NOMINATION OF BERNARD W. ROGERS, FRED P. WACKER, ROBERT N. SMITH, M. ALAN WOODS, AND JUANITA ASHCRAFT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

NINETY-FOURTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

NOMINATIONS OF

GEN. BERNARD W. ROGERS TO BE ARMY CHIEF OF STAFF

FRED P. WACKER TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE/COMPTROLLER

DR. ROBERT N. SMITH TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS

M. ALAN WOODS TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

JUANITA ASHCRAFT TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

AUGUST 5, 1976

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

75-895 WASHINGTON : 1976

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

JOHN C. STENNIS, Mississippi, *Chairman*

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri
HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington
HOWARD W. CANNON, Nevada
THOMAS J. McINTYRE, New Hampshire
HARRY F. BYRD, Jr., Virginia
SAM NUNN, Georgia
JOHN C. CULVER, Iowa
GARY HART, Colorado
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont

STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
JOHN TOWER, Texas
BARRY GOLDWATER, Arizona
WILLIAM L. SCOTT, Virginia
ROBERT TAFT, Jr., Ohio
DEWEY F. BARTLETT, Oklahoma

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

CONTENTS

NOMINATION OF GEN. BERNARD W. ROGERS TO BE ARMY CHIEF OF STAFF; FRED P. WACKER TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE/COMPTROLLER; DR. ROBERT N. SMITH TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS; M. ALAN WOODS TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS; AND JUANITA ASHCRAFT TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

THURSDAY, AUGUST 5, 1976

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, a 10:08 a.m., in room 212, Russell Senate Office Building, Senator John C. Stennis (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Stennis, Symington, Cannon, Byrd of Virginia, Nunn, Culver, Thurmond, Taft, and Bartlett.

Also present: T. Edward Braswell, Jr., chief counsel and staff director; John T. Ticer, chief clerk; Phyllis A. Bacon, assistant chief clerk; Charles J. Conneely, George H. Foster, Jr., John A. Goldsmith, Edward B. Kenney, Robert Q. Old, Francis J. Sullivan, George F. Travers, Kenneth Fish, professional staff members; Susan Pitts, Assistant to Senator McIntyre; Peter Hughes, assistant to Senator Byrd; Jeff Record, assistant to Senator Nunn; Charles Stevenson, assistant to Senator Culver; Doug Racine, assistant to Senator Leahy; Will Ball, assistant to Senator Tower; Ronald Lehman, assistant to Senator Scott; Bill Lind, assistant to Senator Taft; and Fred Ruth, assistant to Senator Bartlett.

OPENING STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, this is an open hearing.

Mr. Braswell, for the information of those who are here, will you tell us the items of business that are before the committee this morning?

Mr. BRASWELL. We have five nominees. First, General Rogers to be Chief of Staff of the Army, and four statutory nominees beginning with Mr. Wacker to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Comptroller; Dr. Smith to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs; Mr. Woods to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for

Public Affairs; and Mrs. Juanita Ashcraft to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, I believe all of the potential nominees are here, and we give them a special welcome.

We will have an executive session after hearing the nominees to receive the report of Senator Byrd on a matter of legislation.

We will now hear from General Rogers. General Rogers has been nominated to succeed Gen. Fred Weyand, about whom I will have more to say later. He is no stranger to this committee having served as head of the Army's congressional liaison activities in 1971 and 1972, and following that assignment he was Deputy Chief of Staff of the Army for Personnel. General Rogers has been Commanding General of the Army Forces Command since November 1974. He served as Assistant Division Commander of the 1st Infantry Division in Vietnam during 1966 and 1967, following which he was Commandant of Cadets at West Point.

General Rogers, I want to give you a special welcome and call on you now for any statement you may wish to make.

[The nomination reference and report and biographical sketch follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 28, 1976.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Gen. Bernard William Rogers, [redacted] Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3034.

Reported by Mr. Stennis August 5, 1976, with the recommendation that the nomination be *confirmed.*

BIOGRAPHY OF BERNARD WILLIAM ROGERS

Date and place of birth: 16 July 1921, Fairview, Kans.

Years of active commissioned service: Over 33.

Present assignment: Commanding General, United States Army Forces Command, Fort McPherson, Ga., since November 1974.

Military schools attended: United States Military Academy; The Infantry School, Basic and Advanced Courses; United States Army Command and General Staff College; and United States Army War College.

Educational degrees: United States Military Academy—BS Degree—Engineering, and Oxford University, England—BA and MA Degrees—Philosophy, Politics, and Economics.

Major permanent duty assignments—last 10 years: Assistant to the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, later Executive Officer, Office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Washington, D.C., September 1962–November 1966; Assistant Division Commander, 1st Infantry Division, United States Army, Vietnam, November 1966–August 1967; Commandant of Cadets, United States Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., September 1967–September 1969; Commanding General, 5th Infantry Division—Mechanized—and Fort Carson, Colo., September 1969–December 1970; Chief of Legislative Liaison, Office, Secretary of the Army, Washington, D.C., January 1971–October 1972; and Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, United States Army, Washington, D.C., November 1972–November 1974.

Promotions	Dates of appointment	
	Temporary	Permanent
2d lieutenant		June 1, 1943.
1st lieutenant	Dec. 1, 1943	June 6, 1946.
Captain	Feb. 3, 1945	Jan. 2, 1949.
Major	July 3, 1951	Jan. 2, 1957.
Lieutenant colonel	Aug. 18, 1953	Jan. 2, 1964.
Colonel	Sept. 1, 1959	June 3, 1968.
Brigadier general	Oct. 27, 1966	Aug. 12, 1971.
Major general	Feb. 1, 1970	June 27, 1973.
Lieutenant general	Nov. 1, 1972	
General	Nov. 8, 1974	

U.S. decorations/badges: Distinguished Service Cross; Silver Star; Legion of Merit (with 3 Oak Leaf Clusters); Distinguished Flying Cross (with 2 Oak Leaf Clusters); Bronze Star Medal with V Device (with Oak Leaf Cluster); Air Medals with V Device; Army Commendation Medal (with Oak Leaf Cluster); and Combat Infantryman Badge.

Source of commission: USMA.

STATEMENT OF GEN. BERNARD WILLIAM ROGERS, NOMINEE TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

General ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First let me say that it is an honor and a personal pleasure to be appearing again before this committee.

Second, if confirmed it will be a great privilege to follow two outstanding leaders, General Abrams and General Weyand. After the withdrawal of Army forces from Vietnam they set the course that the Army should follow. And I look forward to building on what they have done, to continue on that same azimuth toward which they pointed us. This means to continue: to improve the readiness of the total Army; that is the Active component and the Reserve components; to work within the stable end strength of 785,000 to 789,000 to produce as much combat power as we can and as appropriate; to improve the quality of the force, to insure that we have people-oriented leaders; to procure that equipment which is necessary to increase our inventory to the required levels; to work to improve the relationship between the Active component and the Reserve component; and finally, to do the best we can to use in an efficient manner those resources which the Congress makes available to us.

The CHAIRMAN. That is very good. Glad to see you state all of those.

We talked a little bit the other day about the personnel matter—the volunteer forces, the use of personnel, the judgment as to the ones to take in and the ones to let go, and the ones to work on for reenlistment. I think that is an awfully big job you have. I am glad you think so, too.

Do you want to say something special about that in addition to what you have already said?

General ROGERS. Thank you for your very kind comments, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to the Volunteer Army, I would just say that we do have challenges in that area, although there has been great progress

made. The challenges lie primarily in the personnel field. As you know, we are below strength in both the Army Reserves and the National Guard. We are taking steps to pull out of that slump and climb back up to the strength we believe is necessary as mandated by the Congress.

On the Active component side we also have a challenge in the area of recruiting; that results from the fact that recruiting is really resource sensitive. Since we have no problem getting the quantity we want, the challenge revolves around the quality of the force, as you and I discussed about the other day. Our studies have shown that, in measuring the quality of the recruit the high school diploma graduate is more motivated, more self-disciplined, and has a 2-to-1 chance over a non-diploma recruit to complete his 3-year term of service.

We also measure that quality, by the mental category score a potential enlistee gets on the tests we give him. In the lowest category we take, category IV, we find that a recruit has less chance of being trained than one who scored in a higher category.

So that is our challenge. As Secretary Hoffmann has testified, we do need additional resources to insure that we get the percentage of high school diploma graduates we need; not only will that improve the quality of the force, but it will save money since it will reduce the losses which are an expense to the Government.

We recruited 56-percent male high school diploma graduates this past fiscal year. We anticipate that about 33 percent of all the force we recruited during that period will not complete their 3-year enlistment for one reason or another. We are shooting for 68-percent male diploma graduates; our studies show that if we enlist that 68 percent, the losses will be reduced to 25 percent, which is just about the best that we anticipate we can do. To do that, Mr. Chairman, it does require additional resources for advertising, for recruiter aids, and for enlistment bonuses. But that request for additional resources is before this committee, having been put there by Secretary Hoffmann.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I am not quick to give advice, but I will give you a little counsel. I think you just have to put your most talented men in recruiting, it has been so crucial.

Senator Thurmond.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you.

General Rogers, we want to welcome you back here. We especially welcome you back as Chief of Staff.

General ROGERS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure of knowing General Rogers for years, and I think he is one of the most capable officers in the Army. And I think the Secretary of the Army and the Defense Department used rare judgment in appointing him as Chief of Staff.

General Rogers, as commanding general of the U.S. Army Forces Command for the last year or so, what do you see as the major problems facing the Army today?

General ROGERS. Well, it really can be lumped, Senator, under the broad heading of readiness, because that is our business in Forces Command and our business in the Army. And under readiness I refer back again to my previous comment with respect to filling the force with quality personnel, both the Active component and the Reserve components. That to me is one of our biggest challenges.

Next I would put in order the need to procure the equipment that brings our inventory up to the level that is required.

Third would be the development—again under the umbrella of readiness—of the total Army force structure. First, the 785,000 to 789,000 Active component with certain types of units in the Active structure. Next, the follow-on forces, particularly the D to D plus 60 force package, those types of units that are needed in certain quantities according to a priority as established by General Blanchard, commander in chief of the U.S. Army in Europe. Once this total Army structure is established, we must concentrate on the Active units and that D to D plus 60 package to insure that those units are filled, equipped, trained, and continuously qualified for expeditious shipment overseas.

So the short answer, Senator, is readiness. And under that those three components that I mentioned: strength and quality; procurement; and force structure.

Senator THURMOND. When you say readiness you really mean a combination of things.

General ROGERS. That is correct.

Senator THURMOND. You mean adequate personnel, properly equipped and trained and ready to go?

General ROGERS. That is exactly right.

Senator THURMOND. General Rogers, what really do you see for the Reserves and the Guard in the Army's present posture?

