

Dr. HORNIG. No, the Committee has worked closely with me, and with the agencies concerned, but they produced no published reports.

Mr. DADDARIO. Its purpose was other than a published publication?

Dr. HORNIG. That is right. The purpose was to secure some action.

Mr. DADDARIO. The Panels have been working together?

Dr. HORNIG. That is right.

Mr. DADDARIO. And you feel it has produced action?

Dr. HORNIG. Yes. There is lots more needed, but on many of these things one can achieve much more by working with the people who have to remedy the problem than by publishing documents about them.

Mr. DADDARIO. Could we sometimes say when we bring together a commission of this kind that it will not necessarily produce a report so when it does not, there will not be suspicion about it?

Dr. HORNIG. The normal state of affairs for the President's Advisory Committee is that it does not publish reports. It is the case 95 percent of the time.

Mr. DADDARIO. Notwithstanding that, when somebody heads a panel to perform a study and the study is not published, then there are sometimes dire statements made in the press about something of a cloudy nature being hidden. I know that is not the case, but it might be a good idea to spell it out in the first instance.

Dr. HORNIG. I think this is an excellent suggestion.

During the past year the Department of Defense has been taking vigorous steps to realine and redefine the missions in the Army and Navy laboratories, and to some extent the Air Force laboratories. An analysis has been made to determine whether the administrative inhibitions found in those laboratories have their origin in congressional actions, in civil service rules, or have been self-generated within the individual departments and commands. Most commonly it is the latter. What emerges in all these studies is that the laboratory is, and must be, closely related to the organization of the service of which it is a part. Thus, there is no single general prescription even for the Department of Defense.

In 1964-65 a major study of the National Institutes of Health was conducted under the auspices of the Office of Science and Technology by a distinguished panel headed by Dr. Dean E. Wooldridge. Its report, entitled "Biomedical Science and Its Administration," was published in February 1965. The panel found that the national biomedical program had been extraordinarily productive, but that there was much room for improvement in its management. Many of the suggestions have been taken into account.

From the various studies which have been carried out, there emerge some guidelines for successful laboratory operation on which there seems to be a remarkable consensus among groups with diverse backgrounds.

The Bell report states:

It is generally recognized that having significant and challenging work to do is the most important element in establishing a successful research and development organization.

I would add to this the need for the laboratory to have strong, capable leadership, able to relate the laboratory to the purposes of its sponsoring agency or agencies, and able to motivate the laboratory personnel.