when the CPFF contract was canceled out and lump-sum contracts were solicited. Since that time, all the construction conducted by the Army for the mainland of Alaska has been on a lump-sum basis. The prices being quoted during the past construction season have been materially lower than those heretofore received and all things being equal, a great part of this reduction in costs can be attributed to the new type of contract. As an example, similar houses built south of the range, which under the CPFF contract cost in the vicinity of $26,625 per unit plus Government-supplied materials, are now being constructed for approximately $11,795, plus Government-supplied materials.

"...There was no evidence of any improper activity or collusion on the part of the contractors involved in these contracts and, in fact, they appear to have done as good a job as could be expected under the circumstances. However, over $100,000,000 was paid under a contract which was originally estimated at $30,000,000, and the subcommittee feels that it is extremely fortunate that it has been terminated."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


"We were surprised somewhat at the difference in the cost of these various projects as presented by the Army and the Air Force. Both of these services...use the services of the Army engineers. The cost of construction as presented by the Navy show that there is somewhere in the neighborhood of almost 10 percent difference in their proposed costs of comparable items. We concluded that if the Navy could construct the various items and buildings for 10 percent less, certainly with all the years of experience that the United States engineers have had, and their much vaunted skill and efficiency, they, too, could very well look their cost figures over. So we...trimmed their estimates in the neighborhood of $200,000,000 in construction funds."

Savings: $200,000,000.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, Congressional Record, October 10, 1951, p. 131146.
ORDNANCE CORPS

Ordnance Service and Supplies.

"LOOK REPORTS FROM WASHINGTON, JULY 3, 1951.

"Last summer Ordnance needed some grills for Army tractors. Several companies, including Austin Metal Products, were notified and bid on the job. Austin's bid was accepted and it got the contract. The price was $59.78 per grill.

"The blueprint for the job had a little note on it that said the grills had to be William F. Klemp Co. -- type B-1 grill or equivalent. This meant, as you might guess, that the grill had to be just like the ones made by the Klemp Co., a concern in Chicago that made grills good enough to be accepted as the Army's standard."

... ...

"It did not occur to the Ordnance office in Detroit, where the contract was let, that if it wanted some Klemp-type grills maybe it should get in touch with the Klemp Co. and find out whether it would like to sell some, and for how much. Klemp never got a chance to bid on the contract.

"But Emerson C. Whitney, the president of the Klemp Co., found out about it because the Austin Co., after getting the contract, turned around and sublet the whole thing to him. The Klemp Co. agreed to make the grills for the Austin Co. for $19.60 apiece.

"The procedure did not seem to make sense to Whitney, who could not get it through his head why the Government should be paying $59.78 for a $19.60 grill. It did not seem to make sense to the Senate Small Business Committee, either, after Whitney described the deal in his testimony before the committee. Whitney said there had been some difficulty and that he had tried to back out of his contract but Army Ordnance threatened to cut off his steel supply."

... ...

"Things went along like this for about 9 months but nobody in Ordnance seemed worried because the grills weren't coming along. Nobody talked about canceling Austin's contract or asked why the company had taken a job that it had to turn over to somebody else.

"Finally Whitney got a certified check guaranteeing payment and a few weeks ago he began delivering. So now the
Army is finally getting the grills at $59.78 apiece that it could have had last fall for $19.60 if it had mentioned the matter to the Klemp Co. in the first place."

Savings: $40.18 per Army tractor grill.


"I mentioned the Ordnance Department. At the Detroit district office they are buying two-thirds of all this Army hardware. As I said, they had a commanding general there at the arsenal who seemed to have a conflict of loyalty between the Government on whose payroll he was and his own private interests.

"In Detroit Ordnance bought some grills for tractors. Some official bought grills one month for about $24 each. The very next month at this ordnance district procurement office in Detroit the Government bought some more grills, 40 of them, and paid $59.78 each for the identical grill which had been bought the month before for $24. It was only a waste of about $1,000; but my point has been, and the hearings will reveal it, that we fool around with chicken feed probably too much, whereas about $30,000,000,000 in this bill will go for procurement. If we had better procurement practices, if we could save 1 percent on $30,000,000,000, just 1 percent on these aircrafts and tanks and ships, we could save $300,000,000...I do not accuse our procurement officers of duplicity and fraud. Generally speaking, they are honorable, upright Americans, but somehow they have not been able to grasp this big program and carry it forward with the speed and economy that is required..."

Savings: $300,000,000.

Source: Mr. Mahon, Representative from Texas, Congressional Record, August 8, 1951, p. 9755.

