

RELATIONSHIP OF THE ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD TO MILITARY
PROCUREMENT,
26 April 1946.

140-70
CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction--Brigadier General Donald Armstrong, Commandant, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces	1
Guest speakers:	
Colonel G. V. McPike, USA, Army and Navy Munitions Board	1
Captain Ralph J. Arnold, USN, Army and Navy Munitions Board . .	6
General discussion	9
Student	
Colonel McPike	
Captain Arnold	
Colonel Robert W. Brown, USA, Assistant Commandant, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces	
Captain E. R. Henning, USN, Assistant Commandant, The Industrial College of the Armed Forces	

RELATIONSHIP OF THE ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD TO MILITARY
PROCUREMENT,
26 April 1946.

GENERAL ARMSTRONG:

Gentlemen, we are having a little teamwork this morning, as is eminently fitting from the Army and Navy Munitions Board. The first speaker will be Colonel McPike, of the Army. The second speaker will be Captain Arnold, of the Navy.

Colonel McPike is another one of the former members of the faculty of the Army Industrial College. He has had a great many educational advantages in the Army, and he has been in China as A-4 of the 14th Air Force. The subject of his lecture is the "Relationship of the Army and Navy Munitions Board to Military Procurement."

Captain Arnold, of the Navy, will speak on the same subject. Captain Arnold is a graduate of the Naval Academy, Class of 1923. He served as a line officer on the "California," the "Brazos" and "Lexington"; as supply officer on the "Canopus" and "Yorktown." He was staff officer, Air Command, such as Fleet Air, Numea, New Caledonia; South Pacific; and Pensacola Naval Air Station. He is the holder of the Navy Cross.

I now present the first speaker, Colonel McPike.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

General Armstrong, faculty of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, and members of the Class of 1946: As a member of your official family no introduction should be needed. I hope that this morning, between the speeches of Captain Arnold and myself, we can give you a few points as to the mission of the Army and Navy Munitions Board which will cause you to produce some original thought in your study. As you know, we are depending on members of the class to come over and give us some assistance after your course has been concluded.

The Army and Navy Munitions Board by the terms of its charter is charged with coordination of procurement. Failure of this coordination on the part of the Armed Services has been the cause of serious concern to the Congress for the past twenty-five years. The remedial measures which have been proposed have varied from merger to deprivation of the procurement function altogether and assigning it to another agency.

A consciousness of these deficiencies has actuated the services toward improvement from time to time. This has been especially marked in World War II. Various studies were conducted, which you have studied or which you will study. The most notable perhaps is the study called the Strauss-Draper Report.

As a result of these studies considerable progress has been made in the field of procurement. This progress has been especially notable in

the field of purchasing. The term "joint procurement" is usually taken to denote joint purchasing or joint buying; but, as you know, joint purchasing is only a very small part of the function of procurement.

There is no doubt that in joint buying a great deal has been accomplished which merits praise. However, the greatest necessity today lies in the field of requirements, in the designation of items, in provision of an adequate catalog, in contracts and contract procedures, and in that great realm of standards, which will include specifications and all that it implies.

With reference to purchasing, three methods have been involved. The first is joint purchasing, where the requirements, the personnel, and the facilities of the agencies have been merged, and a joint contract results. The best example is the joint Army and Navy medical procurement agency for the procurement of medical supplies and surgical supplies in New York City.

Another method is collaborative purchasing, where officers of each agency, the Army or the Navy, occupy adjoining offices and make separate contracts. Access to both parties, of course, is rendered very easily by their physical layout. The best example of this is the purchase of clothing and textiles in New York City. Of course, the objective of all of these operations is to center in one place geographically all the operations which pertain to this particular commodity.

The other method is cross procurement, one agency buying the entire requirement. The best examples of this are in the procurement of subsistence, in the procurement of lumber, and in petroleum. The long-range objective has been built on the following basic assumptions:

- a. All items common to the Army and Navy should be procured jointly or by one Service.
- b. Uniform procurement policies and procedures should be developed for items not common to the two Services.
- c. Items with substantially the same end use should be standardized.

