

Y4
. Ar 5/3
N219/2

1034

92V4
Ar 5/3
N219/2

NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

GOVERNMENT

Storage

MENTS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

16 1971

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LEGISLATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

S. 2296

TO AMEND SECTIONS 107 AND 709 OF TITLE 32, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND TO NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS, RESPECTIVELY

KSU LIBRARIES



✓
E60774
11900 477093

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1971

1/2/51
A. 1/2/3
1/2/51

Handwritten notes in the top left corner, including the number '7' and some illegible scribbles.

HEARING DOCUMENTS
AUG 16 1951

THE LIBRARY
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
GENERAL LEGISLATION

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi, *Chairman*

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri | MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine |
| HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington | STROM THURMOND, South Carolina |
| SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina | JOHN G. TOWER, Texas |
| HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada | PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado |
| THOMAS J. McINTYRE, New Hampshire | BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona |
| HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia | RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania |
| HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa | WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio |
| LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas | |

T. EDWARD BRASWELL, Jr., *Chief Counsel and Staff Director*

JOHN T. TICER, *Chief Clerk*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LEGISLATION

HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia, *Chairman*

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| THOMAS J. McINTYRE, New Hampshire | WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio |
| HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa | RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania |
| LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas | PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado |

CHARLES J. CONNEELY, *Professional Staff Member*



NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIANS

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 30, 1971

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL LEGISLATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 1:30 p.m., in room 212, Old Senate Office Building, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., (subcommittee chairman) presiding.

Present: Senator Byrd (presiding).

Also present: John T. Ticer, chief clerk and Charles J. Conneely, professional staff member.

Senator Byrd. The committee will come to order.

The Subcommittee on General Legislation of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is meeting today to hear testimony and receive information on the number of technicians to be employed by the National Guard.

The National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 established a permanent statutory calling of 42,500 for the number of technicians that may be employed at any one time. The subcommittee is meeting today to consider whether or not this permanent ceiling needs to be increased in light of the newer, more sophisticated equipment being used or planned for use by the National Guard and, if so, what the new level should be.

A legislative proposal has been submitted to the Senate by the Department of Defense requesting removal of the provision in the 1968 act which establishes a permanent statutory ceiling. This proposal was referred to the Committee on Armed Services but it has not been introduced in the Senate. The matter referred to this subcommittee, and on which we are meeting today, is that of the number of technicians which the National Guard anticipates will be needed to meet their requirements in the near future.

I understand that there also is a matter regarding the apportionment or availability of appropriations which representatives of the National Guard Bureau will want to discuss today.

We are delighted to have with us today Major General Winston P. Wilson, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, as the principal witness. I should like to take this opportunity to note that General Wilson will soon retire and this is probably the last appearance he will make before members of this committee. The job he has done as Chief of the National Guard Bureau is to be highly complimented and I feel certain I can speak for the entire committee in wishing him the best of everything for the future.

General Wilson submitted his statement sufficiently in advance to enable the staff to review it in depth. Questions have already been submitted to him which will be made a part of the record with their answers. There will no doubt be further questions today.

General Wilson, you may proceed as you wish.

**STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. WINSTON P. WILSON, CHIEF,
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU**

General WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a short statement. It has already been submitted for the record. If it is desired I can read it or I can go into any other questions that the committee might have, sir.

Senator BYRD. If you have a short statement, I think it would be well for you to read that statement.

General WILSON. All right.

It is a privilege to appear before this committee in behalf of the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau in support of the proposed legislation to amend title 32 of the United States Code. This legislation was included in the Department of Defense legislative program and relates to National Guard technicians as its primary purpose. Additionally, however, the proposed legislation would, upon passage, eliminate the necessity to include clarification annually in National Guard appropriation acts.

