

1034

Y4

.Ar 5/3:

B49/

12/971

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

DOCUMENTS

921/4
Ar 5/3
B49/12/971

GOVERNMENT
Storage

11 1972

HEARING

LIBRARY
STATE UNIVERSITY

BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-SECOND CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 4729

PROVIDING ADDITIONAL RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING
CORPS SCHOLARSHIPS FOR ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE

H.R. 6723

PROVIDING SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES FOR MEMBERS OF
THE MARINE CORPS OFFICER CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

H.R. 6724

PROVIDING INCREASED SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCES FOR
SENIOR RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS MEMBERS

H.R. 7950

PILOT RATING REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMY,
NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND AIR FORCE

H.R. 8356

TO MAKE PERMANENT THE AUTHORITY TO PAY SPECIAL
ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNI-
FORMED SERVICES TO OFFSET EXPENSES INCIDENT TO
THEIR EVACUATION

H.R. 8656

RELATING TO PROMOTION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED
SERVICES WHO ARE IN A MISSING STATUS

NOVEMBER 5, 1971

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1971

70-658 0

KSU LIBRARIES



0067TA 221808

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi, *Chairman*

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
THOMAS J. MCINTYRE, New Hampshire
HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia
HAROLD E. HUGHES, Iowa
LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
JOHN G. TOWER, Texas
PETER H. DOMINICK, Colorado
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM B. SAXBE, Ohio

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

JOHN T. TIGER, *Chief Clerk*

(II)

CONTENTS

Statements of—

Maj. Gen. Leo E. Benade, USA, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy, Office of Assistant Secretary of Defense (M. & R.A.)-----	Page 13
Brig. Gen. Russell G. Ogan, USAF, Deputy Director, Directorate of Personnel Programs, Office of Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Headquarters, USAF-----	13
Brig. Gen. E. R. Reid, USMC, Legislative Assistant to the Commandant Headquarters, USMC-----	13
Col. Leland C. Shepard, Jr., USAF, Chief, Policy Division, Directorate of Personnel Planning, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Headquarters, USAF-----	13
Brig. Gen. T. H. Tackaberry, USA, Deputy Director for ROTC Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Department of the Army-----	13
Reserve Officers Association-----	36

CONTENTS

1	Introduction
2	Chapter I. The History of the Church of England
3	Chapter II. The Doctrine of the Church of England
4	Chapter III. The Liturgy of the Church of England
5	Chapter IV. The Sacraments of the Church of England
6	Chapter V. The Clergy of the Church of England
7	Chapter VI. The Laity of the Church of England
8	Chapter VII. The Church of England in the World
9	Chapter VIII. The Church of England in the Future
10	Index

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 1971

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

The subcommittee met pursuant to notice, at 2:05 p.m., in room 212, Old Senate Office Building, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., of Virginia (presiding.)

Present: Senators Byrd, Jr., of Virginia, McIntyre, Saxbe, Schweiker, and Dominick.

Also present: Labre R. Garcia, professional staff member.

Senator BYRD. The committee will come to order.

Today the Subcommittee on General Legislation meets to take testimony on six bills pertaining to military personnel.

Three of these bills relate to officer accession programs for each of the services and raise the subsistence allowance for ROTC students and Marine Corps officer candidates. (H.R. 4729, H.R. 6723, and H.R. 6724.)

There are three other bills which will be explained during these hearings dealing with emergency evacuation expenses for dependents, benefits to survivors of military personnel promoted while missing and, finally, a bill on pilot training. (H.R. 7950, H.R. 8356, and H.R. 8656.)

(Bills follow:)

(1)

H.R. 4729

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 19), 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To amend section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, to provide additional Reserve Officers' Training Corps scholarships for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 2107 of title 10, United States Code, is
4 amended as follows:

5 (1) By amending the second sentence of subsection (a)
6 to read as follows: "Not more than 20 percent of the per-
7 sons appointed as cadets or midshipmen by the Secretary
8 in any year may be appointed from persons in the two-year
9 Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps course."

1 (2) By adding a second sentence to subsection (c) to
2 read as follows: "At least 50 percent of the cadets and mid-
3 shipmen appointed under this section must qualify for in-
4 State tuition rates at their respective institutions and will
5 receive tuition benefits at that rate."

6 (3) By striking out "5500" whenever it appears in sub-
7 sections (d) and (f).

8 (4) By striking out "5500" whenever it appears in
9 subsection (h) and inserting "6500" after "Army program",
10 "6000" after "Navy program", and "6500" after "Air
11 Force program".

12 SEC. 2. This Act is effective July 1, 1971.

Passed the House of Representatives July 19, 1971.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

H.R. 6724

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 19), 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To amend section 209 (a) and (b) of title 37, United States Code, to provide increased subsistence allowances for Senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps members.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 209 of title 37, United States Code, is amended
4 as follows:

5 (1) By striking out "subsistence allowance at the rate
6 of not less than \$40 per month or more than \$50 per month"
7 in the first sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in place
8 thereof "a subsistence allowance of \$100 a month".

9 (2) By amending subsection (b) to read as follows:
10 "Except when on active duty, a cadet or midshipman

1 appointed under section 2107 of title 10 is entitled to a
2 monthly subsistence allowance in the amount provided in
3 subsection (a) of this section. A member enrolled in the
4 first two years of a four-year program is entitled to receive
5 subsistence for a maximum of twenty months. A member
6 enrolled in the advanced course is entitled to subsistence as
7 prescribed for a member enrolled under section 2104 of title
8 10 as prescribed in subsection (a) of this section.”

9 SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become
10 effective on July 1, 1971.

Passed th House of Representatives July 19, 1971.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

H.R. 6723

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 19), 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To provide subsistence allowances for members of the Marine Corps officer candidate programs.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That until June 30, 1976, except when on active duty, a
4 member enrolled in a Marine Corps officer candidate pro-
5 gram which requires a baccalaureate degree as a prerequisite
6 to being commissioned as a regular or reserve officer, and
7 who is not enrolled in a program or an academy established
8 under chapter 103, 403, 603, or 903 of title 10, United
9 States Code, may be paid a subsistence allowance at the
10 same rate as that prescribed by section 209 (a) of title 37,
11 United States Code.

Passed the House of Representatives July 19, 1971.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

H.R. 7950

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JUNE 8, 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To repeal sections 3692, 6023, 6025, and 8692 of title 10, United States Code, with respect to pilot rating requirements for members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; and to insert a new section 2003 of the same title.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That chapter 353 of title 10, United States Code, is amended
4 as follows:

- 5 (1) Section 3692 is repealed.
- 6 (2) The analysis item relating to section 3692 is
7 repealed.

II

1 SEC. 2. Chapter 555 of title 10, United States Code, is
2 amended as follows:

3 (1) Section 6023 is repealed.

4 (2) Section 6025 is repealed.

5 (3) The analysis items relating to section 6023 and to
6 section 6025 are repealed.

7 SEC. 3. Chapter 853 of title 10, United States Code,
8 is amended as follows:

9 (1) Section 8692 is repealed.

10 (2) The analysis item relating to section 8692 is
11 repealed.

12 SEC. 4. Chapter 101 of title 10, United States Code,
13 is amended as follows:

14 (1) A new section 2003 is inserted to read as follows:

15 **“§ 2003. Aeronautical rating as pilot: qualifications**

16 “To be eligible to receive an aeronautical rating as a
17 pilot in the Army or Air Force or be designated as a naval
18 aviator, a member of an armed force must successfully
19 complete an undergraduate pilot course of instruction pre-
20 scribed or approved by the Secretary of his military
21 department.”

1 (2) An analysis item relating to section 2003 is in-
2 serted to read as follows:

“2003. Aeronautical rating as pilot; qualifications.”

Passed the House of Representatives June 7, 1971.

Attest: W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk.

H.R. 8356

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 19), 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To make permanent the authority to pay special allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services to offset expenses incident to their evacuation.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 2 of the Act of May 22, 1965, Public Law
4 89-26 (79 Stat. 117), as amended (80 Stat. 851), is
5 amended by striking out “, and terminates on June 30,
6 1971”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 19, 1971.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

H.R. 8656

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JULY 20 (legislative day, JULY 19), 1971

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To amend titles 37 and 38, United States Code, relating to promotion of members of the uniformed services who are in a missing status.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 552 (a) of title 37, United States Code, is
4 amended by adding the following sentence: "Notwithstand-
5 ing section 1523 of title 10 or any other provision of law,
6 the promotion of a member while he is in a missing status
7 is fully effective for all purposes, even though the Secretary
8 concerned determines under section 556 (b) of this title that
9 the member died before the promotion was made."

10 SEC. 2. Section 402 (a) of title 38, United States Code,

II

1 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at
2 the end the following: "or as of the date of a promotion
3 after death while in a missing status".

