

We do not today, in my opinion, have throughout the military service sufficient in-house capability to do all that we want to do during this system's development phase at any rate of the systems. We have to rely in many cases on contract personnel in order to get it done.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Are the military people that are in the program subject to assignment to different type duties periodically, or are they pretty well kept in that line of work specialization?

General MILLER. They have been subject to other assignment, although we have an agreement with our Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel that their MOS's be coded to indicate their automatic data capability, and during a shortage of these people, particularly in the critical skills, they are being assigned in the systems area.

Now one of the tasks that my office has in the personnel and training element is to develop a program so that we will have career ladders in these fields in order to keep our military moving progressively along promotionwise, which may help offset this civilian industry appeal. How successful we will be, I do not know.

Mr. ROBACK. Do you consider this management structure too complicated to work effectively?

General MILLER. You mean the division of responsibility here?

Mr. ROBACK. Yes. You have a lot of development. You have three major development entities, and then you have direction and control. Now there is no question but what you have direction. The question is, Do you have control?

General MILLER. Yes, I think we have control. And I think this is a very good system. I will explain why.

Our Combat Developments Command here is charged with the development of organizations and activities for the Army in the field. By that I mean they are charged with the development of how the division is going to look. How the corps is going to look. How the field army is going to look. Not only the logistical portion of this, but the combat portion of these activities; and so, therefore, it is perfectly natural that the logistics portion of this should be vested in the same agency.

The Continental Army Command, as I mentioned, has the primary job of operating the posts, camps, and stations within the continental United States, and the training centers and training areas. Therefore, it is logical that they should be the ones developing the system, what we might call the base system, and if you look at the Air Force system and the Navy system, they both have a division in that area between the operational elements in the field more or less, and those who are operating the bases.

AMC is responsible here for the Army wholesale system. The wholesale system is that activity which goes to industry and procures the items needed. It stores them in depots throughout the continental United States and makes them available for issue. It is therefore logical that their development and their activities and their systems are entirely different from the Army in the field.

What we have to do from the Deputy Chief of Staff, Logistics, point of view is to make sure they all speak in a common language, so that the computer systems will intermesh from the bottom to the top. So I feel that the structure we have for this control for the Army is a