

*as such, with the exception of Dr. Astin, its members are not working laboratory directors. What advantages and disadvantages would you anticipate for a small council of Federal laboratory directors that would represent their views at the Executive Office level for both directly and contractor-operated Federal laboratories?*

Answer. With respect to the establishment of a small council of laboratory directors, I believe that there are a number of positive advantages which could result from such an arrangement. The Federal laboratory directors could be broadened by exposure to problems on a national scale. Further, their ideas and inputs could add greater breadth and insight for the activities of the Committee.

The representation of contractor-operated laboratories in the Committee is a moot question. There are those who believe that this would not be appropriate. Their motivation, needs, administrative arrangements, problems and relationships with their contracting agencies are considered quite different from Federal laboratories. This lack of commonality of specific needs and interest, together with the different framework for contract laboratories, makes their involvement in the Committee's activities of questionable value.

On the other hand, there are those who feel that an arrangement such as this might offer many benefits. Both types of organizations could learn from one another. Contract laboratories may have solutions to management problems which seriously concern Federal laboratories, and vice versa. I believe that the Committee on Laboratories should test this suggestion out and determine its utility even if it were only in a limited area.

*Question No. 8. In what ways are the directors of your large, multipurpose laboratories kept informed of the scientific and technological content of new or changed Government functions, such as those of the Department of Transportation or the Department of Housing and Urban Development?*

*(a) What incentives are there for your laboratory directors to give thought to such matters in addition to their primary responsibilities to your program?*

*(b) Are DoD laboratory directors authorized to fund research relevant to national problems which may be outside the strict mission objectives of DoD?*

Answer. I should begin by pointing out that there are few problems in other agencies which do not have Defense relevance. We have strong interests in health, housing, education, training, weather forecasting, oceanography, standardization, criminal investigation, etc., to name a few. We have had a three-year program in gun detection and are involved in riot control measures. With the exception of relatively few areas (e.g., air and water pollution), our broad interests are similar to those in most other agencies. We differ only in specifics.

As a natural consequence of these common interests, laboratories keep informed of new and emerging national programs. In addition, there is much high level collaboration with other agencies with resultant specific assignments to individual laboratories. For example, we participate in the Inter-Agency Committee on Atmospheric Sciences (ICAS) which involves collaborative efforts in oceanography, meteorology and such specific activities as clear air turbulence. We have participated and have close communication with HUD on an experimental housing program. As I mentioned in my testimony, the DoD laboratories work closely with NASA, AEC and DOT in areas of aircraft, space vehicles, nuclear programs, and transportation.

Another motivating factor is that our laboratories must keep up-to-date with science and technology which evolve from other agencies' programs also because of their potential use in furthering DoD's mission. Thus a great deal of the responsibility for keeping up with such programs rests with the individual laboratories.

The technical directors of these laboratories/centers are expected to maintain close contact with all new Federal and/or commercial work and developments which are related to their mission areas or may impact on their ability to accomplish their assigned missions, and in most cases do.

There are relatively few incentives for our laboratory directors to stimulate work in non-DoD relevant areas, nor in our opinion should there be. Most laboratories/centers are under heavy pressure by program sponsors to devote all their resources to the execution of agreed programs within the over-all mission of the activity. This pressure is reinforced by the common requirement to use appropriated funds for their intended purpose.

While DoD laboratory directors cannot divert mission funds to support programs outside of the DoD mission, the independent research funds provided to laboratories may be used for this purpose. However, the after-the-fact review on the utilization of these funds for such purposes would soon discourage it.