

and were helping us with problems in the area of health and safety. These meteorologists, by virtue of having worked in this multi-program environment were interested in matters of biology, in matters of the physical sciences, and so on. It wasn't long before, as they went to meetings with colleagues and so on, they heard about problems in their field where their expertise could help. It wasn't very long before we had other agencies in the Government, starting with staff to staff discussion, finding out that we at Brookhaven could do things which could assist them. We worked out with the Commission the type of interagency transfer that we have talked about today.

The first one or two of such projects are hard to start. In other words, you have to do a lot to get them started. On the other hand, as more and more of this work is done it becomes more the practice or the pattern. People find that it does work, that one agency can have work in another agency's laboratory and they are able to have direction. They don't have to just turn it over and forget it. It is a little bit of success breeding success. So as these projects have developed successfully, I think there is a greater inclination to do more.

In part, my answer is "Yes," it is a little better these days as based on just that aspect.

I am not unaware of the point that you made and I am not unaware of the fact that anyone likes his own laboratory, to do his own work and not have to have too many bosses. It is human nature.

One of the ways that we in the Commission have tried to overcome some of this in major areas is through joint offices, and, for example, in the space area AEC and NASA have a joint office. Personnel from both agencies manage this program jointly and the program then is effected, parts in NASA laboratories, parts in our laboratories. This is interagency cooperation.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Felton.

Mr. FELTON. One way of fostering interagency work would be that the personnel ceilings which exist in Government-operated laboratories do not apply to interagency work. In view of what you just said, would you agree with this type of procedure?

Dr. TAPE. I will have to condition my answer, but I would tend to agree with that.

The condition I want to inject is the following. AEC through its contractor-type operations does not impose personnel ceilings per se on the contractor. The personnel ceilings generally have to come about because the sum of money that is available pretty much fixes what the personnel levels will be anyway.

The point I want to make here is that as an ex-manager in a Federal laboratory, I am fully aware if one has a job to do and has a certain budget in which that job must be done, the manager needs flexibility to decide on personnel numbers and specialties, for example, scientists, engineers, technicians, et cetera. The most important thing is to weigh costs, personnel versus services, and so on. We can't sit here in Washington and tell him to do the job with so many dollars and with so many people. We do have the advantage of letting the Director judge for himself the best way of getting it done.

However, there are other restrictions on the laboratories, and this goes back to some of the Economy Act provisions which say that in these Federal laboratories, if you do take on work for others of this