4 SEC. 3. For the purposes of chapter 13 of title 38,
5 United States Code, this Act becomes effective upon the
6 date of enactment. For all other purposes this Act becomes
7 effective as of February 28, 1961.

Passed the House of Representatives July 19, 1971.

Attest:

W. PAT JENNINGS,

Clerk.

Senator BYRD. It is my understanding that Maj. Gen. Leo E. Benade, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Military Personnel Policy, of the Department of Defense, will be the principal spokesman on each of the bills under consideration. It is also my understanding that there are supporting witnesses from each of the services to answer any questions the subcommittee might have.

General Benade, it is always a pleasure to see you, and will you please proceed in your own way.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. LEO E. BENADE, USA, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL POLICY, OFFICE, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE M. & R.A.; ACCOMPANIED BY BRIG. GEN. T. H. TACKABERRY, USA, DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR ROTC, OFFICE OF DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY; BRIG. GEN. RUSSELL G. OGAN, USAF, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PROGRAMS, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PERSONNEL, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE; BRIG. GEN. E. R. REID, USMC, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT TO THE COMMANDANT, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS; COL. LELAND C. SHEPARD, JR., USAF, CHIEF, POLICY DIVISION, DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE; AND CAPT. R. G. HARTMAN, USN, HEAD, OFFICER EDUCATION DIVISION, BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

General BENADE. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before the committee to express the support of the Department of Defense for six proposals which are the subject of this hearing today: H.R. 4729, H.R. 6724, H.R. 6723, H.R. 7950, H.R. 8656, and H.R. 8356.

The first of three bills deal with the Reserve Officers Training Corps—ROTC—and are essential to the continuing operation of the officer procurement programs of the services. A more detailed discussion of and justification for these bills is set forth in the attachments to my statement, and I ask that they be included in the record as part of this statement.

Senator BYRD. Without objection, they will be included.

General BENADE. Briefly, H.R. 4729 would increase the number of ROTC scholarships by 1,000 for the Army, 1,000 for the Air Force, and by 500 for the Navy. The bill also limits the number of scholarships available in the 2-year program to a maximum of 20 percent of the total number awarded, and requires that at least 50 percent of the students must qualify for in-State tuition rates.

H.R. 6724, would increase ROTC subsistence payments to \$100 per month from the present \$50 per month. The current rate, designed to defray the students' living expenses, has not been changed since it was first established for the Navy in 1946, and the Army and Air Force in 1964. The bill also limits subsistence payments for freshmen and sophomore scholarship students to 10 months per year.

H.R. 6723, would provide a monthly subsistence allowance of \$100 to students enrolled in the Marine Corps platoon leaders' class pro-

gram, the same amount proposed to be authorized for ROTC students.

These three bills before your committee reflect certain amendments made by the House. These amendments are acceptable to the Department of Defense.

The other three bills, H.R. 7950, H.R. 8356, and H.R. 8656, respectively, propose certain changes in the law dealing with flight training and certain benefits and allowances for dependents of military personnel. Further discussion and justification for these bills are contained in additional attachments which are also offered for inclusion in the record as part of this statement.

Briefly, the bills would accomplish the following:

H.R. 7950, would eliminate specific flying hour requirements and other certain obsolete provisions in the law. Currently, the law requires a service member to pilot a heavier-than-air craft for at least 200 hours to receive a pilot rating. Tests show that it is possible to reduce this training time. The bill would repeal this provision and require a member to successfully complete a course of instruction prescribed or approved by the Secretary of his Department. Enactment of this bill would provide the military services with necessary flexibility in light of technological breakthroughs in flight simulation and other training innovations and techniques.

H.R. 8656, would insure that promotions of personnel carried as missing under title 37, United States Code, are valid for all purposes including Federal benefits to survivors, even where the date of death of the missing member is later determined to have occurred prior to the promotion date. The bill would have the specific effect of providing for dependency compensation payments to survivors based on the higher grade or rank held.

H.R. 8356, would make permanent the authority of Public Law 89-26, which terminated on June 30 of this year, enabling the Secretaries of the Military Departments to pay certain special allowances to the dependents of members of the uniformed services who are evacuated from overseas duty stations under emergency conditions.

Funds to meet the cost of these legislative proposals have been included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1972.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared statement. I should have pointed out at the start that I am accompanied by General Tackaberry from the Department of the Army, and by General Reid from the U.S. Marine Corps, who are here on behalf of their services with respect to the bills affecting the ROTC proposals.

We will be happy to try to answer any questions concerning any portion of the bills referred to in my statement.

(Attachments to statement follow:)

ATTACHMENT 1

H.R. 4729 proposes to increase the number of ROTC scholarships for each of the Military Departments.

Our original proposal was amended by the House of Representatives and a smaller increase was substituted. At present, 5500 scholarships are authorized for each Service. The amended House bill proposes an additional 1,000 scholarships for the Army; 1,000 for the Air Force; and 500 for the Navy. In addition, the amended bill requires that no more than 20% of the scholarships be available to students in the two-year program and that at least 50% of the students must qualify for in-state tuition rates. The Department of Defense interposes no objection to these amendments.

In the past, the ROTC program has been the largest single source of officer procurement and has proved to be a highly effective program in providing officers for our career forces. However, our experience also shows that after times of national crises, interest in military wanes and enrollments in the ROTC decline. With today's efforts toward an all-volunteer force, a zero-draft posture, and with the trend of universities to make the ROTC program voluntary, an increase in scholarships is necessary to meet post-Vietnam requirements.

Increased budgetary requirements of DoD are estimated to be:

	<i>Cost in millions</i>
1972-----	\$6.3
1973-----	16.1
1974-----	26.0
1975-----	33.4
1976-----	41.0

ATTACHMENT 2

H.R. 6724 proposes to increase ROTC subsistence payments,

The proposal recommends an immediate increase in the monthly subsistence rate from \$50 to \$100. As amended by the House of Representatives, it limits subsistence rates for freshman and sophomore scholarship students to 20 months for the first two years of college. The House also deleted a provision that authorized a cost-of-living adjustment based on the Consumer Price Index. The Department of Defense interposes no objections to these amendments.

A survey was made of room and board expenses at 53 colleges and universities for the years 1946 and 1970. In 1946, the \$50-monthly subsistence allowance provided full coverage of these expenses at 85% of these schools. In 1970, this same allowance did not offset these expenses in any of the schools. The limitation on freshman and sophomore students will preclude payments during the summer months when these students do not have a military obligation.

Estimated annual increased budgetary requirement resulting from the amended bill is \$20,170,000.

ATTACHMENT 3

H.R. 6723 purposes to provide financial assistance through subsistence payments to students enrolled in the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class program.

These payments would be identical to those paid to members of the ROTC and would provide assistance in defraying educational costs. As with ROTC, the student is required to spend one or more summer periods engaged in training which reduces his earning power and his ability to afford higher education.

This measure would insure that many qualified and desirable officer candidates are not lost. About 85% of Marine officers come from civilian college campuses. However, statistics show that the Platoon Leaders Class program has recently experienced an increased shortage of military candidates. In 1968, the program obtained 97% of its candidates; in 1969, 77%; and in 1970, 72%. To continue the necessary accession of candidates, it is considered that monetary subsidization of Platoon Leaders Class applicants would greatly increase the enrollment incentive. In addition, we have considered the impact of the Marine Corps program on the ROTC and it is our opinion that both programs can survive and flourish.

Assuming that the subsistence allowance for the ROTC will be increased to \$100 per month as proposed, costs are estimated to be:

Year:	Number of officer candidates	Cost
1-----	1,000	\$900,000
2-----	1,500	1,350,000
3-----	2,000	1,800,000
4-----	2,500	2,250,000
5-----	3,000	2,700,000

ATTACHMENT 4

H.R. 7950 proposes to revise and repeal certain statutes relating to flight training and requirements.

Repealed sections of the law would eliminate specific flying hour requirements and certain obsolete provisions. A new section would permit military pilots to be trained in a manner consistent with mission needs, safe operation in U.S. air space, and up-to-date pilot training techniques.

The current law—written in 1916 and amended in 1926—is overly restrictive with respect to present and future developments in flight training. A change is necessary to provide the military services with flexibility in light of technological break-throughs in flight simulation and other training innovations and techniques.

Enactment will not increase budgetary requirements nor reduce costs. But the proposal should improve the quality of training and produce economies in entry level flight training.

ATTACHMENT 5

H.R. 8656 pertains to promotion of missing-in-action personnel.

The bill provides that promotions of missing-in-action personnel are valid for all purposes, including Federal benefits, even when the date of death is later determined to have occurred prior to the promotion.

Under title 38, USC, section 402(a), dependency and indemnity compensation paid to the survivors of a serviceman who dies on active duty is based on the pay grade held by the member as of the date of his death. If this date is determined to have been prior to the date of promotion, the promotion cannot be considered in determining compensation payments.

