

stations, and they got carloads of all kinds of bolts that were obsolete, like the bolts and nuts that were used to put gun carriages together in the Civil War. This sounds ridiculous, but it was literally true. Here were these stocks being carried in inventory, obsolete items that had been carried in inventory for 75 or 100 years.

Mr. FASICK. This has been the subject also of some effort on our part. First of all, precisely the same thing happened in Vietnam about a year ago. The Department of Army sent 500 men over there to go down to the DSU units, which are the units that directly support the combat elements and to get them to return material they didn't need—no questions asked. Carloads of items were returned into the depots that the Army has in Vietnam. It required a great deal of effort to catalog, identify and get items back into stock. This posed a problem to the Army.

In the area of inactive items we issued a report about a year ago pointing out that DSA and the Navy had over 800,000 items in their inventory that had not moved for 2 years or more. We suggested to them that they take a new hard look at this—do you need to keep it in your system? Inactive items in the system compounds the problem of trying to manage inventories. They are aware of this problem, but it is tied into a number of other problems and it is going to take quite awhile for them to work themselves out of this situation.

Mr. HORTON. I have no further questions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Any questions, Mr. Randall?

Mr. RANDALL. I have none.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Roback?

Mr. Randall, will you take the chair?

Mr. RANDALL (presiding). Our chief counsel, Mr. Roback, do you have some questions?

REPORTING AND VISIBILITY

Mr. ROBACK. You discussed in your statement the question of visibility, namely, getting information worldwide. You also have stated or implied that visibility ought to lead to control. Is it your position that the Army Materiel Command, after acquiring visibility, ought to have the power to redistribute stocks against the preference or the requests of the theater commander?

Mr. FASICK. Down to a certain level, yes, sir. I think materiel should be under the control of AMC. The materiel exists in the major stockage points outside the AMC area as it is known today. For example, the material are located at depots under the control of the Supply and Maintenance Agency in Europe and at the 8th Army depots—there are two of them over there, Camp Carroll and Ascom City. They are large complexes, comparable to the complexes we have in the United States, and we believe the materiel should be under the control of AMC. We do not believe it would be necessary to bring under such control the materiel at direct support units which are supporting the combat units. They have sizable amounts of stocks, ranging between 2,000 and 10,000 items, which they usually manage. This we don't suggest that AMC control.

Mr. ROBACK. The philosophy of the Army as distinguished from the Air Force and Navy, as you point out, has been more toward com-