"...It is quite obvious that when you draft new specifications for trucks you set in motion the demand for new types of tools. It has been testified...that there has been a substantial lag in the deliveries because of the failure to secure the tools necessary and the facilities necessary to produce these items."
"...it is indicated that the cost of tooling for each of these items is respectively, $19 million, $5 million, and $22 million. There is $46 million in tooling which might be avoided or seriously cut down if these trucks were more nearly like the trucks used in commercial activities."

Savings: Up to $46,000,000.

Source: Mr. O'Mahoney, Senator from Wyoming, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense Appropriations for 1952, p. 999.

* * *

"I have in front of me at the moment personnel tables for 'Ordnance service and supplies, Army.' Between the year 1950 and the year 1951 that set-up shows an increase in positions of 110,000 and an increase in man-years of 79,000.

"Then, when I come over to the fiscal year 1952, that shows an increase of 7,000 in positions and 21,000 in man-years. That is a little bit too much for me to swallow."

Savings: Up to 7,000 positions.

Source: Mr. Taber, Representative from New York, in Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense Appropriations for 1952, Part 1, p. 150.

* * *

"...the authorization bill for the Armed Forces passed on Friday last requested the sum of $8,313,533 for Rossford Ordnance, for expansion, so I believe that the operations of the Rossford Ordnance Depot should be completely investigated before millions more are wasted while no efficient use is made of what is already there."

"...those connected with Rossford Ordnance, instead of performing its own service, farmed out repairing, installation of windshields, painting, and other items on the outside, even though this vast investment in warehouses, plant machinery, and parts existed in Rossford Ordnance Depot."
Savings: Millions of dollars.

Source: Mr. Weichel, Representative from Ohio, Congressional Record, August 16, 1951, p. A5436.

* * * * *

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Maintenance and Operation.

"A number of speakers have tried to justify this expenditure of $95,000 on the basis that the Military Academy should be honored at its sesquicentennial...."

"...we had a centennial celebration for the Military Academy, which is true, but in 1901 and 1902 we were not at war. The Federal budget at that time...was in balance and we certainly did not have a debt of $257,000,000,000.

"Let us take the figures and be specific as to why this particular amendment should be approved...the sesquicentennial exhibition and static display will cost $30,000. Just where can they spend $30,000 on a static display at West Point?..."

"They want a conference on the history of West Point at Hudson Highlands, N.Y. And I can see where they might want to have a conference on the history of West Point, but why do they have to bring in $2,000 for Hudson Highlands?

"They have an item of $6,000 for a conference on education; then they want $5,000 for a conference on military education; they want $4,000 for a visit of the Boy Scouts...."

"I repeat again in conclusion, I certainly believe that this amendment, which cuts it from $95,000 down to $5,000, if approved, will permit the Academy officials to do certain things which will be worthwhile and desirable. I am sure this $95,000 is just another example of the Pentagon coming in here asking for about 10 times what they actually need and what they can spend judiciously."

Savings: $90,000.

Source: Mr. Ford, Representative from Michigan, Congressional Record, October 18, 1951, p. 13744.
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

PERSONAL SERVICES

"Senator O'Mahoney, Is there anything to the statement one frequently hears that the personnel in a particular bureau is expanded because supervisory employees are graded and paid upon the basis of the numbers of individuals who are under them?

"Admiral Schoeffel, Of course, there is some truth in that statement, but it is a situation that is constantly being combated and constantly being watched for."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. O'Mahoney, Senator from Wyoming, and Admiral Schoeffel in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense Appropriations for 1952, p. 351.

* * *

"At El Toro, the maintenance and photographic departments were overstaffed for the remarkable reason that there were simply too many qualified men available. These two departments had 128 excess people. The motor pool also had excessive personnel—37 over the number authorized—ostensibly due to the assignment of men for on-the-job training. However, interviews with the so-called trainees revealed that they were getting no training and loafed all day. The trainees blamed this situation upon the civilian mechanics who they said were reluctant to pass on their knowledge for fear of becoming unessential. Poor management and careless supervision is responsible for the existence of such a situation."
"At Quantico, civilians had been hired to replace several military specialists. These military technicians remained at Quantico in jobs which did not require their technical skill."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * * * *

MILITARY PERSONNEL

"The committee has been disturbed about the use of travel funds throughout the services and feel that all necessary travel can be performed at a considerable savings to the appropriation account. Accordingly, it is recommended that the travel fund requested in this estimate be reduced by $3,608,000, leaving a balance in this item of $70,000,000. In the light of investigation it is felt that a further reduction in the amount of $3,282,000 can be made in the item for Supplies and Materials, leaving the amount recommended in that item $253,000,000. This reflects an over-all reduction in the appropriation of $6,890,000, leaving for the appropriation $2,456,475,000."