I will discuss first the proposed legislation as relates to technicians. As you will recall the National Guard Technicians Act of 1968 included an amendment to title 32 which fixed a ceiling on the number of technicians that could be employed. This number was established at 42,500. It was the observation of the committee, at that time, that the number of technicians were increasing out of proportion to the increased total strength of the National Guard and that a statutory ceiling would effect economies and efficiencies in terms of personnel.

The Department of Defense, while having some concern as to the effects of a permanent statutory ceiling, was nonetheless in complete understanding of the decision. Until recently it has been possible to maintain a relationship between responsibilities and workloads and technician personnel resources to permit a satisfactory level of training and readiness.

However, the change in certain concepts of defense posturing announced last fall have resulted in conditions whereby the ceiling on the number of technicians becomes a serious deterrent to the application of these concepts. More specifically, the National Guard, as well as all Reserve components, is expected to be trained and maintained to a state of readiness for immediate augmentation of the Active Forces rather than expanding those forces through the draft in times of emergency. Concurrently, a greater reliability is being placed on the National Guard, and other Reserve components, in respect to the assignment of missions and the equipment levels as an offset to a reducing Active Force condition. Regarding this latter point, the National Guard is programed for mission changes and equipment changes that are unprecedented. Many of these changes and equipment changes have already occurred and more are planned during the next couple of years.

In the Army National Guard, for instance, equipment being allocated includes CH-47 "Chinook" and CH-54 Flying Crane aircraft; M107 175 millimeter self-propelled guns; M60 tanks; M113 personnel carriers; 2½ ton multifuel engine trucks; and a new family of tactical radios. Additionally, other onhand equipping is programed to increase from the present 60 percent of authorized to approximately 80 percent by the end of fiscal 1973.

Likewise in the Air National Guard nearly one-third of the flying units either have or are scheduled to convert to other aircraft or missions or both. Aircraft being assigned to the Air Guard include F-100's, RF-4's, F-101's, and C-130's.

It is because of these changes in defense requirements as pertains to the National Guard that we find it necessary to introduce legislation requesting the removal of the technician ceiling in order that the total defense structuring can proceed in an effective manner with the highest attention given to economies. We appeal to this committee with a sense of urgency to support and advance this legislation to passage.

The other feature of this proposed legislation as regards section 107 of title 32, United States Code, would not of itself prompt a legislative proposal. However, as this section now stands it has been found necessary for many years to provide for relief annually through the appropriation acts. Therefore, this being the case, we take this opportunity to introduce a request to provide the amendment to title 32 United States Code which will eliminate the need to provide this clarification on an annual basis.

Briefly, section 107 of title 32, United States Code, currently provides for the apportionment of appropriations to the various States in the ratio of the troop strength in each respective State. This at one time, no doubt, was a valid and equitable basis for distributing available funds. However, as modification of the National Guard began to occur with the assignment of mission equipment, expenses no longer could be measured by troop strength. Instead, expenses had a direct relationship to this equipment. This of course prevails today and is the reason for section 107 to be repeatedly excepted as a part of an appropriation action. It is requested that the committee favorably consider this amendment.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I wish to assure this committee that the Department of Defense and the National Guard Bureau are very cognizant of the importance your committee places on this legislation particularly as it pertains to the numbers of National Guard technicians. The Department of Defense further assures this committee that the stewardship of this program by the National Guard Bureau will be under the surveillance of the Department of the Army and the Air Force as well as this Department. With these assurances we urgently seek and recommend your support of this proposed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much your remarks on my past service. I would like to say that the support and understanding that this committee has given the National Guard during my tenure of office in the Pentagon have been greatly appreciated. I can assure you, sir, that without the legislation and the support that this committee has given we would not have been able to reach the readiness that we

have in both the Army and Air Guard and for that the Guard is deeply appreciative, sir.

Thank you very much. I will be glad to answer any questions.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, General Wilson.

As I understand it, what you and the Department would prefer is that the statutory ceiling be eliminated entirely?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. This would restore the procedure followed prior to the passage of the technicians act. Before that time we had technicians in the program as determined by the annual plans of the Department of Defense for the Army and the Air Force, the readiness goals, the equipment levels, and so forth. The National Guard technician program was based on these requirements and the annual appropriation review determined the number similar to other services in the Department of Defense.

