

Mr. DADDARIO. You already have given some examples of how your laboratory gradually developed other activities to the point where now some 13 percent of the funds you expend come from other agencies.

Dr. WEINBERG. Right.

Mr. DADDARIO. Notwithstanding that, you then said you agreed with Dr. Hornig that we ought not to be rushing into this. This subcommittee is particularly concerned about taking advantage of what we have learned, and I would think that we ought to make this gradual development a little more accelerated. I guess our argument here would be a matter of speed.

Dr. WEINBERG. Yes.

I guess I am not prepared at this stage to say that we should have a GSA for the general laboratories. It is to this extent that I disagree with the Bell report.

On the other hand, I agree with you fully, Mr. Daddario, that giving the agencies a Government-wide flavor is a good thing, and I think it can be done in the way that we have been doing it at Oak Ridge.

Mr. DADDARIO. At this stage I do not believe I would be in favor of a GSA-type program, either. But that is not to say that I believe that because various agencies of Government or even various committees of the Congress have jurisdiction over certain areas that it ought to be that way and we ought not to recognize these as to what they are and then break them down. It would follow more logically from one type of laboratory to another if these inhibiting barriers can be removed.

Dr. WEINBERG. I agree

Take civil defense, for example. The Federal Government supports some 200 separate contracts, but where can one go for a "coherent doctrine" with respect to civil defense? The interdisciplinary "projectism" that characterizes research in the national laboratories can impose a much-desired coherence on the research of the Federal Government. The crossing of agency lines implies a reintegration at the working level that can counteract the inevitable fragmentation caused by the structure of our Government. Problems transcend agencies. Only when problems are dealt with as a whole, as is possible in the big laboratories, do they get solved as a whole. Desalting requires the technology of evaporators and the technology of energy sources; in a laboratory these two can be reintegrated, even though in the Government they are fragmented, the one being the concern of the OSW, the other of the AEC.

I am convinced that the key to the responsible redeployment of the big laboratories is the role and attitude of the top management. I believe that the redeployment will be successful and in the national interest if the laboratory director himself views very broadly his responsibilities in a way that transcends the confines of his own supporting agency, and if he is aware of and sensitive to the national interest. It is on this account that I have strongly recommended that directors of big interdisciplinary Government or captive laboratories be brought into the highest levels of Government science policy. I would recommend that PSAC, for instance, always have at least one laboratory director on it. I must say that I have always valued my own term on PSAC not so much for what I contributed, but rather for the breadth of understanding that my tenure gave me, a breadth that has proved invaluable in the current redeployment of ORNL.