

ion that reflect a position and then be available for your questioning. I think it might be more useful from the committee's standpoint.

(Mr. Hughes' biography follows:)

PHILLIP S. HUGHES

Phillip S. Hughes took office as Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget on March 10, 1966. Prior to his present appointment he was Assistant Director for Legislative Reference of the Bureau of the Budget for 8 years, from June 1958. In that capacity, he reviewed legislative proposals sponsored by the Administration and advised the Budget Director and the President on legislative matters. Earlier he served as Deputy Chief of the Office of Legislative Reference for 2½ years.

Mr. Hughes has been a career civil servant with the Bureau since 1949. At the time he joined the Bureau's staff he was a Budget Examiner for veterans programs. In 1953, he became an Assistant Division Chief.

Mr. Hughes was born in Chicago in 1917. In 1930 his family moved to the State of Washington, and in 1938 he received a B.A. degree from the University of Washington. He entered Federal service as an Analyst with the War Manpower Commission in the early days of World War II.

Subsequent to military service in the Navy, he joined the staff of the Veterans Administration. Three years later in 1949, he joined the staff of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Hughes was honored with an Exceptional Service Award by the Bureau in 1965, and the Career Service Award by the National Civil Service League in 1962.

He is married to the former Jean Evans and they have 3 daughters and one son. They reside in Chevy Chase, Md.

STATEMENT OF PHILLIP S. HUGHES, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

As I indicated we are here to discuss some of the key issues that you have identified related to the effective utilization of laboratories. I think quite obviously we share the committee's concern that the Government's research and development facilities are managed efficiently and effectively just as we have the same concern with the use of all Government resources. We recognize and agree that this requires at least some degree of flexibility in terms of the using of existing capabilities to meet the research needs of other agencies.

Feasibility is a problem here and I think this is something that we should talk about.

I refer in my statement to the Bell report, which I am sure you are thoroughly familiar with. Unless there is some point that you wish to pursue there, or perhaps we could come back to it, I would suggest that we move on perhaps to about page 4 of the statement.

We are in essential agreement with the general concepts of the Bell report, and I don't think it is necessary to reiterate them.

Mr. DADDARIO. No.

Mr. HUGHES. You have posed a number of questions which bear on two major aspects of Federal laboratory management: First, keeping the laboratory responsive to new needs and opportunities which strongly relates to the quality of the laboratory, and the second, the utilization of existing laboratory resources to meet such pressing national problems as transportation, pollution, housing, and crime.

With respect to the upgrading of laboratories these problems obviously are the prime responsibilities of the agencies.

We do, however, feel that basically the management of the agency must consider the future of its laboratories in terms of their capacity