Dr. PICKERING. In our case the physical plant, the facilities, are owned by the Federal Government. We operate the laboratories for the Federal Government.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Right. I just raise this as an example of a way that some people are getting discretionary funds. If discretionary funds can be allocated, there is no reason why an arrangement like this couldn't be. I am saying it is another way that it is being done, not the best way nor the way it should be done.

Your answer is not an answer because we have Government-owned property, as the gentleman sitting behind you can tell you, in private commercial operations all across this country, so the very fact that that is the rule now does not necessarily mean that it must be the rule forever.

Mr. DADDARIO. All right.

Dr. PICKERING. The question has been raised as to how a mission-oriented laboratory can be responsive to such national problems as transportation, housing, or crime. We tend to presume that problems which have been caused or aggravated by technology can be solved by technology. In fact, the solutions involve political, social, and economic considerations, and new technical devices may be a minor contribution to the total solution.

A concerted attack on the problems can best to made by a team of specialists including skills ranging from the physical to the behavorial sciences to economics and law. Such teams must operate under the disciplines developed by the systems analysts in the mission-oriented laboratories, and can be readily built around the existing groups. Some elements of these skills already exist in laboratories concerned with total mission responsibilities, because mission operations require human operators; thus human skills, motivations, and limitations must be incorporated into mission design. Therefore, it is quite feasible to convert existing Laboratory capabilities in response to these national problems. In fact, many engineers and scientists are deeply concerned with such social problems, and I am sure that in most laboratories, it would be easy to find high motivated individuals willing to explore these areas.

Recently, at JPL, we held informal discussions with senior members of the Los Angeles Police Department concerning the technical problems they face. It is clear that the Laboratory has the skills to develop some of the needed solutions.

The interdisciplinary attack, in which the system analysis is accomplished by social and political scientists as well as engineers and physical scientists, is an attractive and promising concept, although largely untried. Cal Tech has been moving in this direction, seeking to close the gap between the physical and social sciences by expanding and reorienting its curriculums.

Finally, we have the question of whether to create new laboratories for new missions, or whether to assign new missions to existing laboratories. I believe that the assignment of a new mission to an existing laboratory can be profitable. An established laboratory processing staff, management, and facilities can, if competent and suitably matched to the new task, move more rapidly into the new mission.

On the other hand, such a reassignment should be made only when there is assurance that the quality and character of the laboratory justify the new mission. Since the Federal Government does have a