

come in from the field, toss them over to the Navy, that is their responsibility?

Mr. WITT. Generally slightly oversimplified but basically I think the last part of your statement is correct.

We give the MIPR's and, as I say, we feel they have been doing a good job for us over the years now.

Mr. ROBACK. If you supply the MIPR's on a weekly basis, they have to go sole source because they do not have any time to look around?

Mr. WITT. On a weekly basis there is no question about that.

Mr. ROBACK. So the user contributes to the sole source problem?

Mr. WITT. There is no question, sir, that looking at our requirements and the way the buildup in Southeast Asia has gone, as Mr. Shillito mentioned yesterday morning, we have given the Navy some very short time periods in which to provide us with the launchers. We are the first to admit that our requirements have come in sporadically as the changing forces over there, we have had a number of force changes. Our requirements have escalated very, very rapidly.

Mr. LUMAN. Is there something in the mechanism though where, after you do this several times, someone would sit back and say, "We cannot say how many thousand we are going to need 5 months from now but we can promise you we are going to have a steady, continuing heavy demand"? In this way the buyer might be able to start breaking in new sources without getting hit with these requests all the time.

Mr. ROBACK. He should be building up and replenishing inventories and you should be drawing on inventories, and you should be procuring, not on a sporadic hit-or-miss basis, but like an orderly self-controlled wise gentleman.

Mr. WITT. I wish that we had been in a better position to forecast how these requirements were going to hit us, because it would have made the Navy's job considerably easier. There is no question about that in my mind.

Mr. ROBACK. We are not assuming on the basis of your testimony that that is the only reason why these things have been doled out that way, but you say it is a contributing factor?

Mr. WITT. Yes, I would say so.

Mr. ROBACK. Do you think that is a weakness of the single service approach, where one service has to respond to another without having anything to say about organizing requirements in some kind of orderly way if possible?

Mr. WITT. No, I don't think so.

Mr. ROBACK. This could either be urgency of request or it could be what you might call lack of attention to the problem, you know.

Mr. WITT. I see what you mean.

I think before we got into the escalation in Southeast Asia of activities there, there was much more give and take back and forth, you know. Can you not give me such a short time in which to provide requirements, things of this type. There was a lot more give and take, and we were in a better position to say well, we will wait a little later for deliveries, things of this type.

But when you look at the fact that in calendar year 1965, for instance, we flew [deleted] sorties in Southeast Asia, tactical air-to-ground type sorties which reflect back on our launcher requirements, [deleted] sorties, the following year it was [deleted] sorties, and in looking back