officers	34,158	32,727	90,130	37,614	36,089	106,059	41,453	39,706	119,044
Enlisted	3,359	3,143	4,352	3,905	3,659	6,196	4,537	4,252	7,440
TOTAL	37,517	35,870	94,482	41,519	39,748	112,255	45,990	43,958	126,484

COMPARISON OF RETIRED PAY EXPENDITURES WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

(Dollars in Millions)

Fiscal Year	All Military Functions	Retired Pay	Percent
1937	$934	$55	5.89%
1938	1,033	59	5.71
1939	1,075	61	5.67
1940	1,492	66	4.42
1941	5,998	73	1.22
1942	23,570	84	.36
1943	62,664	49	.08
1944	75,797	57	.08
1945	80,048	57	.07
1946	42,044	85	.20
1947	13,838	140	1.01
1948	10,937	175	1.60
1949	11,573	193	1.67
1950	11,891	193	1.62
1951	19,764	321	1.62
1952	38,897	329	.85
1953	43,604	357	.82
1954	40,326	386	.96
1955	35,531	419	1.18
1956	35,792	477	1.33
1957	38,436	511	1.33
1958	39,071	562	1.44
1959	41,223	641	1.55
1960	41,215	694	1.68
1961	43,227	786	1.82
1962	46,815	894	1.91
1963	48,252	1,015	2.10
1964	49,760	1,209	2.43
1965	46,173	1,384	3.00
1966	54,409	1,591	2.92
1967	67,466	1,830	2.71
1968	77,373	2,095	2.71
1969	81,240	2,444	3.01
1970 (Estimate)	79,432	2,857	3.60
1971 (Estimate)	73,583	3,193	4.34

RETIRED SERVICEMAN'S FAMILY PROTECTION PLAN

(Dollars in Thousands)

Fiscal Year	No. of Retirees Electing to Participate1/	Reduction in Retired Pay	Survivors Receiving Benefits1/	Payment to Survivors
Actual				
1954 (last 8 months)	11,243	$1,597	149	$67
1955	11,401	4,308	499	462
1956	12,580	4,692	814	797
1957	14,859	5,424	1,128	1,136
1958	17,890	6,251	1,469	1,479
1959	19,846	7,204	1,881	1,880
1960	22,967	7,786	2,312	2,422
1961	27,997	8,933	2,807	3,003
1962	33,659	10,806	3,271	3,495
1963	43,254	13,141	3,713	3,992
1964	52,143	14,906	4,187	4,595
1965	60,996	18,447	4,643	5,295
1966	69,445	21,338	5,149	6,046
1967	80,102	24,762	5,746	6,850
1968	91,371	28,446	6,476	7,869
1969	100,208	32,751	7,202	9,009
Estimate				
1970	110,067	36,863	8,039	10,393
1971	119,994	40,587	8,958	11,802
TOTAL		$288,2392/		$80,592

1/ Number at end of fiscal year.

2/ Annual amounts will not add to total due to rounding.

RETIRED MILITARY PERSONNEL ELECTING SURVIVORS' BENEFITS AND AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION FROM RETIRED PAY BY CATEGORY

(Dollars in Thousands)

Category	Past Year FY 1969		Current Year FY 1970		Budget Year FY 1971	
	No. on Rolls End of FY	Amount of Deduction	No. on Rolls End of FY	Amount of Deduction	No. on Rolls End of FY	Amount of Deduction
Nondisability						
Regular Officers	19,670	$10,994	21,422	$12,487	23,164	$13,901
Regular Enlisted	26,421	3,782	30,841	4,586	35,416	5,266
Nonregular Officers	24,882	10,590	26,997	11,612	28,979	12,528
Nonregular Enlisted	458	83	517	105	577	126
Subtotal	71,431	$25,449	79,777	$28,790	88,136	$31,821
Temporary Disability						
Regular Officers	434	$289	423	$284	412	$279
Regular Enlisted	599	78	607	79	614	81
Nonregular Officers	294	69	314	76	335	82
Nonregular Enlisted	18	3	14	2	15	2
Subtotal	1,345	$439	1,358	$442 1/	1,376	$444
Permanent Disability						
Regular Officers	3,290	$2,304	3,618	$2,637	3,943	$2,910
Regular Enlisted	3,456	637	3,930	755	4,380	845
Nonregular Officers	4,675	1,901	4,775	1,966	4,872	2,018
Nonregular Enlisted	117	9	158	10	198	11
Subtotal	11,538	$4,851	12,481	$5,368	13,393	$5,784
Fleet Reserve						
Regular Enlisted	14,200	$1,570	14,668	$1,770	15,155	$1,980
Nonregular Enlisted	570	65	574	68	578	72
Subtotal	14,770	$1,635	15,242	$1,838	15,733	$2,052
Total Receiving Reduced Retired Pay	99,084	$32,374	108,858	$36,439 1/	118,638	$40,101
Cash Contributions	1,124	$377	1,209	$424	1,356	$486
TOTAL	100,208	$32,751	110,067	$36,863	119,994	$40,587

1/ Sum of individual amounts will not add to total due to rounding.

TOTAL MILITARY PERSONNEL RECEIVING RETIRED OR RETAINER PAY AS OF 30 JUNE 1969

Retired Pay Grade	All Retirements 1/			Nondisability Retirements 1/			Disability Retirements		
	No.of Persons	Monthly Amount	Avg.Mo. Ret.Pay	No.of Persons	Monthly Amount	Avg.Mo. Ret.Pay	No.of Persons	Monthly Amount	Avg.Mo. Ret.Pay
O- 10	124	$182,988	$1,476	71	$105,085	$1,480	53	$77,903	$1,470
O- 9	287	372,952	1,299	173	222,325	1,285	114	150,627	1,321
O- 8	1,569	1,692,231	1,079	1,061	1,098,614	1,035	508	593,617	1,169
O- 7	1,587	1,412,591	890	1,162	993,745	855	425	418,846	986
O- 6	36,913	25,079,258	679	30,781	20,334,737	661	6,132	4,744,521	774
O- 5	69,577	36,184,675	520	60,727	31,103,455	512	8,850	5,081,220	574
O- 4	54,186	23,113,222	427	44,759	19,142,661	428	9,427	3,970,561	421
O- 3	26,979	9,043,500	335	13,843	4,954,494	358	13,136	4,089,006	311
O- 2	15,456	3,938,437	255	3,345	983,422	294	12,111	2,955,015	244
O- 1	5,391	1,165,201	216	600	151,462	252	4,791	1,013,739	212
W- 4	7,459	3,513,709	471	6,661	3,106,527	466	798	407,182	510
W- 3	8,775	3,001,582	342	8,055	2,734,532	339	720	267,050	371
W- 2	12,961	3,785,686	292	11,451	3,339,305	292	1,510	446,381	296
W- 1	4,537	1,126,016	248	3,199	815,854	255	1,338	310,162	232
Total Officers	245,801	$113,612,048	$462	185,888	$89,086,218	$479	59,913	$24,525,830	$409
E- 9	15,202	$5,490,823	$361	13,841	$4,952,481	$358	1,361	$538,342	$396
E- 8	36,975	10,832,806	293	33,960	9,860,802	290	3,015	972,004	322
E- 7	187,353	44,813,839	239	171,005	40,747,110	238	16,348	4,066,729	249
E- 6	119,818	24,170,370	202	105,800	21,449,747	203	14,018	2,720,623	194
E- 5	65,725	10,885,073	166	50,697	8,606,107	170	15,028	2,278,966	152
E- 4	21,695 2/	2,603,835 2/	120	9,494	1,257,169	132	12,201 2/	1,346,666 2/	110
E- 3	9,698	776,411	80	1,528	152,366	100	8,170	624,045	76
E- 2	3,731	229,383	61	332	29,947	90	3,399	199,436	59
E- 1	756	51,196	68	88	10,021	114	668	41,175	62
Total Enlisted	460,953	$99,853,736	$217	386,745	$87,065,750	$225	74,208	$12,787,986	$172
GRAND TOTAL	706,754	$213,465,784	$302	572,633	$176,151,968	$308	134,121	$37,313,816	$278