We understand, sir, why the Senate Armed Services Committee desired to control the number of technicians that could be employed at any one time in the National Guard. We were able to manage within the 42,500 ceiling until recent months when missions of the active Army and Air Force phased down and new missions were assigned the Guard without prior programing. This has caused us to be unable to accomplish some of the things that we should have because of the complexity of the equipment.

It is my understanding that this committee still is interested in a ceiling on the number of technicians to be permitted.

If I may, I would like to suggest that if the committee desires to control the technicians, another way of doing it might prove useful. As you know, under section 412 of P.L. 86-149, as amended, the military strength of the National Guard, both Army and Air, is set annually based on our program requirements and our force structure.

Our appropriations are then related to the authorized strength and I would suggest, sir, that maybe it would be appropriate that at the same time we annually authorize the number of technicians. This would permit a fluctuation of the technician strength to match the program that had been approved by the Department of Army and the Air Force for the program year.

Senator BYRD. Well, that, of course, could be done. I must say frankly I am inclined to the continuation of a ceiling. What the ceiling should be is something else. But it occurs to me that it would be well to keep a ceiling.

The committee annually has so many things it needs to go into and look after.

If you could establish a ceiling for a couple of years it might be helpful. But also I think the trend should be and to some extent has been for the Congress to keep a little tighter rein, shall we say, on some of the Defense Department matters, and I do concur with that view, and I think this statutory ceiling is along that line.

Let me ask you this: For fiscal year 1972, which begins tomorrow, if the committee were to establish a ceiling, what do you think that ceiling should be?

General WILSON. I would say the ceiling, based on our projected requirements for fiscal year 1973, should be set at 53,100, sir.

Senator BYRD. I thought you planned to increase during 1972 by 6,700.

General WILSON. That is correct, sir. Accompanying this proposed legislation, a sum of money for fiscal 1972 has been recommended by the Department of Defense consisting of \$11.1 million in Air Guard and \$4 million in the Army National Guard for a total of \$15.1 million. This would finance an end fiscal 1972 strength, sir, of 49,200 technicians. That is about 96 percent of the requirements projected for fiscal 1973.

Senator BYRD. So you plan to or would like to increase by 6,700?

General WILSON. Yes, sir. That is the number of people to be actually hired in 1972.

Senator BYRD. How do you visualize your requirements for fiscal 1973?

General WILSON. In fiscal 1973, based on the equipment densities that are programmed to come into the Guard, which could increase as they have already this year, we would require approximately 53,000 technicians, sir.

Senator BYRD. Let's see, that would be an addition of how many over what you have now?

General WILSON. Well, right now we are authorized 42,500.

Senator BYRD. This would be an increase of 10,500.

General WILSON. Yes, sir. For example, just to give you an indication—

Senator BYRD. Excuse me a minute. If that figure was to be approved then you would need, and if there was to be a ceiling established, it would be around 53,000.

General WILSON. Yes, sir; if there were to be a ceiling that would get us by for a couple of years, sir.

Senator BYRD. A couple of years beyond 1973?

General WILSON. No, sir; I am talking about 1972 and 1973, sir.

Senator BYRD. So we can get this clear. You plan to or you would like to add 6,700 in the fiscal 1972 which would bring you up to 49,200, if that were possible?

General WILSON. Yes, sir; 49,200 actually onboard people.

Senator BYRD. Then you would like to add—

General WILSON. To that an addition.

Senator BYRD. A little less than 4,000, 3,800.

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Which would bring you up to 53,100?

General WILSON. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. Now the questions which the committee provided and which you have supplied answers to, will be inserted at this point in the record.

General WILSON. Thank you.

(The questions and answers follow:)

Question. Would you provide for the record a breakout by State of the number of increased technicians that you are requesting for fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973?