Savings: $6,890,000.


* * *

"...though the cost of the bill [Reimbursement of naval personnel for certain expenses incurred] has been cut by the Armed Services Committee from $89,905 to $42,780, this is an illustration, though a small one, of action by executive agencies who believe that they can presume to disobey the laws of Congress. We have here a perfectly clear law passed by Congress, not an administrative rule at all, that whether abroad or at home, there shall be no cash allowance for services of domestic help. Yet the Navy went ahead and gave an order that the officers should disregard the act of Congress."
AIRCRAFT AND FACILITIES

"...One of the complaints that have come to this committee—as long as you are asking for an appropriation on that base [Patuxent Naval Air Base]—is about wasting money down there. Perhaps it is because it is near Washington, but you certainly get these complaints fully as much on that base as any other.

"One of them, for instance, is the large amount of oil that you use—and gas, and so forth that you use there—that you have got deep-water facilities, but instead of unloading your oil and gas there you bring it 90 miles up the bay farther, and then you unload it and then you truck it back 90 miles down to Patuxent Air Base."

"Then, we hear things like, for instance, the maintenance of a green house there, employment of several men, the use of fuel, and so forth just to raise flowers for the commanding officer and the executive officer."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Bridges, Senator from New Hampshire, in Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military and Naval Construction, pp. 127-128.
in the Navy and his partner. Curren is the name. He and a man named Ladd have secured control of that through the village of Bunker Hill for $1 a year. Curren is getting something like $11,000 a year from the Bunker Hill corporation which is operating this airport. Ladd is getting something like $4,000 a year, and there that airport is, in use, paying a profit to the Bunker Hill Corp., controlled by Ladd and Curren. Now, why, I do not know. It is that kind of a situation that makes us dubious about expenditures of the amount carried in this bill—$4,800,000.

"On that airport are three custom-built aircraft, especially constructed to train at one time 12 pilots—sold as junk."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Hoffman, Representative from Michigan, Congressional Record, August 10, 1951, p. 10050.

* * *

"Hazardous-duty compensation payments—amounting to 30-40 percent of base pay—are being made to personnel assigned to submarine staff forces...men charged with supervision and command functions, who are rarely exposed to the perils of undersea operations have been drawing the extra compensation. It was not the intention of Congress to award hazardous-duty pay to noncrew personnel when they are not exposed to hazards...."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * * * *

MARINE CORPS TROOPS AND FACILITIES

"...when you get into railroad construction, into an examination of the estimates before your committee, you must remember that those estimates were made several years ago, and you are going to find that when they finally start construction, before the work is completed, you are going to spend not $3 million, but several
more million dollars, and when you come to buying railroad equipment for the transportation of these men at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina...it is going to run into a lot more money."

"I certainly hope that something will be worked out to eliminate this further drain on the Federal Treasury. We talk about economy, then we talk about increasing taxes and all other obligations on the taxpayers of the United States. If we can save this amount of money and provide the service that ought to be provided and which should have been provided long before this, we can at least eliminate the expenditure of this vast amount of money."

Savings: $3,000,000.

Source: Mr. Johnson, Vice President and National Legislative Representative of the Order of Railway Conductors, in the Hearings before the Subcommittee for the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 1333.

"...just listening to this conversation, I would like to ask this question. Why couldn't Congress order the Navy to give up that base at Ottumwa to you? It seems to me we have got to take some calculated risks, to use that expression.

"If war comes and the Navy needs a base out there, perhaps they could go into Sioux City, perhaps they could build a new base, but we hope and pray that we are building up this force so there will not be war, and if there will not be war, there is a field...at Ottumwa that the Navy only wants if there is war, and you gentlemen need a new base out there.

"It seems to me, I will not say 'obvious,' but it seems to me there is reasonable justification for saying that somebody, Congress or the President of the Secretary of Defense, should order the Navy to give you that base."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Saltonstall, Senator from Massachusetts, in Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military and Naval Construction, p. 193.
CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

"...another item which looks somewhat dubious ... the proposed purchase of 95 new airplanes for the Navy, to be used purely for administrative purposes, and to cost $2,225,000 apiece, for a total cost of approximately $215,000,000. Those are to be luxury planes, similar to commercial planes. Their cost compares with the cost of $3,500,000 for a huge B-36.