General ROGERS. Well, I am on record, Senator, as believing that the role of the Reserve Components is more important today than at anytime since before the formation of the Continental Army, when we drew upon the organized militia to form that Continental Army. We absolutely are dependent upon the Reserve components today if we are going to be mobilized, deployed and sustained in combat. We are using, as you know, the Reserve components to round out four of our Active component divisions, one brigade each from the Guard. We are using Reserve component battalions to augment other Active component divisions. And we have squeezed the 785,000 end strength of the Army to get as much combat power as we could, building 16 divisions from an end strength which is 185,000 less than the last time we had 16 divisions. We have squeezed from the Active component combat support and combat service support units, and placed them in the Reserve components. It is that type of unit plus the combat units of the Reserve components to which I address myself when I speak about the importance of that D to D plus 60 package being ready to go.

Senator THURMOND. General Rogers, as a former Chief of Personnel, I am wondering are you comfortable with the All Volunteer Force?

General ROGERS. I am comfortable, Senator Thurmond, with the force. It has been a success to date. It has not yet been institutionalized to the point where, as I indicated, we are retaining the strength of the Reserves. I do think we will be able to do that. It will take additional resources to accomplish that and to maintain the quality that we not only need in the Active component but also the level of quality which will reduce the losses and in the end save money. Those are the two biggest challenges as I see them in the Volunteer Force. I would just like to underscore, however, the entire Volunteer

Force concept by saying, Senator Thurmond, that the soldiers I see in the Army today are the finest with whom I have ever served in 33 years of service.

Senator THURMOND. If the time came when you did not get the numbers you needed, the quantity, or did not get the quality, I presume as Chief of Staff, regardless of what the policy of the Defense Department is, you would tell the Congress if you are asked your frank opinion about the situation as you would with any other matters?

General ROGERS. Title 10 authorizes me to do that, Senator Thurmond, and I would exercise that authority.

Senator THURMOND. General Rogers, in closing what do you see as the chief hardware requirements of the Army?

General ROGERS. There are several. One, a better tank. Two, a better means to move soldiers across the battlefield in a carrier that can keep up with tanks. I am talking about the MICV, the mechanized infantry combat vehicle.

The development of laser designated ammunition.

An advanced attack helicopter and a new utility helicopter.

Improvements in the antitank weapon. We have good weapons. We don't have the number we need, as you know, of the TOW and the Dragon. But we need to continue to improve those weapons.

We have a shortfall in several areas, one in the communications electronics area. We need to procure that equipment and continue to develop new families of that type of equipment.

So as you can see, Senator, there are a number of areas in which I think we need either improvement or we need procurement.

Senator THURMOND. Thank you very much. I wish you well in your work as Chief of Staff.

General ROGERS. Thank you, Senator Thurmond.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I first met General Rogers almost 10 years ago in Vietnam. General Rogers was then a brigadier general in the field. I had the opportunity to fly with him in a helicopter to observe some combat operations. And I might say that it was near the Cambodian border. And the general was very meticulous in following instructions not to cross the border, which I must say suited me just fine.

General ROGERS. And me, too, Senator.

Senator BYRD. I was very much impressed with General Rogers at that time. And I had the feeling that one of these days he would be Chief of Staff of the Army. And I am pleased that he is. And I congratulate the President on appointing General Rogers.

I congratulate General Rogers on the appointment, and I am pleased to support his nomination.

General ROGERS. Thank you, Senator.

Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Nunn.

Senator NUNN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I met General Rogers about 4 years ago when I first arrived. I have been impressed with every appearance he has made before either the subcommittee or the full committee. He is very knowledgeable. As I told him a few minutes ago, I feel that we will gain him in Washington but we will lose him in Atlanta, Ga., and I regret the latter. I

think he will make a real fine Chief of Staff in the U.S. Army. He comes in at a time when I think we do need a new look at a lot of divisions, and a new look in NATO, and we need a new look at the Volunteer Force. I believe that General Rogers will do that; and I am pleased to hear him pledge today that he will do it.

General Rogers, I have just one line of questioning. I certainly plan to support your nomination because I think it is an excellent choice. Before I ask my question I wanted to precede with one comment.

I am concerned about the problems at West Point and the honor system. We have had several days of hearings in my Subcommittee on Manpower. We have purposely and carefully avoided becoming involved in the details of the individual cases on the premise that those cases must be a matter to take place within the Cadet honor system at West Point. I still feel that way, and I think that is the right decision.

As recently as yesterday however several of the Defense counsels in a public forum before House Members made the very serious charge that the Army was intimidating them for carrying out what they perceived to be their duties in representing the cadets that have been assigned to them. We have allegations of transfers, we have allegations of bad reports on their efficiency records, plus several other allegations.

Now, I make no judgments on those allegations. But while the Congress should not get into individual cases—some have but in my opinion should not—I believe when a matter of this seriousness as these allegations from Regular Army officers who are assigned to defend cadets are made in public or in private, we do have a duty to investigate them because we want to insure that due process is afforded. We don't want to pretend that we are the judicial system, but this is a very serious matter.

I don't expect you to have the answer this morning, but I would like any comment you may have. I would also like to have your view about whether you will look into this and report back to us as soon as possible?

General Rogers. Senator Nunn, I, too, saw those reports in the press this morning. I can assure you that if confirmed, and upon being sworn in, I will look into such allegations.

Senator Nunn. What is your general opinion, hypothetically, if you find that the Army has indeed intimidated defense counsel? What if the defense counsels are being punished while they are trying to defend the cadets? I am asking you that as a hypothetical matter, not in any way casting judgment on what is happening. Hypothetically, if that is found to be the case, what is your view about it?

General Rogers. Well, I would say that we don't need that kind of action in our Army, Senator Nunn. And I can assure you that appropriate action will be taken against those who are intimidating, if, in fact, that is the case.

Senator Nunn. Will you assure the committee also that you will do your best as Chief of Staff to create an atmosphere in this particular matter and in others that may come up at West Point to insure that defense counsel are accorded the right to represent their clients in a vigorous legal and ethical way, without being intimidated from the Army?

General ROGERS. I will, Senator Nunn. And I think the record will show that has been my position for 33 years.

Senator NUNN. I am confident it has, and I am confident that you will. We will be asking—and have already called this morning and asked for a report—for you to look into the specifics of these allegations. And we will detail our questions in a letter to the Secretary of the Army, General Weyand and yourself.

The other aspect that is becoming more disturbing to me is what I observe is happening as I filter information from a good many cadets, many of them are not involved in the scandal in any way. The cadet honor code at West Point—and Superintendant Berry, Secretary Hoffmann and others, when they appeared before our committee, emphasized this, and their emphasis was on, I think, the correct premise that if Congress interferes and Congress tries to legislate an honor code, there won't be an honor code, because it will be an act of law, and it will not be the cadet honor code. They emphasized these words: "The honor system is cadet property, owned by the cadets, controlled by the cadets, and operated by the cadets."

I have been in an honor system. I have been in a school were there wasn't an honor system. I think that if it is to be a viable honor system, if the people are not on their honor it won't work. If you have to have marshals patrolling everyday and looking over everybody's shoulders, you don't have an honor system, you have a different kind of system. I think this is a correct statement, and it ought to be adhered to both by the U.S. Army and by Congress.

Our committee stayed out of the individual cases, because we do believe it is the cadet's code. And yet it is a growing feeling that I have that the Army has taken over lock, stock, and barrel the prosecution of these cases without any cadet participation, without any cadet review board. You have Regular Army officers that are conducting both the prosecution, the defense—some of that is according to custom—but also there is no cadet participation in the adjudicatory process. You have Regular Army panels that are trying those.

Now, I understand the problems here. You have a massive number of cases, and you have some more coming up. But I think you are on the verge of losing the honor system unless it is indeed premised on the cadet's feeling that they are participating. I again don't expect you to have the answers at this point to this problem, but I would appreciate your attention to the question about whether the cadets themselves are participating in this process.

General ROGERS. Senator, may I comment?

Senator NUNN. Yes, sir.

General ROGERS. As a Commandant of Cadets from 1967 to 1969 I was charged with monitoring the honor system. As Deputy Chief of Staff of Personnel, supervision of the Military Academy came under my office. I agree with everything you say, with one exception. In the internal review panels that they have established now, expedient as they are because of the graduation of the honor committee of 1976 in June and the need to deal with 192 cases, I understand there are cadet representatives from the class of 1977, so that cadets are participating on those panels. My major concern, Senator—and let me preface that by saying that I have reached for the phone on several occasions because of my overwhelming interest in the Military Academy and its honor system, and I have hung it up without making

the call. Because we do have talented, capable leaders who are charged with dealing with this problem. My main concern today is how do we get the cadet honor code and system completely back into the hands of cadets, so that it still remains their honor code. It has to be.

Senator NUNN. I couldn't agree with you more on that. And I think we are about to witness a double tragedy. I think Congress—some people are about to get Congress involved in this honor system in detail, and if that happens, I think the cadets are going to lose the honor system, whatever happens to the immediate cases. I think the immediate cases are important, but I think the honor code itself and the survival of it are much more important. And I think the two are not incompatible. But I also think that the Army is on dangerous ground in this area, both from the first allegations that are made, and also from the point of view that there is a growing conception that the Army has taken over the honor code in these cases. Perhaps you are accurate on that and we will look forward to a report that the cadets are participating. But there is an active feeling in the cadet corps—we have talked to a lot of them, people who are not involved in the cheating—that no longer do the cadets have control of their own code.

General ROGERS. Senator, that perception exists for two reasons: First, in the current cases they have appointed internal review panels, which is different from the way the honor system has worked in the past.

Second, the cadets also tend to have that perception because in 1974 and 1975 there was a study made by a group of cadets and officers of the entire honor system, as you are aware. Even though the number of cadets was greater than the number of officers on that study group, there still was a perception on the part of some cadets that "they" are taking it away from us. The honor code, "We do not lie, cheat, or steal, or tolerate anyone who does," must remain the cadet honor code, and they must believe in it, and they must enforce it.

Now, there can be some changes made in the honor system. You commented that the system itself belonged to the cadets. It does up to a point, Senator. And that is after the cadet honor committee has met and found the cadet guilty, the finding then goes to the commandant, and the cadet has two options, either to resign or request a board of officers.

Senator NUNN. But the initial finding has to come from the cadets?

General ROGERS. That is right.

