

Mr. RUMSFELD. How many missions, if there are two missions basically involved in the \$454 million, how many were in the \$626 million request which the Bureau of the Budget disapproved?

Dr. MUELLER. Actually the same number of missions was provided at the \$626 million level. There were, however, different missions in 1969 than we have in 1968. There are two missions in calendar year 1968 that we are talking about. In calendar year 1969 at the \$626 million level, there were additional apparatus carried up to the vehicle that we are not now carrying. We will reuse the old equipment in 1969. That provides a great savings providing the old equipment is equipment that you really want to use.

Mr. RUMSFELD. The figure, \$454 million is five and a half times the \$80 million for fiscal year 1967, yet when you compare the total expenditures for Apollo and Apollo Applications they are level. To combine them it is \$2.99 billion in fiscal year 1966; \$2.99 billion in fiscal year 1967; and \$3 billion in fiscal year 1968. Is this just a coincidence?

Dr. MUELLER. In a sense it is a coincidence and in another sense, I am sure that the Bureau of the Budget in carefully looking at our activities has said to itself: Is there a level at which one can operate. I think though that it is not a coincidence in that sense. In fact, the Bureau of the Budget has allowed us an increase in the amount required in the fiscal year 1968 manned space flight R. & D. program because they felt that we do absolutely have to have this relatively slight increase. If my recollection is correct, we have actually gone up about \$45 million in R. & D. in fiscal year 1968.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Combining the two?

Dr. MUELLER. In total the Bureau held back \$60 million from NASA in fiscal year 1967, as part of the President's anti-inflation effort.

Mr. RUMSFELD. With the \$60 million of prior years?

Dr. MUELLER. Yes. The \$60 million was made available to us to cover fiscal year 1968 requirements. Literally the reason the Bureau of the Budget let us go up is that they couldn't find any way of bringing us down and still have a viable program.

Mr. RUMSFELD. If you take your NASA request of \$626 million and reduce it to this figure you are recommending \$454 million, we are increasing to a level of \$263 million in vehicles but we have cut back in the other areas which in fiscal year 1969 would have given us the capability of possibly making greater use of that original investment from an experimental standpoint?

Dr. MUELLER. That is exactly right.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I would like to talk about the space station for a minute.

What were the specific goals that you set forth in the request to the Bureau of the Budget? What were the things that NASA hoped to gain? And to reverse that, what are we losing by not requesting, authorizing, and appropriating the \$100 million for the beginning work on the space station?

SPACE STATION NEEDS AND REQUIREMENTS

The following statements summarize the potential objectives and requirements of the space station.

1. The prime justification for a manned space station rests in the potential it provides for undertaking with a single space vehicle broad-based research and