After the cessation of hostilities in Southeast Asia there is a strong possibility that personnel accounting and identification procedures for those members carried in a missing status, as defined in title 37, USC, 552(2), will uncover positive evidence that many of them died during the period of their captivity. Under title 37, USC 556, the service Secretary or his designee is charged with the responsibility of making status determinations in these cases. The actual date of death for these personnel must be based on the evidence and information available, such as aircraft wreckage and remains, intelligence data, eyewitness reports of released prisoners, and other similar sources. In certain cases where conclusive evidence such as this may not be available, a presumptive date of death will be made, predicated on circumstantial evidence.

Although any money credited to a member's account or received by his next-of-kin as a result of promotion to a higher grade is not repayable to the Government, the family still must suffer the anguish of being notified that payment of death gratuities and entitlement to any subsequent benefits will be based upon the lower grade held on the date of death. Enactment of this legislation would provide for increased dependency and indemnity compensation payments to survivors based on the higher grade or rank held and may serve to alleviate some of the burden borne by survivors in these cases.

This legislation will result in no increase in budgetary requirements to the Department of Defense, but assuming the worst possible circumstances, the additional cost to the Veterans' Administration will not be in excess of \$135,000 yearly.

ATTACHMENT 6

H.R. 8356 makes permanent the authority to pay special allowances for the emergency evacuation of military dependents from oversea duty stations.

There are four basic allowances in the law:

- (1) A dislocation allowance equal to one month's basic allowance for quarters;
- (2) A per diem payment, based upon the current rate established for the location involved for a period ordinarily limited to 30 days;
- (3) The shipment of a privately owned vehicle at Government expense from the place evacuated to the place of temporary residence; and
- (4) The waiver of recovery of up to 1 month's pay which may have been advanced to assist in the evacuation of the dependents.

In October 1962, dependents were evacuated from Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and in May 1963, from Haiti, in the West Indies. Evacuation of dependents from the Panama Canal Zone and the Island of Cyprus was ordered in February 1964, from Vietnam and Indonesia in 1965, Egypt and Libya in 1967, and most recently, Jordan in 1970. Without the authority of this legislation, the Department of Defense would have been required to seek special legislation authorizing the payment of special allowances to the dependents involved in each of the mentioned instances. Making the authorization permanent would reduce the administrative burden, as well as the cost, of preparing individually remedial legislation. The legislation will

only be used on occasions when it is necessary to evacuate dependents from an area outside the U.S. due to very unusual circumstances or those which constitute a valid emergency.

Because conditions requiring evacuation of military dependents are largely unpredictable, it is not possible to estimate the additional costs which may result from enactment of this legislation.

Senator BYRD. You mentioned the cost but you didn't give a figure. What is your cost figure?

General BENADE. The costs will vary for each bill, sir. H.R. 8356 has no immediate costs connected with it. It would simply provide a continuing or permanent legislative authority to pay expenses in connection with evacuations that might occur in the future, so there is no cost to that item.

The next bill, H.R. 8656, would insure the promotions of personnel carried as missing under title 37 are valid for all purposes. It has no immediate cost implications to the Department of Defense. There is a zero cost for fiscal 1972.

Any budget costs that would be connected with this proposal, sir, would actually be borne by the Veterans' Administration. We have checked with the Veterans' Administration to determine costs in the worst possible case, that is, if all of the promotions that have been effected later turn out to be promotions that were made after a man had, in fact, died. The Veterans' Administration has estimated a maximum cost of \$135,000.

Senator McINTYRE. That raises an interesting point.

Supposing I was missing and you promoted me to, say colonel and pay and allowances then corresponding would be payable to the beneficiaries or to my wife and dependents?

General BENADE. Yes, sir.

Senator McINTYRE. Now, what if it is then decided and found out that actually on the day I was promoted, or 7 or 8 months afterward, do you go back to the widow and say, "You know, you owe us \$1,274"?

General BENADE. For the purpose of indemnity compensation, yes, sir; that is one of the unfortunate results of existing law and this is what we are trying to correct.

Senator BYRD. This would correct that?

General BENADE. This corrects it.

Senator McINTYRE. Oh, good; you won't come back and the girl found she was a widow and she didn't know it and she was paid so much money and say, "Now you pay it back to us"?

General BENADE. I am referring to dependency payments. In the case of actual pay and allowances the widow would receive, we do not require a recoupment. But in the case of the Veterans' Administration and, in particular, I am referring to the indemnity compensation which is paid by the Veterans' Administration. Under existing law, it is required that those payments be based on the grade held by the man at the time of death, so that the subsequent promotion of the man is of no effect so far as this is concerned; and payments must revert back to the lower grade. We think that is unconscionable, and that the promotion should be valid for all purposes.

I can give you one case that comes to mind, sir.

There was a case of an enlisted man in the Marine Corps who actually was promoted in December of 1969. Later it was established that his death had, in fact, occurred as a prisoner in January of 1969.

Now, the increased payments that would have been made to his widow by the Department of Defense are not recouped but the payments from the Veterans' Administration would be based on the grade that he actually had in January as opposed to the grade that we promoted him to in December when we thought he was still alive.

Senator BYRD. Why did you promote him in December?

General BENADE. We didn't know he was dead, sir. We promoted him in December because the policies of the services, Mr. Chairman, take into account the missing in action or the prisoner-of-war personnel. They are considered for promotion along with their contemporaries and almost invariably promoted, sir.

Senator BYRD. Yes, I see. In other words, they follow the same procedures as to time in grade?

General BENADE. Yes, sir; they are regarded for all purposes as though they were present and if their records justify promotion, they are promoted along with their contemporaries—equality of consideration.

Senator BYRD. What are the annual requirements for officers and how are the ROTC graduates being utilized?

General BENADE. Would you care to answer for the Army?

General TACKABERRY. Specifically, next year we will need on active duty 8,000 from ROTC. In the future it will be between 6,000 and 7,000. That is active duty, sir, each year. However, the Reserves tell us that they are going to need officers, and as the draft phases out, of course, it is more difficult to get officers for the reserve components. They say they can use up to 10,000 officers a year from ROTC. Some of these are made up of officers who have finished their obligated tours of active duty but many of those must be officers who come right out of school and get their commissions.

Senator BYRD. How do you utilize the ROTC graduates?

General TACKABERRY. We utilize the ROTC graduates to fill the requirements for active duty first. After we have filled our requirements for active duty, for example, next year it will be 8,000—any that are in excess of that figure will go into the Army for 3 to 6 months to receive branch basic training; they will be on an active duty status. Then they go back into the reserves to serve 8 years from the anniversary of their commission.

Senator BYRD. You want to increase the number of ROTC personnel in each service; you want to increase it by 1,000?

General TACKABERRY. The scholarships by 1,000.

Senator BYRD. The scholarships by 1,000?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. How many scholarships do you award each year and how many applications do you have?

General TACKABERRY. We award—we have been awarding approximately 1,000 in the Army. Applications run about 5 to 1. In other words, we get about 5,000 applicants for the 1,000 that we choose.

Senator BYRD. Then you want to double the number of scholarships as a practical matter?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir. Well, no, it actually isn't double. What it is doing is increasing the Army from a total of 5,500 to 6,500 at any one time, spread over a 4-year period.

Senator BYRD. I thought you said you awarded 1,000 scholarships per year; is that it?

General TACKABERRY. That's right. We award 1,000 a year but we are restricted to a maximum of 5,500 at any one time.

Senator BYRD. Then this would increase the maximum to 6,500?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir; right. So it will increase the number that we award each year by about 250.

Senator BYRD. It is not to increase the number by 1,000 each year?

General TACKABERRY. No, sir.

General BENADE. Not each year, sir; not at all. It would raise the present limitation of 5,500 in total to a new figure of 6,500 total.

Senator BYRD. That is for the Army?

General TACKABERRY. And the Air Force, and a total of 6,000 for the Navy. They will get an increase of 500.

Senator BYRD. And the Marines are included in the Navy total?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Will the additional scholarships increase enrollments or simply place more cadets under scholarships?

General TACKABERRY. Well, the purpose of it, of course, is to increase enrollment. We feel that the added scholarships will help our enrollment.

Senator BYRD. What effect will awarding scholarships to 2-year program cadets have on the 4-year ROTC program?

General TACKABERRY. It is, we think, quite essential that we are allowed to award some of our scholarships to 2-year cadets.

Senator BYRD. Why?

General TACKABERRY. Because some of our schools only have the 2-year program. For example, Gettysburg College, which I visited last week, doesn't have any scholarships. We are precluded from giving their students scholarships because they only have the 2-year program; they don't have a 4-year program; and the Air Force finds them in the same condition.

Senator BYRD. This is something new, then, to include the 2-year scholarships?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir; it is new. We have been prohibited by law from giving 2-year scholarships, rather, scholarships, to 2-year students. Scholarships can only go to 4-year students under the present law.