1/ Includes Fleet Reserve 2/ Includes 11 NAVCADS

Analysis by Fiscal Year of the Number of Retired Personnel and Obligations for the Department of Defense

Category	Actual FY 1969			Estimate FY 1970			Estimate FY 1971		
	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000
Nondisability									
Regular Officers	73,810	72,643	484,668	79,520	77,473	564,186	84,503	82,708	622,235
Regular Enlisted	273,596	262,006	689,878	308,193	293,206	845,021	348,949	331,398	985,622
Nonregular Officers	112,078	109,458	536,663	121,641	116,902	612,538	129,193	125,865	673,099
Nonregular Enlisted	3,850	3,633	5,515	4,396	4,150	7,443	5,028	4,743	8,708
Subtotal	463,334	447,740	1,716,724	513,750	491,731	2,029,188	567,673	544,714	2,289,664
Temporary Disability									
Regular Officers	1,292	1,306	10,254	1,303	1,302	11,617	1,366	1,364	12,870
Regular Enlisted	14,494	13,198	27,549	16,780	15,705	32,814	18,662	17,886	39,661
Nonregular Officers	1,232	1,138	6,425	1,427	1,337	8,116	1,685	1,580	9,797
Nonregular Enlisted	2,452	1,830	2,426	4,506	3,581	5,464	9,365	7,290	11,394
Subtotal	19,470	17,472	46,654	24,016	21,925	58,011	31,078	28,120	73,722
Permanent Disability									
Regular Officers	16,692	16,468	106,430	17,495	17,121	121,277	18,247	17,868	131,300
Regular Enlisted	53,331	51,250	110,442	60,060	56,902	132,992	66,833	63,748	153,582
Nonregular Officers	40,697	40,680	161,308	40,830	40,773	174,241	40,984	40,905	179,531
Nonregular Enlisted	3,931	3,499	4,019	5,015	4,552	5,944	6,566	5,905	7,879
Subtotal	114,651	111,897	382,199	123,400	119,348	434,454	132,630	128,426	472,292
Fleet Reserve	109,299	107,746	288,355	114,510	111,946	326,954	116,191	115,347	346,520
Survivors' Benefits	7,202	6,833	9,009 1/	8,039	7,626	10,393	8,958	8,517	11,802
TOTAL	713,956	691,688	2,442,941 1/	783,715	752,576	2,859,000	856,530	825,124	3,194,000

1/ Sum of individual amounts by Service will not add to DoD total due to rounding.

Analysis by Fiscal Year of the Number of Retired Personnel and Obligations for the Department of the Army

Category	Actual FY 1969			Estimate FY 1970			Estimate FY 1971		
	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000
Nondisability									
Regular Officers	15,026	14,806	125,307	15,945	15,466	140,253	17,177	16,655	153,735
Regular Enlisted	123,605	118,142	312,359	137,533	130,739	381,697	156,012	148,158	445,796
Nonregular Officers	67,407	66,024	312,369	71,042	69,382	348,528	75,598	73,662	376,874
Nonregular Enlisted	1,347	1,288	1,622	1,525	1,452	2,013	1,729	1,642	2,469
Subtotal	207,385	200,260	751,657	226,045	217,039	872,491	250,516	240,117	978,874
Temporary Disability									
Regular Officers	268	248	2,253	331	299	2,942	435	390	3,914
Regular Enlisted	3,920	3,252	7,297	5,591	4,881	11,757	8,020	6,987	17,220
Nonregular Officers	625	553	3,316	778	711	4,470	1,008	909	5,818
Nonregular Enlisted	1,996	1,399	1,673	4,105	3,152	4,556	9,003	6,918	10,492
Subtotal	6,809	5,452	14,539	10,805	9,043	23,725	18,466	15,204	37,444
Permanent Disability									
Regular Officers	5,591	5,591	35,533	5,588	5,585	38,153	5,572	5,580	39,039
Regular Enlisted	16,156	15,390	32,017	17,744	17,082	39,864	19,550	18,783	45,808
Nonregular Officers	25,122	25,171	93,920	24,997	25,055	99,978	24,920	24,952	101,396
Nonregular Enlisted	2,498	2,071	1,971	3,566	3,109	3,763	5,113	4,456	5,663
Subtotal	49,367	48,223	163,441	51,895	50,831	181,758	55,155	53,771	191,906
Fleet Reserve	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Survivors' Benefits	3,264	3,140	3,649	3,573	3,418	4,080	3,913	3,743	4,521
TOTAL	266,825	257,075	933,286	292,318	280,331	1,082,054	328,050	312,835	1,212,745

Analysis by Fiscal Year of the Number of Retired Personnel and Obligations for the Department of the Navy -- (Navy)

Category	Actual FY 1969			Estimate FY 1970			Estimate FY 1971		
	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000
Nondisability									
Regular Officers	37,617	37,399	216,190	38,939	38,584	242,314	40,310	39,981	259,469
Regular Enlisted	36,171	34,915	91,867	40,636	38,538	109,320	45,880	43,477	125,736
Nonregular Officers	9,603	9,118	30,369	10,779	10,284	36,821	12,098	11,426	42,067
Nonregular Enlisted	2,235	2,103	3,539	2,535	2,394	4,963	2,879	2,721	5,631
Subtotal	85,626	83,535	341,965	92,889	89,800	393,418	101,167	97,605	432,903
Temporary Disability									
Regular Officers	630	674	5,229	552	587	5,408	483	537	5,381
Regular Enlisted	4,431	4,366	9,851	3,779	4,027	8,447	3,227	3,480	8,325
Nonregular Officers	206	208	1,155	215	207	1,481	224	228	1,659
Nonregular Enlisted	334	324	611	272	297	727	212	240	714
Subtotal	5,601	5,572	16,846	4,818	5,118	16,063	4,146	4,485	16,079
Permanent Disability									
Regular Officers	5,732	5,729	32,411	5,831	5,805	36,401	5,934	5,880	37,804
Regular Enlisted	11,384	11,052	21,156	12,237	11,850	23,895	13,071	12,689	25,872
Nonregular Officers	3,255	3,268	12,020	3,246	3,260	12,891	3,239	3,245	13,083
Nonregular Enlisted	1,026	1,019	1,651	1,040	1,035	1,759	1,040	1,040	1,785
Subtotal	21,397	21,068	67,238	22,354	21,950	74,946	23,284	22,854	78,544
Fleet Reserve	95,816	94,680	250,577	99,074	97,313	280,261	99,683	99,404	295,190
Survivors' Benefits	1,985	1,914	2,466	2,168	2,087	2,790	2,367	2,285	3,096
TOTAL	210,425	206,769	679,092	221,303	216,268	767,478	230,647	226,633	825,812

