

cerned, it is the President's decision as to when he wants to make his decision. He has not made it yet so far as I know.

Mr. CHENOWETH. That is all, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Secretary, you are playing on a team, and you have to be a team player or you should get off the team. But we are all in a much larger team and I don't think "agreeable disagreement" hurts the team, but Mr. Gilpatric gave us one reason for this directive and that was, to use his words, "for stronger central direction and control."

Then later in his statement he said they gave consideration to the claim that "this directive would bring about an overall loss of effectiveness in the other Services and result in an impairment of their capabilities."

Now, I would like to know for the record of some of the advantages of this directive and some of the things that the Army considers to be a disadvantage of this directive.

Secretary STAHR. Well, I think the advantage has been stated by Secretary Gilpatric. I could not add anything to it. I could not think of any others.

Mr. TEAGUE. Stronger directional control is the whole thing we are getting from this.

Now, Mr. Gilpatric also stated that he——

Secretary STAHR. I thought he had one or two other points in there, Mr. Teague.

Mr. TEAGUE. If so, I haven't found them. I read it a number of times.

Also there was the question of an eventual one Service, doing away with an Army, Navy, and Air Force, whether that was a point of discussion and he said no. Was that a point of consideration as far as the Army was concerned?

Secretary STAHR. Not to my knowledge. Certainly not with me or during any of the discussions in which I participated.

Mr. TEAGUE. Was it the Army's position this would bring about an overall loss of the effectiveness of the Service?

Secretary STAHR. Potentially.

Mr. TEAGUE. In other words, it is a "roles and missions" type decision being made under the guise of research and development?

Secretary STAHR. I don't know whether I would characterize it that way or not. The point is that this directive provides that the Army's requirements for the performance of its own roles and missions must be met, even though the Army is not exclusively vested with the management of all of the programs which would contribute to meeting them.

Now, you can just splinter things to the point where you really do have critical overlapping and duplication and wasted funds and effort. The precise point at which you get the best balance is one that people have been arguing about for years, and, in my opinion, will continue to argue about a long time.

But, certainly, I don't think we should say that any time the Army or some other Service is not given everything, is not allowed to have everything under its management which is important to it, and to the other Services, we have made a mistake. I don't think we can say that.