In the field of functions a number of committees have been formed, chief among which is the Engineers-BuDocks Committee, which functions in the field of procurement of heavy machinery and construction machinery. This committee meets monthly, and has reduced requirements and procurement substantially by a careful check of the Army excess stocks against the current Navy procurement programs and vice versa, and has sponsored joint tests on research and development.

The Engineers purchased on detailed specifications, having preferred models. The Navy bought on performance specifications, which tended to the use of standard commercial models. After prolonged discussions these differences are being resolved. The Navy Department has accepted the Engineers' proposal that not less than two preferred models will be eligible under the specifications to be written. With this arrangement much greater headway should be made toward standardization of equipment and toward joint or single-service procurement of combined needs.

I attended a meeting of the Engineers-BuDocks Committee yesterday and the question came up of storage and issue. The Navy has a big depot in California and the Army has a large depot in Ohio. Investigation had revealed that there was a tremendous duplication of items in each locality. So the question arose, how far would the Army and Navy Munitions Board be concerned with this question of storage and issue?

Present indications are that is a phase of procurement with which the Army and Navy Munitions Board is not concerned. Perhaps that lies more in the realm of functions of the General Staff. But you can see where this interest of ours would be very strong in tending to eliminate duplication in standard cataloging and in many phases of this particular storage, where storage could be confined to one section of the country for one service and to another for another section of the country.

In the field of ordnance, a considerable degree of procurement coordination between the Ordnance Department and the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy has developed informally over a long period of time, exemplified by arrangements for purchasing combined needs of both departments by a single service in the field of small arms ammunition and many component parts of larger pieces.

Now, because the ordnance items represent such a large proportion of the total purchased during the war, the Strauss-Draper Report recommended that an over-all coordinating body be established to give formal cognizance to cross procurement arrangements; to study opportunities for further standardization; to correlate test, research and development projects; and to explore possibilities for joint specifications on many items, including those similar in end use but varying in details.

This proposal was not approved by the two chiefs of ordnance during the war. But with the end of hostilities we were finally successful in securing the establishment of a high-level joint Army-Navy Ordnance Committee, headed by the two chiefs, to obtain these objectives. The first meeting of this organization was held on 7 January 1946.

With this sponsorship it is believed that much headway will be made toward further agreement covering ordnance items, including uniform policies in transactions with contractors and extension of the program of single procurement of combined needs.

Another committee which should be mentioned at this time in the process of formation is the Committee on Standardization of Internal Combustion Engines. Originally--I think it was about 1941--the proposal was made by the Engineers to standardize all internal combustion engines. This proposal related only to those engines which were supplied by the Corps of Engineers, most of them of small horsepower. They revealed that some sixteen types have been furnished during the war. They wished to consolidate those possibly into seven or eight types.

This proposal was sent through the services and met a very enthusiastic response. The big question was whether automotive engines should be included. Of course, the inclusion of automotive engines would also

require a revision of the types of vehicles, and you can see the many ramifications which this problem would involve. That is a problem which we are trying to solve at the present time. It is acknowledged by all concerned that marine and aircraft engines should be excluded from the subject of the study.

With reference to the development of specifications, I am happy to inform you that the enthusiasm in this field at the present time is very strong. In August 1945, the two departments approved the establishment of a Joint Specifications Board, with representatives of all bureaus and technical services. There was a Joint Specifications Council set up, composed of four top-ranking officers from the two departments. This council is a general-policy agency, a court of appeals. The board occupies offices in the Munitions Building, and joint specifications have been undertaken on about nine hundred products, with approximately 250 completed to date.

A study has revealed that a minimum of three thousand important items exist on which agreement should be reached between the two departments. The Joint Specifications Board has approved a five-year program, with achievement quotas for each month.

Allied with this study is a study in the department of a method of standard drawing practices. That is a condition precedent to accurate specifications. I will give you the history of that later on in the questions if someone is interested in finding out the present status of that project.

Joint specifications must also include definite agreements on materials and component parts, which is a very complicated process. The importance of this work can not be over-stressed, and special emphasis has been placed on contacts with those bureaus and services where current contracting volume is small and they, therefore, should now have ample time to address themselves to this problem.

In the field of packaging an Army-Navy Packaging Board was established early in 1945. On the Army side the membership was composed of officers assigned to the Army Packaging Board, and coordination with the Navy was achieved by making certain that policies established in the War Department were in accord with those in the Navy and vice versa.

