

Mr. LUMAN. Could we talk to the philosophy of this for just a minute, General Miller?

One of the accusations sometimes levied against the Army is that there is a heavy reliance on command prerogatives, sometimes to the detriment of efficiency, and some people say that your computers, for example, do not match because each command went out and got their own computer and designed it the way they wanted it and programed it the way they wanted it, and now you have them and they do not match with each other.

The General Accounting Office and some others have said that you have the same problem here with overseas stockage, that there is a great reluctance to have the theater commander report his assets, because he is the man on the ground, and he is in command.

And we have reports, one here that came out of Europe, for example, where the Army stated that permissive overstockage not to exceed expected usage for 12 months is authorized. These stocks are not considered part of the wholesale supply distribution system, subject to redistribution at the discretion of the CONUS NICP's, because they belong to the 7th U.S. Army, which is a tactical force having an assigned military mission.

Mr. ROBACK. Identify the study.

VISIBILITY FOR CONTROL

Mr. LUMAN. This is the report to the Congress on the availability of selected stocks of the U.S. Army in Europe for requirements of other commands. Now this seems to be the Army's one position.

In other words, the theater commander must have this authority, even including permission to overstock and not report the overstockage.

On the other hand, as Mr. Roback has pointed out, you have these high value items, these crucial items which are already managed by AMC, and you have these intensive management items, some 35,000 of them, which General Heiser indicated AMC could require visibility reports on.

So what is the philosophic attitude?

Do you accept complete visibility or do you accept it in part? Do you want to see more or less of it?

General MILLER. Yes; we want to see more of it, and more control over it naturally, because we want to know where these assets are, keep better control and track of them.

I am not familiar with that report, but I feel that perhaps there was some unfortunate wording in there. I think that an examination as to why they were permitted this 12-month overstockage would show that those supplies were in-country. How they got there is not the point.

Mr. LUMAN. The question at issue here, though, was that some of these items that they had overstockage on were crucially short somewhere else. Because of the reporting system the inventory management did not know about this permissive overstockage. They were in-country, I am pretty sure, from the way the record reads.

General MILLER. Well, the only reason for that would have been that it was more costly to return them than it was to leave them there to be attrited.