

ularly relate to this question. I believe the attitude of top management toward redeployment would be improved if laboratory directors had more opportunity to participate in the work of OST and PSAC. Although I know of no policy to hinder this, I believe there is no special policy to foster such participation.

(b) In every case of redeployment, our laboratory received the full sanction and concurrence of AEC. All money spent at ORNL goes through AEC—either by direct appropriation or through interagency transfer.

(c) Duplication is not really much of a problem since ultimately what any government or contractor laboratory spends is paid for by a government agency, and the government agency presumably has cognizance of what is going on in fields it pays for.

2. *While the present Laboratories Committee of the Federal Council for Science and Technology is concerned with Government laboratories as such, with the exception of Dr. Astin its members are not working laboratory directors. What advantages and disadvantages do you see for establishing a small council of Federal laboratory directors that would represent the views of both directly and contractor operated Federal laboratories at the Executive Office level?*

2. I don't think much of a council composed exclusively of Federal laboratory directors. They would spend most of their time talking about unessential administrative questions. Rather, Federal laboratory directors should be brought into the existing scientific policy-making framework of the government as panel members, advisors, and members of the regular committees such as the Defense Science Board, General Advisory Committee to AEC, PSAC, etc.

3. *A sharp line frequently is drawn between those Government laboratories that are directly operated and those that are contractor operated. In terms of your experience, what are the principal characteristics of each mode of operation and the differences between them that are significant to utilization of Government laboratories?*

3. The main practical difference is that a government laboratory usually operates both on a personnel and budget ceiling, a contractor laboratory only on a budget ceiling. This gives the contractor laboratory a good deal more flexibility than the government laboratory. On the other hand, since the contractor laboratory is not really part of government, its influence on government practice is apt to be less direct. However, this depends profoundly upon the personalities of the laboratory management and their counterparts in government.

4. *What authority do you have to deal directly with other agencies that may wish to engage ORNL's research and development services?*

4. Strictly speaking, all our contacts must go through AEC; in this sense we have no authority to deal directly with other agencies. However, AEC has interpreted our prerogatives in this respect liberally, and, once contacts through official channels have been set up, day-to-day relations with other agencies are handled about like day-to-day relations with separate branches of AEC.

5. *As a general policy, do you believe that discretionary funds should be made available to all laboratories or only those which have demonstrated quality work (a reward for competence)?*

(a) *Do you believe that discretionary funds should be used only in furtherance of an agency's mission or could some of the funds be used as seed money to explore how technology developed by a laboratory could be applied to other national problems, perhaps outside the jurisdiction of the sponsoring agency?*

5. I think some discretionary funds should be available to every laboratory. The size of the fund should be negotiable, and naturally would be cut back if the management used these funds irresponsibly.

The laboratory management should be allowed to use the funds for very broad exploration, even if this leads outside the agency's narrow mission. Again what is required is a sense of proportion and responsibility on the part of management, and this comes from participation in policy formulation.

6. *The DOD witness proposed the elimination of manpower controls on cross-agency work in order to achieve flexibility similar to that available to the AEC contract laboratories. What is your opinion of this proposal?*

6. As I said in number 3, I agree that there should be a budget ceiling, not a personnel ceiling on a laboratory. This implies that people can be fired; I assume that even within Civil Service this is possible when there is a reduction in force.

Mr. DADDARIO. This committee will adjourn until tomorrow morning at this same place at 10 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 27, 1968.)