

many things? Take such items as the crating, the boxing, the finishing, the things where the use of a weapon, or the use of a particular facility isn't affected by whether it has spit-and-polish finish at the end, or a crate that is built out of the finest lumber you can get?

I have had people at Bendix Aviation tell me it is absolutely wicked what the Government inspectors do when they come in there in connection with the boxing of finished merchandise. They throw away, they repack, absolutely for no real purpose.

Admiral RICKOVER. I can only answer in a general way, sir.

You must realize that when you buy a floorlamp for your home you are intending it for a specific use and no fancy packing is needed. The military in its specifications must frequently figure that the item will be used under adverse conditions, as in combat. It may have to be shipped thousands of miles, perhaps to a humid tropical climate where it can rust quickly. It may have to be dropped by parachute. So what to an ordinary person would seem to be extravagant packing may not actually be so for the intended use.

It would be difficult to segregate some items and say this item shall be used in Vietnam and this one in the United States. It is not practicable to do that. I can only talk from personal experience, as for example, specifications where radiation is involved.

I am responsible for operating a large number of nuclear reactors. We have never had any serious radiation incident in some 15 years of operation of naval reactors. Much of this is due to extreme care in specifications. Anyone can say these specifications are unnecessary when he isn't fully aware of the issues and consequences, and does not bear the responsibility. Since my ability to get ships and equipment is limited by the amount of money I get, I am therefore definitely interested in not adding specifications that are unnecessary, and I can assure you I am personally familiar with the technical details of what goes into my specifications and what the reason is.

You can get individual Members of Congress to point out this or that fault. You are bound to find errors in procurement in a \$70 billion defense appropriation. But why should you expect military people to do better in handling their jobs than civilians do in handling theirs? Do the civilians do a better job in running the civil affairs of the country than the military in running military matters? I doubt it.

Mr. WIDNALL. There is a plant of Bendix Aviation right next to my district. I was saying that the inspectors in connection with the delivery of material have thrown out and caused the company to recrate and rebox many, many things that were just as sturdy as they could be but didn't look good; they weren't beautifully polished or they weren't this, that, or the other thing, or there was a scratch on it.

Admiral RICKOVER. You are probably correct, sir. But you should remember that one of the major difficulties we have in the military today is the lack of adequate in-house capability. For the past several years the Defense Department has been in the process of turning nearly everything over to industry—design and everything else. I maintain this will not work. One of the reasons we may have undue specification requirements is because we do not have an adequate number of qualified people in the military branches to review the specifications.

You must not blame the military for everything. Nearly all specifications used by the military are prepared by the supplier. The number