MEMORANDUM

There will be a hearing at Room 324 of the Senate Office Building at 10:00 o'clock, Tuesday morning, June 29, with respect to aircraft. The Army will bring several witnesses who have already been furnished with a series of questions on behalf of the Committee. Unlike the Navy, the Army did not comply with the Committee's request that it furnish answers to such questions in advance, the reason assigned being that the questions, in some cases, related to matters which were secret and which the Army would be willing to tell to the Committee but not desirous of putting down in writing and sending in a memorandum.

The Army has been requested to have an officer available who would be able to tell the Committee the location and numbers - in the least general terms - of the various planes which are actually at fighting fronts. The purpose of this is to ascertain, generally, the proportion of planes which are at fronts as compared with the proportion of planes which have been manufactured, or otherwise referred to publicly as being available. It is the understanding of the Committee that many of such planes are at modification centers and other places and are not actually being used, and in many cases, are not capable of use. In the spring of this year, there were approximately 12,000 army combat planes in this country in emparison to about 6,000 on all fronts, 40% to 60% of which were serviceable.

The Committee also asked that an Army officer be available, not necessarily Tuesday but, if not Tuesday, Wednesday, who could testify with respect to the number of planes which the Army has made available to private lines or will make available to private lines in the near future. The thought behind this is that approximately 100 planes were taken over from the private airlines, to their great detriment, and that there has been some suggestion that the Army is about ready to try to start a competing air service within the United States. The Committee has asked that the officer also be prepared to state the number of hours on the average and the number of miles which the Army

has operated the planes which it has taken over.

The Committee has asked the Army to be able to discuss cargo aircraft and the numbers of such craft that are to be built.

The Committee has further asked the Army to discuss the B-29 and B-33 planes and the difficulties which explain the fact that there have been very much greater delays in bringing them into production than had originally been anticipated. It is the Committee's understanding, from other sources, that the engine was an experimental engine which has not been built in large numbers because of great difficulties in overcoming various problems that have been encountered, particularly, ignition, and carburetion. The Chrysler Corporation built a large plant at Chicago which has six or eight thousand sen in it and which is ready to go but unable to operate because the engine has not yet been agreed upon, or because the design of the engine has not yet been finally determined. The B-29 had also incorporated into it remote wat control gumnery and supercharged cabin theories which have caused many complications. In short, there seems to be a considerable suspicion that the Army in an attempt to make a perfect plane has lost the definite certainty of being able to make a much better plane than the existing B-17 and B-24 planes. Improved planes of that character could have been made by switching to the R 2800 engine which is used in the Republic P-47 and in other planes, and with which it would have been possible to obtain a much longer range and carrying power in both the B-24 and the B-17. We may have lost an intermediate plane of great value by an attempt to reach perfection too soon.

The Committee has also indicated that it will want to know the situation with respect to the training of pilots and other members of the crew for the purpose of determining whether that or the production of planes is a limiting factor and whether that has resulted in an inability to use to a maximum all the planes that have already been produced.

ARMY AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

| TYPE AND MODEL | TOTAL NO. ON BL PROGRAM | PRODUCTION ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED TO BEGIN | PRODUCTION BEGUN | LATEST MAXIMUM PRODUCTION SCHEDULE | APRIL 1943 SCHENULE AS SET-UP IN SEPTEMBER 1942 | PREDUCTION IN APRIL | COMMITS |
|--|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|---|
| HEAVY BOMBER 4 REGINE LONG RANGE | 8 | | | | | | |
| Bosing B-29 Bell, Atlanta | 412 | Sentember 1943 | | 50 September 1944 | | | The B-29 is a greatly en- larged successor of the Fortress designed to have |
| Boeing, Renton | 440 | August 1943 | | 25 March 1944 | | | a range of 6000 or more |
| Boeing, Wichita | 949 | June 1942 | (describe | January 1944 | 20 | 0.000 | miles and a maximum bomb load at short distance of |
| Fisher Body, Cleveland | 281 | September 1943 | | December 1944 | | | over 10 tens. It has had development difficulties and is substantially behind schedule. |
| Consolidated B-32, Ft. Worth | 313 | April 1943 | conscion | 20 Jamary 1944 | | *************************************** | Consolidated design similar to B-29 in per- formance and beset with same troubles. The only one delivered crashed. |
| Northrop B-35 Martin, Baltimore | 200 | February 1944 | | 20 September 1944 | **** | | This is the big flying wing designed by Northrop Little is known of its supposed characteristics but Army is extremely hopeful. |
| Northrop, Hawthorns | 64 | June 1944 | - | December 1944 | •••• | an evanous | |
| HEAVY BOMBER 4 ENGINE | | | | | <u> </u> | | |
| Boeing B-17 (Fortress) Boeing, Seattle | 6,439 | In production since early 1941 | In production since early 1941 | | 190 | 190 | |

| TYPE AND NODEL | TOTAL NO. OF SI. PROGRAM | PRODUCTION ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED TO BEGIN | PRODUCTION BERUN | LATEST BAXISUM PRODUCTION SCHEDULE | APRIL 1943 SCHEDULE AS SET-UP IN SEPTEMBER 1942 | PRODUCTION IN APRIL | COMMENTS |
|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|---|
| Douglas, Long Beach | 2,134 | January 1942 | June 1942 | 100 Nay 1944 | 60 | 85 | - |
| Vega, Burbeak | 2,519 | February 1942 | June 1942 | 120 December 1943 | 61 | 52 | |
| Consolidated B-24 (Liberate (a) Consolidated, Ft. Worth | | July 1948 | December 1945 | 175 October 1943 | 106 | 40 | |
| (a) Douglas, Tulsa | 170* | July 1942 | January 1943 | 25* June 1943 | 65 | 3 | (a) These plants are Gov't owned assembly plants. They were to be furnished parts by Willow Run and were held up by slowness there. |
| | | | | | | | * Contract for Douglas Tulse was originally 1610 but was reduced on February 1943 to 170. |
| Consolidated, San Diego | 5,897 | In production since early 1941 | In production since early 1941 | 240 October 1943 | 156 | 168 | |
| Ford, Willow Run | 7,359 | May 1942 | September194 | 405 December 1943 | 73 | 95 | |
| North American, Dallas | 1,311 | February 1943 | Not by April | 75 Setober 1943 | 4 | | |

