

tion, logistics, and installations involve both a civilian and a military component. In these functional areas duplication currently exists; offices with the same functional responsibilities are found in the secretariat, headed by assistant secretaries and deputy assistant secretaries, and in the military staffs, headed by two star and three star officers. The bill would require integration of the staffs performing these functions.

Several provisions have been included by the committee to emphasize that many existing authorities, responsibilities and acceptations would not be changed by the legislation. These include the following:

(1) Subsection 401(b)(4) specifies that civilian officials on the department staff who are political appointees would not be placed in a position subordinate to a military officer.

(2) Subsection 401(b)(6) would prohibit abolishment or consolidation of reserve component staff functions.

(3) Subsection 401(b)(7) would continue and safeguard the position of administrative assistant in each military department.

(4) Subsection 401(d) specifies that nothing in title IV of the bill would limit the authority of a service chief to exercise supervisory control over military personnel "in the manner exercised by the service chief before enactment. . . ."

(5) Subsections 404(a) and 404(b) would continue the existing overall responsibility of each service Secretary for the intelligence activities of his military department and for the operational readiness of forces organized, trained, and equipped by his department.

Finally, the committee notes that absence of a provision in the bill on any other offices is not meant to convey they would be eliminated. Specifically, the committee in this legislation does not intend that deputy assistant secretaries in the military departments would be eliminated through consolidation.

#### TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

The Office of the Secretary of Defense has been criticized for favoring micromanagement over policy development, articulation, and implementation; inability to link military planning and national objectives; approving military programs without evaluating alternative approaches; failing to ensure that decisions are carried out; and weak oversight in assessing the results of decisions that have been implemented.

The committee believes that these criticisms are not without foundation. Witnesses from the Office of the Secretary of Defense have contended, for example, that the Office should articulate policy but not be responsible for following up to ascertain whether the military departments and other elements of the Department of Defense adhere to policy. Such a viewpoint, if held by many officials of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, would explain why the Office has been criticized as ineffectual.

Section 502 of the bill would require that the Secretary of Defense conduct a management study of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and that a parallel study be conducted by a private contractor. Moreover, companion independent studies of the Office of