But those in authority also have the responsibility to train cadets in the meaning of honor. I won't go into the details and cite chapter and verse with respect to particular type incidents; however, there have been cases in which the honor committee has found a cadet not guilty because the particular type of violation did not break the cadet code. In discussing, some cases of this nature with the chairman of the honor committee, the commandant has pointed out to him that under the officer code of ethics such violations would be considered a violation of a person's honor. It is up to the authorities to lead the cadets to believe that such particular types of violations should be considered a violation of the cadet honor code. But the cadets themselves must believe it, and they themselves must produce the memorandum that is distributed throughout the corps via the honor representatives pointing out that such violations will, in the future be considered a violation of their code. That has happened. That respon-

sibility lies with the superintendent, more particularly with the commandant, to see that the cadets are trained in that area as well. So although the code itself must belong to the cadets, and the initial implementation of the system must be by the cadet, there is that underlying responsibility of those in authority to train them and lead them in a proper direction.

Senator NUNN. General, I agree with that. I think that is a good analysis of it.

There is one other disturbing aspect that I hope you will look into. Again, these are allegations, and I do not assume that all of them are valid. But I believe that there have been considerable press reports that some prosecutors have basically stated that they are being limited in the scope of their investigation, that there are many more people involved, and they are not being turned loose to find out the scope and the magnitude of the cheating, and so forth. And, of course, that adds to the overall problem and perception. So I would hope you would look at that, also.

General ROGERS. Yes sir.

Senator NUNN. I would hope also—and I know you have had a lot of experience with this and I believe that it is a very important matter in the Army right now—that you would give intensive study as to how the cadets can be more involved in the process. I know they had one vote on sanctions where 55 percent of the cadets voted to have flexible sanctions, so that the only punishment would not be expulsion. I happen to think the code would work better if there was more flexibility, that is my own personal belief. But I believe that is up to the cadet corps, not up to Senator Nunn. But I would hope that you would take a good look at possible examination by the whole cadet corps on some of these questions, so that they can participate in some very difficult problems the Army has about sanctions in general, now and in the future. Specifically whether they should be made retroactive, whether there should be flexibility, and whether this ought to apply to current cases. I think all of those matters ought to be discussed thoroughly with the cadets, and perhaps there ought to be some referendums in the early part of this school year. I happen to think the Army is not going to be able to get out of the situation with equity done to all, and with an intact honor code, unless the cadet corps participates in a vigorous way when the school year starts back. I don't mean those who are accused, I mean those who are not accused.

General ROGERS. I personally would predict that there will be a referendum among the corps this fall in which discretion will be voted by two-thirds majority by the cadets, so that separation from the corps is not the only sole sanction.

Senator NUNN. I believe that would strengthen the code.

General ROGERS. It would reduce the pressure on the nontoleration clause.

One of the saddest things that a commandant has to deal with, Senator Nunn, is when a man reports himself for an honor violation. He has internalized the concept of honor. Usually, he does not want to leave West Point. He is just the kind of a man that we are looking for to be an outstanding officer. And yet there is no sanction other than separation from the corps. I have experienced that on too many occasions not to become somewhat emotional on that issue.

Senator NUNN. I know how difficult that would be. I know how difficult it would be for a young man to turn himself in under those circumstances, realizing that his career would be ended. That probably is the most honorable cadet that you have.

General ROGERS. Exactly.

Senator NUNN. I am delighted you are going to be looking into this. I know you have a lot of priorities, but I think this certainly should be one of them. I hope you will examine the question of retroactivity and perhaps let the cadets participate in that. I have no opinion on what it ought to be; I know there are two sides of that. But I think the cadet corps should play a vital role in that question.

General ROGERS. I would just like to underscore again, Senator Nunn, the cadets must have their own honor code. The Senate should not legislate it, the Army should not legislate it, and the authorities at West Point should not legislate it. It has to be the cadets.

Senator NUNN. I completely agree with that. I believe, though, that it is absolutely imperative that, while these investigations are going on, that you get this whole situation back on tract, that these people who are adduced now be given due process, and that their defense counsels be given the flexibility they need and the freedom they need in the Army to defend their clients as they see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that is a good suggestion. We will come back to that if you wish.

Senator Taft.

Senator TAFT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have talked to General Rogers and reviewed his background, and I feel he is very well qualified indeed for the position he has been nominated for.

I do have just two or three questions I would like to ask. First of all, could you comment on the question of force structure and what questions you think ought to be raised and what steps, if any, you think ought to be studied in relation to force structure, and particularly some of the new training concepts, of which the "fight outnumbered win" concept is a part?

General ROGERS. Senator, by the "fight outnumbered and win" you are relating that to Europe?

Senator TAFT. I think the doctrine is related to Europe principally.

General ROGERS. That is the concept under which we are operating. It impacts upon our training doctrine today, which is for the corps or division commander, to the best of his ability to determine where the major thrust is coming, and then to move the tanks, the attack helicopters, and other pieces of equipment that he can to that point to blunt that thrust. The importance of the antitank weapon today is similar to the importance of the machinegun in World War II. Today, as you walk the line of a defense position, and you ask the commander, what weapon do you emplace first, it is not the machinegun, it is the antitank weapon. It is important to have that antitank weapon sited along those avenues of approach of the tanks. It is important that higher level commanders establish antitank strong points.

So yes, we are training to fight under that concept, and we anticipate that we are going to be successful. We have some distance to go in inculcating that concept throughout the Army. I know that

as a fact just from my experience with the 11 divisions that we have in Forces Command.

Now, with respect to future changes in structure, that again is related to weapons system development. As new weapons come along, there will be changes in force structure. There will be some changes in the tactics that we will be using on the battlefield related again to these new weapons. These latter changes will also impact upon force structure.

I do believe that today the Army structure in the active component is appropriate for the missions that we are expected to accomplish

I mentioned earlier that one of the challenges we face is to insure that we develop the total Army structure, so that we have in that D to D plus 60 package those units we need ready to go on the time schedule by which they should arrive in Europe.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much.

Are you aware of the provision in the armed services procurement bill this year relating to the advanced concepts laboratory?

General ROGERS. I am not, sir.

Senator TAFT. There was an authorization in the bill for $2 million, as I understand it, to authorize the Army to use the advanced concept laboratory approach, and to contract out to think tanks or other competent groups certain studies and research suggestions. Do you have any comments on your feelings in that regard?

General ROGERS. Well, sir, I am of two minds on that, Senator Taft, so you are going to get a straddled answer, I am afraid. There is a tremendous amount of talent in the Army inventory that can do just that kind of work. On the other hand, there are 210 million people in this country. I just happen to be one who believes that we ought to tap all sources to improve what we are trying to do. You will find that my record supports the thought that, within the Army, we should tap the brain power of our soldier; he can probably tell us more meaningfully than anybody else what we need to do to improve our operation because he is our customer.

In response to your question I would say that I would prefer to see us not be restricted in going outside the Army. However, we first must exploit the talent and capability we have inside before going outside.

Senator TAFT. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Symington.

Senator SYMINGTON. It is a pleasure to see you sir. You and I have been friends for many years. And I congratulate you. And I look forward for your confirmation as Chief of Staff.

General ROGERS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. In the years I have been here I have never known anybody more respected by this committee than you have been. And I can only hope as you analyze these various problems incident to the questions asked by Senator Nunn today that you give consideration to what I believe is the greatest problem that all the military have. And that is their proneness to follow tradition as against modernity, especially if they won the previous war.

I remember the chairman of this committee 30 years ago shaking his baseball finger at me as late as 1941 and saying, are you trying to tell me that tanks can go where horses can go? And now we have the

problem of how vulnerable or invulnerable are the tanks? I am not taking a position on it.

I am sure this comes up all the time in your thinking as to how you can follow modernity, because I am one who believes that, as the Chief of Staff of the Army said to me years and years ago in the early twenties, regardless of what happens, all wars will be won with a knife by people who go somewhere they are not wanted and stay there. Sometimes you put it on the end of a gun and call it a bayonet, but it is still a knife. And I believe that, too, although the nuclear picture disturbs me a little in consideration of it. But I do hope that you work for not only the integrity of the Army, as illustrated in the questions by my colleague, Senator Nunn, but also the modernity of the Army, especially in new development in the military field. I congratulate you again.

General ROGERS. Thank you, sir.

Senator SYMINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Culver.

Senator CULVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Rogers, the Army, yesterday, as you know, announced an agreement with West Germany for certain common components on the new main battle tank. And although this will perhaps result in a slippage of the schedule of the XM–1, I wonder whether or not you feel that you can pledge to the committee that you will do everything you can to help make this agreement work, and to seek a higher degree of standardization in our NATO operations.

General ROGERS. I am prepared to do that, sir.

Senator CULVER. I think it is important to have the best tank for our Army, and of course increased standardization for NATO. Do you agree with that?

General ROGERS. I do, but I caveat that to the extent that while I believe in standardization, I also believe in producing for our soldiers the best piece of equipment we can. If that can be brought about through standardization, then that is the course we should follow.

Senator CULVER. That is what I said, so that we will have the best tank for our Army and increase the standardization for NATO.

Now, will you undertake to see whether any other planned new equipment for the Army, to every extent possible, has components which it might be possible to standardize within NATO or at least make equipment interoperable in NATO?

General ROGERS. I will, Senator Culver, to the best of my ability, review them, though again against the background of producing the best piece of equipment for our soldiers.

Senator CULVER. But I do want to emphasize what a serious concern about standardization which many of us have now in Congress. On this committee, Senator Nunn, Senator Taft, and I have been particularly involved in different aspects of standardization issue. It does seem to me that it is imperative, if we are going to have a meaningful and credible conventional deterrent in Europe, that we aggressively and sincerely and intensely address this problem.

General ROGERS. Senator, I believe that the areas which most lend themselves to standardization are rations, fuel, ammunition, communications, and doctrine. We are at work in all these areas to see what we can do to enhance standardization.

Senator CULVER. I know you have your work cut out for you, and I wish you well. And I know this doctrine business is difficult. I was in Europe just 2 years ago and met with the German tank commanders and had briefings from them, and had briefings by our American tank commanders. You wouldn't believe they were on the same side. When I asked questions of the American tank commanders, do you use these doctrines for the deployment of a tank, I was told this was a Euro-group approach.

Do we have representation in the Euro group?

No.

And I know as a result of some of these reports, when we returned, that certain steps have been taken to bring about a greater degree of integration in doctrine and commonality. But without that you can't have meaningful standardization anyway, you don't know what kind of weapons you need until you have agreement on the doctrine employed. I know you have your work cut out for you. And I know that there are some difficult decisions for you and the Congress to make. But we have reached a point where the waste and lack of combat readiness that results from the absence of standardization has reached such a state that I think it becomes really apparent to the American public that you would not have support from NATO and politically in this country.

General ROGERS. May I add a footnote to your statement, Senator.

General DuPuy, who commands the Training and Doctrine Command, has spent considerable time with his counterpart in the Federal Republic of Germany Army within the past year developing common doctrine.

Senator CULVER. I met with General DuPuy when I got back. And I am very appreciative of the efforts he is making in this area. But what I wanted to bring out was, do you support him in his efforts?

