

The routine reporting of these assets by the S. & M.A. USACOMZEUR to CONUS NICP's is not considered appropriate because these stocks are under the control of a tactical force and not within the wholesale supply distribution system.

Does that statement still stand or are you modifying the requirements for reporting certain stocks by the S. & M.A.

Mr. MORRIS. I am not intimately familiar with this case and the statement probably would still stand. The intent of the comments in my statement is to say it is the conviction of all of us that command prerogatives are no obstacle to our proceeding in the future with worldwide visibility where it makes good sense. We think that the confidence that commanders at all levels have gained as a result of Vietnam has dispelled this kind of a myth.

Our people are getting supplies. They don't have to hoard supplies. We find that nobody wants to hold on to excess stocks. In fact, they are a great burden. The 1,900 units that the teams went out and relieved of their excess were very pleased to be relieved of those excesses.

Mr. LUMAN. So you don't see any objection, from the point of view of the commander's responsibility for assets in his theater, to requiring this commander to report on these assets.

Mr. MORRIS. No, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. In fact, I would say, Mr. Luman, that is one of the major vehicles for establishing confidence. I would say this in terms of command prerogatives. We have found no case where a commander overseas or any of his supply people are knowingly trying to hoard assets over and above a known requirement. The problem has been the known requirement, and the known assets.

We get information and make sure that the commander has that information on what his assets are and what his requirements are; there is no problem whatsoever that we have found in redistributing assets that are over and above his requirement. It is the problem of visibility.

Mr. LUMAN. I really got the impression from some of the earlier Army testimony that the belief that the commander should control his resources was the reason for saying that he can have a certain amount of permissive overstockage and he doesn't have to report it to the ICP's.

Mr. BROOKS. There have been cases of permissive overstockage. However, this is not a case where the commander feels that he necessarily has to have this. It is a question of economics, that it is more economical to leave it there, at least temporarily until another requirement develops, rather than to move it right away to another theater or back to the United States.

Mr. ROBACK. Your position, then, Dr. Brooks, is that as far as visibility and control are concerned, visibility is sufficient for purposes of redistribution. As long as you know where the material is, there isn't any problem of moving it around?

Mr. MORRIS. That is right, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. No problem.

Mr. ROBACK. You don't have to have specific commodity manager control over the commander's supply, so to speak.

Mr. RILEY. One of the purposes of having visibility of all of your high-cost assets is that you won't buy too much and put too much over there in the first place. You will know what he needs, and what he has.