Answer. Yes sir, I will.

PROJECTED TECHNICIAN INCREASES, BY STATE

State	Fiscal year 1972 increase	Fiscal year 1973 increase	Percent of total fiscal year 1972 and 1973 increase	Percent over initial 1972 budget
Alabama	170	145	3.0	27
Alaska	36	29	.6	24
Arizona	78	59	1.2	19
Arkansas	110	60	1.6	23
California	367	263	5.9	25
Colorado	78	79	1.5	22
Connecticut	149	49	1.9	27
Delaware	77	17	.8	27
District of Columbia	105	72	1.7	29
Florida	122	38	1.5	26
Georgia	127	96	2.1	23
Hawaii	71	87	1.5	22
Idaho	105	25	1.2	28
Illinois	189	129	3.0	25
Indiana	150	69	2.0	26
Iowa	112	63	1.6	23
Kansas	123	77	1.9	28
Kentucky	89	27	1.1	25
Louisiana	113	36	1.3	23
Maine	86	40	1.1	29
Maryland	180	51	2.1	27
Massachusetts	210	118	3.0	27
Michigan	215	118	3.1	30
Minnesota	134	73	1.9	23
Mississippi	157	95	2.3	24
Missouri	123	90	2.0	23
Montana	84	17	.9	26
Nebraska	86	21	1.0	28
Nevada	59	12	.6	27
New Hampshire	66	21	.8	27
New Jersey	241	170	3.8	25
New Mexico	96	22	1.1	26
New York	258	297	5.2	24
North Carolina	129	64	1.8	27
North Dakota	79	24	.9	24
Ohio	155	226	3.5	23
Oklahoma	116	64	1.6	23
Oregon	94	51	1.3	23
Pennsylvania	238	197	4.0	24
Puerto Rico	96	43	1.3	20
Rhode Island	89	25	1.0	27
South Carolina	125	41	1.5	25
South Dakota	92	29	1.1	29
Tennessee	131	104	2.2	22
Texas	187	182	3.4	25
Utah	96	24	1.1	26
Vermont	84	20	.9	27
Virginia	211	64	2.5	29
Washington	161	66	2.1	26
West Virginia	87	19	.9	22
Wisconsin	140	85	2.1	23
Wyoming	55	20	1.2	27
Total	6,731	3,913		

Question. Let me ask you another question. Would you provide for the record a table or chart showing the net increase in equipment to be received by the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard, and relate this increase to maintenance and other factors so as to give a total view of your technician requirements for fiscal '72 and fiscal '73?

Answer. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to do that. We have broken it down by areas so that it comes up to a total of 10,644.

(The attached tables are submitted for the record :)

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIAN/EQUIPMENT RELATIONSHIP

Type of equipment or technician	Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973	
	Quantity	Technician requirement	Quantity	Technician requirement
Surface equipment:				
Small arms.....	+11,512	+14	+5,000	+1
Artillery.....	+327	+57	+1,752	+113
Combat vehicles.....	+2,122	+762	+2,420	+304
Tactical vehicles.....	+1,993	+398	+2,403	+168
Tactical trailers.....	+1,453	+38		
Auto components.....		+40		+20
Telephones.....	+876	+6		
Radios and radar.....	+21,541	+420	+15	+2
Special purpose equipment.....	+52	+22	+115	+16
Electric power generators.....	+4,127	+598		
Miscellaneous equipment.....	+166	+37		
Canvas items.....		+17		+7
Supervisory inspection and support.....		+368		+179
Aircraft:				
O-1.....	-125	-67		
OV-1.....			+18	+22
U-1.....	-3	-2	-3	-2
U-6.....	-38	-32	-81	-67
U-8.....			+4	+4
U-9.....			+4	+4
U-10.....			-2	-2
OH-13.....	-8	-5	-139	-93
OH-23.....			-130	-98
OH-58.....	+173	+95	+375	+206
UH-1D.....	+182	+222	+627	+765
CH-34.....	-16	-25	-122	-193
CH-47.....	+11	+25	+26	+58
CH-54.....	+6	+15		
Supervisory inspection and support.....		+135		+580
Other:				
Training operations.....		+291		+150
U.S.P. & F.O.....		+344		+69
Air defense.....				+27
State headquarters.....		+163		+21
Grand total (Army).....		+3,936		+2,261

