

I just wondered if we could have your opinion on that.

General TAYLOR. The quality of the Joint Staff, of course, has been controversial for years. I think that some misunderstanding exists on the part of some of the serious critics of this situation.

Some seem to think that the Joint Staff suggests that you have to have nothing but young Napoleons in every position. That is far from the case. Like any other staff, the Joint Staff has many jobs which are very minor. The quality of the Joint Staff will always depend largely on the director, who has a very important job, his assistants, and the heads of the various staff sections. If those positions are really like that, the whole staff is going to do well. So, to set up guidelines requiring that the services send only the very best of their men, that is not the way to do it. The services also need their best men in certain positions.

I also have the feeling that some people think that you have to have been a Joint Staff officer to be any good. If, indeed, the services are doing their task in educating their officers, and I have no reason to believe they are not, an officer gets training for general staff work in schools like the Army's at Fort Leavenworth. You used to have 2 years; now, they only have 1. They are smarter now than in my generation.

But the preparation for service on any big staff is a preparation for service on a Joint Staff. The organization, procedures, and methodology of all senior staffs are about the same. Service on one does not require continuous service on a general staff as was the case in the German Army where an officer would serve on the general staff from the time that he was a lieutenant until a field marshal.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. HOPKINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, first let me say that I have been one of your fans over the years, and this gives me the opportunity to say so publicly. I admire very much the contributions you have made to this country.

The question that I would like to ask you has to do with the 400-man statutory limit on the Joint Staff as proposed by the administration which wants to remove that 400-man limit. It is clear to me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff has a very important job to do, and I don't think that we ought to limit that ability by the lack of proper staff. We in Washington don't seem to be very concerned about cutting back on staff members either in the House or in the Senate. I don't recall in the few years that I have been here any reduction at all in the workload or reduction in the numbers of staff members, or salaries, or benefits. And yet we seem to limit one of the more important areas that we have, not only for this country, but for the world.

How do you feel about removing the statutory limit of 400 members on the staff of the Joint Chiefs? Do you agree with the administration that that statutory limit ought to be removed? Do you think 400 is sufficient? How do you feel about that?

General TAYLOR. I couldn't pick an ideal number; 400 sounds reasonable to me.

Bear in mind, that prevents a Chief of Staff from getting support from his own service staff. That perhaps is not ideal, because you