

like to feel that everything the Chief has got comes from a joint source, but it does not in practice, and it never will.

No, I was never worried, really, about that figure.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, it just seems to me, General, that with the responsibilities that organization has, the Congress ought not to limit them to 400.

As I told the Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff a few weeks ago, in my view if they need a few more members on their staff to do the job of protecting this country, far be it from me to criticize them from doing that. There are many, many other areas in the Department of Defense, I think we could look at very closely as far as a money-saving device, but not on the think tank of the defense of this country. I think it would be very shallow on our part.

As you say, 400 may be enough. I don't know if it is or not; but I certainly don't want to limit, in my opinion, people who know more about it than I do. If they feel they need another 100, I told them to go get it as far as I am concerned. I just want to get the job done.

General TAYLOR. Well, I thank you for your consideration. I am sure the Joint Chiefs all appreciated that in the Pentagon. Again, it is quite possible that you can all control so many things here annually, if you ask of our account—how many officers have you got? That would make them realize the numbers are considered important by Congress.

But, again, I don't think it makes much difference.

Mr. HOPKINS. Thank you very much, General Taylor.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Kasich.

Mr. KASICH. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLS. General, let me ask you one question with reference to the type of officers that go to the Joint Staff.

There seems to be some difference in philosophy between the services as to, I guess, the quality of the officer that we send to that Joint Staff. In my judgment, we ought to send the very best officers that we have, and yet last year, I believe we had testimony from one branch of service indicating that, because this was a smaller branch of service, they didn't have a great preponderance of very best officers and that they sent some of their very best, and then they sent some, I suppose we would term it, mediocre officers.

Would you comment on that? I guess specifically what I am asking you is should a JCS Chairman be given the responsibility to select from the most outstanding service officers the people he has on his staff? I believe that provision may be included in Mr. Skelton's bill.

General TAYLOR. I might say that when I was Chief of Staff of the Army, I felt strongly about the need for excellent officers in the key positions, and not every place is a key position.

And in the case of the Army, for the key positions, when we had to nominate, I would ask among our best officers who had served on the Army staff for about a year. With this experience he should be well qualified for the Joint Staff level or above, operating as I indicated. That staff work is really, in terms of procedural matters, essentially the same. I forbade the Army staff ever to deal with him. I didn't want the word to get around—I didn't want him to