

to the whole Federal family, are just immense. This whole area is going to grow. It cannot help it. We agree with your statement.

CENTRALIZED MANAGEMENT WOULD MATERIALLY ASSIST BUREAU
OF THE BUDGET

Mr. BROOKS. Through centralized management as provided in the bill could GSA materially assist the Bureau of the Budget and others in the Executive Offices of the President in development of long-range budgetary and management policies pertaining to ADP equipment?

Mr. BOUTIN. Absolutely we could. We, of course, work very closely with the Bureau of the Budget. In particular, right now, speaking of the Office of the President, we work closely with them on matters of procurement policy.

Of course, we do prescribe procurement policy now for the civil side of the Federal Government and work closely with the Department of Defense on the ASPR regulations. There is no question in my mind but that this legislation lends itself to a very close working relationship with the President, himself, and the Bureau of the Budget in formulating regulations and procedures.

Mr. BROOKS. Could you assume these responsibilities in a manner so as not to diminish or compromise the traditional budgetary and the policy control of the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. BOUTIN. Yes, because, of course, the Bureau of the Budget, itself, would have to pass on any financial request for appropriations that we would make to the Congress. So, inherent in the legislation, itself and in the procedures of the executive side of the Federal Government, we go to the Bureau with fund requests, so they would have a close rein there. Then we would have to go to the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, itself.

GSA ADMINISTRATOR SUGGESTS MINIMUM OF EXEMPTIONS

Mr. BROOKS. On the exemption question, you heard the Comptroller General's comments on it. Do you agree with him that basically there ought to be a minimum of exemptions passed on by the Administrator, probably by and with the counsel of the President?

Mr. BOUTIN. Yes, I do completely agree with that. I would like to point out that the Administrator of General Services—in fact, all of his top assistants—have complete and absolute clearance as far as any security matters are concerned. We work now with the CIA, we work with the National Security Agency, we work with the Department of Defense in many other areas apart from ADP.

There very likely could occur, as the Comptroller General pointed out, certain instances where a requirement is for specifically engineered equipment that would not be the usual type of ADP equipment where an exemption would be desirable. I think this ought to be administered very tightly, that the Administrator ought to be thoroughly familiar with the exact reasons for an exemption, that the Office of the President should be equally familiar with those reasons. This would not be something that would be treated lightly, at all.