General ROGERS. Senator, I am so proud of the work done and the progress that has been made by Training and Doctrine Command to bring our concepts and our doctrine out of the forties and fifties and into the 1970's and 1980's that I can assure you that he will have my complete support.

Senator CULVER. On that point, I would like to follow up on the observation by Senator Symington and the question by Senator Taft with regard to the future role of the heavy tank on the battlefield. Those tanks now are going to run about $1.2 million a copy, whatever we agree on. We are talking about buying 10,000 of them. It will be in excess of a $10 billion package to get our inventories up to NATO requirements among our allies and to meet foreign sales, and so on. Now, we do face a TOW missile capability or its equivalent, and worse on the Soviet side, as evidenced in the Middle East battlefields, at least we have to anticipate that degree of sophistication as an anti-tank capability currently.

You no longer need the Congressional Medal of Honor to knock out a tank since you can stand off 3,000 yards and be the most nervous guy on the other side; it is like shooting ducks in a pond under any circumstances. You add the COBRA attack helicopter to that, equipped with TOW capabilities, and so forth, and you can make a pretty good case that tanks are just metal coffins.

Now, with all due respect to the kind of tactics that you are going to talk about, in the confusion of the battle field, and air support and

artillery fog, and hugging the ground with low silhouette, and cunning tank commanders—that is still a pretty hairy operation. Now, given all that, will you push the Army to make a rigorous analysis of the future of the tank and the appropriate tank-antitank weapon mix? This committee requested the Army to do that at my prompting over a year ago, but we don't have the text yet. Now, that doesn't make one very sanguine about the seriousness of this undertaking. And that is not intended to deprecate the good faith efforts of a lot of people. But you sit here and ask for that report, and then we back up and take action on tank programs, and we don't have that report—it seems to me it is very much in the Army's interest to give some tangible evidence to the world that you are sensitive to certain changes in the environment of the modern battlefield and the post-Middle East experience, if only to tell some critics who say that we shouldn't even go forward with this XM–1 Leopard competition, that it is all a waste of time. If we can have something to show that the Army in a very tough-minded way, politically as well as tactically, has come to grips with some of the challenges of these new weapons developments and breakthroughs, then I think it will enhance the credibility of some of these requests and the prospects of prompt and responsible congressional action.

General ROGERS. Senator, I would just like to make one or two comments on that. First, there is no question in my mind of the need both for the tank and for the antitank weapon. In the Yom Kippur war, over 80 percent of the tank kills were caused by other tanks. Tanks killed tanks. When the Israeli defense forces used the combined arms team—as I am sure Bill DuPuy discussed with you, as he has made quite a study of this whole subject—used the artillery, the smoke, the close air support, they were able to knock out or to destroy the antitank defenses.

Now, I do not believe we have yet developed, Senator, the ultimate weapon in the conventional mode. In the European environment it will be the exception rather than the rule that you get that 3,000 meter range because of the terrain, as you are well aware.

Senator CULVER. General, I am fully appreciative of a lot of this, and I know you have a case to make on that. I just want to emphasize the urgency I feel in getting this study and getting a report back to this committee and getting some evidence that you are trying on an experimental, innovative basis to put in the field some of these new tactical combinations in the NATO environment or elsewhere. What changes are you making? It is all well and good to say, yes; we know the history of the horse cavalry and the battleship and the machine-gun. But then the bottom line again is, we don't change anything—it isn't all that credible and persuasive that you learn from the past. And we just want to see some hard, tangible evidence that you are a little smarter than that generation of officer corps that went before on many of these kinds of fundamental questions.

General ROGERS. I wouldn't want to categorize myself as being smarter than that previous generation, having served with several of them. But I will say, Senator, that we can give you some pretty good results of our study on that. And I will see to it that you get it.

Senator CULVER. And some evidence in the field?

General ROGERS. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, I don't like to interrupt, but we will come back to that.

I have an announcement to make.

Senator Bartlett, I know you have crisp questions that are brief.

Senator BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I hope your optimism is not misdirected and misplaced. I will try to be brief.

General Rogers, I, too, share a lot of interests of the Senator from Iowa about standardization. However, I have taken a position all along that we should keep our XM–1 tank competition consistent with the timetable that was set up. It seemed to be one of the best competitions that has ever been managed by the Defense Department, and perhaps also by the Army. I was very unhappy with the delay in the selection of the winner of the XM–1 tank competition, because I felt that in the interests of standardization the choice was delayed when it didn't have to be delayed, that the choice of the winner between the two entries could have been selected, and the winner then enhanced with certain items of the losing entry, and that this could have been accomplished at a lesser cost rather than the greater cost that I believe it will entail.

The reason given in the release was standardization.

I believe in standardization, but I don't believe it has to interfere, particularly with ample planning, with the development of the new generation weapon that XM–1 tank is.

I would hope that you would use all of your influence so that the XM–1 tank would have a process now of selection of these commonality items in the interest of standardization so that that could take place as quickly as possible with as little delay in the overall approach.

I was quite disturbed by a representative from Germany, Mr. Damm, who seemed to be more interested in the trade of military weapons than he was in the caliber of weapons. And he pointed out that Germany wanted to buy our AWACS, but only if we bought their Leopard. And on an answer to the question, how would he react if the Leopard came in second best in the competition with the XM–1, he said he still felt the same way, that we should buy the second best item so that they can buy the AWACS.

So again I feel that in the interest of standardization we shouldn't be just interested in quid pro quo trading.

So I appreciate your answers to the Senator from Iowa. And I would appreciate any other comments you have on delays, on the trading aspects of development of new generation weapons.

General ROGERS. Senator, I was not involved in the decision or involved in the entire XM–1 situation in any way. However, I do know enough about it, probably, to categorize myself as being dangerous. Nonetheless I would like to make some comments.

The first is that in Forces Command what we are looking for is a better tank and getting it as soon as we can. I have looked at the arguments that have been made concerning this latest decision, and I believe that there is another aspect to it besides the important aspect of standardization. The other aspect is, we may well end up with a better tank because of this delay—4 months, 5 months, whatever it may be—inasmuch as the decision requires that the two firms developing the XM–1 models must come in with a proposal that will interchange components between the two versions of the XM–1 that we have now—and I am talking about such components as the turbine engine, the tracks, and a turret which will take either the 105-mm gun or the 120-mm gun.

I believe, Senator Bartlett, that that holds out a very distinct probability of providing our soldiers with a better tank.

I cannot comment on your question with respect to trading the Leopard for the AWACS. That is outside my field, and I cannot comment on that.

Senator BARTLETT. With respect to the comment about having improved tank, wasn't the original contract so written so that the selection could be made and the improved components added to the tank without delay?

General ROGERS. I am not sure about those details, Senator. I would comment along this line, however, that by still having the competitors come in with their proposals, I believe we have a better assurance of a lower cost and a better product than if the selection had been made and then we had asked, put on the turbine, change the tracks, make the turret both for 105-and 120-mm's. There would have been no competition under those conditions. Now, that may or may not be so, but those are my instincts.

Senator BARTLETT. How are your instincts on whether that should have been done prior, within the year prior to the exact date when the winner was to be announced?

General ROGERS. My instincts tell me it would have been better.

Senator BARTLETT. Which way, earlier?

General ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Senator BARTLETT. General Rogers, we had a briefing recently by one of the generals of the Army which was one I would call as unfiltered without any vote or alternation by the Joint Chiefs or any political decisions being made or considered in the information we received. My feeling is that the Congress is the body that should make the political interpretations and decisions, and that this is done for better or for worse, but that the information received by Congress should be unadulterated, unfiltered, direct, honest observations of the various officers of the various services. Would you work toward making that possible on every possible occasion, so that the information received would be the honest convictions of the military people and not changed in any way for political reasons?

General ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Senator BARTLETT. I thank the distinguished General.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

May I ask, how long were you Superintendant of the West Point Military Academy?

General ROGERS. Sir, I was commandant for 2 years, not the Superintendant.

The CHAIRMAN. Two years?

General ROGERS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, we have other important nominations here. We have an operating quorum, a quorum that we can vote on matters.

Senator Culver.

Senator CULVER. I have a couple of more questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator NUNN. I have one other comment.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, gentlemen. Do any others have comments?

[No response.]

Senator Nunn.

Senator NUNN. Very briefly, General Rogers, we have differing opinions on the Department of Defense decision on the tank. I happen to agree with Senator Culver. Senator Culver and I wrote a letter back in April of this year urging that interoperatability and standardization be given strong consideration in the selection of this tank. I happen to think the Department of Defense has made the correct decision. And I happen to think it was a very courageous decision, because politics domestically are on the other side of it.

I believe Secretary Rumsfeld should be commended on that. And I do believe we will not only end up with a better tank, which is a priority consideration, but more importantly, we will begin to put NATO on a cohesive basis. If we had the best tanks ever devised by mankind, and if we had exactly the number of those tanks that we have right now, the NATO defense would still desperately have to have allied support. There is no way 300,000 Americans would ward off 10 times that many Soviets, or at least 5 times that many Soviets, with 18,000 tanks. It doesn't make any difference how good our tank is.

So unless NATO itself begins to standardize and have the same kind of equipment—if I were a tank commander and I had a breakdown during the middle of a conventional war, then I would want somebody on the allied side to be able to replace some of my parts. I would consider that just as much a priority as anything else.

So I think the Defense Department is to be commended on this. And I know the timetable is going to slip a little bit. But if somebody's timetable doesn't slide in NATO, we would never have a standardized or interoperable weapon, it is impossible. There is no way we will ever get everybody's timetable cohesive.

So I think the United States of America has stepped out in the lead on this. And I know there are different opinions on it. But I just wanted to give you my opinion, because you will be playing a key role.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, gentlemen, let me call your attention to this. You know under the rule now we have to get permission to meet during Senate sessions. Our permission to meet was just for this morning. So for that reason let's try to contract this thing a little. We have several other nominations.

Senator Culver, do you have some additional questions?

Senator CULVER. General, do you support the President's proposal for a gradual phaseout of the current subsidies for the commissary?

General ROGERS. Senator, there are two things involved. One is the amendment that just passed the Senate, which would cause the phaseout to occur over a 6-year period. Related to that is what the Army is doing to bring the commissaries under centralized control, which we started, in April, and which we hope to complete sometime in October or November. We anticipate that there will be savings from this new organization both in manpower and money, as well as greater efficiency in the operation of the commissaries. I would like to study both and come back and answer your questions, Senator.

Senator CULVER. For 2 years I note on your biography you were Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel.

General ROGERS. Yes, sir.

Senator CULVER. In that position no doubt you became quite familiar with the pay and benefits systems as well as recruitment and retention problems?

General ROGERS. Yes, sir,

Senator CULVER. My questions are, Do military personnel in your judgment today, have the pay comparability with civilians?