This board made a semiannual report, which called attention to the tremendous losses entailed during the war by faulty packaging, and recommended the employment by the Army and Navy Munitions Board of a full-time packaging specialist to supervise attempts to reduce these losses by both Services.

This recommendation was not approved, because of the precedent involved for "specialists" in other fields; but the Army and Navy Munitions Board was instructed to continue its progress, in close cooperation with the Specifications Board, which establishes specifications for packaging materials.

A five-year program of specific objectives in the packaging field has been set up by the Packaging Board; and, with the cooperation of individual services in attacking this problem, substantial savings should result.

In inspection much progress has been made since VJ-day in coordinating inspection activities between the War and Navy Departments. Due to reduction in procurement volume, duplicate personnel in many plants have been eliminated; and this program has been given considerable impetus by constant effort on the part of both Services to extend cross-inspection arrangements. ASF Circular 446, 17 December 1945, specifically directs that this coordination be continued.

Regular meetings of the War Department Inspection Advisory Council are attended by representatives of the Navy. Within a short time a complete compilation showing inspection districts of the ASF, AAF and the Navy Department will be released; so that it can be readily determined as to which inspection department of the particular service involved will be most suited to serve that locality.

Now I would like to speak to you about procurement assignment. I think assigning the function of procurement to the agency most fitted to procure is one of the most important features of procurement assignment.

Within the last few weeks the Under Secretary of War and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy have approved a Procurement Assignment Board, which has authority to assign to any technical service of the Army or bureau of the Navy authority to purchase the entire needs of both Services for specified items. It also has the authority to recommend standardization of items, which is a very important feature.

This group has authority to examine all duplicated procurement, and, where it is believed desirable, to recommend the proper assignment. It does not wait on joint specifications, it being possible for one department to buy items varying in characteristics where necessary. But the board will also point out to the joint specifications agency cases where joint specifications are particularly desirable.

I went to the Headquarters, ASF, a few days ago to inquire about the program for a joint federal catalog. They have approximately three hundred people employed at this time on this project. It is something in which we are all vitally interested. They have produced a catalog on tools, which is well worth your attention if you are not familiar with it already. A reduction in funds is going to force a sharp curtailment of this activity. As you know, sponsorship of legislation with reference to this project is in the hands of the Bureau of the Budget.

I have endeavored to cover the field of accomplishments to date in the field of procurement, which has been carried forward by the Army and Navy Departments under the supervision of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. Captain Arnold will tell you the nature of some of our future plans.
Captain Arnold.

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

General Armstrong, members of the faculty, and students of the College: Colonel McPike has outlined to you some of the developments which have already taken place in coordinating Army and Navy procurement. The reason, I believe, for attacking the problem from that viewpoint is that is how we could best tell you how we function. I will go into that a little later, General Armstrong, that is, in general, the way the Army and Navy Munitions Board functions. But first I will talk a little about some future things that we think should be done. This will be along functional rather than material lines.

One of the last things Colonel McPike spoke to you about was the development of a uniform and standard catalog. That is unquestionably a vital need. For example, the Army Quartermaster Catalog on Class 53 materials lists paper, stationery and office supplies. The Navy catalog on similar materials includes only about ten percent of items which can be determined from an examination of the two catalogs to be definitely the same. I think it must be obvious to everyone that there should be a much greater degree of standardization than there is already in that field. About twenty percent of the items look as though they might be similar, but one cannot tell definitely by looking at the items in the catalogs.

One of the ways in which we can get around standardization, I think, is by developing a uniform nomenclature and descriptive patterns. In other words, if we are describing a kind of paper that is used by both Services, they should decide how to describe it and both describe it the same. That is one of the things that needs a lot of action in that field.

Along the same line is the standardization of items. That should be done by speeding up as fast as possible the work of the Army and Navy Specifications Board. But that is not all that can be done. There can be agreement, as Colonel McPike has outlined, in the field of mechanical equipment or anything which is bought direct from the manufacturer as standard equipment. On gearing, for example, the Army and the Navy will buy a certain kind to make a tractor. A steam shovel cannot be made with that same kind. It is not necessary to devise a standard specification for that. The Services can simply agree on that. If these standard models are agreed upon, at least when war comes standard models can be purchased on that basis.