"I think there is a very real question whether we need as many additional new planes as those for the transportation of naval personnel, because, for one thing, if there is one kind of travel orders of which there is an excess it is the kind entitling the bearer to air transportation... If we provide additional planes at $2,225,000 apiece, we provide the capacity for increased travel by air, and then perhaps we shall find not only an additional number of generals, but also colonels, lieutenant-colonels, majors, captains, lieutenants—yes, also sergeants and corporals and privates, who will be riding around the country in airplanes."

Savings: $215,000,000.

Source: Mr. Douglas, Senator from Illinois, Congressional Record, September 10, 1951, p. 11325.

* * * * *

CONSTRUCTION OF SHIPS

"Blundering... in stopping construction of a super aircraft carrier in 1949 has cost the taxpayers around $94 million and 3 years time in providing the nation adequate naval defense.

"The Navy has just awarded a contract for a new super-carrier, similar to the one scrapped... It is to cost in the neighborhood of $218 millions. The carrier scrapped, after its keel had been laid was to have cost $124 million."

Waste: $94,000,000.


* * *
"DECISION TO SCRAP FIRST SUPERCARRIER: WHAT IT COST
U. S. IN TIME AND MONEY.

"Cancellation cost in money: 65 million dollars
2.7 millions in settlement pay to shipbuilding
company; 17 millions' worth of plans and materials;
45 millions in higher costs resulting from infla-
tion between 1949 and 1951.""
Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense Appropriations, Part 3, Department of the Navy, pp. 596-597.

* * * * *

CIVIL ENGINEERING

"...Quite frankly, one of the questions I was going to ask, and I would have been justified in asking, was for a pretty detailed bit of information as to why they [Civil Engineering, Navy] would have to have $269,500 for officer and civilian travel. Now that comes in in a figure of $200,000. That is a cut of $69,500. That is around 20 percent. Something is wrong somewhere. They either overestimated in the first place or are low now. That was a considerable jump. It was a jump from $156,000 in 1951 to $269,500, which to me looked like a very disproportionate additional increase in the request. If $200,000 is realistic then, of course, $269,500 is unrealistic and should not have been presented."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense Appropriations, Part 3, Department of the Navy, p. 1015.

* * * * *

PUBLIC WORKS

"It is a room in the Standard Bachelor Officers' Quarters of the Navy is large enough for two, to permit the ideal situation; what is the reason why it cannot be used by three during this emergency when dollars are so short? ... the Federal spending will be somewhere between $6 and $7 billion, and possibly $10 billion more than the income, which means that all of this construction is going to be done on borrowed money, which means the sale of bonds which automatically adds 25 percent to the total cost, because when the bonds
are sold each $75 worth of bonds to raise cash for these buildings will cost the taxpayers $100 to pay them off. We have reached the point where there are a lot of things that we would like to have but we cannot afford them; we have got to do with less until the pressure is off when there is more money available to spend."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 1057.

* * *

"You have $80,000 here for 25-man brig, That sounds like a hotel."

* * *

"I do not see why you need this, I have been out to Kwajalein and it would be a long swim from one island to another; they are not going to get very far. I do not see why, if they are recalcitrant, if they have breached some disciplinary provision, I do not see why you have got to set them up in any such fancy noosegow as this would be. The weather is not cold there and they do not need so much protection from the elements."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 1126.

* * *

SERVICE-WIDE SUPPLY AND FINANCE

"The committee recommends a reduction of $12,500,000 of which $2,500,000 is to be applied against the request for employment of 700 man-years of civilian employees and the remaining $10,000,000 against other activities under this appropriation. The committee feels that by more efficient management in the use of civilian
employees and programming of the many activities under this appro-
priation no harm will be done to the over-all program by effecting
the economies suggested."

Savings: $12,500,000.

Source: Report of Committee on Appropriations, House of Repre-
sentatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense

"Mr. Mahon. The statement in the press was that:

"The House Appropriations Committee has just discovered
that the Navy has 11,000,000 dozen oyster forks on hand."

"You say the statement which I have given you in quotes
is not correct?"

"Admiral Fox. That is wholly in error, sir. The total
inventory position of the Navy is 10,493 dozen oyster forks, of
which 10,422 dozen are steel-base silver, which have proven to be
unsatisfactory for normal use. There are on hand 271 dozen of
good forks, and these represent an inventory position of approximately
one-third of the required stocks."

"Mr. Mahon. Frankly, I am not interested as a Member of
Congress or as an American citizen in providing oyster forks as a
mobilization reserve. I do not think anybody else is."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Mahon, Representative from Texas, in Hearings
before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of
Defense Appropriations, Part 3, Department of
the Navy, pp. 644, 645.
SERVICE-WIDE OPERATIONS

"The committee recommends a reduction of $1,950,000 in this request for appropriation in the belief that by better management of the civilian employment at least 600 man-years of employment can be dispensed with and the program handled efficiently."