Analysis by Fiscal Year of the Number of Retired Personnel and Obligations for the Department of the Navy (Marine Corps)

Category	Actual FY 1969			Estimate FY 1970			Estimate FY 1971		
	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000
Nondisability									
Regular Officers	6,541	6,449	38,294	6,917	6,763	43,059	7,384	7,176	46,262
Regular Enlisted	3,644	3,390	9,404	4,428	4,044	13,390	5,793	5,275	18,708
Nonregular Officers	859	826	3,746	985	928	4,488	1,115	1,059	5,088
Nonregular Enlisted	58	55	96	61	59	105	65	62	112
Subtotal	11,102	10,720	51,540	12,391	11,794	61,042	14,357	13,572	70,170
Temporary Disability									
Regular Officers	213	197	1,423	226	226	1,704	248	240	1,820
Regular Enlisted	3,789	3,183	5,572	5,060	4,434	7,641	5,112	5,092	8,918
Nonregular Officers	108	86	393	112	110	514	115	114	535
Nonregular Enlisted	94	88	114	84	96	126	92	81	106
Subtotal	4,204	3,554	7,502	5,482	4,866	9,985	5,567	5,527	11,379
Permanent Disability									
Regular Officers	1,304	1,305	7,237	1,359	1,327	7,873	1,411	1,384	8,302
Regular Enlisted	3,757	3,611	6,033	5,710	4,774	8,311	7,719	6,845	12,044
Nonregular Officers	830	822	2,654	852	844	2,912	869	863	3,009
Nonregular Enlisted	327	330	280	326	325	289	328	326	293
Subtotal	6,218	6,068	16,204	8,247	7,270	19,385	10,327	9,418	23,648
Fleet Reserve	13,483	13,066	37,778	15,436	14,633	46,693	16,508	15,943	51,330
Survivors' Benefits	208	192	300	224	217	350	239	232	374
TOTAL	35,215	33,600	113,324	41,780	38,780	137,455	46,998	44,692	156,901

Analysis by Fiscal Year of the Number of Retired Personnel and Obligations for the Department of the Air Force

Category	Actual FY 1969			Estimate FY 1970			Estimate FY 1971		
	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000	Year End	Avg. No.	$000
Nondisability									
Regular Officers	14,626	13,989	104,877	17,719	16,660	138,560	19,632	18,896	162,769
Regular Enlisted	110,176	105,559	276,248	125,596	119,885	340,614	141,264	134,488	395,382
Nonregular Officers	34,209	33,490	190,179	38,835	36,308	222,701	40,382	39,718	249,070
Nonregular Enlisted	210	187	258	275	245	362	355	318	496
Subtotal	159,221	153,225	571,562	182,425	173,098	702,237	201,633	193,420	807,717
Temporary Disability									
Regular Officers	181	187	1,349	194	190	1,563	200	197	1,755
Regular Enlisted	2,354	2,397	4,829	2,350	2,363	4,969	2,303	2,327	5,198
Nonregular Officers	293	291	1,561	322	309	1,651	338	329	1,785
Nonregular Enlisted	28	19	28	45	36	55	58	51	82
Subtotal	2,856	2,894	7,767	2,911	2,898	8,238	2,899	2,904	8,820
Permanent Disability									
Regular Officers	4,065	3,843	31,249	4,717	4,404	38,850	5,330	5,024	46,155
Regular Enlisted	22,034	21,197	51,236	24,369	23,196	60,922	26,493	25,431	69,858
Nonregular Officers	11,490	11,419	52,714	11,735	11,614	58,460	11,956	11,845	62,043
Nonregular Enlisted	80	79	117	83	83	133	85	83	138
Subtotal	37,669	36,538	135,316	40,904	39,297	158,365	43,864	42,383	178,194
Fleet Reserve	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Survivors' Benefits	1,745	1,587	2,595	2,074	1,904	3,173	2,439	2,257	3,811
TOTAL	201,491	194,244	717,240	228,314	217,197	872,013	250,835	240,964	998,542

STUDY OF MILITARY RETIREMENT SYSTEM

Mr. SLACK. Thank you, Mr. Spence.

During both the 1969 and the 1970 hearings, we discussed a study that was being made by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower regarding the military retirement and survivorship system. The purpose of the study is to determine whether or not the system as it now operates is performing the function which the retirement system is intended to perform.

The study was also to determine if the system is performing that function in the most efficient way possible

Has this study been completed?

Mr. SPENCE. The study phase has been completed, sir. The retirement study is part of the overall study of the compensation system which was completed during the last administration.

As for the status of the proposal at the present time, it has not finally been decided what will be submitted to the Congress in the way of recommended legislation.

Mr. SLACK. What are the recommendations, in general terms?

Mr. SPENCE. As far as the retirement portion of the study is concerned, it is recommended that there be a two-step retirement plan which would provide for a lesser rate of retirement pay in the case of individuals who retired prior to completion of 30 years' service and prior to age 55.

On completion of a specified number of years' service after retirement, the amount of that annuity would be increased.

CONSUMER PRICE INDEX INCREASE

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Spence, there have been several increases in the Consumer Price Index. Would you please discuss any changes in the Consumer Price Index which may have occurred during the past year and how it has affected retired pay?

Mr. SPENCE. The Consumer Price Index, of course, reflects the cost of living of persons in the economy. It has been increasing at a rapid rate during the past several years. During fiscal year 1970, in fact last November, the formula under which retired pay is adjusted resulted in an increase of 5.3 percent in the amount of retired pay of those persons then on the retired rolls. This consisted of a 4.3-percent increase in the Consumer Price Index plus a 1-percent additional increase which was authorized by Public Law 91–179.

The purpose of Public Law 91–179, which authorized the additional 1-percent increase, was to offset the erosion of retirement pay, the purchasing power of retired pay, which resulted from the delay between the Consumer Price Index achieving the higher levels and the actual adjustment of retired pay.

COST OF CONSUMER PRICE INDEX INCREASES

Mr. SLACK. At this point in the record, will you place a table showing the dollar effects on the 1970 and 1971 budgets?

Mr. SPENCE. The effect of the Consumer Price Index adjustments; yes, sir.