AIR NATIONAL GUARD TECHNICIAN/EQUIPMENT RELATIONSHIP

Type of equipment or technician	Fiscal year 1972		Fiscal year 1973	
	Quantity	Technician requirement	Quantity	Technician requirement
I. Aircraft maintenance:				
Aircraft type:				
F-4C	+24	+123	-----	-----
F-102	-72	-306	-----	-----
RF-4C	+48	+282	+12	+113
F-84F	-216	-585	-----	-----
F-101	+74	+447	-----	-----
F-86	-24	-58	-----	-----
RF-101	+72	+362	-----	-----
A-37	+24	+58	-----	-----
F-100	+144	+598	-----	-----
RB-57	-12	-56	-12	-56
F-105	+90	+653	-----	-----
RF-84	-126	-413	-----	-----
O-2	+36	+102	+36	+102
U-10/HU-15	-30	-108	-----	-----
KC-97L	-----	-----	+10	+71
C-97	-24	-241	-8	-78
C-130	+66	+1185	-----	-----
C-124	-56	-651	-16	-182
Other maintenance: Includes munitions and nuclear weapons, photo-radar, aerospace ground equipment, life support, personnel equipment, etc.	-----	+413	-----	+605
Total aircraft maintenance	-----	+1805	-----	+575
II. Command, Administration and ground training: Includes command supervisor, military personnel, civilian personnel, administration services, education and training, career control, etc.				
-----	-----	+423	-----	+229
III. Base supply: Includes logistical support in base supply, warehouse equipment management, fuels management, etc.				
-----	-----	+213	-----	+275
IV. Aircraft operations and flying training: Includes flight instructors, safety, simulator training, loadmasters, intelligence, flight engineers, command post, aerial port operations, etc.				
-----	-----	-20	-----	+89
V. Base support: Includes transportation, motor vehicle maintenance, photo, fire-fighting and crash rescue, civil engineering, maintenance and repair of buildings and grounds, medical, ground radio, etc.				
-----	-----	+173	-----	+361
VI. Ground communication and electricity: Includes ground communication, radio-radar maintenance and operations, tower operations, direct air support operations, etc.				
-----	-----	+84	-----	+84
VII. Security: Security policy				
-----	-----	+117	-----	+39
Grand total (Air)	-----	+2795	-----	+1652

Senator BYRD. Now, I have several additional questions that I would like to put to you, General.

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Would you provide for the record a breakout by State of the number of increased technicians that you are requesting for fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, I will.

Senator BYRD. And as a part of that question, where one State appears to be getting a disproportionate share of technicians, would you explain the reasoning for that?

General WILSON. Yes, sir. Mr. Chairman, it would be similar to this. For example, in Virginia, at Byrd Field, we are going from the F-84-F aircraft to the sophisticated F-105, which were returned from Vietnam. Due to the sophistication and the cost in maintenance man-hours for that one unit, they need 98 additional technicians. We haven't been able to give them that. We are trying to convert it at the present time but we are not able to give them the help.

Senator BYRD. You mean 98 additional technicians?

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. How will the number of planes compare with what you have now?

General WILSON. It will be the same number of planes.

Senator BYRD. Same number of planes but the same number of planes will require 98 additional technicians.

General WILSON. Yes, sir; because of the sophistication of the weapons system, the increased flying maintenance man-hour cost, the different types of aircraft weapon systems that have to be maintained, and the different types of support equipment. The F-84 is an airplane that has been with us since the Korean days. The F-105 is a much newer, more complex, and modern airplane. As a matter of fact, this airplane came direct to Virginia from Thailand where it was being used in Vietnam, sir.

