

important both for the results it will give us and for what it does for the morale of his people when they can act on good ideas when they come up, rather than writing proposals for successive review which may result in permission 2 years later to go ahead with it.

Mr. DADDARIO. How far would you allow this discretionary authority to go if during the course of his work a laboratory director saw an opportunity to be helpful in an area of great interest to the country? For example, if Dr. Weinberg sees that some of his people in accomplishing one thing developed an ability to handle certain of our problems relating to crime, would you allow him to use part of his discretionary funds to prove this out to the point where it could be used?

Dr. HORNIG. Well, this, for instance, gets outside of the general mission of Dr. Weinberg's laboratory, so I would say that no, I would not include any real program in crime within his discretionary authority.

On the other hand, if his people came up with a really good and promising idea that was on a relatively small scale, and as a prelude to discussion with, for instance, the Attorney General, if he wanted to do some exploratory work to test the validity of the concepts they were going to provide, I would say, yes, this made good sense.

Mr. DADDARIO. This is one of the weaknesses I see in your argument about the agency relationship. On occasion, knowledge could develop to the point where it could be applied to other problems and people who are working on this, having a social conscience, being concerned about the problems of the country, should be allowed to pursue it. In fact, it may affect their work if they were not allowed to have this kind of flexibility. I recognize it is a difficult decision, and should not be allowed in every instance. Nor do I, at the moment, see any type of language that we as a committee could recommend as a guideline. Nonetheless, I think that there ought to be some provision whereby such work can be done even though it is not related to the particular agency.

Shouldn't we in some instances allow the director to do a certain amount of whatever he wants, regardless of the mission objective?

Dr. HORNIG. You ask a number of questions. Obviously, if the Oak Ridge National Laboratory has capabilities, for instance, in the crime or pollution area, we can and we do use its capabilities on behalf of other agencies. But this is a little different from a question of what should he do within his discretionary authority, because within his discretionary authority he is using AEC funds. I think Dr. Weinberg would have a pretty hard time explaining to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy any extensive efforts in areas not related to atomic energy which he carried out with money appropriated for atomic energy. This is a management problem. Somebody else has got to pay for it.

Mr. DADDARIO. That is what we are trying to find an answer to.

Dr. HORNIG. We do it.

Mr. DADDARIO. But how will he know this capability has other applications in the first instance? He would have to compress his activity because it is not within the mission objective. Therefore, you would be stifling this growth before it has a chance to prove itself.