

Mr. FASICK. It is this. It gets back again to the basic principle of visibility. The Army loses visibility from the point of view of an inventory manager in the United States, once it is shipped out of the Army Materiel Command's depot complexes. If it goes to a post, camp, or station in CONARC, the inventory managers lose control. If it goes to Vietnam or any unit in the U.S. Army, Pacific, they have lost control. They have lost visibility.

Mr. HORTON. On that question the chairman asked you to define ownership, and I don't think it was discussed fully, not to my satisfaction anyway, later in the report. Does that ownership mean that once it is turned over to a command, the higher command then loses it? Do they sign for it?

Mr. FASICK. In effect, this is what it amounts to. Once it is issued it is out of the Army Materiel Command system. It gets back again to the principle in the Army of command prerogative where the commander is responsible for logistics as well as his people, as well as his military operations. Whereas in the other two services, the inventory control people in the United States do retain visibility and have influence on the redistribution of stocks. This is the primary difference between the Army's system and those of the other two services.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This gets down to the point of having an accurate inventory for posts, camps, and stations, doesn't it?

Mr. FASICK. That would be a very important—

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You lose it at the post level, do you not? Is it the post or the command level?

Mr. FASICK. You really don't lose it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know you don't lose it physically, but you lose it from the standpoint of accountability in inventory.

Mr. FASICK. Yes, sir; from the point of view of worldwide control. A man sitting back here, who is responsible for a commodity area, has no visibility and no jurisdiction over the really hundreds of millions of dollars of stock, once it has been shipped out of his depots, of which there are 20 in the United States.

Mr. ROBACK. However, you have a different type of control. For example, in the post, camp, or station, the commander is allotted so many funds, he has to buy those things? He has to buy those supplies under a stock fund concept. The theory is if he has to pay for what he uses, he is not going to be wasteful. So there is a different type of control at that level.

Mr. FASICK. This is true, but they also have problems under the stock fund in terms of excesses—more supplies than they need—or supplies that they do need that are not on hand.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know when this committee was working on the uniform catalog, we found out that posts, camps, and stations had tremendous stocks of certain items which apparently were completely stagnant, and this was demonstrated when the war was over and we finally got into the problem of disposing of surplus materials. An order would go out to all of the posts, camps, and stations to look for a certain item, and if it was in excess, to ship it in, and there were literally carloads of items that were shipped in from some posts, camps, or stations that they had lost track of.

I recall in one instance they gathered up in a central point of accumulation nuts and bolts from these different outlying posts, camps, or