

In adopting this approach, the committee is mindful of the considerable authority of the Secretary of Defense to initiate internal changes, including reorganization, without legislative action. The committee encourages the Secretary of Defense to supplement the legislative measures contained in this bill with aggressive administrative actions to strengthen the joint structure.

In choosing the incremental approach, exemplified by H.R. 3622, instead of proposals to replace the existing joint organization, the committee was also influenced by the reservations expressed by some witnesses who, despite generally acknowledging that problems exist, oppose organizational change. The bill is designed to address many of the major areas of concern voiced by advocates of reorganization while accommodating, through specific legislative provisions, the reservations of opponents. H.R. 3622 does this, however, without in any way diminishing its overall objective of improving the quality of military advice available to civilian leaders and thereby restoring the military voice to its appropriate stature in the highest councils of government.

#### DISCUSSION OF MAJOR PROVISIONS IN THE BILL

##### *Expanding and strengthening the sources that render military advice*

Although the committee agrees that the dual responsibilities of service chiefs may undermine the advisory capability of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a corporate group with respect to certain issues, it does not believe that the JCS is fatally flawed. To the contrary, while recognizing the existence of structural defects in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and resolving to correct them, the committee recognizes and affirms the validity of the principle established by the framers of the National Security Act that the President and Secretary of Defense should have available a body composed of the chiefs of the military services to render military advice on national security issues when needed.

A range of important issues do not involve service conflicts and little criticism of JCS performance in those areas was heard during the hearings. The issues on which the Joint Chiefs of Staff allegedly stumbles relate to cross-service decisions, such as those concerning resource allocation, roles and missions, unified and specified command structure and functioning, joint doctrine and joint training. The committee recognizes that a fundamental problem exists when an institution chartered as the "principal military advisor" to civilian authorities is unable to render meaningful advice on some of the most fundamental military issues. But it is nevertheless true that such issues would cause intense internal conflicts within the Department of Defense whether it were organized into services, as at present, or in some other way. In addition, conflicts of this nature have their counterparts in most other large organizations, both public and private. Consequently, eliminating the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not eliminate the conflicting issues that must be resolved. Such action would, instead, terminate a body that, if it were functioning as it should, could contribute to resolving conflicts; that is, a body that could grapple with all major military issues and participate, along with the JCS chairman, the Joint