(The information follows:)

Dollar effects on the fiscal year 1970 and fiscal year 1971 military retired pay budgets due to the increases in the Consumer Price Index

Fiscal years:	*Effect*
1970	+95,000,000
1971	+147,000,000

ADMINISTRATIVE COST OF RETIRED PAY SYSTEM

Mr. ADDABBO. What is the estimated cost of administering the retired pay system?

Mr. SPENCE. We have a table which, if you like, I can supply for the record, or which I can read if you wish.

Mr. ADDABBO. You may supply it for the record.

Mr. SPENCE. All right, sir.

(The table follows:)

ESTIMATED COST OF ADMINISTERING THE MILITARY RETIRED PAY SYSTEM

Category	Fiscal year—		
	1969	1970	1971
Personnel	492	510	509
Cost	$3,938,000	$4,520,000	$4,590,000

PROCESSING OF RETIREMENT CHECKS

Mr. ADDABBO. Where are your retirement checks actually processed?

Mr. SPENCE. Each of the military services has its own finance center. The Army's retired pay checks are mailed from Fort Benjamin Harrison, the Navy's from the finance center in Cleveland, the Air Force from Denver, Colo., and the Marine Corps from Kansas City.

Mr. ADDABBO. Has any study ever been made about consolidating and centralizing this operation?

Mr. SPENCE. To my knowledge, no specific study has been directed at possible consolidation of the payment of retired pay.

I want to point out the finance centers not only administer retired pay, but also administer all of the pay accounts of active personnel as well as retired personnel. They each are very large operations.

UNDERSTATED PROJECTED COST OF RETIRED PAY

Mr. ADDABBO. We note your estimate for retired pay, including projected pay and price increases, for the year 2000 is $15.6 billion. Last year you had estimated $12.8 billion, and the year before you had estimated $10.9 billion.

Since your estimate attempts to include future pay and price increases, why was it necessary to increase your estimate by 50 percent during the last 2 years?

Mr. SPENCE. Actually, of course, our projections, as you know, are based upon some kind of estimate of what will happen in the form of both basic pay increases and price increases. Also, we must take into account the fact that in the last several years there have been substantial increases in the amount of retired pay that is required because of a rapidly increasing Consumer Price Index.

These facts, plus some additional retirements which are occurring primarily because of the expanded size of the active duty forces, has resulted in this difference.

Mr. ADDABBO. Does this in any way effect appropriations, or is this just an estimate?

Mr. SPENCE. This is solely an estimate.

Mr. ADDABBO. It does not determine any costs?

Mr. SPENCE. No, sir. The whole purpose of the estimate is to get some kind of feel for what the retired pay appropriation may be in the future based upon some theoretical assumptions which we make.

Mr. ADDABBO. In other words, you are not asking for any money to be deposited now to build up a fund for the year 2000?

Mr. SPENCE. No, sir. The military retirement system is an unfunded system. That is, the retirement payments are made from appropriations made by the Congress each year. There is no funding involved.

DISABILITY RETIREMENT

Mr. ADDABBO. Would you please explain to the committee the difference between a disability retirement and nondisability retirement?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir.

The nondisability retirement is somewhat self-explanatory. Whenever an individual is being retired or separated from the Military Service, he is given a physical examination. If, as a result of that physical examination, he is found to be physically fit for military service and he qualifies for retirement, then he would be retired and placed upon the nondisability retired rolls.

If, on the other hand, in connection with that physical examination or as a result, as in many cases, of service-incurred combat wounds, the man is found to be physically unfit for military service, then he will be retired for physical disability and either placed upon the permanent disability retired rolls or on the temporary disability retired rolls.

Temporary retirement, as I indicated in my statement, is resorted to when it appears that the man's condition may improve to the extent that he could possibly be returned to duty and be found fit for service or, on the other hand, if the condition has not yet stabilized so we do not know precisely what his percentage of disability will be over the long haul.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR DISABILITY RETIREMENT

Mr. ADDABBO. For disability retirement, does he have to complete his 20 years' service, or can he get it after completing 5 years' service?

Mr. SPENCE. There is no minimum required length of service in order to qualify for disability retirement. For example, we have many young men who are being wounded in Vietnam who come back and we are retiring them for physical disability.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION PENSIONS

Mr. ADDABBO. Would they also be entitled to a VA pension?

Mr. SPENCE. They are entitled to elect to receive either compensation

from the Veterans' Administration or military retired pay, whichever is to their advantage.

But in any event, we process them through the physical disability retirement system, place them on the retired rolls, which in and of itself provides the individual and his family with certain benefits apart from the military retired pay which he may waive in lieu of Veterans' Administration compensation.

PROJECTED DECREASE IN DISABILITY RETIREMENTS

Mr. ADDABBO. On page 6 of your statement, you show the actual and projected number of retirements among military personnel. In 1969, you experienced 22,358 disability retirements. Yet for 1970, you project only 10,964. What would cause this sudden drop in disability retirements?

Mr. SPENCE. Would you give me the reference again?

Mr. ADDABBO. The actual and projected number of retirements among military personnel on active duty, fiscal year 1968 to 1975.

Mr. SPENCE. In making our projections of the numbers of disability retirements, sir, we have not taken into account the relatively large number of disability retirements which are resulting from the combat operations in Vietnam. I am not sure whether this is the answer to your question or not, or explains the point. The projected figure does not include those.

Mr. ADDABBO. So, this would underestimate your requirements, would it not? You have certain projections from prior years. Would that not be a better way to project it than to take this figure of 10,964?

Mr. SPENCE. It is extremely difficult to project the number of combat losses we will experience. As a result, rather than attempt to project something which may be completely unrealistic, we disregard the possibility of combat casualty retirements and project only the normal amount of retirements.

Mr. ADDABBO. Is this something which is made up later in a supplemental or next year's budget?

Mr. SPENCE. To the extent that there are disability retirements in fiscal year 1971, it will be in fiscal 1971. To the extent there would be additional retirements resulting from whatever level of combat casualties there may be, it probably would require an additional appropriation.

E–1 AND E–2 RETIREES

Mr. ADDABBO. On page 10 of your statement you show the number of retirees by pay grade. Under what conditions would an individual retire as an E–1 or E–2 after 20 or 30 years of service?

Mr. SPENCE. I find that really difficult to explain.

Mr. ADDABBO. You may explain it for the record.

Mr. SPENCE. All right, sir.

(The information follows:)

This table was compiled by a computer run. Without a manual search of records it would not be practical to identify the individuals reported as receiving nondisability retired pay in pay grades E–1 and E–2 or to determine the reason therefor. Some small part of the total of 420 may have resulted from machine error. However, a serviceman with 20 or more years of service can be reduced administratively or by courts martial action to pay grades E–1 or E–2 and apply for and be retired while serving in that lower grade. The majority of the 420 individuals undoubtedly fall in this category.

FUND FOR ALLIED FORCES

Mr. ADDABBO. One final question. Is there any money in your budget for any of our Allied forces in Vietnam?

Mr. SPENCE. No, sir. This covers only disability retirement payments to people who are retired from the U.S. Armed Forces.

