

activities during a given year simply wasn't needed or wasn't scheduled for or wasn't desired. That won't show as clearly.

Mr. FINGER. I am going into too much detail in my consideration of it, but it seems to me it would be very difficult to present the integrated picture of what that organization is doing in support of the laboratory people associated with it. Some people would be charged to one agency and others to another and I do not believe you would get a budget that would show the total context of what that organization is supposed to do, and what its total workload is.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I won't pursue this because I suppose it is more properly a subject for people who deal in that area.

Mr. FINGER. It is an active subject of discussion.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I will say this as a member of the Government Operations Committee. We just yesterday had a discussion about the many Government reports that are put out. Should the public pay for them or should the people who want them, pay for them? It seems to me having to pay for something is a very good way to impose a discipline. If people want them, they will purchase them. If the demand is that great, people will be willing to pay 25 cents for this little publication that is being reprinted. I am just afraid that NASA might be wandering out of its area of expertise in recommending these very fixed conclusions as to how the funding should take place.

Mr. FINGER. Without meaning to get into that subject that you discussed in a broad sense, we found that when we do put a charge on some of these technology utilization reports, the demand actually goes up.

Mr. RUMSFELD. You bet your life.

I don't have any other questions.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Finger, just one further point on this, however. Mr. Rumsfeld mentioned a point which I think to be particularly important.

You had a lot of agencies looking to NASA to do work when it had the money and they did not. You now have a period of severe budget limitations and you can no longer do that. I would come to the conclusion then that the work was not important in the first place, and that it was just being done by chance and there was no particular plan to it. What we would like to know is how, in fact, do you manage these things so that you are doing things you ought to do and not doing it just because money is available?

Mr. FINGER. The point I really was trying to make is that if work is requested, NASA has taken it on within its broad areas of responsibility; in such areas as the aerodynamic research or in communications activity, weather research, where we are charged with a research and development responsibility in a broad sense.

That is still our primary responsibility. If someone else came into NASA to ask to use a part of the capability that was in existence for work that was not at all within NASA's areas of responsibility, then I think that would have to be weighed in terms of priorities with the ongoing activities that NASA had. NASA would have to weigh them. They would certainly also be reviewed in the Bureau of the Budget in the process of their budget review activity. They would be reviewed in Congress as the Congress acted on total resource allocations to these installations.