

## ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF MR. DENTON

### INTRODUCTION

The bill as reported is a compromise on matters that were extremely controversial within the Committee, and on several crucial issues decisions were taken by very narrow margins. The final vote reflects far more an approval of the compromise, and of the efforts of the Committee's Chairman, Ranking Minority Member, and other Senators in bringing it about, than it does endorsement of the need for substantial reorganization or of the draft bill itself.

Moreover, at the time that the final vote was taken on March 6, 1986, neither the bill itself nor the Report was available in final form, and the Report did not exist even in draft. Major changes have since been made to the format, order, wording, and arrangement of the bill, although not to its major provisions, and the limited time allowed for review of the Report made it difficult to ensure that it is in accord with the Committee's decisions and the points made in its debates in executive session.

The Committee did not meet to review either the bill in its final form or the Report as drafted and filed.

### MAJOR PROBLEMS WITH THE REPORT

The Report states, in the section "Discussion of Problems," that "the Committee" concluded that "many serious problems remain" with the organization and decision-making procedures of the Department of Defense. In fact, the Committee as a body reached no such conclusion. Some members of the Committee believe that there are serious problems, but other members of the Committee strongly disagree with that position both as a general statement and in connection with specific allegations, such as the quality of advice provided by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The section "Discussion of Problems" is in fact drawn from the Staff Report "Defense Organization: The Need for Change," which explicitly did not represent the views of the Committee as a whole or of any of its members. That situation still pertains.

The Report states, in the section on "Background," that "During its markup sessions, the Senate Committee on Armed Services evaluated the Packard Commission's recommendations and found them to be consistent with the provisions of this bill." That statement is not wholly accurate. In two specific cases—the provisions governing the roles of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and of the newly created Vice Chairman—a majority of the Committee rejected the specific recommendations of the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on Defense Management, the Packard Commission.