General ROGERS. Senator, I don't think we should speak in terms of comparability. If we talk about comparability in my opinion we should talk about comparability of jobs. There is no job in civilian life that is comparable to having to go out and face a machinegun.

Senator CULVER. You can always say that. But what standard are you going to use in deciding if you have pay comparability?

General ROGERS. Is it competitive? And by competitive I mean, is it competitive enough so that it will attract into the service the numbers in the quality that we want and is it competitive enough, along with the benefits, to retain those soldiers we want to keep in the service?

With benefits and with pay I think the question is—at least in my mind—is it competitive?

I have mentioned the difficulty we are having right at this moment in getting into the active component the quality that we should have, and that the country should insist that we have in our Army, both from the viewpoint of the type of service they perform and from the viewpoint of the savings that would accrue to the Government by recruiting more high school diploma graduates.

There is a perception that I find in the field, Senator Culver, among the careerists who are the ones, obviously, affected by the benefits. I find a perception that there is an erosion of those benefits.

Senator CULVER. Whose fault is that? It is obviously a lack of education, given the acceleration of pay, improvements, and the general posture. And people are laboring under some obsolete notion that they work for inferior pay, and so on and so forth. It seems to me that the figures go right back to the inadequacy of the DOD program, and that services ought to be required to properly inform and educate their personnel that this perception is false and erroneous.

General ROGERS. Senator, I believe the fault can be shared.

Senator CULVER. I have never seen a situation where the fault couldn't be shared. But I know the point you are trying to make.

General ROGERS. May I make two points?

One, I agree with you with respect to the education——

Senator CULVER. As far as putting a price tag on facing a machinegun, there is no way you can do that. You can hire a kamikaze from that point. There isn't a money figure. And we also get to the point where, if you are just talking about money enticement to get in it. I wouldn't want to get in a foxhole with that guy anyway if that is the sole motivation.

But, the thrust of my question was whether it has a comparability now, and what we can do about this false self-perception, and improve education, whether or not, for example, you believe that we can improve those perceptions about military pay if there were a single salary system with all compensation explicit, so that they know what they receive, and they know what they are paying for it.

Now, this gets critically improtant in terms of the morale in the country, and the relationship, in my judgment, between the American people and the military. And it is very much, I think, in the military interest to have an accurate perception of what their benefit situation is, particularly at a time when there is this kind of misunderstanding.

Now, I think Congress can be properly faulted. I voted for every pay increase, including the increases that many didn't on cost of living, every single one of them. And where I think Congress made a horrendous mistake was not packaging those increases with the discontinuance of a lot of fringe benefits that were only justified at a time of an inferior pay scale. I think that is our fault. But having accepted that blame, what can you tell us you are going to do to bring about a more sophisticated and accurate appreciation in the service itself as to just how well off they are now vis-a-vis other people in this land, many of whom—or a staggering proportion of whom are unemployed—can't find work at all, and so on and so forth, so that every time we turn around and take a responsible, prudent management step to get necessary money to apply to O. & M., when we talk about erosion of benefits——

The CHAIRMAN. Pardon me, I am sorry, your time has expired. I will have to allow the gentleman some time to answer.

Will you take 1 minute and answer, please. You can submit a further answer for the record.

Senator CULVER. Maybe we will have the witness back. This is no way to railroad this through. We have no opportunity to even see the Chief of Staff that frequently, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator, I wish you would withdraw that term in referring to the way we are operating in the Senate. I wish you wouldn't use that. But that is a matter of judgment.

Did you wish to answer the question?

General ROGERS. I assure you that I will continue the program started in January of this year to insure that every soldier in the Army understands what his total compensations are. And I agree with you that there has been a shortfall in that area in the past, and we will insure that they do understand.

Senator CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to make a statement at this time for the record, If I could. I ask unanimous consent to make it.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't want to cut you off, Senator, but I ask you to respect our time situation here.

Senator CULVER. I ask a unanimous consent request that I make a statement here in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. How long?

Senator CULVER. I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. I object to your proceeding right at this point—I am a member of the committee, too—I object to your proceeding any further now. Your time is far over.

Senator Thurmond, do you have any more questions?

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any more time. We have a lot of nominations here. And I think we ought to get along with business.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Taft.

Senator TAFT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Nunn.

Senator NUNN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. That brings it back to you, Senator Culver. I don't object to your proceeding for a reasonable time. But let's get it over. And you can submit further questions.

Senator CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly familiar, after 12 years in Congress, with the rules of committee procedure. And I sympathize and respect the enormous responsibility the chairman has to carry out expeditiously and yet responsibly the business before this committee. But I would like to respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we adopt a 10-minute rule or some similar agreed upon procedure here for examination of witnesses and strictly and conscienciously adhere to it. I have been on this committee now for 2 years, and there have been enumerable occasions where I have sat for many hours to wait for a second turn around to ask questions of witnesses. I have been very happy to do that. I think it is proper. I am not asking for anything special. All I want to do is to be treated fairly.

Now, when I came in here there was a protracted questioning period going on by one of the members for one whom I have as high a respect as any person in the U.S. Congress. I think those questions were valuable and useful. And if there is one thing we don't do very responsibly in Congress it is oversight. And if we don't have enough time because we have two or three other nominations, or we have this or that, to ask the pending nominee—who is to assume one of the most important and responsible positions in the entire national security field of this Nation—so that the Senate committee charged with the responsibility to make that judgment on his qualifications can explore at least a half dozen questions of what is felt to be by a particular member an important policy issue and area, to get his views, then I don't think that any members can make very informed judgments on his qualifications. And I certainly don't think it is a very responsible way to run the committee. I will sit here as long as necessary. And I will ask Senator Mansfield if we can meet another time, or anything necessary to do our job. But when we get cut off, or have to have the sense that we are somehow imposing on everybody else's time, or we don't have time to really adequately explore this gentleman's qualifications for this high responsibility, then I would let the American public decide whether or not we are handling this thing right.

And I am not going to impose any longer on this committee's time, but I am certainly going to have to think about what I can possibly do that doesn't offend the chairman in terms of properly questioning this witness. I don't have any more questions. I asked the questions I had as concisely as I could, and if they aren't crisp enough, I will have them written out like other members so that somebody else can read them.

But that is what I wanted to ask, and that is what I wanted to say. And I will perhaps have to vote present, if we haven't had a chance to go on these things; and I may make a floor statement about the way we proceed on these areas.

On this tank thing, a year and a half ago we recommended exactly what the gentleman is right now saying we should do—standardization and commonality of that tank, a year and a half ago that was my recommendation. How much money has the American public wasted now? And if I had had a little more attention and a little more sup-

port by certain quarters on this committee, on this issue, everybody wouldn't be sitting around applauding the wisdom of the Army going this way now when we could have gone that way a year and a half ago with all the attendant and salutory effects in NATO and in our own operations. But we didn't have time maybe to really think about it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Just on matters of fact, the first time I called on you it ran between 12 and 13 minutes, according to my record here. And the next time——

Senator CULVER. Are we operating under a 10-minute rule, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. And the next time you used over 12 minutes. And then you have had this talk.

I think, Senator Culver, most of the members come here to ask questions and hear other Senator's ask questions. And we try to limit it reasonably so that everyone will have their day. I don't want to get in a contest with you about this. We have to move to the business of the committee.

You talk about wanting to speak about it on the floor, the floor is wide open as far as I am concerned.

Senator CULVER. I appreciate that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You can do anything you want to.

Gentlemen, are there any other questions now concerning the nominee in relation to his record and to the nomination for which he is presented to us?

[No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. We want to thank you, General Rogers; it may be a close vote but I believe you will pass. Everyone expresses their confidence in you.

And I want to thank Mrs. Rogers for being with us.

General ROGERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We will pass on this as soon as we can.

Gentlemen, we have other nominees here. All those who wish to leave may do so, of course, but we will proceed. I will call the names, and I am going to ask all of them to come up to the table.

Gentlemen, Senator Thurmond has an appointment he must make. So I ask him to preside, and we will start this off.

Senator THURMOND [presiding]. I have a few questions for Mr. Wacker, Mr. Woods, Dr. Smith, and Mrs. Ashcraft. I have heard nothing but good about all of you. I would be glad to support your nominations. I just have a few questions for the record. And will ask the staff to put these questions to you. I have to go. I will be back, but you may be gone. But I wish you well anyway.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

I am glad it's agreeable with you that for the time being we will take Mr. Wacker, Dr. Smith, Mr. Woods, and Mrs. Aschraft all in a group, so to speak. They are nominated to be assistant secretaries in various areas. And anyone can ask any or all of them any questions they wish.

We will now go to the nominees for civilian positions in the Department of Defense and first call on Mr. Fred P. Wacker.

Mr. Wacker has been nominated for Assistant Secretary of Defense as the Comptroller. He has had a long association with the com-

mittee, having been in the Department of Defense Comptroller's Office since 1962 and achieving ever-increasing responsibilities until he is now Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Program and Budget. Mr. Wacker is a native Washingtonian, a graduate in economics from American University with a masters degree from George Washington University. Mr. Wacker further distinguished himself by selecting as his wife a lady from Mississippi.

Mr. Wacker, do you have a statement? If so, you may proceed in your own way.

Mr. WACKER. Just briefly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I would be glad to hear from you.

STATEMENT OF FRED P. WACKER, NOMINEE TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE/COMPTROLLER

[The nomination reference and report and biographical sketch follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 29, 1976.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Fred P. Wacker, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice Terence E. McClary, resigning.

Reported by Mr. Stennis, August 5, 1976, with the recommendation that the nomination be *confirmed,* subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF FRED P. WACKER

Mr. Fred P. Wacker, a native of Washington, D.C., was born on December 3, 1926. His parents, Fred W. Wacker and Marguerite A. (Dommel) Wacker were natives of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Wacker attended the District Public Schools, graduating from Western High School in 1944. After graduation, he served with the U.S. Army as an infantryman. Subsequent to his discharge in February 1946, Mr. Wacker attended American University and was graduated magna cum laude with a Bachelor of Arts Degree in economics in 1950. He also holds a Master of Arts Degree in Financial Management from the George Washington University.

After a brief periods of service with the General Accounting Office and the Department of Commerce, Mr. Wacker joined the Department of the Navy as a management intern in 1951. He has served continuously with the Defense Department since that time and is now in his 25th year of Federal Service.

From 1951 to 1956, Mr. Wacker worked as an accountant and a budget analyst for the Navy's Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. His efforts were associated primarily with the Military Assistance Program. In 1956, Mr. Wacker transferred to the Office of the Navy Comptroller where he served as a budget analyst until 1962. During this period, he worked in both the operations and the military construction areas.