Senator BYRD. Well, those who graduate from the 2-year college; are they in the same status militarily as those who graduate from a 4-year college?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir; in other words, to go into the 2-year program a man has to attend a summer camp before entry into the program and that brings him up, supposedly, to about the same level that the man who is in the 4-year program is at the 2-year mark.

Senator BYRD. What percentage of junior ROTC cadets are awarded scholarships and what provisions should be made to include them in the scholarship program?

General TACKABERRY. Well, that is an extremely good question, and one that the Army is vitally interested in.

Last year, of our approximately 1,000 scholarships that were awarded, 30 percent went to students from the junior program on a nationwide competition. What the Army would like to do is to give every one of our junior units one scholarship a year to award to its outstanding candidate. We cannot do that now because we don't have enough scholarships in the Army. We have approximately 600 units and since

we have been offering about 1,000 scholarships a year, if we gave one to each junior unit that would leave us only 400 for our nationwide competition which would emasculate that program.

The Navy, with a lesser number of junior units, and the Air Force, are able to do this, to give each junior unit a scholarship, but we need more scholarships in the Army so that we can give one to each of our junior units. As a matter of fact, 1,000 is not enough; we will need 1,500 additional or 2,000 more to do this.

I think we should, sir, link the junior program as closely as we can with the senior program. The Navy and the Air Force do it now. We hope to do it in the future in the Army.

Senator BYRD. What are your scholarship selection criteria?

General TACKABERRY. They are, I would say, almost identical with the criteria that have successfully been used at West Point over the years. It is the whole man concept. We take into consideration the college board examination scores, his extracurricular activities, such as athletics and student council work; we take into consideration his physical ability, and we take into consideration his standing in high school and his grades. It is the whole man concept. We also have each man appear before a board of officers and we give him so many points for each of these categories and then he is matched up in competition with all other applicants.

Senator BYRD. What is the basis for doubling the subsistence allowance from \$50 to \$100 per month rather than selecting some other increased amount?

General TACKABERRY. Well, it is common knowledge that the price of living has gone up and the \$50 a month was based on the Consumer Price Index in 1946; on the amount required for a student in college at that time; and in 1946, \$50 a month could pay for a student's subsistence in about 85 percent of the colleges. Nowadays, we feel that the Consumer Price Index has increased just about 100 percent, so now we need a 100-percent increase. We feel \$100 a month will now take care of the students in about 85 percent of the schools.

Senator BYRD. In other words, \$100 a month will do now what \$50 a month did in 1946?

General TACKABERRY. It is a simple way to do it, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Is the ROTC cadet paid subsistence during the summer months when he is not attending school?

General TACKABERRY. No, he is not. He is paid for 10 months rather than 12.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Will the chairman yield?

I understand under the present law we do do that?

General TACKABERRY. Under the present law we do.

Senator SCHWEIKER. And we were in the position of paying a student who went to summer school the same money as a student who didn't go to summer school?

General TACKABERRY. That is true.

Senator SCHWEIKER. And this has been interpreted that way by the Defense Pay and Entitlements Manual of DOD? How do we make sure this does not happen in this bill?

General BENADE. This is one of the amendments made by the House with which we are in agreement, Senator. The bill now before the committee specifically limits the payment to no more than 10 months of the year.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Unless they go to summer school. What happens if they take summer studies?

General BENADE. They are still limited in that there is a total limitation of 20 months altogether, so this would permit—they can be paid while they are actually attending and pursuing proper instruction, but the limit is 20 months.

Senator SCHWEIKER. In other words, if they accelerated the program during the summer school, they could get paid as long as it is part of the legitimate course of study?

General BENADE. That's right, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. And that is in specific language in the bill?

General BENADE. It would be covered, I believe, Senator, by the provision of not to exceed 20 months of payment. You see, this subsistence applies to third- and fourth-year students. Normally, the scholastic year is going to be between 9 and 10 months with a summer vacation. So there is a limitation of not more than 20 months. If a student were to accelerate his program, presumably he would be completing the required work before his contemporaries who would be taking 2 full years to complete it—their school work—but the House amendment was intended to avoid a situation of paying someone during a period when he was not attending school.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Senator Schweiker.

In reply to Senator Schweiker, did I understand Senator Schweiker to say that under the situation now existing you pay for 24 months?

General BENADE. The student may be paid for 12 months, yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. And you feel that the 20-month provision will take care of what Senator Schweiker is bringing up?

General BENADE. I believe so, Mr. Chairman. I think we should remember, too, that there is a period between the junior and senior year where the individual would be attending summer camp. At such time he is going to be on active duty and will receive pay and allowances prescribed by law so he is not without income during these summer months.

Senator BYRD. Senator Saxbe?

Senator SAXBE. What other payments do they receive? Now they receive the uniform allowance beginning in their third year?

General BENADE. No, sir; there is no uniform allowance. I think you have to distinguish the two categories of ROTC. There is a nonscholarship and the scholarship. In the case of the nonscholarship, the only pay that they receive, sir, is this presently \$50 a month. What is proposed is \$100 a month and that is all they receive.

Senator SAXBE. They don't get any uniform allowance now? They have to buy their own uniforms when they embark on their third year?

General TACKABERRY. The uniforms are issued except at certain schools such as military colleges—we have five of these. In this respect, there is a uniform allowance which is paid for the school, but the student does, at these military schools, have to pay a certain amount of money because they do have large uniform costs. They wear the uniform 7 days a week, so if a student goes to a military-type college, he will have to pay for his uniform. If he goes to a regular civilian-type college, his uniforms are issued.

Senator SAXBE. He gets ROTC officer uniforms?

General TACKABERRY. With the various insignias. When he goes out and goes into the regular service, then he gets a certain amount of allowance like anyone else who comes in.

Senator SAXBE. Now, in regard to H.R. 6723 for subsistence allowance for the Marine Corps, this, I understand, is for the platoon leaders' course?

General REID. That is correct.

Senator SAXBE. They don't have to attend any formations, do they?

General REID. They do not, sir, only summer training.

Senator SAXBE. They don't get the \$50 now?

General REID. That is correct. They don't get any subsistence at all.

Senator SAXBE. And this would be subsistence for 20 months even though they only attend summer camp?

General REID. We plan to pay only on a 9-month year for 3 years, so we are a little bit different. However, the language of the bill says it will be paid at the same rate as to the ROTC or the section that provides for ROTC payments. We are planning and budgeting for 9 months for 3 years.

Senator SAXBE. Wouldn't this give you a decided advantage in competing for students in that they get the same pay as the man who has to go to ROTC class at least once a week, maybe twice?

General REID. Well, we hope we get a better advantage than we have now, or else we are in trouble with our PLC's. You just heard one portion of the ROTC testimony indicate that ROTC is getting five applications for each opening. We are not getting one application for one opening as it stands now.

We are running about 70 percent of our quota of about 2,200 a year, and we feel we need to sweeten the incentives here to get the man attracted. In other words, it is not attractive enough for him today to obligate himself to the PLC program.

Senator SAXBE. Under the other system, the PLC man gets longevity—

General REID. That is correct, sir.

Senator SAXBE (continuing). From the time he signs up. Now, suppose he doesn't make it at the end of the PLC program?

General REID. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. He still has an obligation, doesn't he, unlike the others?

General REID. He does not in the current PLC program; if he doesn't make it he is returned to civilian life.

Senator SAXBE. Well now, then, how do you justify their getting longevity and the others don't?

General REID. Well, he only gets longevity and gets paid for it if he is successfully commissioned.

Senator SAXBE. Yes, but the ROTC man—of course, the PLC is just a 2-year course, I understand?

General REID. PLC is a 3-year course.

Senator SAXBE. Three year course?

General REID. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. He goes two summers?

General REID. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. And then at the end when he graduates, he gets his commission?

General REID. Yes.

Senator SAXBE. Now, he gets, then, the full amount by the time he gets his commission?

General REID. That is correct, sir. Actually, it could be possible he would have 3½ years because we will sign him up after he has demonstrated scholastic performance in his first grading period which would be a semester, and we can sign him at that time, so on a 4-year course he would have 3½ years. By the time he came to be commissioned he would have at least a full year, or as you point out, up to 3½ years for longevity purposes.

Senator SAXBE. That still does not attract them?

General REID. No, sir; that is the reason we come to the Congress for help.

Senator SAXBE. Of course, longevity does not mean much when it comes to youth.

General REID. Yes, sir; that is part of the problem.

Senator SAXBE. Yes.

General BENADE. If I might add, this has been a feature in the Marine Corps since 1935—that is for 36 years—so there is nothing new in this feature. What perhaps brings it into the spotlight right now is for the first time there would be added to this feature the proposed subsistence at the same level that the ROTC student receives. I think it is important to remember, though, sir, that the graduate of the platoon leaders' course comes in on a 4-year obligation compared to the 2-year obligation that is required of the Army nonscholarship ROTC man. I think perhaps the fairer comparison might be with the ROTC scholarship man who does have a 4-year obligation when he comes in.

