likely to be frequent, it is desirable to have that option when unusual circumstances make it desirable to have continuity in this position or to gain the services of a former Director to meet an urgent need.

These proposals for legislative changes are evidently modest. They do not entail any radical alteration in the structure of the JCS. The current members of the JCS do not believe radical changes are necessary to the effective functioning of the organization, nor do I. The DoD legislative proposal does not contain many of the changes found in other bills introduced in the 97th and 98th Congress; I will attempt to explain our reasons for not embracing most of those proposals in our bill. First, I will discuss the provisions of H.R. 6954, the bill that was reported favorably by your Subcommittee in the 97th Congress and subsequently passed by the House of Representatives.

Many of the provisions of H.R. 6954 require changes that can be, or have been, accomplished without legislative modifications. They are, in other words, management changes affecting administrative matters that come within the existing discretionary authority of the Secretary of Defense or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Reporting of dissenting views to the President or the Secretary of Defense by members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for example, which H.R. 6954 would expressly authorize, requires no legislative change; it is explicitly a responsibility of the Chairman under present law.

The provision in H.R. 6954 for the creation of the position of Deputy Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, by contrast, would indeed require a legislative change. The need for such a position, however, has not been demonstrated to my satisfaction nor to the satisfaction of the current Joint Chiefs of Staff. The present practice for dealing with the absence or unavailability of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is to authorize one of the Chiefs of Staff to serve as Acting Chairman for a three-month period, after which that responsibility is rotated to another Chief. This procedure has worked satisfactorily in recent months, but other systems can be and have been employed successfully. For example, Admiral James Holloway, III in his testimony before your Subcommittee last year describes an arrangement by which he served as the designated Acting Chairman for two one-year periods, at any time the Chairman was absent or unavailable during that period. Under this kind of system the Chief designated to serve as Acting Chairman is expected to adjust his schedule so that he is present whenever the Chairman is absent or unavailable. This kind of flexibility is, in our view, preferable to dedicating another four star officer to the role of Deputy Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.