In 1962, Mr. Wacker joined the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) where he was assigned to the Procurement Directorate in the budget office. As a budget analyst, he reviewed aircraft, electronic, tracked combat vehicles, and support programs of the military departments. In 1966, he was appointed Director for Procurement. In this capacity he developed the Standard Weapons System Cost criteria which provides a uniform basis for the presentation of costs required to acquire weapons systems. It is used internally within DoD in all phases of the Planning, Programming and Budgeting System and for all presentations to the Defense System Acquisition Review Council (DSARC). Also, it is used for all external reporting, including among other things the Selected Acquisition Reports and the Congressional Data Sheets.

Mr. Wacker was appointed to the position of Deputy Comptroller for Program/Budget in September 1971 and he was named Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Program/Budget) effective June 19, 1973.

Mr. Wacker is married to the former Louise Ginn of New Albany, Mississippi, and Washington, D.C. They have three daughters—Robin 22, Susan 19, and Lisa 16—and reside at 1733 Dalewood Place, McLean, Virginia.

Mr. WACKER. As a career civil servant for some 28 years it is a personal satisfaction for me to be nominated for the top financial position in the Department. I have worked closely with this committee and its competent staff, ably led by Mr. Braswell, for many years. With the advent of the new Budget Act, I have worked even closer. And, if confirmed, I look forward to that continued association in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a very important office, Comptroller. And I know some national organization, a few years ago, selected a comptroller as man of the year, with national recognition of the importance of the office that the gentleman was in.

I have heard Mr. Braswell speak of you. And we are delighted you are going to be in this position.

Next, we will hear Dr. Smith who has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs.

Senator Taft is here and will now make some remarks in behalf of Dr. Smith.

Dr. Smith is a native of Toledo, Ohio, where he now practices anesthesiology. He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the University of Nebraska College of Medicine. During the second World War, Dr. Smith was an Air Force pilot.

Dr. Smith, I call on you now if you have a statement you wish to make to the Committee.

STATEMENT OF DR. ROBERT N. SMITH, NOMINEE TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR HEALTH AFFAIRS

[The nomination reference and report and biographical sketch follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 29, 1976.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Robert Nelson Smith, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice James R. Cowan, resigned.

Reported by Mr. Stennis, August 5, 1976, with the recommendation that the nomination be *confirmed,* subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

BIOGRAPHY OF ROBERT NELSON SMITH

Date of birth: April 2, 1920.
Place of Birth: Toledo Ohio.
Practice: Anesthesiology.
Office: 3939 Monroe Street, Toledo, Ohio 43606.
Home: 3424 Gallatin Road, Toledo, Ohio 43606.
Education: Toledo Public Schools, University of Michigan, United States Military Academy—B.S. 1943, Massachusetts Institute of Technology—M.S. 1945, and University of Nebraska College of Medicine—M.D. 1952.

Internship and residency: Internship—Toledo Hospital, 1952–53, and Residency—Toledo Hospital, 1954–59.

Board certification: Certified by the American Board of Anesthesiology, 1962.

Professional Affiliations: Fellow of the American College of Anesthetists, Member of the American Society of Anesthesiologists; Member of the International Anesthesia Research Society; Member of the Ohio Society of Anesthesiologists; Member, Toledo Anesthesia Society; Member, American Medical Association; Member, Ohio State Medical Association; and Member, Academy of Medicine of Toledo and Lucas County.

Military: Active duty, US Air Force, pilot, 1943–48.

Hospital appointments: Toledo Hospital, Mercy Hospital, Riverside Hospital.

Medical organization activities: Treasurer, Academy of Medicine of Toledo; Medical Director, Toledo area polio vaccine campaign; Chairman, Toledo area Disaster Medical Care program; Served on numerous other local committees; Councilor, Fourth District of OSMA, 1963–68; OSMA Committee on Auditing and Appropriations; OSMA Committee on Legislation; OSMA Committee on Redistricting; OSMA Advisory Committee to the Ohio State Society of Medical Assistants; Member of Executive Committee and Board of Directors, Ohio Medical Indemnity, Inc., Blue Shield Plan for Ohio; President-Elect OSMA, 1968–69; President, Ohio State Medical Association, 1969–70; Alternate Delegate to the American Medical Association, 1965–70; and Delegate to the American Medical Association, 1970-current.

Community organization activities: Member, Board of Directors, Hearing and Speech Center; Advisor from Toledo Academy to Red Cross; Parent-Teacher Organization; and Member, Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, Masonic Lodge, Scottish Rite order, etc.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you wish to say something now? And I understand you are a graduate of one of the academies.

Dr. SMITH. Yes, sir, West Point.

The CHAIRMAN. We will cover that.

Dr. SMITH. I don't have a formal statement, Mr. Chairman, but I would like to take just a minute to summarize my feelings.

I am honored and pleased to have been nominated by President Ford to be Assistant Secretary of Defense, and to be supported by Senator Taft. With my military and medical background, including experience in the Armed Forces, the private practice of medicine for 22 years, in medical financing and insurance, and in health planning, I hope to make a contribution to the health aspects of our national security. If confirmed I will look forward to working closely with the Department and with your committee, Mr. Chairman, in finding ways of further improving the health care available to our military personnel and their dependents. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

I want to recognize Senator Taft at this point. The doctor is from your fine State, and I would like to hear from you, Senator.

Senator TAFT. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, it is a real pleasure and a privilege to be able to introduce to you today Dr. Robert N. Smith, who has had a most distinguished career. He received his B.S. from the United States Military Academy, an M.S. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and his M.D. from the University of Nebraska College of Medicine.

Dr. Smith is currently a member of the staff of three hospitals in Toledo, and is one of the most distinguished members of the Ohio medical community. Among his many distinctions, he is the treasurer of the Academy of Medicine of Toledo; the medical director of the Toledo area polio vaccine campaign; and the chairman of the Toledo

area disaster medical care program. Dr. Smith served as the president of the Ohio State Medical Association in 1969–70, and is currently a delegate to the American Medical Association.

I know Dr. Smith will be a major asset to the Department of Defense. He brings to his work a distinguished record of medical and public service, outstanding professional expertise, and a deep dedication. It is an honor to the State of Ohio that we are able to make such a great contribution as Dr. Smith to the medical needs of our Defense Establishment. I urge that the committee vote to confirm his appointment.

I have only known Mr. Smith briefly, but I have long known of his fine reputation in his own community, and of his character. And his background, I think, will enable him to do an outstanding job in a very challenging assignment. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Gentlemen, we have the four nominees here, and we have called on Mr. Wacker to make a brief statement of his attitude toward his work, and also Dr. Smith.

Mr. Alan Woods of Missouri is our next nominee, to fill the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

I recognize Senator Symington at this time.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Mr. Woods to the committee. His record is before you. He has a very distinguished public record already, even though he is a relatively young man. And I can't imagine a better candidate even though, looking at the records, I doubt if he is a member of my own party. I think the most important thing is, would he be a good public servant or would he not. And I just want you to know that I have checked him out with people I respect in my State, including Governor Bond, the major assistants, and I have checked with him with the newspaper publisher who I respect from his part of the State, who's a friend of mine. And I find nothing but good about him. So, without reservation, I recommend that the committee confirm him for this important new job.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Mr. Woods is currently the Special Assistant to the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretaries having been appointed to that position by Secretary Rumsfeld in January of this year. Prior to that assignment Mr. Woods was Principal Deputy to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs. He has served in the White House both as Assistant Press Secretary and as Deputy Director of the Personnel Office.

Mr. Woods the committee would be pleased to hear any statement you may wish to make at this time.

STATEMENT OF M. ALAN WOODS, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR PUBLIC AFFAIRS

[The nomination reference and report and biographical sketch follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 29, 1976.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

M. Alan Woods, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice William I. Greener, resigning.

Reported by Mr. Stennis, August 5, 1976, with the recommendation that the nomination be *confirmed,* subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

BIOGRAPHY OF M. ALAN WOODS

Birth Date: October 13, 1945.

Family Status: Married to the former Millicent Wasell of Winston Salem, N.C.

Current Position: The Special Assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretaries of Defense, since January 2, 1976.

Experience: 1965–67, Press Assistant to Congressman Robert F. Ellsworth; 1967–69, Administrative Assistant and Press Aide, Republican Presidential Campaign Committee; 1969–70; Assistant Press Secretary to the President; 1970, Campaign Director, Christopher S. Bond for Auditor of the State of Missouri; 1970–72; Vice President, investment research firm of Bradley, Woods & Company, New York, N.Y.; 1973–74, Chief of Staff to Governor Christopher S. Bond of Missouri; 1974–75, Deputy Director, Presidential Personnel Office, The White House; and 1975–76, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs).

Education: B.A., Political Science, American University, Washington, D.C.

Mr. WOODS. I don't have a formal statement, Mr. Chairman. I am grateful to the President for nominating me to this position, and I am pleased to appear before the committee. I will be glad to answer any questions.

The CHAIRMAN. We will come to all of them as a group.

It is now my pleasure to call on Mrs. Juanita Ashcraft. Mrs. Ashcraft has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

Mrs. Ashcraft has been a member of the California State Personnel Board, which is equivalent to a State civil service commission, since 1967, having served as its chairman for 2 years from 1971 to 1973. She is also a member of the California Governor's Commission on Executive Salaries having been appointed to that position in 1970. Mrs. Ashcraft has also been active in private business management in the field of real estate and insurance.

Mrs. Ashcraft, we will be pleased to hear from you now, if you have a statement you wish to make.

STATEMENT OF JUANITA ASHCRAFT, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS

[The nomination reference and report and biographical sketch follows:]

NOMINATION REFERENCE AND REPORT

IN EXECUTIVE SESSION,
SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
July 19, 1976.

Ordered, That the following nomination be referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

Juanita Ashcraft, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, vice David P. Taylor.

Reported by Mr. Stennis, August 5, 1976, with the recommendation that the nomination be *confirmed,* subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

BIOGRAPHY OF JUANITA ASHCRAFT

Mrs. Nita Ashcraft was nominated to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) on 19 July 1976. Prior to her current position, she served as appointee by Governor Ronald Reagan to a 10-year term as a member of the California State Personnel Board (equivalent to Civil Service Commission). This is the policy and salary setting body of the 120,000 employees of California. The Board itself has a staff of over 500. Mrs. Ashcraft was Chairman of the Board, a two-year rotating position, in 1971–1973. She was appointed by the Board to the Governor's Commission on Executive Salaries in 1969 and served until her appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Air Force. During 1967, she was Assistant Appointments Secretary for Governor Ronald Reagan of California. Her professional background also includes ten years each in insurance and real estate.