The reason, so far as I can determine, sir, which justified back in the 1930's the longevity feature is the fact that the man is enlisted in the Reserve. We have always under title 37, which is permanent law so far as pay, provided that service in the Reserve counts for longevity. These young men are members of the Reserve; whether they are called up or not is a separate matter, but they are technically members of the Reserve.

Let me be completely frank, sir. It is also something, I think, that you should know and realize. Longevity over the course of a full career, if you assume that a man stays for 30 years, does provide additional pay to this man over the course of 30 years of about \$22,000 under the present pay scale. I am talking about the law (Public Law 92-129) that was just enacted but not yet in effect; and when I make that statement I am making certain assumptions with respect to promotion flow consistent with the normal Marine Corps pattern. It does have that advantage, sir, and there is no question that it is significant.

Yet another way would be to say that it provides pay on the average over the 30 years of about \$700 a year. It is not a small amount, neither is it a fortune; and if the man does stay for 30 years, it is still a very good investment. There is no question that it provides an advantage over the other programs. But again, the small size of this program relatively is an important consideration. The Marine Corps has some

advantages as well as disadvantages that flow from being the smallest of the services. We do not feel that this particular advantage on behalf of the Marine Corps endangers in any way the other programs. If it did, or if we thought that it did, I assure you the Department of Defense would be the first to seek some modification of it. We do not think that it does.

Senator SAXBE. The Academy man, he gets full longevity, too, doesn't he?

General BENADE. No, sir; there is a specific prohibition in law against longevity credit for Academy graduates, but this is very understandable. They used to receive longevity prior to 1916 and then Congress enacted legislation prohibiting that, and, I think with very good justification. There is a great difference in the cost. To put a young man through one of the service academies for his 4 years costs the Government between \$44,000 and \$50,000, depending on what costs you want to ascribe to it. But certainly a conservative cost per man would be \$45,000 to \$50,000. In the meantime he is also receiving pay and he is getting a leg up toward the things he will need to buy when he is commissioned. We think that the treatment of Academy cadets is a very fine and a very generous treatment right now. We have no complaint about the lack of longevity.

Senator SAXBE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Well, just what do these individuals do to get that \$100? I am not clear as to what they do.

General REID. The PLC students?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

General REID. They really don't do anything; it is retention; it is to give us a long-range program. Mr. Chairman, what we are doing today—this has been a good program for us over the years but we recognized in 1969 that the last year that we had met our quota in this program was 1967. We started slipping with that 97 percent in 1968 and we slipped down to the 1970's, 70 percent.

Senator BYRD. But they don't—you say they don't do anything to get the \$100?

General REID. Except for the fact that they belong to the Reserve; they are in a long-range, officer-producing program. They do not drill; they do not have on-campus activities; only for the summer training, it is the only time they are under obligation to the Marine Corps.

Senator BYRD. What length of training in the summer?

General REID. We have two 6-week courses; once they complete successfully the last one, then they are commissioned and sent to—

Senator SAXBE. Between the sophomore and junior, and junior and senior year?

General REID. One of the provisions for applying this bill, the man's full payment of subsistence, is that he will have to go to training between his freshman and sophomore year if he wants to get in early, because he will not get pay or subsistence unless he proves himself successfully in the training in the first summer.

He has to get over that; and in this selectivity, looking again at the whole man concept, we are also watching performance both the year in school and also 6 weeks in Quantico in the course of training before we will authorize payment of subsistence.

Senator BYRD. In other words, a man enters college in September of this coming year, say, you would not begin this \$100 until he completes his school year plus 6 weeks of training?

General REID. That is correct, sir, and this is where we get the 3 years versus the 4 years because we want to make sure this man has a good opportunity for success before we will make this investment in him.

He is not doing anything, it would seem, to earn this \$100, but you must remember in order to tie this man up for summer training we are denying him, by taking 6 weeks out of his summer between school terms, an opportunity to earn a salary; and there could be a difference, of course, in opportunities in where he lives and so forth. This is the rationale for paying him to retain him.

Senator BYRD. You are paying him at the rate of \$200 a week, aren't you?

General REID. \$200 a week for training for the 6-week program?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

General REID. Let's see, we are paying him at the rate of E-5 which is \$366 a month under the new pay bill.

Senator BYRD. But if he is in for 6 weeks and you are going to pay him \$1,200?

General REID. Yes, sir, I see, \$900 for the scholastic year plus his training.

Senator SAXBE. But he is still limited to 20 months?

General Reid. We are only paying him 9 months per year for his last 3 years.

Senator SAXBE. I understand. It is what the lawyers call a retainer (Laughter.)

General BENADE. That's right, sir. I think it is important to have in mind the concept that he is not being paid on a monthly basis for any activity that he is engaging in at that period. What we are really saying to the young man is, "If you will sign up on this program, you will be undertaking certain obligations. You are going to go to summer camp between your sophomore and junior year and between your junior and senior year; and when you graduate you are obligated to accept a commission and you are obligated to come on active duty for 4 years. Now, if you will do that, we will pay you \$100 a month to help you get through school," is about the best way to put it.

General REID. May I explain the 4-year requirements?

Basically, if the man did not accept or did not want subsistence, we still have a provision to take him through the program. But for each scholastic year that he accepts subsistence we require him to put an extra 6 months in on active duty. So, therefore, if he takes the full 3 years of subsistence, plus the basic 30-month obligation, that comes out to 4 years, so this could occur—he could only accept this in his senior year and have to serve 3 years.

Senator SAXBE. At the present time it is just a 3 year tour?

General REID. That is correct, sir.

Senator SAXBE. Now, you still keep the accelerated program where they can go 10 weeks between the junior and senior?

General REID. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. That is still—and, of course, then he would only draw for 1 year?

General REID. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. Senator Dominick?

Senator DOMINICK. I have no questions.

Senator BYRD. Senator Schweiker?

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes, I have a question.

I still would like to pursue this point I had because, first of all, I found out that the old practice, under the old law, cost the Government \$4,732,000 to do it the old way for paying students when they went to school; and if we do it that way again it is going to cost about \$9 million. I see in the language that is coming out of the House bill, H. R. 6724, the 20 months as written in there applies. It says to the first 2 years, and then it says—for the advanced course it refers to section 2104 of title 10 and does not put a limitation in.

Now, it is confusing to me unless there is something in 2104 or title 10 that covers it, it looks like we are now repeating that 20-month exemption for the advanced course.

General TACKABERRY. I think the explanation is, Senator, the scholarship student gets subsistence in his first 2 years whereas the nonscholarship student does not. The bill restricts that to 20 months for the first 2 years. During the student's last 2 years, he goes to summer camp between the junior and senior year and he is not paid subsistence during that period. He gets food in kind while he is training.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Right.

General TACKABERRY. And then he graduates in June, his last year, and there is no summer because he is out of college, so effectively he is only getting around 20 months the last 2 years, too; in fact, he may be getting a little less than 20 months so it is really put in the bill to take care of students in the last 2 years who don't go to any summer camp and they don't get paid during the summer.

Senator SCHWEIKER. So you are saying a junior and senior student, of course, the junior, over the junior-senior summer, goes how long to a summer camp?

General TACKABERRY. Six weeks.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Six weeks?

General TACKABERRY. Yes, sir.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Then he still is not paid for the other 6 weeks he doesn't go to summer camp?

General TACKABERRY. No; no, he is not paid there.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Show me the prohibition. That is what we ran into before because I think it was the intent of Congress before not to pay this. In fact, I think you can make a good case, and yet I see the DOD people ruled we should pay it.

Now, what happens for the other 6 weeks? You are going to pay him, aren't you? There is no prohibition?

Senator SAXBE. He wouldn't be in school.

Senator SCHWEIKER. Yes.

Senator SAXBE. I mean, you can't take 6 weeks off the summer period.

Senator SCHWEIKER. That was the trouble before; we were paying all these people who were not in school in summer. And here is a ruling of the Department of Defense in the Defense Pay and Entitlement Manual specifically permitting those payments in contradistinction to what the law was and now here we have a junior-senior—there is no prohibition for doing the same thing because of the same ruling,

because during the junior and senior years he still goes to summer camp and he could still get subsistence as I read it for the 6 weeks he doesn't go to summer school.

Senator BYRD. Where is the prohibition on that, General?

General BENADE. It is my understanding this legislation meets the point you are making. If not, I can assure you, in light of the legislative history, and the House made very clear what their intention was, it is our intention and the services' intention to administer the bill in the manner being described. That means the students will not be paid for periods while they are not in school or on active duty.