There is also a great need of uniformity in stock control procedure, and perhaps of inventory procedure, the stock control of inventories. In other words, coordinate the procurement of paper and chemicals and so forth between the War and Navy Departments. If that coordination is to be successful, it means that the people in the Army and the people in the Navy who are determining the requirements must be determining their requirements at the same time. In other words, they must survey their procurement needs, how much they want to buy, how much they have in excess, and must get together at the same time, and go into the market at the same time and buy. That means agreement on the procurement lead time, so that they present a uniform problem to the manufacturer and the bidder.

699

There is room for a great deal of work, I think, in the field of expansion of single service procurement. We had a great deal of it during the war. But there is unquestionably a need for single service procurement. For example, I can think at the moment of motor vehicles and trucks. There seems to be no reason why the Army and the Navy should go into the market separately to buy motor vehicles and trucks.

There is need for the establishment of additional joint procurement agencies. By "joint procurement agencies" I mean such as the joint medical procurement agency in New York, which goes into the market and buys any supplies at the same time for both Services. I am sure you could all think of other cases where that could be done. Aeronautical standard materials, such as sheet metals and hardware, are an example. That field comprises thousands of items. It seems to me that that is a prime example of where an additional joint procurement agency could well be established.

In the field of procurement itself, that is, purchasing, there is need for a further standardization of contract clauses, policies, and procedures; also with regard to pricing, contractor appeals, renegotiation, financing, contractors' schedules, insurance and auditing.

As you doubtless know, there is one over-all coordinating federal agency which is doing that work. That is the Procurement Policy Board. That board has already succeeded in drawing up unified legislation, which is now before the Congress. But there is room for closer cooperation in the details I outlined before.

Another function closely allied with procurement which needs greater standardization is inspection. As you all doubtless know from your studies, there is a wide variation in inspection organization and functions between the two Services. It arises in a great many instances from top-level policy differences.

I have outlined to you some of the functions in which we think there is room for a great deal of standardization. I think this might be a good time to tell you how ANMB functions.

First of all, it is not an operating agency at all. We attempt to achieve this coordination by a general survey of the problem, seeing what the need is in general, and attempting to devise a joint agency which will correct the thing that needs correction. In other words, if a committee is established to study standardization within a certain field, the order for that committee will be drawn up by the Army and Navy Munitions Board for the signature of the Secretary; but that committee would not be composed of Army and Navy Munitions Board members.

Another way in which it functions is by some supervision over the policies of such procurement joint agencies as already exist. A meeting was held yesterday, for example, of the policy committee for the medical procurement office in New York, that being a joint agency over which the Surgeon Generals of the Army and Navy exercise joint control. That means that when an agency is started up, we should have in its purchase functions some sort of supervision, the same sort of supervision which is exercised

in the Army, we will say, by the Army Service Forces and in the Navy by the Procurement Policy Branch of the Material Division, Assistant Secretary's Office.

Obviously the Army and Navy Munitions Board is not in a position to exercise that supervision. So the Procurement Policy Committee decided at this meeting that in ordinary, routine administrative matters this agency would be governed by the rules of the Army Service Forces. It decided also that they would use a standard series of Army contract numbers.

At the meeting yesterday the further question came up as to items which are used by the medical departments of both the Army and the Navy, but for which the joint medical agency has not achieved any coordination. So at the meeting yesterday it was decided that the Army and Navy Medical Office in New York would draw up a list of items of which they thought the Surgeon General of the Army should have cognizance and present them to the Surgeon General's organization in the Navy for further reference to higher authority to see if it could not get unanimity as to which items are which. That is an example of the manner in which the Army and Navy Munitions Board functions over these joint purchases by the Navy.

I think it would be appropriate now to tell you something of the difficulties in furthering procurement coordination.

One of them is lack of personnel and funds in the Army and the Navy to work out such "workhorse" problems as developing standard specifications, cataloguing, stock control and inspection procedures. I think if we face the problem, we will realize that ironing out these differences in the established procedures and policies involves a tremendous amount of work.

Another difficulty is that there is not an exact split with regard to material between the Army and the Navy. An example of that is that practically all the chemicals used by the Navy are bought by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; but in the Army the Engineer buys a great many chemicals. So that in coordinating chemical procurement we cannot coordinate by simply coordinating the Quartermaster and the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. The Engineers have to come into the picture too.