Mrs. Ashcraft was born in Amarillo, Texas on June 25, 1921. She was affiliated with Geldermann Realtors of Danville, California, serving as sales manager from 1955–1960. Mrs. Ashcraft next was a partner in the firm of Wentner and Associates, an insurance brokerage company in Walnut Creek, California and remained there until 1970.

Mrs. Ashcraft is married to Mr. Hale Ashcraft, a former California State legislator. She has one daughter.

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. Mr. Chairman, I think in the interest of time I will forego any formal statement and just answer any question you may have.

The CHAIRMAN. I have this question for all of you. I would like to know—and it is not a personal question at all, the very opposite—I know you have to have a strong motivation to be willing to carry your responsibilities, and this is not all play, but just why are you willing to take this position or to fill this role, just what prompts you?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. Mr. Chairman, I think I would have to answer that by saying that perhaps I feel an additional responsibility, having been chosen as the first woman and to serve as an Assistant Secretary. And I certainly don't want to put undue emphasis on that, but I am sure that it induces me a great deal. And also because of my great devotion to the two-party system and my belief in our Government. And I think one cannot turn down a request from the President.

The CHAIRMAN. And I ask this of the others specifically, you don't have in mind now just coming in and hanging up your hat awhile and going out and using that as a background or foundation for some lucrative position or something?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. No, sir, I have no future plans, sir. My home is in California, and at such time as the President no longer wishes me to serve, I will return.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Symington has to go.

Senator SYMINGTON. I have another hearing, is my problem. I am leaving you my proxy, Mr. Chairman.

I am interested in all of these good people. And I am sure the Air Force with which I used to be connected is lucky to have this lady.

I hope that this commitee will confirm all of these people.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Woods, what is your purpose in serving in this capacity, the prime motivation?

Mr. WOODS. Senator, I believe that politics and work in Government is about the highest calling that an individual can have in life. As you can see from my background, that is where I have spent most of my life. It is where my interests are, in the public service area, and I feel obligated to serve in any way I can in public life.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, that is a fine spirit. I am glad I have given you a chance to say so, both of you, and put it on the record.

Doctor, you have spoken somewhat along that line, but let's come back to you a moment. What is your purpose?

Dr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is a high privilege to serve my Government and my President. I was fortunate in being able to go to the military academy. I chose not to go on with a military career, and went into medicine. Now I find myself with an opportunity to put these two careers together. and I look forward to doing that in service to my country—partially to repay for my education.

The CHAIRMAN. I have had some contact with the problems that come to this office that you are nominated for in the course of my years here. And the Services have talked to me about some of the problems. It is highly important—we need someone that does under-understand their problems, the medical problems, the problems of being a doctor. And it makes me feel good, from what I know about you, that you are going to be here with us.

Dr. SMITH. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know a great many officers in the military departments, but I do happen to know some in the different services, including the surgeon general. And I think you will find a high type people there.

That brings us to you, Mr. Wacker. You have touched on this some already. How many years did you say you had in Government?

Mr. WACKER. About 28 years, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I am glad you are willing to stay. And you have already said in effect that you want to serve and carry out this mission and not use it as a stepping stone for some lucrative position.

Mr. WACKER. No, sir, it is the pinnacle of my profession.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Thurmond.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Chairman, I think they are all well qualified. And I will be glad to support each for the position for which he has been nominated. And I have a few questions, but they can be answered for the record to save time.

The CHAIRMAN. All right, I will you put your questions in the record.

Take note of that, please, whoever it applies to, that they will be in the record and you will please furnish the answers for us.

(See p. 31, for questions submitted by Senator Thurmond.)

Senator Nunn.

Senator NUNN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know we have a final problem, all of us do. And I wouldn't take but just a moment.

I have looked at the background of all of the nominees, and I find no objection to the qualifications of any of them.

I would like to ask our distinguished lady, Mrs. Ashcraft, one or two questions. I had it pointed out to me that the first Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower was a woman back in 1950, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg. And so you are the first female in that position after her. But this very important question of manpower is now, as it was in the 1950's, one of our most important areas. And I will be working with you a good deal as Chairman of the Manpower Subcommittee of this committee.

I notice you have a great deal of experience with the California Civil Service Commission. How many people does that Commission have jurisdiction over?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. About 120,000 State employees.

Senator NUNN. One of the big problems we have in the military services now—and the Air Force is the most expensive in terms of manpower because of the high school level requirement, and I don't think that is going to change—but one of the biggest problems we have is how much money do we have left over after we pay the manpower for procurement, research and development? Do you have any ideas now about what can be done in terms of manpower costs?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. I think perhaps in looking at the total budget of the Air Force, I am certainly very aware of a large percentage in personnel costs. And I think this is something that we have to take into consideration and look to in the future. I will have to consider this, though you understand that I have not had a chance to get into this seriously yet. But I think it will probably be one of my No. 1 priorities.

Senator NUNN. The thing I would like very much for you to keep in mind is that in the budget process we have now, the overall sum for the Department of Defense, the question of how much we have for procurement research and development is directly related to whether or not manpower assumes more and more of the expense. To the degree that you can make efficiencies in manpower in an equitable way, to that same degree in my opinion, we strengthen our national security. I think that money will go into procurement and will go to research and development and I think those are the areas where we are falling behind in our efforts.

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. I am certainly aware of that, Senator, and I am also aware of your interest on the subcommittee in this area, and certainly look forward to working with you on it.

Senator NUNN. I look forward to working with you and each of the nominees.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Bartlett.

Senator BARTLETT. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Byrd.

Senator BYRD. Senator Nunn covered the area in which I was interested. I have no further questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Taft has just stepped out.

I am satisfied from the questions I have asked. Here is a question for all of you. The Senate democratic caucus has adopted a policy with respect to every nomination which requires that every nominee be asked this question: "Do we have your commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate?"

Dr. SMITH. Yes, sir.

Mr. WACKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WOODS. Yes, sir.

Mrs ASHCRAFT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. All of you answered yes. Let the record show that.

We will hear now from Mr. Braswell, our Chief of Staff, a statement regarding the alleged conflict of interest questions that come up with reference to nominees.

Mr. BRASWELL. Mr. Chairman, for the record, all four nominees have submitted a letter from themselves to the chairman of the committee with respect to the so-called conflict of interest rule. Two of the nominees indicated that they had no stocks in defense-related industries. Two of them did, but identified those stocks and stated they would be sold upon confirmation. And so therefore there has been compliance with the committee rule.

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Senator NUNN. May I ask Mr. Braswell one other question.

Does that mean that during their tenure of office they should not purchase any other defense-related stocks, is that part of our rule?

Mr. BRASWELL. The rule has never gone that far, Senator Nunn. But it is implicit in the internal defense management, that rule does apply, internally in defense.

Senator NUNN. Is that the top hundred companies, or how do they decide that?

Mr. BRASWELL. No, it is every company whose annual business with the Department of Defense exceeds $25,000. And the reason it doesn't go below that, there is no way you can computerize that small amount. So it includes every corporation in America whose annual business in the last reporting period exceeded $25,000 annually. And we do exclude the public utilities whose rates are publicly established.

Senator NUNN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. That certainly is a part of the understanding for every nominee. Look over what you might have now, we might ask you to sell something, and promise that you won't go back and buy anything on this list.

If there is nothing else, we thank you for coming in.

Senator Thurmond and Senator Goldwater have submitted questions to be answered for the hearing record.

(The questions with answers supplied follow:)

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR THURMOND

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Wacker, based on your experience as Deputy to Mr. McClary, I would think you are well qualified for this position. Do you envision any significant changes as Comptroller?

Mr. WACKER. I do not anticipate any significant changes as Comptroller. I have served in this organization for more than 14 years and have participated directly in the implementation of a significant number of improvements. At the present time, I believe that the organization is serving the Department effectively. We will continue, of course, to seek opportunities to minimize our staffing requirements while continuing to provide essential financial management assistance to the Secretary of Defense.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Wacker, I certainly would encourage you to take a conservative outlook in your role as custodian of the Defense Department funds. Do you have any views on that point? Also, I would urge that you take a very open attitude in dealing with Congress and providing information as necessary.

Mr. WACKER. As a career public servant in this field, my principal concern for many years has been to help assure appropriate stewardship of the public resources that are allocated to our national defense programs. In my judgment, one of the strengths of the Department of Defense is its ability to take a critical look at its budgetary requirements. The product, of course, should be a defensible budget presented openly and candidly to the Congress.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Wacker, what authority do you have in regard to government contracts?

Mr. WACKER. The responsibilities of the Defense Comptroller with respect to government contracts fall essentially into two areas—prescribing accounting policies and procedures and providing contract audit assistance to procurement officers.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Wacker, what weaknesses do you see in the present financial structure of the Pentagon?

Mr. WACKER. In general, I feel that the financial structure of the Pentagon is in a very healthy condition. I do feel that more work needs to be done with respect to program execution in order to close the loop and provide an effective feedback with respect to our objectives as expressed in the DoD Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Woods, do you see your role as a conduit between the military and the press, or more an advocate of the military viewpoint?

Mr. WOODS. I feel my primary responsibility is to provide the American people with as much information as possible about the Department of Defense consistent with national security. It is equally important, I believe, for this information to be conveyed in a manner that is readily understandable and not confusing due to imprecise language or military jargon. I see my role as being one of explaining Department of Defense policies but not of advocating a military viewpoint.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Woods, can you envision any circumstance where it would be necessary to mislead the press on the grounds of national security? Sylvester under McNamara.

Mr. WOODS. No. I cannot envision a circumstance where it would be proper to intentionally mislead the news media on the grounds of national security.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Woods, what do you see as your chief goal in this public affairs position?

Mr. WOODS. It is essential that the United States remain militarily strong and that our national defense requirements be seen in proper perspective by the American people. While U.S. military capabilities are "sufficient" today, it is essential that the American people understand and appreciate that trends of the past ten to fifteen years have adversely affected the existing balance, and that steps must be taken to arrest and reverse those trends.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Woods, will you continue to keep a civilian as Director of Office of Information for the armed forces?

Mr. WOODS. I have no plans to convert the position of Director of the Office of Information from a civilian to a military position.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Smith, this position requires not only a medical background, but some experience with personnel. What do you see as your chief personnel problems in assuring adequate medical care for the military?

Dr. SMITH. I believe there are a number of problems today in the management of military health personnel. Of paramount concern is ensuring the availability of trained health manpower to support combat, mobilization and contingency plans for the military forces.

We should seek the very best people to meet military requirements. They should be a good mixture of career and noncareer, of youth and experience. We must allow for career progression, recognize achievement, and remain flexible enough to meet peacetime and wartime demands. I believe motivation is an important

aspect and we should seek the men and women who are dedicated to the service of their country.