Senator SCHWEIKER. As I read it now, it really doesn't say that—it just says the 20-month limit only applies to the first 2 years and after that it just refers to section 2104, title 10, which, of course, was in the bill.

General BENADE. If I might make a recommendation, Mr. Chairman, and Senator Schweiker, we can sit down with the committee's counsel and staff. If the language is deficient in achieving this result, perhaps we can develop substitute language that would meet the objective of the committee.

Senator SCHWEIKER. I think that is a good suggestion. The reason I am concerned is that by utilizing this money we can just make that much more money available to other students in the program; that is all.

General BENADE. I see.

Senator BYRD. I think Senator Schweiker raises a significant point and if the committee approves, I think the suggestion of the general should be followed and with the gentlemen of the staff work out the appropriate language.

General BENADE. We will do that.

Senator SAXBE. With respect to this pilot training bill, H.R. 7950—

General BENADE. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. At the present time we have a limited rating; it does not require 200 hours flying and so on. Do you still have limited ratings?

General OGAN. Liaison, glider, or service pilots? These are all things in the past. We do have differentiations in the pilot rating itself.

Senator SAXBE. They all require 200?

General OGAN. We start with a pilot. Senior pilot and command pilot are further advancements of the pilot rating.

Senator SAXBE. I understand. What is the senior pilot, 5,000 hours?

General OGAN. He is roughly 2,000 hours.

Senator SAXBE. 2,000 hours, and command pilot?

General OGAN. 3,000 hours.

Senator SAXBE. 3,000?

General OGAN. Yes, sir.

Senator SAXBE. What I was thinking now, when you did have the limited ratings, you didn't have to have 200 hours to fly an L-4, did you?

General OGAN. I don't know the exact answer to your question. I am quite confident we probably didn't and it would not have been covered under this law here since this only applies to pilot ratings in peacetime.

Senator SAXBE. I see. That is all. Thank you.

Senator BYRD. In that connection, are the flying hour requirements the same under title 10 for all services?

General OGAN. Yes, sir.

General BENADE. Yes, sir.

General OGAN. They are the same, yes, sir. They are 200 hours. In case of the Army and Air Force, they require 75 hours solo. In the case of the Navy, they require 75 hours, either solo or in command of a dual-controlled-type aircraft.

Senator BYRD. What moneysaving would be involved in a reduced flying hour program?

General OGAN. Well, this bill does not—our proposal does not specifically say we will have a reduced flying hour program, but obviously if we had a reduced flying hour program you would have less fuel used and less maintenance, and things like that. You basically reduce your overall operating and maintenance costs. Now, an example of this, we used to have a flying hour program of 240 hours required per pilot to get his rating, and we reduced that program down to 208½ hours, and that is what our present ongoing program is in the Air Force today. That was a basic savings of some \$19 million yearly in that particular case. It gives you a good example what flying-hour reduction could give you.

Senator BYRD. Well, how is it that you can reduce the flying hours? Has there been a marked technological progress in flight simulation?

General OGAN. There are several areas that allow us to do this. One is the type of aircraft we are now flying. For example, the old T-33 had quite large wingtanks on the end of the wings. The first half-hour of flight was confined basically to straight and level flying.

Our present aircraft don't have wingtanks; there is no restriction from the time the aircraft is airborne so that as a result, you accomplish the same amount of training in 1 hour that you did in an hour and a half before.

Another example that we could cite in the way of innovations in training, such as the airlines are using today in checking new pilots out. For the 727 it used to take some 24 hours; now, with the advent of more sophisticated simulation, they can actually do the same job in 9 hours. We are doing the same types of things in the Air Force and some in the Navy. We would hope, and with the elimination of this 200-hour restriction, when we do get to the proper degree of sophistication, it might be possible, for example, to qualify a pilot from a technical standpoint, from a proficiency standpoint, maybe in 150 hours while having maybe 80 or 90 hours simulation which would cost us less than flying an airplane.

Senator BYRD. Under the present 200-hour program, those 200 hours are spread over what period of time?

General OGAN. I believe it is about 11 months. It is an 11-month period, sir.

Senator DOMINICK. Would the chairman yield for a few questions at that point?

Senator BYRD. Senator Dominick.

Senator DOMINICK. I am really interested in this and I just want to be a little more definite on it.

Do I understand you to say now that there is no limit, no requirement, for any number of hours in aircraft, so that presumably someone

could get through the whole course, if they were proficient enough, in, we will say 20 hours?

General OGAN. No, sir. The bill, under present law requires 200 hours flying time now before one can be rated as a pilot and—

Senator DOMINICK. I know, but under the new law that is passed, you could presumably put them through the course in about 20 hours?

General OGAN. We don't think this would ever be feasible, sir. Under the new law, you would leave it, naturally to the judgment of the service Secretaries what we are asking for in this case. We have had in being sir, at Moody Air Force Base in Georgia, a test program to see if we could actually qualify an individual in less flying time than that. We have a 188.5-hour program at Moody Air Force Base. What we are doing here is a test case to see whether we can get any additional economies and not sacrifice the proficiency of the individuals themselves. So we are watching these people that would graduate and we also watch them as they go into the advanced fighter type aircraft or bomber type aircraft, to assure we have not gone too low from the standpoint of the actual flying hours themselves.

Senator DOMINICK. Suppose you have a fellow who is what we call a slow learner, and when I was going through the cadets we had quite a few slow learners; and they didn't graduate; they got washed out in one place or another before they got through. Some of them, unfortunately, did get through but didn't last long.

What do you do about that? I would presume you could keep them in as long as you want them; there wouldn't be any washout?

General OGAN. We would still maintain the same washout basic requirements. You would always have the slow learner; we would try to nurse them to the same degree we do today. However, in a case like that, this is a case where simulation may be of a really great advantage to us. We could maybe bring that fellow along because, as you know, a washout itself is done at considerable cost to the Government.

Senator DOMINICK. Yes, but at this point, as I understand it, under this revised law if we should accept it, you could keep him for 400 hours if he happened to be a favorite son of somebody and leave him in there for 400 hours before he finally graduated?

General OGAN. We have this same problem with us today in the 200-hour problem. I would hope the integrity of the folks involved there would not let it be the case, and we don't think it is today in the Air Force.

Senator DOMINICK. I read in a report that the only people who were learning to fly now are commissioned officers. Is this true in all services?

General OGAN. Yes, sir; it is true in the Air Force and I think it is true in the Navy.

General BENADE. In the Army, Senator, however, we do have warrant officer pilots for our helicopter programs.

Senator DOMINICK. But no one is permitted to become a pilot unless he is already an officer; is this correct?

General OGAN. This is correct, sir.

Senator DOMINICK. In the Army if you are going to become a pilot of any kind, you have to become a warrant officer first?

General BENADE. We have both commissioned officers and warrant officer pilots, Senator. No enlisted pilots, but warrant officers.

Senator SAXBE. They go through the regular OCS course before they go to pilot training?

General BENADE. They are appointed as warrant officers and take their flying training as such.

Senator SAXBE. How about a man who enlisted or signs up, has got a commercial license, what do you do with him today? Is he still required to get 208 hours?

General OGAN. Our problem has been going the other way, as you are aware of; we are losing them to the commercial pilots. I don't know of any provision, do you, Colonel Price? There is no current provision. There was during wartime, to get back your old rating, if you will recall wings with the "S" on it, service pilots; yes, sir, that was the provision at that point during World War II and there has not been any since that time.

Senator SAXBE. So at the present time a man comes in who may be a jet pilot; he has got to—no matter how proficient he is, he still has to take the full course?

General OGAN. I would say that would be the answer; we haven't had that happen to us, I don't believe, sir. I am sure we would have taken a real good look at it.

Senator SAXBE. You will if it keeps on the way it is.

General OGAN. If we have the good fortune.

Senator BYRD. In regard to the Marine Corps civilian students, let me ask just two questions on that:

What would be the increased cost of the proposed program over the present PLC program?

General REID. The maximum cost would be \$2.7 million a year. For the first year, the first full year it would cost us only \$900,000 because we only would have 1,000 in the inventory that would be acceptable to provide those who would receive subsistence and this would go up then by increments of 500 a year, until we get a maximum of 3,000.

Senator BYRD. How many do you have in the present program?

General REID. We have about 2,400, sir.

Senator BYRD. And you want to get that up to what?

General REID. Three thousand. The reason we want to get it to 3,000 is because we are now getting more officers from the short-term program, right now OCS, where we sign up a senior in college and at the end of the year commission him after he is screened through OCS. The problem is that with the draft phasing down and analyzing the programs to date, if a man is not motivated by the draft to come into that program it will dry up on us. That is the reason we are trying to absorb the difference under the PLC program—a long-range program.

Senator BYRD. I assume that this proposed new program would not undermine in any way the ROTC programs for the other services?