RETIREMENT PROJECTIONS

Mr. ADDABBO. In last year's record, part I, on page 495, you had a table, "Projected number of military personnel receiving retired or retainer pay and annual disbursements, Department of Defense," and also a table, "Projected number of military personnel receiving retired or retainer pay and annual disbursements, with assumed pay or price index increases."

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir. We have a similar table, and we will provide it for the record.

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you.

(The table follows:)

Projected Number of Military Personnel Receiving Retired or Retainer Pay, and Annual Disbursements with no assumed pay or Consumer Price Index Increases, Department of Defense
(Number of persons in thousands; dollar amount in millions)

Fiscal Year	Constant Active Force[1]	
	Number receiving retired pay	No pay or price increases
1975	1,065	$4,123
1980	1,255	5,167
1985	1,426	5,942
1990	1,568	6,558
1995	1,671	7,020
2000	1,738	7,345

1/ Assumes that the Active Force remains unchanged at the June 30, 1968 level.

Projected Number of Military Personnel Receiving Retired or Retainer Pay, and Annual Disbursements with Assumed Pay and Consumer Price Index Increases, Department of Defense
(Number of persons in thousands; dollar amount in millions)

Fiscal Year	Constant Active Force[1]	
	Number receiving retired pay	Pay and price increases[2]
1975	1,065	$ 4,519
1980	1,255	6,352
1985	1,426	8,256
1990	1,568	10,399
1995	1,671	12,824
2000	1,738	15,609

1/ Assumes that the Active Force remains unchanged at the June 30, 1968 level.
2/ Pay rates are assumed to increase by 3.5 percent annually and the consumer price index by 1.5 percent annually.

Mr. ADDABBO. Could you supply for the years 1969, 1970, and 1971, a breakdown of those on the inactive Reserve rolls who are receiving retired pay of one sort or another? Is that possible?

Mr. SPENCE. On the inactive?

Mr. FOSTER. This would be a retired reservist, someone who has been in the Reserves on inactive duty for 30 years. As I understand it, they receive some type of retired pay after 30 years. We are wondering how much is in the budget for payment to this type of person as opposed to someone who has spent 20 or 30 years in the service on active duty and then retired.

Mr. SPENCE. We do have a table prepared which we will furnish for the record, which shows the number of individuals who are retired under what we call title III. These are reservists whose primary service has been in the Reserve, not on active duty, and who at age 60 are entitled to receive a retirement benefit. We do have the numbers and dollars involved, and we will be happy to supply that for the record.

(The table follows:)

TITLE III, PUBLIC LAW 810, RETIREMENTS -- FISCAL YEARS 1969, 1970 AND 1971
(10 U.S.C. 1331)

(Dollars in Thousands)

	FY 1969 Actual			FY 1970 Estimate			FY 1971 Estimate		
	Year-End Number	Average Number	Obligation Amount	Year-End Number	Average Number	Obligation Amount	Year-End Number	Average Number	Obligation Amount
Officers	34,158	32,727	90,130	37,614	36,089	106,059	41,453	39,706	119,044
Enlisted	3,359	3,143	4,352	3,905	3,659	6,196	4,537	4,252	7,440
TOTAL	37,517	35,870	94,482	41,519	39,748	112,255	45,990	43,958	126,484

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. SLACK. Mr. Davis?

COMPUTATION OF PAYMENT

Mr. DAVIS. These are all completely noncontributory programs; are they?

Mr. SPENCE. In the technical sense; yes, sir. The reason I say in the technical sense is that in the establishment of rates of pay for the last few years the fact that the military retirement system is noncontributory has been taken into account in fixing the rates of basic pay that military personnel receive.

Mr. DAVIS. What is the basis for the computation? Let us take the man who spends 25 years in the regular Armed Forces. What is the basis for the computation of his retirement?

Mr. SPENCE. The normal rule, sir, is that you take the basic pay, that is, the man's basic pay that he is entitled to on the last day of his active duty, and multiply that dollar amount by 2½ percent times his years of service.

For example, to make it easy for me, assuming he retires at 30 years of service, 2½ percent times 30 would give him 75 percent, which would be multiplied times the basic pay that he was entitled to receive on the last day of his active duty.

I have kept reiterating basic pay because this is only one element of a man's total compensation. A military man receives basic pay, quarters allowance, subsistence allowances, and so forth. It is only the basic pay which is used in computation of retired pay.

RETIREMENT PROMOTIONS

Mr. DAVIS. You read every once in a while of some officer being promoted as of a time very shortly before his retirement, who actually never performed service in a branch of the Armed Forces in that pay grade. Do you find much of that going on?

Mr. SPENCE. As a practical matter, there is a requirement in law that an individual who is promoted to a temporary grade can be retired in that temporary grade only if he has served for at least 6 months on active duty in that grade.

In addition to that, the Department of Defense has a rule which prescribes that normally an individual in the grade of lieutenant colonel and above will be required to serve for at least 2 years on active duty in a grade in order to be retired in that grade.

We have one exception which I believe should be mentioned, and that is in the case of Reserve personnel who are serving on active duty, who are eligible for two types of promotion. They operate under a temporary promotion system in which they actually do change their insignia while serving on active duty. Concurrently with that promotion system, there is a Reserve promotion system and the reservist can be promoted in the Reserve to a grade which is higher than the grade in which he is serving on active duty.

To take an example, an individual could be serving as a major on active duty and actually be a lieutenant colonel in the Reserve. When he retires, he can be retired in the Reserve grade, even though he has not served on active duty in that grade.

We in the Department of Defense feel that this is not an appropriate method for providing retirement benefits for personnel, and have submitted legislation to the Congress urging that that system be modified to require at least 6 months on active duty in grade for anybody before he can be retired with pay in that grade.

Mr. DAVIS. Have you run across any instances of a man being promoted to a higher grade just before his retirement on a retroactive basis in order to increase his retirement benefits?

Mr. SPENCE. Sir, I know of no way this could happen.

RESERVE VERSUS ACTIVE DUTY BENEFITS

Mr. DAVIS. How would the retirement entitlement of the Reserve who has served a very small portion of his time on active duty compare with a man in the same grade or rank who has spent his entire 25 years in the Regular Forces?

Mr. SPENCE. For each year of active duty that the reservist has, he receives the same retirement amount for that year of active duty as the Regular who serves on active duty all this period. For his years of nonactive duty service, the retirement computation is approximately one-seventh, between one-sixth and one-seventh for a year of nonactive duty that he would have recevied had he served on active duty. So it is less than one-half of 1 percent for a year of nonactive duty as compared to the 2½ percent for each year of active duty.

COMPUTATION OF DISABILITY BENEFITS

Mr. DAVIS. What about the officer retired on the basis of disability? In addition to this retirement program, is he entitled to VA benefits for the same disability?

Mr. SPENCE. No additional; no, sir.