Senator BYRD. The technicians who have been handling the planes which you now have—will be qualified to handle the new planes?

General WILSON. Yes, we are converting them through school training and we have a mobile training detachment at Richmond where we are training not only the technicians but other guardsmen as well.

Senator BYRD. How many technicians do you have to handle the present number of planes?

General WILSON. State of Virginia, sir, at the present time we have 109.

Senator BYRD. 109.

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. In other words, by changing planes it will almost double the number of personnel.

General WILSON. Yes, sir; the cost for the sophistication, and so forth—let me check that to be sure I have got the right figure.

I am sorry, they had 202 technicians and they need 90.

Senator BYRD. In other words, you are increasing by 50 percent then.

General WILSON. Yes, and that is all tied, Mr. Chairman, to the maintenance man-hours per flying hour, and the complexity of systems this airplane has over the old airplane they had, sir.

As another example, the F-4, which is going into another unit and also replacing F-84's has two engines compared to a single engine on the F-84, and all kinds of sophisticated radar equipment. All of these things have to be maintained, and initially we are using the Air Force standard maintenance man-hour factor which they have developed over the years.

Senator BYRD. What I am trying to get clear is this: Am I right in my assumption that as you go to those more sophisticated planes, the number of personnel required to or technicians—

General WILSON. Go up.

Senator BYRD. Will go up at a rate of 50 percent?

General WILSON. Not all the way across the board; no, sir. It depends on the type of airplane and the type of equipment that the airplane is equipped with.

Senator BYRD. It seems to me that is a smashing increase of personnel needed.

General WILSON. Well, sir, if the Guard is going to be responsive in the type of equipment that it has, we have to be able to fly it and fly it safely.

The Air Force has determined it takes so many maintenance man-hours per flying hour and so many maintenance hours based on the sophistication of the weapons system, fire control system, and so forth, to maintain the equipment. Therefore it costs the Guard about the same as the Air Force to fly it 1 hour.

Senator BYRD. But aren't your technicians better qualified than the Air Force?

General WILSON. They will be, sir, after we get to know the system.

Senator BYRD. Aren't your present technicians better qualified?

General WILSON. On a new airplane I would say they are not until they have had the airplane for awhile.

Senator BYRD. Your technicians as a whole, do you regard them as better qualified?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, as highly qualified.

Senator BYRD. More experienced.

General WILSON. History has shown we get very proficient in a new weapons system after we had them for a year or two—

Senator BYRD. You are basing your personnel needs on what the Air Force says its personnel needs are in regard to technicians, yet are not your technicians better trained and more experienced, speaking broadly and generally?

General WILSON. Generally they are; yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. So why would you need to follow what the Air Force says?

General WILSON. We need to follow it while we are in a learning curve.

Senator BYRD. Is this increase, to take an example that you gave at Byrd Field, of 50 percent in round figures, would you visualize that as a temporary increase?

General WILSON. It will be for a period of time. Let me give you an example. In the F-102, which we have in the Guard, and have had for quite a long time, the Air Force maintenance man-hour factor is 33 with the nuclear capability. We do not have the nuclear capability and our maintenance man-hour factor is 22. In the F-84, which they have at Byrd Field, the Air Force factor is 23, ours is 15, sir. So it varies. But with the 105D airplane first coming into the Guard, and until we gain experience in this airplane, we have to use factors so we can fly it safely.

Senator BYRD. Could the committee assume that the 98 additional personnel that you would need would only be a temporary part of that, part of those men would be temporary, as they gain in experience?

General WILSON. As they gain in experience and as we get our experience and figure what it takes to maintain the airplane safely some can probably be released for other jobs.

We have never manned to our authorized strength, nor do we with the figures we are talking about. We are only talking about 93 percent level of the spaces that have been checked, authorized—

Senator BYRD. What is the total number of technicians you have now?

