

very key issue here, sir, and that is that the JCS is very personal-ity sensitive. There is no such thing as a JCS in perpetuity. It changes every time the membership changes, and this particular JCS is an effective, good JCS. I will make the prediction that the one that is going to be in existence on July 1, with my successor and the successor to General Meyer, is going to be a good JCS. The key to all that is this fellow sitting here. [General Barrow motions toward General Vessey.] What kind of leadership does he provide to this body that makes things happen, that causes advice to be timely, that avoids trying to seek consensus or unanimity at all costs?

The latter is an experience I had for 3 years over there, that we must all speak with one voice. Well, that is great if you can, in fact, at the outset be in agreement, because your position is obviously strong by the fact that five of you agree. But if you have to water down the disagreements so that you reach some common level of assent, you have, in fact, produced pap and not in a timely manner. That is history, and I really don't like to talk about it.

But this fellow [General Vessey] has not given himself enough credit. He came in a year ago with clearcut objectives he wanted to achieve, and one of them was obviously to enhance the timeliness and the effectiveness of the advice we give to the Secretary of Defense and the President. In my judgment, that has been done. Can it be done better? Of course it can. Anything that one does can be done better. I personally like what we have. I predict on July 1 it is going to be even better.

Mr. LALLY. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Barrett.

Mr. BARRETT. Yes, sir.

I would like to return to General Meyer's testimony of last year because it certainly conflicts, I believe, with what he said today.

He cautioned the subcommittee last year that any change we adopt should do a number of things. One is that it must enhance "the role of the chairman and permit him to take charge of what I consider to be elemental internal discussions."

He also said, "I don't believe you can tinker with the issues any longer; tinkering will not suffice."

In his article in the Armed Forces Journal, he said that "General Jones' proposal clearly moves us beyond the current system and well along the path of reform. Yet, even with adoption—a process which will require some legislative action—an opportunity for further building exists." And he goes on and says, "First is the divided loyalty we currently demand of the Service Chiefs" that must be ended.

Now, it seems to me that, with those sorts of past statements, to come here and indicate four rather modest administration changes will accomplish any part of his proposed reform is really a change in one short year.

You said earlier, General Meyer, that the quality of military advice must be improved. You said the things you propose in the four items of the administration bill and the other changes that will take place internally will improve military advice. I don't