Take the case of an officer who has a 60-percent disability rating under the Veterans' Administration scale, and he has 20 years of active service. In that case, the officer, rather than using the formula which I mentioned a minute ago of 2½ percent times the 20 years, which would give you a 50-percent multiple, may use his percentage of disability established under the VA schedule of 60 percent and use that factor against his basic pay. He would receive 60 percent of his basic pay, rather than 50 percent that he would get based upon his years of service.

If that individual wanted to receive compensation from the Veterans' Administration, he would have to waive a dollar amount of his retired pay equal to whatever compensation he gets from the Veterans' Administration. In other words, there is no additive character whatsoever.

EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS TO RETIREES

Mr. DAVIS. What about educational benefits? Let us take the case of the retired officer drawing his retirement who decides that he wants to go to law school, would he be entitled to receive educational benefits under the VA program at the same time he is receiving his retirement from the armed services?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, he is. Just like any other individual, the compensation he would receive under the GI bill for educational purposes is equally applicable to the retiree as well as to anyone else.

FUNDS REVERTING TO THE TREASURY

Mr. DAVIS. Did you have any funds available for payment into the Treasury in the last fiscal year under this program?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes, sir. In fiscal year 1969, there was $7,059,000 which reverted to the Treasury.

Incidentally, the preceding year was $1,500,000.

Mr. DAVIS. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Wyman?

TIME IN GRADE PRIOR TO RETIREMENT

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Davis asked whether you had recommended legislation changing the requirement so the reservist given a temporary Reserve promotion but serving on active duty in a lesser rank would be retired at the higher rank, to substitute a requirement similar to other branches of the service of 6 months' active duty in grade.

What would be the situation of those who have already been retired at the higher grade?

Mr. SPENCE. We would not propose that any individual who is receiving retired pay based upon that higher grade or any individual who had already been promoted to that higher Reserve grade—we did not propose that they would be disturbed in their entitlements.

EFFECT OF VIETNAM ON RETIREMENT COSTS

Mr. WYMAN. How much of your retirement picture in terms of cost is due to Vietnam?

Mr. SPENCE. A relatively small amount.

Mr. WYMAN. I noticed in your figures the nondisability retirement cost are very much greater than the disability retirement costs in terms of the overall burden, on the order of 3 to 1.

Mr. SPENCE. Seventy-one percent is nondisability; yes, sir.

Mr. WYMAN. In regard to Vietnam, haven't we had a lot of paraplegics and very seriously wounded veterans who will retire or who have been retired from Vietnam in the disability category?

Mr. SPENCE. This is true, sir, but proportionate to the total number of people who have served in the career forces and down through the years have completed a career, the numbers of those who are being wounded and retired for physical disability as a result of Vietnam is not proportionately large.

Mr. WYMAN. At some point in the record, if figures are available or if you have this information, would you show approximately how many individuals have been added to the disability retirement rolls to date resulting from the war in Vietnam, and what percentage of the overall disability cost, either temporary or permanent category, is attributable to this?

Mr. SPENCE. We might not be able to tie it precisely to the Vietnam hostilities, but we can certainly show for the record the increase in

disability retirements which have occurred and which are attributable in the main, certainly, to the Vietnam hostilities.

(The information follows:)

Precise information as to the number of disability retirements which have occurred in the last few years which are attributable to the Vietnam hostilities is not available. However, using the annual retirement rate of approximately 11,000 as "normal," then it is estimated that approximately 18,000 disability retirements occurred in fiscal years 1967–69 which are attributable to the Vietnam hostilities. In addition to servicemen retired for disability resulting from the Vietnam hostilities, there are substantial numbers of persons who suffered combat wounds but whose resulting disability was less than 30 percent. These individuals are not retired for disability, but are receiving disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WYMAN. We have had supposedly approaching 200,000 individuals who served in Vietnam who have been wounded. This is bypassing the tragedy of the 40,000-odd who have been killed, who would not be on your rolls. Will not a substantial percentage of these wounded wind up on your retirement rolls, one way or another, or will all these be VA?

Mr. SPENCE. A very substantial number of them will wind up on the Veterans' Administration rolls, for this reason: The Congress in establishing a disability benefit system provided a dual system, which consists of the disability compensation system administered by the Veterans' Administration and the disability retirement system whch is part of the overall career compensation system for the Armed Forces.

Many of the individuals who were wounded and are receiving or entitled to benefits based upon the fact that they did suffer serious wounds in Vietnam we will retire, and they will show up on our retired rolls as a retired individual. However, under the formula for computing his retirement benefits, he is better off to go to the Veterans' Administration, because the dollar result is more favorable to him than the dollar result that he would get from the military department.

There are also, sir, many individuals who wind up with a relatively minor disability, in other words, one which is less than 30 percent, who will be discharged and given a severance payment and who will not show up on our retired rolls, but will, in fact, be receiving compensation from the Veterans' Administration for this 10- or 20-percent disability which he has incurred.

PROJECTED RETIREMENT COSTS

Mr. WYMAN. Over the last 8 years, the cost of retirement has gone up very substantially. I see your figures projected through 1975 which get us up over $4 billion.

When, if ever, will this level off and start downward?

Mr. SPENCE. Depending on the assumptions you use regarding force strengths, price increases and wage increases, we anticipate the ultimate level-off period probably will not be before the year 2000.

Mr. WYMAN. At that time, your figures show a projection of approximately 1,738,000 on the retired rolls in terms of individuals, and a cost figure of $15,609 billion. Is that correct?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. The $15 billion figure is based upon certain pay and price increase assumptions, a 3.5-percent increase in prices and a 1.5-percent increase in the cost of living. Also, it is predicated on the military strength of fiscal year 1968.

If the force goes down and assuming that these are valid price and cost-of-living factors, then the cost would tend to come down. If the numbers of people on active duty stay up and these are understated, the cost will be higher than that.

All we can attempt to do is to give an order of magnitude based upon some preconceived ideas of what may happen in the future.

Mr. WYMAN. And there is no way really to indicate reliably what percentage of the appropriations for armed services in the year 2000 this $15.5 billion would be; is there?

Mr. SPENCE. No, sir; no way in the world.

Mr. WYMAN. The nondisability retirements over the years ahead will continue, will they not, to comprise by far the larger part of the financial burden?

Mr. SPENCE. Very definitely, sir, particularly and hopefully if we no longer have any combat situations in which a number of people are being retired for disability as a result of combat.

INDIVIDUALS DROPPED FROM RETIREMENT ROLLS

Mr. WYMAN. The thing that confuses me, Mr. Spence, is that at some point along the line, without wishing anybody any bad luck, aren't retirees of whatever category going to start to die? The big burden in nondisability retirements is World War II age people. That will build up a little more, and then it will start to phase down again?

Mr. SPENCE. That is true. Assuming a force of somewhere in the neighborhood of what we had in 1965, we still would be having people retiring at about the rate of 55,000 a year.

Mr. WYMAN. That is because they have served their 20 years.

Mr. SPENCE. That is right.

Mr. WYMAN. That will just continue.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. WYMAN. Even though we have people dying, there will be others to take their place, and this retirement cost as a percentage of our total Defense appropriation is a relative constant.