General WILSON. We have 42,500.

Senator BYRD. That is your authorized strength?

General WILSON. Authorized to the field to hire is 42,500 because that is the ceiling, sir.

Senator BYRD. But you say you never authorized your full strength.

General WILSON. No, we have never authorized the full required strength within the 42,500 ceiling, sir.

Senator BYRD. So actually you don't have 42,500?

General WILSON. We have nearly that onboard. Our requirement is for 53,100, sir.

Senator BYRD. I am not clear what you meant when you said you never authorize more than 90 percent.

General WILSON. We were not allowed to, sir, because of the ceiling that we have of the 42,500.

Senator BYRD. State again, if you will, because I didn't get the full significance of it, state again if you will what you said in regard to 90 percent. What is the 90 percent figure?

General WILSON. Ninety-three percent at the present time, if you take the 49,200 that we are—

Senator BYRD. Let's forget fiscal 1972.

General WILSON. We have onboard right now in the Army and Air Guard about 42,500 technicians which is the authorization to the States to employ. This means we have an authorization document out to the States which is quite a bit above that which the State is allowed to fill.

Senator BYRD. Well, then, you have authorized the States collectively to go above the 42,500.

General WILSON. No, sir; we have authorized them to employ against known requirements but not to exceed 42,500. Each State knows which technicians are the most important to do that job, and can hire accordingly. What we are trying to do now is to get this level of manning up to a point where they meet their readiness goals that the Active Army and Air Force would like us to have, sir.

Senator BYRD. Let me ask you another question. Would you provide for the record a table or chart showing the net increase in equipment to be received by the Army and National Guard and, Air National Guard, and relate this increase to maintenance and other factors so as to give a total view of your technician requirements for fiscal 1972 and fiscal 1973?

General WILSON. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman; we will be glad to do that. We have broken it down by areas so that it comes up to a total of 10,644.

(See pp. 7 and 8.)

Senator BYRD. Right.

Would you describe briefly the budget constraints that impinge on requirements for technicians, in other words, what level of detail reviews the National Guard technician requirements each year.

General WILSON. Yes, sir. We get a program from the Army and Air Force that states what our requirements and our readiness goals are. We then prepare in our going in budget for the requirements for technicians as well as all other budget requirements, for personnel,

construction, and O. and M., to meet those readiness goals. The technician is one part of that program. It is very closely scrutinized by the Departments of the Army and the Air Force and it then goes to the Department of Defense where it is very closely reviewed including examination by the Office of Management and Budget. We are given approval or a bogie as to what we can include in the President's budget, sir. That is the basis of our total program review to include the review on technicians, sir.

Senator BYRD. Do you have a figure which would be the approximate annual salary of the National Guard technicians?

General WILSON. Yes, sir. I would like to give it to you exactly.

Senator BYRD. This would be an average figure that you would give?

General WILSON. Yes, it would be an average figure. For the Army National Guard it is \$11,185 a year average per technician; in the Air Guard it is \$12,012.

Senator BYRD. You are speaking now of fiscal 1972?

General WILSON. Fiscal 1972; yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. What weekly hours do the technicians work?

General WILSON. They work 40 hours a week, sir; normal criteria. Technicians are different from other civil service employees if they work overtime, they get compensatory time off instead of pay. But their normal duty hours under the regulation is 40 hours a week.

Senator BYRD. So the annual salary is not increased by overtime?

General WILSON. No, sir. The law is very specific on that. It authorizes compensatory time rather than overtime.

Mr. CONNEELY. Is your man-year cost estimates and your salaries the same? In other words, we have figures here for man-year cost estimates for fiscal 1972 for Army National Guard of 11 thousand—

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNEELY. That man-year cost is what you consider salary?

General WILSON. That is right.

Mr. CONNEELY. There are no other factors involved?

General WILSON. That is right.

Mr. CONNEELY. For the Air Guard it would be \$12,012?

General WILSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNEELY. You describe that you are going to be using about \$15 million in fiscal 1972 to fund the increased cost of the technicians over the ceiling?

General WILSON. That is correct.

Mr. CONNEELY. Now if you were authorized, let's say, 53,000 technicians for fiscal year 1972, would you still fund at that level?

General WILSON. We would fund at the 49,000-technicians level even though we were authorized 53,000 technicians.

Senator BYRD. General, I appreciate your coming here today and I want to again compliment you on the work that you have done through the years. The committee will miss seeing you.

General WILSON. I will miss coming, sir.

Senator BYRD. Is there anything further you would care to add?

General WILSON. I just would say one of the reasons I suggested an annual authorization is because of the fluctuation in our program. We do have an annual authorization of military strength and this could be added to make technicians related to the program each year and the ceiling could fluctuate that way. Otherwise it may require, unless the

ceiling is established at a high level, a continuous changing of the ceiling to meet the requirements. Mr. Chairman, these technician strengths are studied and looked at because it costs money. The Department of Defense scrutinizes this program and every time there are technicians added I have to justify to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Defense, and the Army or Air Force as to where it is going.

Senator BYRD. The Department of Defense doesn't scrutinize some of its requests for appropriations too well, I don't think.

General WILSON. This is one that they look at, sir. I think I know why they look at it.

Senator BYRD. I rather suspect you are quite correct in that statement and the committee will take it under advisement and we thank you for coming here today and the committee will stand in recess.

General WILSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

(Whereupon, at 2:05 p.m., the hearing was recessed subject to the call of the Chair.)

(On July 15, 1971, the Subcommittee on General Legislation recommended to the full committee, in executive session, that an original bill be reported to the Senate. Subsequently, on July 16, 1971, the full committee reported S. 2296, as covered by Senate Report 92-267, which passed the Senate, without amendment, on July 20, 1971.)

(S. 2296 follows:)

[S. 2296, 92d Cong., First sess.]

A BILL To amend sections 107 and 709 of title 32, United States Code, relating to appropriations for the National Guard and to National Guard technicians, respectively

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 107 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by—

(1) striking out the catchline and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“§ 107. Availability of appropriations”;

(2) striking out all subsection (a);

(3) striking out “apportioned appropriations” in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof “appropriations for the National Guard”; and

(4) redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (a) and (b), respectively.

(b) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 1 of such title is amended by striking out

“107. Apportionment of appropriations.”

and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

“107. Availability of appropriations.”.

SEC. 2. Subsection (h) of section 709 of title 32, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(h) In no event shall the number of technicians employed under this section at any one time exceed 53,100, except that the number of technicians so employed may not exceed 49,200 during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971.”

thing is established at this level a continuous clearing of the air
in to meet the requirements Mr. Chairman, those of our own strength
are studied and looked at beyond all cost money. The Department of
Defense sees this thing and every time they are looking
at this they refer to the Bureau of the Budget, the Department
of Defense and the Army or Air Force as to where it is going.

Senator Byrd. The Department of Defense doesn't maintain some
of its reports for appointments as well, I don't think.

General Wilson. The point that the House and I think I have
why they look at it.

Senator Byrd. I think it is the date covered in the report
more and the committee will take it under discussion and we should
be looking for the committee will send it to the

Chairman Wilson. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as you know the hearing was recessed until the
end of the year.

On July 25, 1971, the Subcommittee on General Legislation, House
Committee on the Judiciary, held a hearing on the proposed
bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for 1972, H.R. 1017,
which provides for the extension of the authority of the
President to suspend the writ of *habeas corpus* in certain
cases and the extension of the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*
in certain cases.

The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C. The
hearing was held in Room 5600, Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971,
at the Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

1. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

2. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

3. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

4. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

5. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

6. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

7. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

8. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

9. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

10. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

11. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

12. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

13. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

14. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

15. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

16. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

17. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.

18. The hearing was held on July 25, 1971, at the
Department of Justice, Room 5600, Washington, D.C.