

municated in such a way that they plausibly fit into that higher priority, will find, I would think, that the funds or funding through the Bureau of the Budget, through Congress, and ultimately through the taxpayers of this country, will be at a minimum.

Mr. FINGER. That is the way it is done. The Bureau of the Budget does get the various proposals of the various agencies and these include the user requests where the user justifies his need for his system.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Yes; but the thrust of your statement from page 17 is against that. It seems to me that you say you don't want to be a job shop. And yet how else can priorities be established unless one option is weighed against another option and a decision made that one option has a higher priority and one has a lower priority?

Mr. FINGER. I was making that point in support of the position that we have taken that when we do work in support of another agency using our existing capabilities, we should be prepared to fund it.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Are you saying that because that is the position you have taken?

Mr. FINGER. When you build a national resource in a laboratory with the capability that exists in it, you can't have that capability fluctuate by demands from other agencies if you are to retain that capability as an effective resource.

Mr. RUMSFELD. To the extent that a capability is being used to fulfill an effort that has a high priority and is being funded through a different department, wouldn't it be proper to identify the funding and allocate a normal portion of the cost to it? You are arguing against it.

Mr. FINGER. No; if the capability that is in existence is applied to that other required effort, but we need to retain that capability, we should add to the operating costs the add-on costs—

Mr. RUMSFELD. Why do you draw the line there? I am not saying if it weren't used, it should still go on. Then, it would be allocated to NASA.

Mr. FINGER. There are real problems with how those kinds of funds would be transferred back into the responsible agency to support the existing capability.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Wouldn't it be proper to assume that if there is no use for that capability over a period of years in one agency, it should be transferred to a different agency?

Mr. FINGER. I am saying if you have that capability, you ought to evaluate its worth and rather than allowing fluctuations in support levels, there is someone responsible for retaining that capability in existence and applying it against the programs and responsibilities that are undertaken by the Government. We are suggesting that it is an essential requirement to keep that capability in existence and someone—some agency—should be charged with that responsibility.

Obviously, if there is no need for it, that is going show in the program activities that are presented to the Bureau of the Budget, to the Congress, and in the priorities established. In that process, it will be determined if there is no need for the capability and—

Mr. RUMSFELD. It won't show. What will show is that there is a level of capability through which things are being done. What won't show is that the technology that is being developed as a result of those