

that the situation was fragmented in terms of logistical support and systems between the various technical services.

With the abolishment of the Chiefs of the Technical Services, it was felt that standardization of the Army system in accordance with DOD directives and military standard systems would be facilitated.

And, sir, experience has indicated without question that it has been facilitated, without any question.

But recognize that in 1962, when the reorganization was ordered, there was a going concern, with respect to the Chief of Technical Service organization. Looking at ADP, for example, you can go to one of the commodity commands which the Army Materiel Command inherited from the Technical Services, you can look at the Army Tank-Automotive Command, and find that there we had the first large scale computer that was ever installed in any Army installation, the BIZMAC. The BIZMAC was a research and development item with which the Army was attempting to try to determine how to best use a large scale computer.

Because of getting into this so early, one of the serious problems in terms of progress in ADP and in ADP effective programing was to get away from the BIZMAC, which we had, and try to catch up with the state of the art.

These were procedures and these were hardware and software that were in process, and sir, in 1962 we had gone from the BIZMAC to a process of trying to update the hardware through substitution of what became RCA 501 equipments, multiple 501 equipments to replace the high volume of the BIZMAC, and the procedures that went along with it were difficult to change.

I might say, sir, that we are still in the process of trying to get what was working at that time under other processes standardized to meet the requirements of the Army Materiel Command. That is just one example.

We have other examples in terms of training people. At the time the Chiefs of Technical Services existed, they had responsibilities to insure the training of logistic personnel in each of their areas.

I am not at this point attempting to go back in history and say that those responsibilities were bad or good.

I am not talking to that point. That is ancient history and I do not think this is what you are really after.

What I am saying is that in the transition of going from a very strongly controlled Technical Service training program for officers and men, we have had to make this transition into a centralized control of training and still standardize, but still apply the same importance to the training in each of the logistic areas so that we can come up with a fully trained man to do the job in the field, and I think, sir, very sincerely that we are still in the process of doing this. And I think that in so doing, we are discovering that we have to make improvements in our training program in order to achieve the best results in the field.

Mr. HORTON. General, what is the difficulty in training these men? I mean you talk like this takes a long time and it is a great problem. What is the difficulty?

General HEISER. Sir, it is a continual problem, Mr. Horton, because, as you well know, sir, we have a large preponderance of the U.S. Army made up of short-term people in terms of draftees, sir.