| PAGE 3 | TOTAL NO. ONE BL PROGRAM | PRODUCTION ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED TO BEGIN | PRODUCTION BEGUN | LATEST MAXIMUM PRODUCTION SCHEDULE | APRIL 1943 SCHEDULE AS SET-UP IN SEPTEMBER 1942 | PRODUCTION IN APRIL | COMENTS |
|---|--------------------------------|---|---------------------|---|--|------------------------|--|
| EDIUM BOMBER 2 ENGINE | | | | | | | |
| North American B-25 (Mitchell) Inglewood | 3,162 | | February 1941 | 124 Jamary 1943 | 120 | 115 | |
| Kansas City | 6,030 | June 1942 | *February 1942 | 270 November 1943 | 140 | 144 | *After the contract was originally set up, the program was accelerated to bring production at an earlier, as well as, an increased rate. |
| Martin B-26 (Marauder) | | | | 200 | | | |
| Baltimore | 4,456 | | February 1941 | November 1943 250 | 142 | 120 | This plane is a highly controversial plane whi |
| Omaha | 5,006 | August 1942 | August 1942 | October 1943 | 115 | 90 | has Acquired pretty |
| | | | | | | mql | has acquired pretty general reputation for being dangerous. It has performance both in speciand in load carrying captity and, according to most reports is an exceptional fine plane in the air. It has a high stalling apped, however, and consequently is fail difficult to handle in take-off and landing. It has a higher in accident rethan is the B-25 which the Army's other plane comparable size and performance. As a fighting airplane, most pilots with the property of the state of the size and performance. As a fighting airplane, most pilots with the state of the size and performance, as a fighting airplane, most pilots with the state of the size and performance. |

| PAGE 4 TYPE AND MODEL | TOTAL HO. ON BL PROGRAM | PRODUCTION ORIGINALLY SCHEDULED TO BEGIN | PRODUCTION BEGUN | HAXIMUM PRODUCTION | APRIL 1943 SCHEDULE AS SET-UP IN SEPTEMBER 1942 | PRODUCTION IN APRIL | CONSTRUCTION |
|--|-------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|--|
| LIGHT BOMBER 2 ENGINE *Douglas A-20 (Havoc) Santa Monica | 5,964 | In production prior to 1941 | In production prior to 1941 | 275 September 1943 | 173 | 145 | *This plane is one of the universally best lifted planes that has been built in this country. It has performed take number of jobs including night fighting, low level bosbing straiting, etc. |
| Douglas A-26 Tulsa | 1,300 | **Jenuary 1944 | | *** 142 December 1944 | | | **The A-26 was originally scheduled to be built in smaller quantities at Santa Monica. Froduction was to have been in May 1943 |
| | | | | | | | not the maximum production planned at the plant but the present schedule pro- jected far enough to show absolute maximum planning. |
| Nertin A-30 Baltimore | 1,686 | In production prior to 1941 | In production prior to 1941 | 60 September 1942 | 2 60 | 60 | This plane has been in production since early in the program. It was originally built for the British and French. |
| LAND BASED DIVE BOMBER 1 E Douglas A-24 Tulsa | 1,200 | February 1943 | March 1943 | 120 August 1943 | 70 | 8 | The A-24 is an Army version of the Navy's SED Dive Bomber which was in production at Santa Monics prior to 1941. |

In addition to the production as shown in the preceding pages, the following production of non-combat type is under

Army direction:

Production - April 1943

| Type | Number of Models | Number of S-L Progrem | in September 1942 All Nodels | Production in April All Models |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Heavy Transport - Four Engine | • | 1489 | 24 | 15 |
| Heavy Transport - Two Engine | 1 | 2104 | 65 | 26 |
| Medium Transport - Two Engine | 4 | 12526 | 285 | 195 |
| Light Transport - Two | 2 | 4629 | 58 | 250 |
| Light Transport - One Engine | 3 | 2083 | 15 | 37 |

In addition to the foregoing, there are 60,573 trainers of all types on the progrem; the majority of which are under Army contract and supervision.

EXPERIMENTAL CONTRACTS

The Army has the following experimental contracts outstanding:

| Heavy Bomber - 4 engine Northrup XB-35 Consolidated XB-36 | Medium Bomber - 2 engine North American XB-28 | Light Bomber - 2 engine Douglas XA-26 Boech XA-38 | Dive Bomber Browster IA-32 |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|
| Fighter - 2 engine Lockheed XP-49 Lockheed XP-58 McDonnell XP-67 Curtiss XP-71 | Fighter - 1 engine Curtiss XP-46 Curtiss XP-55 Curtiss XP-62 In addition Curtiss has been given a large contract for production of the P-60, which in reality is an experi- mental plan. | Fighter - 1 engine (cont.) Voultee XP-54 Northrop XP-56 Bell XP-59 Bell XP-77 Republic XP-69 Fisher Body XP-77 | |