Savings: $1,950,000.


* * * * *

MISCELLANEOUS

Maintenance, Bureau of Ships.

"Representative Charles B. Brownson, who is in the paint business himself, demanded to know today why the Navy, in 1944 and 1945, bought paint in such volume as could cover 10,666 battleships of the Missouri class.

"And what was worse, according to Mr. Brownson, the Navy ultimately disposed of tons of it as surplus to a German corporation.

"On top of that, he now declares a German firm has offered to sell the material back to the American paint company that made it—at less than half price."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Charles B. Brownson, Representative from Indiana, as reported in the New York Times, July 2, 1951, p. 48.

* * * * *

NAVY STOCK FUND

"The committee recommends a reduction in this appropriation request of $25,000,000 with the thought that a smaller purchase of civilian type items will result in certain savings and in economy of operation."
Savings: $25,000,000.


* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

"The subcommittee's first report recounted that information had been received indicating that, in some instances, new or usable items of value to the armed services had been sold as surplus at Robbins Air Force Base in Georgia."

"Among properties previously authorized for disposal as excess but withheld from sale after August 1 were 34 airplane engines for F-47 fighter planes. The Air Force states that these engines were surplus to its needs. Some of these engines had never been installed in a plane. The F-47 is used by the National Guard for training. It appears that the main reason for planning to sell these $25,000 plane engines at scrap prices was the scarcity of warehouse space. These plane engines may well be needed in our expanding Air Force training program. The cost of 34 engines, $850,000 would build a mighty big warehouse. The sort of thinking by the military which justifies proposed sales on that kind of a basis needs drastic revision."

"In a public release on November 9, 1950 the Preparedness Subcommittee disclosed an incident in which the Air Force had purchased for $63,000 certain aircraft computers which the government had sold as surplus in 1946 for $6,89. The lot of 168 serviceable unused computers--electric fire-control instruments for airplanes--were purchased by an east Texan who bid about 5 cents each for the instruments. He professed that he was under the impression from the
bid-sheet description that these instruments were small, pocket-size cardboard computers, similar to slide rules, for use in rapid mathematical calculations. The Air Force repurchase of these instruments was consummated some 18 months after the original sale by the Government agencies at San Antonio, Tex.

"This transaction was, insofar as the subcommittee can ascertain, entirely lawful. In all our investigations, the subcommittee has not encountered a more astounding case of shortsightedness than was displayed in this instance. The taxpayers have suffered, and corrective action at this late date is not feasible. We only hope that the Air Force—and all other agencies of the Government—will proceed in their surplus property transactions with greater prudence and common sense, so that this kind of incident will not be repeated."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Second Report of the Preparedness Subcommittee of the
Committee on Armed Services, Senate, 81st Cong., 2d Sess.,
Second Report on Surplus Property, Rubber, November 26,
1950, pp. 6, 7, 8.

* * * * *

AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

"In this appropriation the committee was presented with a request for 6,500 additional man-years of civilian employment over the requirement for fiscal year 1951. The employment during that year was on an ascending scale with 11,040 persons being employed on June 30, 1951, the end of the fiscal year. It is estimated that employment at the end of fiscal year 1952 will be 12,520. The committee recommends a reduction of 300 man-years of civilian employment and a dollar reduction in this item of $1,200,000. This is done in an effort to obtain a more economical utilization of manpower. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel testified that there is a terrific wastage of manpower in the defense effort and that efforts were being made to do something about it. The committee is lending what aid it can."

Savings: $1,200,000.

Source: Report of Committee on Appropriations, House of Representa
MAJOR PROCUREMENT OTHER THAN AIRCRAFT

"There is no merit in creating an additional supply system for the Air Force since it is receiving satisfactory supply support with respect to common-use items from the Department of the Army. The establishment of such a supply system would be a step toward triplication, and not toward the goals sought from unification. The duplication of facilities and staff, and the resulting lack of uniformity would place a needless burden on the budget of the United States.

"Recommendation."

"No third and independent supply system for common-use items can be justified. The introduction of a new competitive element is unwarranted and is contrary to the spirit of the National Security Act, as amended.

