

In my view, the people in the laboratory should have the strong sense of purpose which is essential to success. A strong sense of purpose is not nearly so much a matter of having a carefully written statement of laboratory mission, useful as this may be, as it is of having genuinely significant things to do, strong leadership, and a continuing sense of accomplishment.

The Bell report also recommends:

Delegating to research laboratory directors more authority to make program and personnel decisions, to control funds, and otherwise to command the resources which are necessary to carry out the mission of the installation.

Providing the research laboratory director a discretionary allotment of funds, to be available for projects of his choosing, and for the results of which he is to be responsible;

Eliminating, where possible, excess layers or echelons of supervisory management, and insuring that technical, administrative, and fiscal reviews be conducted concurrently and in coordinated fashion; and

Making laboratory research assignments in the form of a few major items with a reasonable degree of continuity rather than a multiplicity of small narrowly specified tasks; this will put responsibility for detailed definition of the work to be done at the laboratory level where it belongs.

I strongly believe that all of these points are still valid. So is the report's emphasis on the need for salary scales which will attract and hold highly competent men and women in the Federal laboratories. Salary reforms in the recent past have done much to improve the comparability between Federal and private pay scales for technical and scientific personnel, but we repeatedly find situations where key personnel receiving less than \$20,000 are able to move easily to positions in the private sector paying two or three times that figure. There also remains a serious problem of compression of the top management salary levels, so that the highest echelons receive comparatively little more than the middle levels and are most likely to leave the Government service.

Mr. DADDARIO. Would you go back to the first two recommendations and spell out for us a little more what you mean by saying that laboratory directors should have more authority to control funds and should have a discretionary allotment of funds. What amount of money or what percentage are you talking about and how does this compare with a private laboratory such as Du Pont?

Dr. HORNIG. It varies from laboratory to laboratory, but I would say that the laboratory director ought to have something like 10 percent of his funds which are internally allocable. I don't think that one can give a general prescription without looking at the detailed circumstance of any given laboratory. The more general purpose the laboratory is in some ways and the stronger its leadership the more discretionary funds I would like to trust to its director.

Mr. DADDARIO. You have to relate the laboratory to the agency as you have said is one of a criteria of strength. If the laboratory director has this discretionary authority to use funds as he sees fit, how do you protect him from the people back in the agency? They may think he is spinning his wheels in areas which are not related to mission purposes, and this is in a time when they are looking for every dollar possible to accomplish a mission objective?

Dr. HORNIG. He still has to submit an annual budget and review of what he does, and if he goes off on tracks which don't contribute to his agency, you don't fund him.