

Mr. ROBACK. We are not criticizing the Air Force for using airlift as such. The question really is can the Army, which has apparently more supply problems than the Air Force, improve its supply system without having to go to airlift to the extent that the Air Force has.

Now if it did, if the Army, for example, is going to move say 75 or 80 percent by air, which I think is probably in the neighborhood of the Air Force —

General RIEMONDY. No.

Mr. ROBACK. No?

General RIEMONDY. I will give you a for instance why this isn't correct.

Mr. ROBACK. All right, we will get to that. Maybe while we are talking one of your assistants can get that figure by telephone.

Colonel YARY. Sir, would you state the question again?

General RIEMONDY. I know the question. How much of supplies that we have a requirement for, in the overseas areas, is moved by air, and how much of it goes by surface, and the statement was made that it would be about 80 or 85 percent.

Mr. ROBACK. Let's have a comparative figure with the Army.

General RIEMONDY. I think this isn't correct. Let me say this. The biggest commodity as far as volume is concerned, that is currently being utilized by the Air Force today, is air munitions.

By the end of May this year, we had dropped more air munitions in Vietnam, than we dropped in the European theater during all of World War II.

We are probably moving in the order of 100,000 tons a month of munitions by sea. Now the total amount of air movement Air Force-wide in the month of May was only 9,500 tons. So if I just talk to the one commodity, munitions alone, I can't come up with your figures of 85 percent by a long shot.

Mr. ROBACK. Do you move your own POL? You get it from the Army, don't you?

General RIEMONDY. The Army is responsible for transporting our POL in-country.

Mr. ROBACK. In-country?

General RIEMONDY. Yes.

Mr. ROBACK. Who moves it from the source, DSA?

General RIEMONDY. MSTs, through the single agency, DFSC, called the Defense Fuel Supply Center.

Mr. LUMAN. If you exclude big bulk things like munitions, and you look at items like repair parts, isn't it true to say that because you have aircraft, more of your repair parts are deemed airworthy than the Army's? You can fly more parts for an airplane than you can for a jeep under present justification, can't you?

General RIEMONDY. But then by the same token we don't have as much of a requirement for total spares as the Army does. For example, I have some figures here that might give you a feel for the amount of material that is moved by Military Sea Transport Service and these are projections.

The total Department of Defense, and this is a projection for the month of July, there is a requirement for 1,235,000 measurement tons.