Mr. SPENCE. An approximate relative constant. It would become a relative constant later on; yes.

Mr. WYMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ADDABBO. Thank you, gentlemen, for your appearance and your testimony this morning.

The committee will now stand in adjournment until 2 p.m., when we take up "Military personnel, Navy."

LIST OF WITNESSES

	Page
Adamson, Col. J. B	3
Allman, Col. C. S	336
Bartholomees, Col. J. B	3
Bellochi, Lt. Gen. J. F	3
Berg, Maj. Gen. W. W	336
Boye, Maj. Gen. F. W., Jr	3
Brinker, Maj. Gen. W. E	3
Davis, Brig. Gen. F. M	3
Davis, Vice Adm. G. M	149
Detwyler, C. M	460
DiFusco, Col. M. P	460
Duncan, Vice Adm. C. K	149
Gaddis, Rear Adm. W. D	149, 263
Gettys, Maj. Gen. C. M	3
Hoffman, Col. R. G	98
Hoisington, Col. E. P	3
Holm, Col. J. M	336
Hutchison, B. M	3
Jones, Col. Percy	336
Kenyon, A. P	149
Kerwin, Lt. Gen. W. T., Jr	3
Kroesen, Brig. Gen. F. J	3
Lenihan, Capt. R	149
Loretti, Col. O. P	421
Low, Maj. Gen. A. S., Jr	336, 421
Marchbanks, Maj. Gen. T. E., Jr	421
Maxwell, Maj. H. L	421
McGough III, Maj. Gen. E. A	336
Neel, Brig. Gen. S. H., Jr	3
Nutt, G. B	3
Parker, Col. M. N	336
Pethtal, B. E	98
Pitts, Maj. Gen. W. F	336, 421
Platt, Maj. Gen. J. M	263
Robenhymer, F. D	263
Robinson, Lt. Comdr. J. E	149
Simmons, Brig. Gen. E. H	263
Spence, L. J	460
Sutton, Maj. Gen. W. J	98
Taylor, Maj. Gen. L. B	3, 98
Widdecke, Brig. Gen. C. F	263
Wieland, Capt. D	149
Williamson, Maj. E. W	98
Wilson, Maj. Gen. W. P	98, 421

INDEX

A

Air Force, Department of the:	Page
Military personnel	336
Activities outside the Air Force, manpower commitments to	362, 383
Air Force Academy cadet program	376, 411
Airman program	371
Gains and losses in numbers of	372, 401
Promotions	373
Reenlistments	372
Subsistence of	413
Weighted airman promotion system	395
Alaska Communication System	381
Assistance programs	418
Project 100,000	375, 418
Project Referral	420
Project Transitions	374, 419
Budget for fiscal year 1971:	
Reduction in	358, 361, 378
Effect on national security	364
Civilian replacement of	390
Director of Personnel Planning, statement of	366
Draft law	384
Family separation allowance	413
Flight medical officers	403
Flight pay	403
General purpose forces	361
Grade structure, change in	400
Graduate education	386–389
Helicopter pilot training	402
Intelligence and communications	384, 399
Losses in, actions to offset	385
Management	363, 383, 396
New food item programs	416
Nurses	406
Officer program	367
Authorized strengths	407, 409
Graduate education	386
Number of, June 30, 1969	410
Promotions	368, 395, 407, 409, 410
Rated officer programs	362, 369
Temporary ranks of	410
Officer-enlisted ratio	397
Organization	363
Permanent change of station program	376
Rations	414
Recruitment	384
ROTC program	392
Retention of	384, 404
Special pay	404, 412
Strategic forces	364
Strength projections	359, 366, 372

Air Force, Department of the—Continued
Military personnel—Continued
Subsistence of enlisted personnel: Page
Overstated estimates 413
Special rations 414
Operational rations 414
Augmentation rations 415
Holiday meals 416
New food item program 416
Support of free world forces 412
Support of other nations 398
Temporary promotions 407–411
Training, medical and other personnel activities 362
Transient account 381, 396, 398
Vietnam, personnel reductions in 379
Volunteer force 389
Warrant officers 400
Women in the Air Force 371, 406
National Guard personnel 421, 427, 436
Aerospace defense alert 459
Airlift support 436
Budget request to Office of the Secretary of Defense 449
Domestic action programs, participation in 452, 454
Force structure 439
Need for 445
Negro participation in 453, 459
Personnel benefits 455
Readiness of 448
Retention of personnel 450
Size of 446
Strength of 440, 448
Structure of, changes in 449
Reserve personnel 421, 430
Budget request to Office of the Secretary of Defense 447
Censorship squadrons 452
Domestic action programs 454
Equal opportunity program 451
Flying units 434
Major operations and joint exercises 431
Officers on active duty 456
Readiness of 432, 447
Reenlistment bonuses 451
ROTC 435, 443, 457
Shortfall in enrollment 458
Reserve school training 456, 457
Retention of personnel 449
Bonuses and proficiency pay 374
Problems with 384
Studies on 385
Medical personnel 404
Revision of 1970 program 433
Strength of, authorized 442
Subsistence of enlisted personnel 456
Absentee rate 457
Travel costs 455
Army, Department of the:
Military personnel 3–97
Absenteeism in mess halls 53
Academy cadets 45
Accessions in fiscal year 1971 24, 46
By sources, fiscal years 1969–71 88
Draft quotas 46
End strength by month 47
Enlisted personnel with critical skills, higher entry grade for 24, 28
Active Army divisions supported in 1971 budget 69, 79

Army, Department of the—Continued
Military personnel—Continued
Page
Administration costs ---- 41
Increase in number of personnel ---- 42
Airborne training ---- 65
Assignment of personnel to activities outside the Army ---- 91
Assistance programs ---- 61
Project 100,000 ---- 61
Project Referral ---- 65
Project Transition ---- 64
Aviator program ---- 47–52
Balance between military and civilian personnel ---- 59
Career planning ---- 84
Central supply and maintenance costs ---- 41
Change of stations, reduction in ---- 57
Combat or hostile fire pay ---- 37
Cost-of-living allowances ---- 87
Critical skills, higher entry grade for ---- 24, 28
Deafness of GI's ---- 33
Dentists, recruiting and retaining ---- 33
Determination of personnel requirements ---- 84
Distribution of Army strength by missions ---- 89
Flight pay ---- 48, 49
Graduate education ---- 29
Grants, subsidies and contributions ---- 86
Guard and Reserve Forces, support of ---- 40
Headquarters staffs ---- 91
Helicopter pilot training ---- 47–49, 81
Cost of training ---- 49
Senior officer pilots ---- 47
Income tax exemptions, abuse of ---- 35, 37
Intelligence personnel, increase in ---- 42
Lawyers ---- 42, 43
Middle East, troop deployments to ---- 77
Nurses ---- 31
Officer-enlisted men ratio ---- 24
Officer Personnel Directorate Career Counsel Team ---- 60
Officer ratios to total strength ---- 89
Officer strengths by grade ---- 89, 95
Officers authorized ---- 93
Compared with number supported in budget ---- 94
Officers in temporary and permanent ranks ---- 96, 97
Physicians, recruiting and retaining ---- 32, 33
Promotion and retention ---- 26, 27
Centralized enlisted promotions ---- 85
Temporary ---- 92, 95
Racial problems survey ---- 71
Recruitment costs ---- 88
Reduction in personnel requirements ---- 38
Reenlistments ---- 25
Release of, early ---- 28
Retention of military personnel ---- 58
Cash payment in lieu of educational benefits after separation ---- 83
Effect of excessive moves ---- 57
Effect of increased pay ---- 58
Junior officers ---- 59
Civilianization ---- 59
Officer personnel directorate ---- 60
All-volunteer army ---- 60
Promotion and retention ---- 26
Early release program ---- 28
Retirement ---- 82
Standards for military service ---- 78
Strengths for fiscal year 1970 and 1971 ---- 24, 47

