

position, a statement be made to the effect that this man had had Joint Staff experience of some sort; and if not, why not?

Well, that had a major effect for the senior level. You could conceivably have used the same approach farther down, except as the officer corps are so large, in the Pentagon, a Chief of Staff—it is rare that he knows anybody below the rank of colonel, for example.

But, nonetheless, you have that reminder, that if this officer is good enough to be promoted to colonel, he should have had some joint assignment—a much larger field than just the Joint Staff, and that might be desirable.

Mr. NICHOLS. The Chair will recognize Mr. Skelton at this time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, thank you so much.

I again want to express my appreciation to the General for sharing his thoughts, not just today, but with me on other occasions. You have been not only very helpful legislatively, but quite inspirational to me, sir.

Everyone has asked all the questions to be asked except one, which I would like to put to you.

General, as you know, the bill that I propose does away with the two jobs—that is the dual hatting of any one member of the Joint Chiefs. It abolishes the Joint Chiefs in essence and keeps the CNO as the CNO, and keeps the Army Chief of Staff as the head of the Army, et cetera. It takes that second job away.

And it seems to me pretty fundamental that they are either doing two jobs or they are not, and you can't compromise on that issue very well. It is kind of like, either someone is, or is not. There is no such thing as being a little bit pregnant. You can't compromise this particular issue, so my point was strengthened, General, by some of the testimony last week. One of the gentlemen, members of the Joint Chiefs, indicated that they had two hats, but he said that he didn't have trouble turning his hat around and doing two jobs.

Another one indicated that full time must be spent on strategy during times of war. Another gentleman indicated that a good part of the time the Vice Chief of Staff runs that service.

So, it indicates that this is still a very basic problem that we must face. Would you elaborate and give us your thoughts on the wearing of the two hats?

What type of serious problems does this pose unless we face that issue now?

General TAYLOR. I believe in the change of 1958 to the National Security Act—the point was made, at the request of President Eisenhower, that the Chiefs of Staff give primary attention to their joint work, and leave to the Vice Chief as the man really running the show.

Well, I was in that position as the Chief of Staff, and it sounds good. I had a very fine Vice Chief, and three very good Deputies—a very good Deputy, every time. And I would give him any job to do, and I would look at him. But do you think that would satisfy people if I sent one of those men up to Congress? Not for a minute. They want the Chief of Staff. He has the responsibility by law, and you can't take it away from him.

So, any Chief I have over there would first be sure those tasks for which he was legally responsible were done to the best of his