

could exercise his own discretion in carrying out the reorganization as he saw fit.

The most important guideline, by far, is the stipulation contained in subsection 401(b)(1) that each military department after reorganization would have a single integrated staff rather than separate civilian secretariat and military staffs.

Even in this case, the Secretary of Defense is given significant latitude. The committee considered a provision that would have specified the relationship between the top civilian and military officials in the departments after the integration took place. The provision was not included in the legislation because the committee realized that many models of staff integration already exist in the military department headquarters. The legislative liaison and public affairs offices in each military department are consolidated. The navy financial management function has been consolidated for years. The Army Audit Agency and the Army Inspector General serve both the Chief of Staff and the service secretary. Thus the committee found no need to prescribe relationships in a consolidated headquarters. Instead, the Secretary of Defense would be allowed by the legislation to select the most suitable organizational arrangement.

Although the bill would require integrated military department headquarters staffs, the consolidation would in fact alter only one of the three principal relationships between the service secretary and the service chief. The role of the service chief as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would not be affected. As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the service chief is responsible for advising the President and Secretary of Defense on joint military matters. He acts independently of the service Secretary and is not accountable to the Secretary. Thus any intercourse between a service Secretary and a service chief with respect to Joint Chiefs of Staff matters is not required by law and is, in fact, completely voluntary on the part of the service chief.

The bill would not change this relationship. It would, in fact, reinforce the service chief's independence by providing him a personal staff, apart from the integrated military headquarters staff, of as many as 30 officers to assist him in his responsibilities as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The existing relationship between the service Secretary and service chief concerning what might be loosely described as uniquely military matters would not be altered by the bill. At present, the military headquarters contain a number of two and three star officers who head large staffs devoted to such functions as military plans, operations, and intelligence. The chief of staff is directly responsible to the military department Secretary for these activities. No civilian official is placed between the chief of staff and the Secretary (with the possible exception of the under Secretary, who may act as the Secretary's alter ego) with regard to these responsibilities. This relationship would not be changed by the bill.

The legislation would, however, alter the existing relationship with regard to what might be termed the "business" side of the military department headquarters—where the private sector and the military interface. Functions such as manpower, reserve affairs, financial management, research and development, acquisi-