Army, Department of the—Continued
Military personnel—Continued
Subsistence of enlisted personnel: Page
Absenteeism 53
Change in costs 54
C-Rations 55
Holiday meals 55
New food item program 55
Subsistence losses 69
Support of free world forces 68
Support of other nations 43
Temporary promotions 92–97
Training centers, closing of 77
Travel expenses 56
Uniformed services savings deposit program 69, 86
Veterinarians 53
Vietnam:
Divisions in 69
Drug problem in 66
Forces in 40
Malaria in 78
Racial mix of troops in 80
Racial problems in 70
Tours of duty in 25, 78
Training prior to duty in 77
Withdrawal of troops from 38
Budget, effect on 39
Women serving in 45
Volunteer Army 60
Warrant officers 50, 52
Women's Army Corps 43
Service in Vietnam 45
National Guard personnel 98, 110, 129
Absentee rate at mess halls 141, 147
Authorization request 137
Combat readiness 124
Equipment, changes in 125, 131
Improvement program 123
Insignia, subdued 140
Strength of 146
Use in domestic emergencies 134
Reserve personnel 98, 120, 126
Absentee rate at mess halls 141
Authorization request 137
Clothing costs 139
Combat readiness 124
Equipment, changes in 125
Improvement program 123
Rations 140
ROTC 129, 143
Supplies and materials 138
Travel costs 142

M

Marine Corps:
Military personnel 263–318
Assistance programs 313
Project 100,000 313
Project Referral 314
Project transition 314
Communications and intelligence 300
Cost increases 300
Average rate 300, 303
Discipline 315
Draft, use of 293
Enlisted plan 289, 305
Flight pay 306

Marine Corps—Continued
Military personnel—Continued Page
Graduate education 297
Helicopter pilots, training of 305
Income tax exclusion 316
Manpower program for 1970 and 1971 288
Negroes 294
Officer plan 289
Officer-enlisted ratio 304
Quarters allowance 309
Recruitment of 294
Reenlistments 292, 295, 296
Retention of 290
Problems with 292
Draft, effect on 295
Efforts to improve 296
Strength on July 1, 1971 291, 299
Subsistence of enlisted personnel 310
Absentee rate 310
Operational rations 311
New food item program 311
Support of free world forces 307
Training, medical and other general personnel support 296, 304, 305
Transportation costs 302
Vietnam, cost of air travel to 317
Vietnam, withdrawal of troops from 291, 299
Volunteer force 293, 315
Women's Marine Corps 308
Reserve personnel 318
Enlistments 335
Equipment received during 1969 333
Equipment withdrawn 334
Readiness of 329
Reservists with active duty experience 329
Strength, shortfall in 327
Supplies and materials 335
Training 331
Drills, weekend 331
Travel costs 334

N

Navy, Department of the:
Military personnel 149–263
Absenteeism at mess halls 229
Aircraft accident rate 198
Assignment to Defense agencies 206
Assistance programs 235
Project 100,000 236
Project Referral 237
Project Transition 236
Budget for fiscal year 1971, reduction in 182, 204
Career motivation program 200
Clothing allowance 228
Distribution of personnel 179
Draft, effect on procurement of personnel 182
Enlisted personnel 178
Emergency rations 230
Enlistment incentives 188
Recruiting program 186
Joint Recruiting Command 189
Seabees 189
Reenlistment rate 228
Subsistence of 229
Absenteeism at mess halls 229
New food item program 229
Funding requirements 180

Navy, Department of the—Continued
Military personnel—Continued
Page
Grade structure, changes in 245
Graduate education 190, 193
Cost of 196
GAO report on 193
Officers with degrees not used in validated positions 195
Officers with graduate degrees versus requirements 195
Helicopter pilot training:
Army training of Navy pilots 209
Senior officers as 208
Laos, operations in 227
Medical personnel and activities:
Corpsmen 217
Dentists and doctors 211
Hospital occupancy rate 218
Hospital ships 218, 219
Hospitals, number of 218
Marihuana 219
Nurses 216
Venereal disease 218
Morale 232
Naval Academy 232
Officer personnel 177
Aviators, procurement of 184
Nucleam submarine officers continuation pay 199, 226
Number by permanent and temporary rank 244
Number of authorized officers by rank 241
Number of commissioned 238
Procurement of 182
Officer-enlisted man ratio 206
Polaris crews 192
Prisoners of war 227
ROTC program 184
Retention of personnel 179, 182, 183
Problems with 182, 183, 196
Effect on early release on 188
Enlistment incentives 188
Seabees 189
Navy efforts to improve 190
Nuclear submarine personnel 191, 198
Fleet readiness, effect on 196
Ship condition, effect on 196
Pilots 197
Career motivation program 200
Studies on 202
Doctors and dentists 211, 213
WAVES 225, 226
Reenlistment rate 228
Subsistence:
Absentee rate 229
New food item program 229
Change in food inventory level 230
Emergency rations 230
Support of free world forces 227
Support of other nations 205
Uniformed services savings deposits 230
Vietnam:
Drug problem 219
Hospital in 223
Nurses in 222
Riverine forces 204
Seabees in 189
Venereal disease 219
Volunteer force 224
Warrant officers 207
Waves 224

Page

Navy, Department of the—Continued
Reserve personnel ---- 246
Drill strength ---- 263
Enlisted career counselor ---- 262
Equipment transferred to ---- 258
Equipment withdrawn from ---- 260
Funding requirements ---- 181
Helicopter pilot qualification training ---- 262
Reactivation of reserve training ships ---- 259
Readiness of ---- 263
ROTC ---- 260
Subsistence costs ---- 262

R

Retired pay, Defense ---- 460
Administrative costs ---- 481
Consumer Price Index increase ---- 480
Cost of ---- 481
Projected ---- 491
Disability retirement ---- 482, 489
Funds reverting to the Treasury ---- 490
Processing of checks ---- 481
Projected number of personnel receiving ---- 484
Retired reservists, payments to ---- 486
Retirement promotions ---- 488, 490
Study of retirement system ---- 480
Vietnam war, effect on costs ---- 490

○.