

up to speed as well as I can on what the Chairman has to do. It has been most revealing to me and a great education to be exposed to the JCS and what goes on over there at those levels with the President and meeting with the Secretary of Defense, one on one, frequently.

So, I do believe what I say about the wartime mode of operation. I do believe that will work if we concentrate on our wartime responsibilities and have the Vice Chiefs, who have been doing this for us in the main—that is what they do is run the staff and help you run the service—fill in more directly in that role.

Mr. NICHOLS. Anyone else?

Mr. RAY. General Vessey, on page 8 in your testimony, you mentioned several times that needed improvements cannot be made in the Pentagon. This of itself in my mind would tend to confirm that the testimony last year that indicated serious problems exist is correct.

Now, I have tried to read back through some of the testimony, just glancing at some of the problems that have been identified which still exist today. In your mind does this mean that maybe these problems cannot be solved internally, or are we going to have to resort eventually to legislation to deal with some of them to get them handled?

General VESSEY. Well, I think, as General Meyer said, when we went through this exercise of examining our own duties and the way we carried out our job, we came to the conclusion that the objective of the exercise was to make the Secretary of Defense—when you look at what his duties are in the law, and where he sits in relationship to the President and what happens to defense in this country—that the objective of the exercise is to make the Secretary of Defense as effective as we can possibly make him. That requires the right relationship between and among the Joint Chiefs and between them and the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary's civilian staff, the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Certainly the Secretary of Defense then is the agent of the President in commanding the operating forces.

Can it be done without changes in the law? As we said, we believe that with these changes in the law we have a good chance of doing what needs to be done. But as General Meyer said, we all recognized that there are some changes that need to be made in the way we do defense business. Some of those changes might well go beyond the Defense Department, such as the things that have been suggested, multiyear budgets and such things as that, with the work that you people have to do. We have set out with the Secretary of Defense to work out the relationships among us, the Secretary and his civilian staff, to get the most efficiency out of that relationship.

Now, can you change that, can you do anything by changing the law? Well, I guess you can write "Do good work" in the law and then if people don't do good work, make it punitive or something like that. That might have some effect on it. These are very difficult problems that we deal with. I would say change the law as has been proposed and then we have a good chance of marching on to make the other changes that need to be made.