The same thing comes into a great many joint specifications. Several bureaus of the Navy Department and several technical services of the Army are involved.

Another difficulty is that at the present time a great deal of emphasis is being laid on demobilization and the disposal of excess material. Those pressing problems are occupying the attention of both departments.

Another difficulty is an honest difference of opinion on all levels from top to bottom as to procedure. Each organization is right.

Another difficulty is uncertainty as to the size and composition of the postwar Army and Navy.

720

Another difficulty is personal and organizational inertia. If there is one thing we in the Army and Navy Munitions Board would like to tell you, particularly those of you who go into the technical services of the Army and the technical bureaus of the Navy, it would be this: When a new problem comes up, a new situation, involving new material and new functions, see if you can at the start achieve coordination between the Army and the Navy. Then you will not have to break down organizational inertia.

To illustrate how easy that seems to be at the start of a new function, take contract termination. Joint termination regulations were developed and were not much trouble. They seem to have served the purpose of the War and Navy Departments. If each service had developed its own procedure to start with and put it into effect and then tried to reconcile the differences, it would have been a very difficult job.

I believe that concludes my talk. We have a few minutes left. Colonel McPike and I would be glad to answer any questions.

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

To go a while further back, something that has to be decided at some level is in combined operation in the field or operations in which both the Army and the Navy are present. Can decision be reached at a high level as to that type of operation? Will the Army settle it or will the Navy settle it?

In World War II the Army supplied all the food and all the motor vehicles. The Navy provided all the compressed gas. That is an example of what can be done. It simplified the supply problem in the field. I do not see any reason why it could not be done with larger operations.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

Outside the Zone of the Interior.

COLONEL BROWN:

I did not understand whether the Army and Navy Munitions Board has general jurisdiction to coordinate requirements between the Army and Navy and prevent duplication of procurement, or whether you are delegated jurisdiction only with reference to particular matters.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

I think that the Army and Navy Munitions Board has general jurisdiction. I think coordination between the War and Navy Departments with reference to industrial planning, with reference to industrial matters, and with reference to procurement plans of the services are under its charge.

That was further exemplified by Order No. 1, which definitely charged the Army and Navy Munitions Board with supervision and control of procurement and the procurement plans of the services. That is a general admonition.

COLONEL BROWN:

The point of my question is this: Why should you back up to please the General Staff on distribution? Of course the Army and Navy Munitions Board cannot issue directives to the General Staff. But certainly it is a matter for liaison primarily or in the beginning with the General Staff. Then, if you can not bring the General Staff around to what you think should be the Army and Navy Munitions Board's policy, you could take the necessary action to bring the General Staff into line, it would seem to me. You merely have the General Staff set up by law with jurisdiction over what we call our distribution, it seems to me; but that would not preclude the Army and Navy Munitions Board from entering that field, because, after all, you lose about half of your usefulness if you back up from that point.

A STUDENT:

I would like to ask whether the Army and Navy Munitions Board is progressing with the development of a new army mobilization plan.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

To report on this I would say that the introduction and the statement of the assumptions, principles and policies, in the order named, are in their preliminary stage and should be completed in the near future.

This plan is purely for use by the Army and Navy Munitions Board and by those agencies of the Army and Navy that will be concerned with promulgating this plan.

With reference to the facilities and material sections of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, notice has been served on the services that they will be called upon in the near future for the preparation of a list of critical items. When that list is received by the Army and Navy Munitions Board, steps will be taken to measure the capacity of industry to produce these particular items. That is a function of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, which does have a responsibility to assess the capacity of industry to produce, and, if necessary, to call for revision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's plan. At the present time committees have been formed and are studying this particular list of critical items to be submitted to the Board.

CAPTAIN HENNING:

May I ask if this particular study is considered as part of an industrial mobilization plan?

COLONEL MCPIKE:

That is part of the function of the Board. Its particular function is allied with the formation of the industrial mobilization plan. I mean, this particular method involved here. Is that what you mean?