Recruiting and retention of quality health professionals is a major concern. In my experience, these are both satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of a career in the military. The positive side should be stressed and then efforts should be continued to relieve the dissatisfiers. Some of the strategies that might be used to obtain the professionals needed include subsidizing medical education and training, residency training programs, supplemental pays, career planning and job progression. I believe professionals should be allowed to develop in their discipline. Physicians, for example should not be required to assume administrative duties in order to attain general or flag rank. The important thing is to have the most cost effective mixture to achieve the best possible force.

An important aspect of health personnel management is the ability to establish valid manpower needs and forecast them into the future. Accurately projecting future needs is essential because of the long lead time in obtaining a fully productive health professional. Another difficulty is the increasing specialization of medicine and the resultant complexity of a cross utilization of health professionals.

I consider that high quality health care delivery is an aid to recruitment and retention of all military personnel. As such the provision of such benefits must be considered a cost.

I believe health personnel management systems should have objectives, practices, policies, and procedures that reflect integrity and are rational. They should be comprehensive with a systematic approach to recruiting, education, retention and utilization of health professionals. I believe problems are often missed opportunities and sound health personnel management policies and actions can overcome most of the problems.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Smith, what are your views on the Military Health Services University?

Dr. SMITH. I support the newly developing School of Medicine of the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences. The Department of Defense, in my view, has a pressing need for career-minded physicians who are oriented toward the problems of military medicine. I would not anticipate that there would be a need for, or that other medical schools would be developed within the Department of Defense, however I believe the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences will fulfill that need and I will try to assist them in their efforts toward that end.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Smith, What are your views on physicians assistants shouldering some of the load now on doctors?

Dr. SMITH. During the last two decades the Physician's Assistant—PA—has experienced a growth pattern that parallels the technological advances and increases in specialization of medicine.

The PA programs of the military services originated for essentially the same reason as those in the civilian community, to alleviate the shortage of primary care physicians by extending their services with specially trained assistants. As the end of the military draft approached and the predicted military physicians shortage became reality, the services became interested in civilian attempts to solve their physician shortage by utilizing experienced military corpsmen who had been given additional formal education. It was logical that the military decided to make use of their own personnel resources and attack the physician shortage by starting their own PA education programs.

In some quarters the PA concept has been characterized as the most exciting health manpower innovation in several decades. Unlike other health personnel who assist the physician the PA concept calls for an individual, trained by physicians, to work at the physician-patient interface and to assume duties that traditionally have been reserved for physicians; in effect, he is an extention of the physician. However, they must work directly under the control of a physician and cannot be used independently.

I understand the military departments are currently using PA's to replace physicians now performing tasks that do not require a physician. This replacement can be continued up to a threshold that allows for a minimum corps of physicians and physician supervisors to perform tasks that must be accomplished by a physician. I feel this employment of PA's is appropriate in that it mirrors the criticality of the military problems in replacing general medical officers.

In comparing the investment in a military trained PA with the investment in a general medical officer procured through the Armed Forces Health Professions

Scholarship Program I'm told the return on the government's investment in terms of man-years is significantly higher for the PA. I believe we should closely monitor the national supply of physicians and continue to train and utilize PA's only as long as they are needed.

I believe the PA is a valuable addition to the health care delivery team and will continue to increase military effectiveness.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Smith, do you feel the associate medical professions such as optometrists and podiatrists should receive incentive pay?

Dr. SMITH. The Department of Defense requires highly qualified personnel from many health professions. The military compensation system should be designed to assure that enough health professionals with the necessary qualifications will find military service attractive. Because of competition from the private sector, there is a need for special pays for several health professions. This need is manifested by difficulty in attracting and retaining enough qualified professionals. Whenever such difficulties arise or are expected to arise, special pays should be considered.

Senator THURMOND. Mrs. Ashcraft, what are your views on the All-Volunteer Force?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. The Air Force transition to the All-Volunteer Force has been successful. We have achieved 100 percent of our Active Force recruiting objectives without sacrificing quality. Enlistment of high school graduates remains high with reductions in training attrition and disciplinary rates. I am optimistic that the Air Force will continue to meet Total Force personnel goals in a draft-free environment.

Senator THURMOND. Mrs. Ashcraft, do you see a significant role for our Reserve forces in our overall military structure?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. Yes, I do. As the primary augmentation source for active duty forces in periods of crisis, the Air Reserve is a most vital part of the total U.S. Air Force. One example of this Total Force in action comes from the Yom Kippur War in 1973 when one or more Reserve crew members participated in about 25 percent of worldwide strategic airlift missions. The Air Force has integrated active and Reserve forces by preassigning Air Reserve forces in peacetime to the organizations with which they will serve during wartime. The legislative action of Congress in approving the bill which allows the President to order to active duty a limited number of selected Reservists without declaring war or a national emergency is a strong indicator of the role that the Reserve forces play in our overall military structure.

Senator THURMOND. Recent comments in the press raise serious questions as to the viability of the Reserve and Guard. Do you have any views on that subject.

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. The Air Reserve Forces have an outstanding record of operational readiness. Except for those flying units undergoing conversion to a new weapons system or mission area, all Air Reserve Force units are tasked and capable of deployment within 72 hours after mobilization. The ongoing Air Force modernization program, with even the newest production aircraft such as the A–10 being assigned to Reserve units, will assure the continuing viability of the total force policy.

Senator THURMOND. How do you feel minority representation should be assured in our military forces?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. To achieve and maintain minority representation, the Air Force employs a combination of measures. We make maximum utilization of existing procurement programs, with particular emphasis of seeking highly qualified personnel. For the minority members on board, we make available educational and other career-enhancing opportunities designed to remove barriers to upward mobility and to insure their retention and continued representation throughout the grade spectrum. We also undertake measures through our affirmative actions plan to insure that the circumstances under which minorities are identified for separation are consistent with current policy and are no less stringent that those for majority personnel.

Senator THURMOND. Mr. Wacker, would you give us your views on the question of placing the retirement cost portion of the Defense budget under another agency or under another budget category? As you know this is an important question that is currently being discussed.

Mr. WACKER. I have long held the view that the military retired pay portion of the Defense budget would be more appropriately presented under another function, such as Income Security or Veterans Administration. The DoD budget is the only one within the Executive Branch which includes within it the costs of retired pay. This leads to an inaccurate impression of the true costs that are being

allocated to current national defense needs. The Department has attempted to adjust for this by excluding retired pay costs from presentations of baseline force programs. However, the confusion which continues to exist could probably best be corrected by transferring the retired costs to another function.

Senator THURMOND. Dr. Smith, as you may know the cost providing health care in the Department of Defense has increased significantly in the last ten years. Do you have any ideas now that you could share with us on how these costs might be gotten under control while continuing to provide the necessary health care for our servicemen? I am thinking here of alternatives, for example, of providing health care for dependents and things of this kind.

Dr. SMITH. Appropriate effectiveness is one of the top priorities in the Department of Defense Health Care System. From my present understanding, I believe the military health care systtm provides effective and efficient care to the beneficiaries while maintaining a unique capability to respond to national security emergencies. However, improvements in effectiveness and efficiency should be possible.

Although I am not now familiar with the details of efforts to contain and control the cost of health care in the Department of Defense, I anticipate this will be one of my high priority areas of concern.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR GOLDWATER

Senator GOLDWATER. Mrs. Ashcraft, I have always had a strong interest in the role of the Air Reserve and the Air National Guard. In this regard how do you view their roles in support of the active Air Force?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. Senator Goldwater, as I stated in response to Senator Thurmond, our Air Reserve Forces are the primary augmentation source for the active Air Force and are, consequently, a most vital part of our total defense posture. In addition to their proven capability for crisis response, they support the active force on a day-to-day basis in mission areas such as aerial spray, weather reconnaissance, SAC SIOP alert, aerial refueling, air defense alert and Army paradrop training. I fully expect this type of support and cooperation to continually improve as we modernize our Reserve units with more capable aircraft.

Senator GOLDWATER. Mrs. Ashcraft, do you have an opinion on the feasibility of merging the Air Reserve and the Air Guard?

Mrs. ASHCRAFT. Yes I do. Many studies have been made on this subject; the most recent being made as a result of your amendment to the military appropriations bill. Generally, these studies concluded that no appreciable advantage Their economically or in readiness, would result from a merger in either direction. the Air Force has the most combat ready and responsive Reserve force of all the mlitiary services. A great deal of credit lies in their management structure. Our efforts should be places on the modernization of these forces.

Senator GOLDWATER. What is your opinion of the announcement concerning the change in the Army's plan to procure the XM1 tank?

General ROGERS. While I was not involved in the recent XM1 decision in any way, I am aware of the arguments made in support of the principle of that decision. In addition to the support of the principle of standardization, I personally believe that the proposed course, that is the transfusion of components between the two models of the XM1, holds the possiblity of providing us with a better tank for our soldiers. The provision of a better tank as soon as possible has always been my goal within Forces Command and will remain my goal as Chief of Staff.

Senator GOLDWATER. Are you confident that the Army can attain the 16-division goal within currently authorized manpower levels?

General ROGERS. Yes. The Army is currently on schedule in developing the 16-division force. Its development is being achieved in a studied and deliberate manner. We have reduced our general upport forces and our combat support forces in order to provide the combat spaces for all but one brigade of each of the 3 new divisions. The third brigade for each will be an affiliated National Guard brigade. However, I must add the caveat that my confidence in the Army's achieving and maintaining the 16-division force is contingent upon the Congress continuing to provide adequate resources. The matter remains resource sensitive, requiring adequate funding to recruit the necessary quantity of quality soldiers to maintain our end strength, the funding necessary to procure the additional equipment required, and the funding needed to train the force properly. Given these resources, and the assurance that there will be no reduction in end strength, I am am confident in the Army's ability to provide the nation a fully ready 16-division force.

Senator GOLDWATER. What do you see as your most difficult challenge in your tenure as CSA?

General ROGERS. My greatest challenge will be to achieve and maintain the level of readiness required of the Total Army. My predecessors have made great progress in providing the nation a professional, combat-ready active force and I intend to build upon the foundation they have laid. We will need adequate numbers of quality personnel who are well trained and fully qualified for the job they are called upon to perform. Any degradation in quality has an adverse impact and tends to make the Army a less cost effective, a less professional, and a less ready force. We also will need adequate resources to procure the level of equipment required. As you know, the war in Southeast Asia and the Mideast War resulted in a significant drawdown in our equipment inventories. These stocks need to be replenished as expeditiously as possible. We also need to continue our efforts toward equipment modernization, the essentiality of our Big Five. Last, we need the resources to maintain this equipment and to train our units. In all of these areas we need the continuing support of the Congress. Sufficient quality soldiers, modern equipment in the required numbers, and the integration of these resources in challenging, realistic, mission-essential training, will give us the ready Total Army we seek.

The CHAIRMAN. We will go into executive session now, gentlemen.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the committee went into executive session.]

○