"All expenditures of funds and employment of personnel directed toward planning, developing, or implementing such an independent supply system for the Department of the Air Force should be terminated immediately and a report to that effect will be requested from the Secretary of Defense."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAL PROPERTY

"...this amendment simply strikes out the $19,019,000 appropriation for a brand-new military installation at Grandview, Mo., not Grandview, Kansas City, but Grandview, Mo. I still cannot understand why the committee saw fit to insert this Grandview airport under such an address as Kansas City because Grandview, Mo., is an incorporated place, 16 air-miles south of Kansas City."
"I have just talked to the Civil Aeronautics Administration about this. The Grandview, Jackson County, airport at Grandview, Mo., in the home of Harry S. Truman, today has six little metal hangars, 30 by 42 feet each. I am told by the Civil Aeronautics Administration that these hangars will hold three or four planes each. The longest runway is only 5,504 feet. It is designated as a class 4 airport, but barely gets under the wire at that. It has one wooden office building, 60 feet by 28 feet. It has one concrete-block shop, 160 feet by 120 feet. That is practically the extent of the physical equipment of the Grandview Airport today. In other words, it will be necessary to expend all of the $19,019,000 if it is made into a military installation. I call your attention again to the fact that Knobnoster Air Base, Mo., 50 air-miles from Grandview, is going to get twenty-two and one-half million dollars under the terms of this bill. There is no reason why another huge base should be built at Kansas City, or in the region of Kansas City. Neither the Grandview Airport nor the other municipal airport in Kansas City has yet been designated as an international airport. It seems to me that this $19,000,000 expenditure in Grandview is probably for the purpose, under the guise of defense work, of establishing an international airport in Kansas City. In other words, if this provision remains in the bill, we will have what amounts to a glorified WPA project at Grandview, Mo. We will have elevated Grandview Airport from a horse and buggy to a Packard limousine, 1951 vintage...."

Savings: $19,019,000.

Source: Mr. Gross, Representative from Iowa, Congressional Record, August 10, 1951, p. 10049.

* * *

"...business people are looking for business, and if they know the Air Force will not have a laundry and dry-cleaning plant, enterprising people who want to get business will provide the facilities. Now, there might be some argument as to whether or not those facilities would be adequate, whether or not the prices would be right, and so forth, but it seems to me, when you are so near an enterprising city like Amarillo, it probably could be met without Government expenditure."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Mahon, Representative from Texas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 150.
...Of course, the Members of Congress are laymen and they are not engineers and they lack a great deal of being experts in aviation, but there is a very strong feeling on the Hill here that the services generally—and it is not confined to the Air Force—do not take into consideration the investments that we have made in World War II.

"If you decide you want a new base you just go ahead and build a new base, and you could utilize to a much greater degree these millions and millions of dollars worth of facilities that are scattered all over the country that were constructed in World War II.

"There can be some minor disadvantages, but there would be a great advantage if we could save 15 to 20 million dollars on even one location.

"When you go to putting in all these water facilities and steam heating plants and sewer systems in these new bases, you are going to find it costs you now about twice what it did during World War II and you have got them on the ground all over this country that were put in there and could be utilized."

Savings: $15,000,000 — $20,000,000 on one location.

Source: Mr. Russell, Senator from Georgia, in Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, Senate, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military and Naval Construction, pp. 192-193.

* * *

Comparison Of Military Construction Costs With Private Construction Costs

"Even though they [Bachelor Officers Quarters] are going to be occupied by two men, $5,500 is a lot of money. The people who have to pay for this, who are struggling to buy a small home and pay their taxes, which are necessary to carry this load, would be pretty hard put to understand why we should spend $5,500 for this space, even though it is to be occupied by two men rather than one who would normally occupy it.

"I cannot conceive of that cost. That is around $12 per square foot, and I just cannot understand it, particularly in what has been referred to as an austere program,
"The building in private homes will include many of the things that are in this, and will include the plumbing, as this includes plumbing, and in many places will run somewhere from $8 to $9.75 a square foot. You can get a pretty good job of building and a good quality of merchandise for that."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in the Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 113.

* * *

"...You [the Army Air Force] would be better off to have some of your civilian churches build your chapels for you... I can take you to any number of congregations in this country, and they will do you a much better job. They will have more seating capacity than 300 in a very fine workable church for a far less figure than $111,000... I have been on too many church building committees to swallow any figure that you have here for 300 seats in a chapel as austere as we are told the chapels are going to be. I furnished the engineers 2 weeks ago a picture of a new church being constructed that had far more seating capacity and other facilities than one of these at much less cost than indicated here. I am in favor of plenty of good churches on our bases but the costs are just completely out of line with what costs are running in the construction of churches, even with the high cost of labor and materials..."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * *

"I have heard ever since the inception of the Air Force how high its morale was and what few disciplinary problems, comparatively speaking, they ran into, and in order even to lessen that Congress was sold on a multimillion program of new uniforms which would increase the morale still higher, so that there
would be even less disciplinary problems. Yet when you come into a base like this [Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado] I suppose you have had a guardhouse there all the time—I have been on the outside of guardhouses looking in, and I think some of them probably have been far more than was required. I would hope this guardhouse was not going to be used very much and, if it is not going to be used very much, I think possibly we might make it a little more austere. You do not have to give them very many comforts when they are in the guardhouse, and a quarter of a million dollars for a jail which this amounts to, does not sound like much austerity to me."

