

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am seeking in my own mind, not from the standpoint of excusing but from the standpoint of understanding—

General HEISER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (continuing). To compare the differences in the problems that are involved. I can see where a ship is a rigid, you might say a rigid, entity.

General HEISER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Self-contained. It has everything right there and you can count it, and as it moves everything moves with it.

General HEISER. And they do not have much room, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is very little attrition, or let us say destruction unless the ship itself is destroyed.

General HEISER. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But where you have masses of troops moving and taking equipment with them and subjecting it to the hazards of continuous destruction, I can see where the physical job of maintaining inventory would be much greater and much more difficult.

General HEISER. And that is part of your answer, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And particularly when you get into smaller items, like rifles and things which can disappear pretty easily by theft, loss or destruction, it would seem to me that the job of maintaining an accurate inventory would be almost impossible.

General HEISER. Yes, sir.

Mr. ROBACK. General Heiser probably would want to add, I do not want to testify for him but maybe he would want to add, that they also have to do a lot of dirty work for the Air Force in the way of supplying things, so the Air Force can have a cleaner supply operation of its own; is that right?

General HEISER. Sir, I appreciate your assistance.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think it is all right for him to testify. I just got through testifying.

General HEISER. Sir, we appreciate this contribution by the chairman and all.

Mr. ROBACK. This is by way of a question in the light of the chairman's question about comparative volume: Is it not a fact that you have responsibilities for supplying the other services with considerable volume?

General HEISER. Considerable volume, yes, sir.

However, I must admit, sir, that at the present time we do not do too much in the way of repair parts, which again to a large extent, what we are really talking about in terms of the problem is the problem of repair parts. There are a number of repair parts that we have to support to keep equipment going.

I think it fair to say that like we do in our aircraft, which is a highly important system, we are paying very intensive management care to this particular kind of item. So does the Air Force.

I think that we have a certain degree of management that we can give to a certain level of items. At some point in time you have to depend upon not the eyeballing by a human being but you have to depend upon equipment, and this is where of course the problem of machines comes in and programing and program design.

(Off the record.)