General BENADE. We don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, the size of this program in comparison to the ROTC programs for the other services is very small. Actually, it represents about 3 percent of the size of the ROTC enrollment of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, so it is a very limited requirement. We don't feel that it poses any threat to the attractiveness of the ROTC with the other services.

Senator BYRD. If there are no further questions along that line, let's go to H.R. 8656, which provides for survivor benefits based on grade to which a man was promoted in missing status.

How many military members are carried in missing-in-action status?

General BENADE. There would be about 1,500.

Colonel SHEPARD. 1,451 total, that is, both missing in action and POW's.

Senator BYRD. Just a moment. My question, though, dealt with missing in action.

Colonel SHEPARD. 986.

Senator BYRD. 986 missing in action. How many POW's?

Colonel SHEPARD. 465, sir; that is all services.

Senator BYRD. Only 465 listed as POW's?

Colonel SHEPARD. As POW's; yes, sir. I have a breakdown by services and by officer-enlisted category.

Senator BYRD. I think it would be well to put that breakdown in the record.

Colonel SHEPARD. For the prisoners of war, there are 228 Air Force officers, 7 airmen; 18 Army officers and 45 Army enlisted men; 144 Navy officers and no naval enlisted men; 15 Marine Corps officers and 8 Marine enlisted men.

Senator BYRD. Well now, let's give the same breakdown for the MIA's.

Colonel SHEPARD. All right, sir. For the Air Force again, 508 officers and 54 airmen; the Army 34 officers and 186 enlisted men; 106 Navy officers and 7 enlisted men; 51 Marine Corps officers and 40 enlisted Marines.

Senator BYRD. How many MIA's have subsequently been declared dead and have had their dependents' compensation revert to the lower grade at the time of death?

Colonel SHEPARD. 32 at this time, sir.

Senator BYRD. How would passage of this bill affect the survivors of men whose pay grade reverted to that held at the time of death?

Colonel SHEPARD. It would raise the pay for these dependents, widows, survivors, to the grade that the individual had been promoted to, so it would amount to a definite increase for them. We have an effective date in the bill of February 28, 1961, which is designed to cover the entire involvement in Vietnam. There would not be any retroactive payments; but it would amount to an increase for this 32 who suffered a loss.

Senator BYRD. How many men in MIA-POW status have been promoted?

Colonel SHEPARD. About 1,200, sir.

Senator BYRD. Twelve hundred of the roughly 1,451?

Colonel SHEPARD. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Are families notified of these promotions?

Colonel SHEPARD. The families, the next of kin, are by letter and copies of the promotion order are also forwarded to them.

Senator BYRD. Is any attempt made to notify the prisoners of promotion?

Colonel SHEPARD. No, sir; quite the contrary. We feel the information could be used to the detriment of these individuals, so the information is withheld to the extent of asking the families to use the old grade even after they have been advised of a promotion in attempting to correspond with the prisoners.

Senator BYRD. What do you estimate the cost of 8656 to be?

Colonel SHEPARD. Under the worst conditions, sir, assuming that none of the widows remarried and that all of these individuals so carried are later declared dead on dates prior to the time of promotion, it would cost the Veterans' Administration about \$135,000 a year, decreasing, of course, as widows did marry, died, and so on. No DOD money is involved.

Senator BYRD. Senator Saxbe?

Senator SAXBE. No questions.

Senator BYRD. Senator Schweiker?

Senator SCHWEIKER. No more questions.

Senator BYRD. Let's go to H.R. 8356, which extends the authority for the payment of emergency evacuation expenses.

What entitlements are authorized for military personnel upon evacuation?

Colonel SHEPARD. Well, sir, under this bill there are four basic payments: per diem, dislocation allowances, in some circumstances the shipment of a private vehicle, and the waiver of recovery of not more than 1 month's advanced pay. However, the legislation which expired on the 30th of June this year did recognize that there are other payments payable under these circumstances provided for in other legislation and joint travel regulations and so on; but these are the four items covered by the bill.

Such things as shipment of household goods and actual transportation of the family are covered in other laws.

Senator BYRD. What do civilians get in comparison to what the military get?

Colonel SHEPARD. With the exception of the dislocation allowance, all of the same benefits. However, the statement concerning the recoupment of advanced pay is phrased as not more than pay for two pay periods in the case of a civilian, which, I think, amounts to about the same thing as a month's pay.

Senator BYRD. How many incidents of evacuation have occurred and how much has been spent?

Colonel SHEPARD. Sir, if you are talking all the way back, our records deal with 11 incidents costing around \$5 million. However, prior to 1965 when legislation of this type was first enacted, this was handled by special DOD money or by special legislation. Since enactment of the recently expired legislation we have really only had three instances, two in connection with the Middle Eastern war in 1967 and one from Jordan in 1970. The most expensive was the evacuation of Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya in 1967. The cost was very close to \$4 million, involving around 3,158 dependents.

Senator BYRD. That was approximately—almost 50 percent of your total?

Colonel SHEPARD. Far more, sir; about \$5 million in total.

Senator BYRD. \$5 million in total?

Colonel SHEPARD. Yes, sir; and this Libyan incident was about \$4 million; in other instances there have been relatively small groups of people and relatively small amounts of money.

Senator BYRD. That is very interesting about Wheelus. How is it considered an evacuation? Wasn't there reasonable time being given?

Colonel SHEPARD. No, sir; the political situation changed so rapidly that it had—there was no provision for orderly removal of these

dependents to safe havens or return to the States. They had to be moved rather quickly.

Senator BYRD. How quickly?

Colonel SHEPARD. Sir, I would have to provide the exact amount of lead time necessary for the record; I don't have it now with reference to that particular matter.

Senator BYRD. Just offhand, without recalling the details of the changing status in Wheelus, I would not consider that an evacuation.

Colonel SHEPARD. Well, it was for the purpose of this legislation, sir, funded under this legislation.

General BENADE. Weren't there really two different aspects to it, though? There were initially some incidents that were occurring and dependents were quickly evacuated at that time; and it appeared there might be some incidents further developing. Then subsequently the negotiations and the ultimate turnover of the field, Mr. Chairman, was a long process; but not an evacuation as the term is intended in this legislation.

Senator BYRD. That is what I was thinking about.

General BENADE. That was not involved, in my understanding.

Senator BYRD. That is not involved in the evacuation expenses.

General BENADE. No sir.

Colonel SHEPARD. No, sir; this sum of money I referred to—\$381,000—dealt only with the first precipitate evacuation when it looked as though the possibility of the field being overrun or something.

Senator BYRD. But you said the cost of evacuation of Wheelus was \$4 million something?

Colonel SHEPARD. Very nearly \$4 million; \$381,000 sir.

Senator BYRD. Not \$381,000?

Colonel SHEPARD. Pardon me, \$3,821,000, sir.

Senator BYRD. Three million eight hundred-some thousand?

Colonel SHEPARD. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. And that was for the period of time prior to the negotiations which led to the termination of the facilities?

Colonel SHEPARD. To the actual giving up of the field to the Libyan Government and moving everyone out; yes, sir. There was an earlier evacuation precipitated by the June 1967 Middle Eastern war, the so-called Six Day War with the political upheaval that accompanied it throughout North Africa and the Middle East. There was an evacuation of a small group of people from Egypt at about the same time.

Senator BYRD. As a matter of interest for me, would you supply for the record and send a copy to my office of when our Government was notified that Wheelus must be—our facilities there, our presence there, must be terminated, and when we were notified, and when we actually left Wheelus?

Colonel SHEPARD. Yes, sir; I will be glad to do that. However, I do want to clarify a point which I may have muddled here—by pointing out that this notification and the eventual giving up of that property were separate and apart from the evacuation which I referred to which cost approximately \$4 million. This was to safeguard these dependents during the 1967 alarm.

Senator BYRD. You may not have this information in your head, but what agreements did we have with Libya in regard to the use of that airbase?

Colonel SHEPARD. Sir, I do not have that information; I can provide it.

Senator BYRD. I am sort of equating it in my mind with what we may be faced with in Okinawa when we revert administrative control to Japan, and I am not completely clear as to whether the two cases would be analogous, but in both cases, in neither case after it reverts, will we have complete control.

General BENADE. That is true, Mr. Chairman. I think the cases are different and will be different; but I can appreciate the point you make.

I would like to suggest, if I might, sir, that in connection with the request you have made, we be permitted to expand in our response and to set out for the record the circumstances that were involved at the time the dependents were evacuated?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

General BENADE. I think, as I say, it will be found to be different from the ultimate turnover of the field.

Senator BYRD. I wish you would do that, but I am expanding now beyond the evacuation as such.

General BENADE. Yes, sir; we will. In the case of Okinawa, of course, sir—there have been, as you well know, extended negotiations which have taken place, including consultations at the highest levels in this Government and in the Japanese Government and arrangements have been made. While I am not certain as to some of those provisions, it is my understanding that we will continue to maintain a military base on Okinawa. But there will be sovereignty reverting to the Government of Japan as opposed to the present time.