**Savings:** Amount unspecified.

**Source:** Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, pp. 182-183.

"...It just occurs to me, as I think it has occurred to some others—possibly not as to this particular base [Harlingen Air Force Base, Texas], but some others—that about all that is happening is that Uncle Sam is going to build a base which eventually will turn out to be a very fine gift to some community, and it will all be done at the expense of the Federal taxpayers. That, of course, is not a very pleasant picture."

"After the other war, the attitude was, well, it will cost us so much to clear the land, and so on, so we will just dispose of these buildings at a very nominal figure, and then somebody has a completed airport with a lot of structures on it, at a pretty low figure, all at the expense of the American taxpayer...."

**Savings:** Amount unspecified.

**Source:** Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, pp. 252-253.
"Here again, we come in, as we did at Lincoln and so many other places with requests for the acquisition of further land. I am getting to the point where it is beyond my comprehension, and certainly it is going to be tremendously difficult to sell it to the American public. They are going to have to dig pretty darn deep for the taxes for this thing, and when you try to justify to them the fact that you are going to go into these places and buy a lot more land it is going to be difficult to sell that to them, especially when you have a base here that already contains 1,600 acres."

"In other words, for the lack of vision on the part of the Air Force and the engineers that is costing us considerable money."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * *

"A lot of that rotting of foundations, etc., necessitating reconstruction was due to very poor construction practice at MacDill Air Force Base, Florida. We saw some of it. We saw where some steps leading into the various buildings had been set there practically on the ground, so close that it was no trouble at all for your termites to build runways into the buildings and into the underpinning."

"...and in addition, instead of insisting on a better grade of lumber you used sappy lumber, and, of course, that became subject to dry rot. Here, again, the taxpayer is called upon to spend a great deal of money due to negligence in construction. Because termite activity in that part of the country is nothing new, and if the new construction which is to be undertaken in that part of the country is done under the same sloppy standards that existed in World War II we are wasting a lot more money..."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

If there is tremendous opposition to this installation at Portsmouth.

...It is already a congested area; you already have in there the Portsmouth Navy Yard and Marine Base. According to my information, the shipyard is being hard pressed to get enough workers to meet the expansion program there; that there is already existing an acute housing shortage, there being far less houses than necessary to take care of the civilian employees and naval personnel presently at the shipyard and, of course, it would be even more inadequate for their increased manpower requirements; that there is a shortage of adequate utilities in that particular area; that Portsmouth already lacks adequate utilities, particularly water and sewerage, to take care of the added impact on that community. According to the information the Air Force has furnished in response to some questions propounded upon this new base and some other new bases, while this is not what is sometimes called a critical area, there will be a shortage of skilled labor that will have to be overcome, which means the importation of skilled labor, which means a great deal of added expense. The information further is that there are literally no housing facilities there. In response to that question as it relates to utilities, the Air Force information states the city does own a million gallon capacity well, but the Air Force will have to replace it; that the Air Force's opinion was the existing sewerage facilities would be capable of accommodating the Air Force, but they do not seem to think so.

...I feel quite sure that somewhere within a reasonable area there can be space obtained to meet the requirements for the construction of a base. I do not feel this committee at this time ought to authorize this expenditure. This is only a starter; this is going to cost considerably more than what you have here.

Savings: Amount unspecified.

"...From the information that has been given to me... a report was made showing that much of this space [storage space of Air Force] is being used for the storage of a lot of items that do not need covered space. If some of these things were moved out of this very costly warehousing space into some other area you could increase your usable warehousing space by a great many million cubic feet."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 476.

* * *

"With all of the other hospitals you have around here—and this applies to some other installations, too—I cannot for the life of me understand why you have to spend nearly $4 million for a hospital at Andrews Air Force Base. You have Veterans Administration hospitals; you have Walter Reed; you have the Navy hospital and all of these other installations around here, why can't they be used for your sick and maimed?"

... . . .

"If you were getting reasonable prices in hospital construction, I would not think so much about it, but when you spend $16,500 per bed it is out of reason. I can show you where private building, some of it church building, is constructing hospitals almost of this size for considerably less, with more in them, because this is just a shell and you still have to buy a tremendous amount of equipment."

