

to the administration or acted into law that a final filter had to be applied to this to see that government generally had a certain level of competence, this then would filter down like everything else does.

Mr. HUGHES. I think that is right. But at least in the present state of art, and I characterize it as an art rather than a science, the best techniques which we have evolved for allocating funds in areas where choices are very difficult, where the management problems are very difficult, are techniques which involve the forcing of choices upon the people who manage the programs. Dr. Pickering referred to this and so did Mr. Finger. We are interested in Harry Finger's selection of R. & D. efforts within his particular sphere of responsibility. Certainly through our own expertise and whatever help we could obtain from Dr. Hornig and his staff, we would try to compare NASA's projects and NASA's laboratories with AEC and National Science Foundation activities.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Let's terminate the answer and go on to something else. I don't think we are on the same wavelength.

If you make a decision that water fountains were necessary in Government installations, then you would allow water fountains through the Bureau. You would let people have water fountains.

Have you ever approached this question of discretionary authority for these laboratories on this basis in the light that Dr. Pickering has suggested; that is, that it is a possible and necessary cost of doing business to see that a laboratory has funds for general competence, morale, or all of these reasons he lists, all of which would not be applicable if you did not apply them to all laboratories?

Mr. HUGHES. We have not taken the initiative with respect to discretionary funds as far as I know.

Mr. WESTRATE. The Bell report which was proposed essentially under the leadership of the Bureau of the Budget dealt with this problem. In that respect, the Bureau did take the initiative. As far as we are concerned that is still a very valid conclusion.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Hughes, we are at the point where we most likely will have to have you come back.

The Bell report states that "it would seem, based on the results of this review, that it would be possible and desirable to make more use of existing governmental facilities and avoid the collection of duplicate facilities. This is not as easy a problem as it might seem. It is ordinarily necessary for a laboratory, if it is to provide strong and and competent facilities, to have a major mission and major source of funding."

It goes on to say this will limit the extent it is possible to make facilities available to other agencies but that "it is clearly possible to do this and a continuing scrutiny is necessary."

What we would like to know, and we can't possibly go into it at the moment, does the BOB feel the same way as it did when this report was published in 1962? What has been done about it? Who performs this continuing scrutiny?

How does it fit into these questions we have been asking about facility ratings and this type of thing?

We may be able to handle this by submitting a series of questions, but if we are not, we would like to try to work out an arrangement to have you come back.

Mr. HUGHES. As you wish, Mr. Chairman.