

whether it was a 400 ceiling or whether it was removed. As a matter of fact, I think defining now who is in fact on the Joint Staff, results in an accurate count of who you are talking about.

So I think that I agree with the bill presented by the Secretary of Defense. I know your concern is probably that this would result in a big inflation of the size of the staff. I don't think so. I think the staff is plenty large, myself.

Now, at one time Admiral King was commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet. And I at one time had that assignment. I noted that my staff was much larger than his. So I got a little curious. I had some people look into his filing system, how many subjects did they file papers under when Admiral King was commander of the Atlantic Fleet? Well, my subjects were about 10 times greater because in the meantime we had the nuclear weapon, guided missiles, NATO, all of the various organizations.

And so the world is expanding and the staff got bigger for the simple reason that there were many more subjects to deal with.

But to get back to the specifics, I don't see—I really don't think that the removal of the 400 will have any impact on the size of the Joint Staff, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Ray.

Mr. RAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Moorer, your arguments are so strong, I am almost ready to take your recommendation. But we do need to get some things in the record.

You argue very well that the present organization should not be modified since it works so well. Yet historically the Joint Chiefs have been unable to address two crucial areas: the allocation of the defense budget among the services and, No. 2, the roles and missions of the services. And I just wondered what your opinion would be there, if this represents a failure to deal with the issues which might indicate a serious deficiency in the current organization.

Admiral MOORER. Well, I think that if you are going to have the Joint Staff or Joint Chiefs of Staff get down to specifics as to every line item in the service budget, then you are really talking about a single service with a single chief of staff, which I don't think is desirable in any sense, in our democratic system.

What the Joint Chiefs of Staff do is to first develop a plan which sets down the force requirements against the threat, with acceptable risk. Now, that always, of course, costs far more than is allocated in the regular division of the Federal budget.

But I think it is important to list essentially what you would need if you really had a war. Then the Joint Chiefs discuss this and you come down to a lower figure, which is generally allocated by the Secretary of Defense in terms of what he calls bogies for each service. At least I am telling you how they did it when I was there.

And next the Secretary of Defense will generate what they call issues over each major weapons system. And the issues are discussed then one by one with the service chiefs and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense, and a decision is made in that fashion.

When you are dealing with technology—the Defense Department is not building automobiles. All the automobile people do is take the headlamps and rotate them 90 degrees one year and they flat-