Savings: Almost $4,000,000.


* * *
"You have several items in here calling for civilian messes. You had some requests for the construction of a civilian mess, and at the same time you had requests for airmen's clubs and officers' messes. It seems reasonable to believe that you could let these civilians who work on a base procure their meals at these officers' clubs or airmen's clubs and everybody would gain by it. The clubs could make a little profit on it and the civilian could get a good meal and you would not have to be putting out your money for additional construction and operation."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * *

"...I know they went up into my territory and would not allow the biggest and best laundries in the territories to bid, but they got some fellow from the outside who had had no experience in the laundry business and was not in the business, and they gave him a contract for most of it and allowed him to farm it out.

"That way of doing business results in costs that would allow you to compete and perhaps amortize in two and a half years or less the cost of the laundry."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Taber, Representative from New York, in Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Military Public Works Appropriations for 1952, p. 150.

* * *

"...ask our friends in the Defense Department to merely do the State of Idaho the courtesy of going out to Lewiston with an inspection team to ascertain whether or not millions of dollars cannot be saved to the people of America by this gratuitous grant, this offer to take over the Northern Idaho College of Education. There will be no strings attached to it,..."
"...if you can save a dollar in the erection of these public schools for the Defense Establishment, we can use that dollar some place else, and the American taxpayers are demanding that we be sincere and try to save.

"It seems to me the least that can be done, that the Air Force, which I admire and am very close to, could do, is send an inspection team out there to look and to see as to whether or not this facility could not be utilized."

Savings: Millions of dollars.


*M* * * * * *

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION

"A reduction of $30,000,000 is recommended in funds for civilian personnel employment. Testimony was presented indicating that as of June 30, 1951 there were 231,156 civilian personnel employed under this appropriation, and that as of June 30, 1952 the number would be 295,364, an increase of 64,208. The committee feels that the Services have been extravagant in the utilization of civilian personnel and are recommending a reduction of 10,000 man-years of employment under this appropriation."

Savings: $30,000,000.


* * * *

"...The committee felt...there was too much gallivanting about over the face of the earth, speaking figuratively, by some of the Air Force flying personnel, on missions which were not strictly necessary, but not necessarily illegal, which were very costly. We have cautioned a reduction in unnecessary flying,
It costs...about $1,000 an hour to fly a B-36 and about $50 an hour to fly the DC-3 type plane. There are variations of cost, dependent upon the type of aircraft, of course. But when an aircraft is in the air it costs the taxpayers a lot of money and there are millions of dollars being spent in the operation of these aircraft...there should be better utilization of our aircraft. This idea of flying to Florida in the winter, flying to the Midwest in the fishing season, and flying north when the skiing is in progress—'I am sort of exaggerating—'

"But to accommodate one's schedule in such a way that he makes pleasure jaunts in flying aircraft, which is costly, should be abandoned. I think the Air Force, by coordination and study, will be able to maintain adequate flying and save a lot of money. Of course, there should be no curbs on essential operation or training flying."

Savings: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Mahon, Representative from Texas, Congressional Record, August 8, 1951, p. 9768.
"Five 75-man dormitories for airmen have recently been completed at Carswell Air Force Base. These dormitories represent a most unusual departure from the traditions of military housing. Construction cost, exclusive of furnishings, totaled $467,233.38 or approximately $1,250 per man housed. The unique aspect of these dormitories is that the space is divided into two-man rooms with hardwood floors and built-in closets. Full-tiled latrines are provided for each section of 10 rooms."

"...This is certainly not the time to launch experiments in new barracks construction. The services should not, during this period of stringent economy, when first priority must be given to providing fighting equipment for our men, encourage expenditures on nonessential luxuries."

Savings: Amount unspecified.


* * *

"...While on the subject of paint, I passed one of the air bases, Shaw, I believe, down South where, much to my surprise, I found that the buildings which had been covered with asbestos siding not the shingles but thick slabs—were all being repainted and by hand at that. My recollection is that the heavy asbestos siding was put on to eliminate the necessity for painting and was supposed to have a permanent color. And I know very well when you go into a process like that of painting that heavy siding by hand, you are going into a very expensive operation—not just for the paint but for the labor itself—and I was amazed to see that procedure going on. I would like to have somebody tell me why.

"Of course, I will admit that fresh paint is a little more attractive than the siding that was on the building, but glamor can prove pretty expensive once in awhile."

Waste: Amount unspecified.

Source: Mr. Scrivner, Representative from Kansas, in Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 82d Cong., 1st Sess., Department of Defense, Appropriations for 1952, Part 4, Department of the Air Force, p. 361.

* * * * *