701

CAPTAIN HENNING:

No. I mean calling on the services and bureaus for a list of critical items and then making an assessment to see if industry could meet those requirements; then calling this industrial mobilization planning. A plan is a method of doing something. An industrial mobilization plan is an outline to be followed on the outbreak of an emergency. The study of requirements as to whether industry can meet them, I think, is another thing.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

Let me ask you a question. What relation does the current war plan that is promulgated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff have to the industrial mobilization plan?

CAPTAIN HENNING:

I do not think it has direct relation to the industrial mobilization plan. The industrial plan is one which transforms a nation from a peace to a war economy. On the other hand, meeting the material requirements of strategic war plans is a function of the procurements plan of the bureaus and services.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

The procurement plan is one part of the industrial mobilization plan.

CAPTAIN HENNING:

I cannot quite agree with that, but I do not want to get into an argument. The industrial mobilization plan is one whereby the economy is converted and controlled to function under war conditions. The procurement plans are something else. They have to do with planning by procurement activities of the War and Navy Departments to meet material requirements resulting from strategic plans. You are going to get into trouble if you mix up the procurement plans with the Industrial Mobilization Plan. Of course, the procurement planning of the bureaus and technical services must be integrated with the Industrial Mobilization Plan.

A STUDENT:

We are interested in the broad plan, not in the supporting plans.

COLONEL BROWN:

I do not know. Sometimes we get the cart before the horse and sometimes we get the horse before the cart. I think that there will be general agreement that we ought to have first an industrial mobilization plan, one of these high, broad, entire plans, for integrating the economy; and that the second plan would be the procurement plan, based on the Industrial Mobilization Plan, based on the troop basis, based on the strategic plan. Is not that right?

COLONEL MCPIKE:

That is the present concept of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

COLONEL BROWN:

I thought from what I had heard that the Army and Navy Munitions Board was developing its secondary plan first.

A STUDENT:

I was going to ask a second question. The answer is that nothing was developed. I do not know whether that is yes or no.

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

I think the answer is that the Army and Navy Munitions Board is engaged in trying to decide what the plan is to outline. Into how much detail should it go? A decision must be made as to the plans general form and how it is to be broken down. Substantial progress has been achieved with it; but in drawing up all the minute details of the plan we could not do that until a decision was made as to what the plan should do.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

I think it is going to take a long time to draw up that plan.

COLONEL BROWN:

Any further questions?

A STUDENT:

Is manpower included as a critical item?

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

Yes, indeed.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

Yes.

A STUDENT:

Who would do it?

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

It will be in the plan. We do not know how much we want the plan to embrace, but definitely that will be embraced in the plan.

LT. COLONEL OSBORNE:

We who are already concerned with the Industrial Mobilization Plan are finding it hard to understand just how far we can go at the present time. We do not know just now what we should expect to get from the higher echelons. For instance, we believe that there should be some standard catalog, as you mentioned, but right down to code procedures. What are the policies and procedures relating to standard type materials and components of manufactures, so that government machine tabulators can be employed for all procuring agencies? How do we submit this material to you? In what form on critical end items and critical raw materials and critical semifinished parts and so forth? We are going to get it in as many different forms as the agencies that are furnishing it. Can you give us any indication as to standard forms, procedures and proposals of this material, anything that should be coming forth from time to time?

The very first direction that we got from the ANMB was to work on this plan. Some of our planning personnel are working on it.

Now, we have been getting a broad directive, a more and more detailed directive. Can you right now or in the near future tell us how you want these things to be coded? We have fairly well standardized forms coded, but every item is not coded, nor have we coded all the items used by the Armed Services.

CAPTAIN HENNING:

In the meantime what is the Signal Corps going to do?

Colonel McPike said, before an industrial mobilization plan is consummated it will take five or six years. Under this conception, I think it will take about a hundred years. Of course, if the Mobilization Plan is to control industry, then the subordinate or branch procurement plans must be based upon it. I doubt whether an industrial mobilization plan can be made to embrace everything that the bureaus and services are going to procure to meet requirements in time of war.

COLONEL MCPIKE:

That is a very good point. That will receive consideration.

CAPTAIN ARNOLD:

In my mind, that is what our committees are for. I think we are getting away from it.

GENERAL ARMSTRONG:

Any further questions, gentlemen? (No response.)

(13 June 1946--200.)S (End of lecture)