Senator BYRD. What we have done is given Japan a veto power where no veto power exists today, and the belief of the State Department is that the Sato government is friendly and we will have no difficulty; but I wish you would include a little history of this Wheelus Air Force Base. I assume that the Libyan Government was friendly for quite a while. How many years did we have Wheelus? We had Wheelus for quite a while.

General BENADE. I think since World War II days, but we will check that.

Senator BYRD. So we had a friendly government in Libya for a great many years and all of a sudden we no longer have a friendly government and I am equating that to Okinawa. We have a friendly government under Sato but are we going to have a friendly government 5 years from now, 2 years from now, or 6 months from now, after the Senate ratifies this treaty next week, which they will certainly do. But, anyway, I would be interested in a brief history of Wheelus.

Colonel SHEPARD. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. When do you think you can give it to me? I am going to give a brief talk on Okinawa on Monday morning. Is that rushing you too much to get something on Wheelus?

Colonel SHEPARD. No, sir; we can get something to you tomorrow.

Senator BYRD. That will be very fine.

Senator SAXBE?

Senator SAXBE. No; I am prepared to move on this if you are.

Senator BYRD. Any further comment the witnesses would like to make.

General BENADE. I think not, sir. I think you have covered the bill very well.

(The following information was subsequently submitted:)

FACT SHEET

WHEELUS AIR BASE, LIBYA

U.S. Presence at Wheelus:

The Air Force had used the facility, named Wheelus in 1945, since World War II. It was used during demobilization and later as a training base with permission of the British government.

1954 Agreement:

In 1954 the U.S. and Libya, which had just gained its independence, signed an agreement granting base rights to the U.S. until 1970. "For the use of Wheelus, the U.S. paid an initial sum of \$7,000,000 and 24,000 tons of wheat, agreed to an annual \$4,000,000 rental until 1960 and \$1,000,000 a year after that for eleven years." (Time, New York, 7-27-59). The agreement could be terminated by either country with a years' notice.

Value of Base to the U.S.:

Wheelus, which the U.S. Air Force had used for more than 19 years, was considered ideal for bombing and rocketry practice because it was in a country of vast desert stretches where the population was small and scattered. Also, the weather allowed year-round flying.

Unrest in Middle East:

Militant nationalism tinged with socialism found its most fertile soil among the discontented: in a working class which showed itself to be exceptionally combative, and among small property owners, civil servants, students and intellectuals. Their principal demands were the elimination of the Anglo-American bases. In Feb. 1964, the Libyan Prime Minister Mahmud Muntasser, presumably speaking for the Parliament, demanded the abrogation of the 1954 U.S. Libyan base agreement and early withdrawal of U.S. forces from Wheelus.

In Aug. 1964 the U.S. and Britain "agreed in principle" to give up their military bases in Libya. However, no firm date was set for withdrawal.

June 15, 1967 Premier Mazik announced the Libyan Government had asked the U.S. and Britain to liquidate their bases in Libya.

On 10 Aug 1967 US and Libya opened talks in Tripoli on withdrawal of US forces from Wheelus.

Emergency Evacuation of Noncombatants from UAR, Israel, Syria, Jordan and Libya:

During the third week in May 1967, when the political situation in the Middle East became extremely tense, the Department of State began an orderly phase out of US noncombatants from the potential war zone. A small number of Air Force personnel and their dependents were in the area, primarily in support of embassy activities. Between 25 May and 4 Jun, all DOD noncombatants including Air Force personnel were moved from UAR, Israel, Syria, and Jordan to European Safe Havens in Rome and Athens or back to the United States.

When the war between the Israelis and Arabs began on 5 Jun, there were no Air Force noncombatants in the area of conflict. After the war began the evacuation of dependents and noncombatants from Wheelus AB, Libya was commenced. This action became necessary when the Libyan national population in sympathy with the Arab states demonstrated by rioting in the Wheelus and Tripoli area.

As the situation in Libya deteriorated, lives of US citizens were endangered, and the American Ambassador directed evacuation of noncombatants. There were approximately 3200 USAF dependents affected. Of this number, 2,599 were evacuated to the United States, 423 chose to remain in Safe Havens in Europe hoping to return to Wheelus, and the remainder stayed at Wheelus. Those remaining at Wheelus were residing on base and were allowed to remain when, prior to their being evacuated, the situation improved.

USAF Withdrawal from Wheelus:

The US began the final withdrawal of its troops from Libya on 12 Dec 1969. The process of evacuation was undertaken on the basis of a phased transfer of command as determined by mutual agreement. Wheelus was deactivated and turned over to the Libyan Arab Republic 11 Jun 1970. The departure was nearly 16 months earlier than prescribed by the 1954 treaty.

The physical plant at Wheelus Air Base included an extensive system of runways, maintenance and refueling facilities, administrative and recreational buildings, and quarters for married and single personnel. No information concerning possible compensation by the Libyan government for the value of these improvements is available.

Senator BYRD. We have a letter and a statement from the Reserve Officers Association of the United States dated November 2, 1971, concerning H.R. 4729 and H.R. 6724 which we will insert in the record at this point.

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., November 2, 1971.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.,
Chairman, Subcommittee on General Legislation, Senate Armed Services Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a copy of our statement in support of H.R. 4729 and H.R. 6724.

It is respectfully requested that this statement be inserted in the record of the hearings on these two bills.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Executive Director.

STATEMENT OF COLONEL JOHN T. CARLTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES ON HR 4729 AND HR 6724 TO EXPAND AND IMPROVE ROTC

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee: We appreciate this opportunity to make our views known to you on these two important bills.

As an organization which has concerned itself since its founding in 1922 in a strong ROTC program we feel we do not have to reiterate before your committee our sincere conviction that a vital ROTC program operating in colleges throughout the geographical spread of the country is most important. This is necessary not only to provide a needed input into the Reserve Components in all parts of the country but also since most serve in the active forces it gives the officer corps thereof membership that reflects the views and traditions of all regions of this nation and from all walks of life.

The defense program of our country has been based on the concept of the citizen-soldier and on civilian control of the military establishment. As Washington once said, "Every citizen of a free government owes his services in defense of it." In Washington's day every man owned a rifle and knew what to do with it; in World War I and World War II we sent men without knowledge of navigation up in the air and out to sea. Their only hope of survival was to play follow the leader. It takes a long time to train intelligent, well qualified leaders for the military establishment. It is the role of the ROTC to supplement the service academies in this mission and, by continually producing officers with a wide variety of educational backgrounds, help to avoid the development of an inbred military caste system and, of course, to supply highly competent officers in the Reserve Components whose importance as a part of our National Defense team is increasing day to day.

In the ROTC program young men are drawn from all geographical areas of our country and all economic and social strata of our society. Many educational disciplines are required for our modern military services. For this reason alone, men are educated in a broad spectrum of American institutions of higher learning and are commissioned annually into the officer corps. Thus ROTC provides a mutually advantageous and cooperative arrangement between the services and institutions of higher learning.

The service witnesses have already testified as to the increasing difficulty in attracting the best quality students into the non-scholarship programs.

Thus, to attract the highest order of applicants, an expansion of ROTC scholarships and an increased subsistence allowance, as proposed in HR 4729 and HR 6724, are vitally important.

We support the provisions of these two bills and respectfully recommend favorable consideration by your committee.

I am attaching hereto a copy of a resolution adopted at our last national convention. It is requested that this also be included in the record of the hearings.

RESOLUTION NO. 7—RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION OF THE UNITED STATES

EXPANSION AND SUPPORT OF ROTC

Whereas, the commitments of the United States for world peace are extensive and worthwhile, for now and for the future, and

Whereas, the planned reductions of the armed forces will require a greater reliance upon a strong and efficient Reserve Component, and

Whereas, ROTC units in high schools, colleges and universities provide outstanding services in the education of such Reserve officers; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States encourage and support the ROTC programs in our various schools and assist them in maintaining their present high standards, and be it further

Resolved, Encouragement and support be given to expanding the ROTC program, and be it further

Resolved, That the Reserve Officers Association of the United States support the passage of legislation to expand the number of ROTC scholarships, increase the cadet subsistence allowance, and reimburse educational institutions for cost of maintaining ROTC units.

Adopted by the National Convention 19 June 1971

Attest:

JOHN T. CARLTON,
Executive Director.

Senator BYRD. Would you care to make a motion regarding those bills?

Senator SAXBE. I will move that we recommend these bills for approval by the full committee.

Senator BYRD. Without objection, the six proposals submitted today will be recommended for approval by the full committee.

General BENADE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, gentlemen.

(Whereupon, at 3:15 p.m., the session was adjourned, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.)

(The subcommittee subsequently reported the bills favorably to the full committee on November 14, 1971.)







