

Mr. ROSENTHAL. And each of these agencies—this is the part that I find a little difficult to understand—each of these agencies, would they reduce their budgetary requests accordingly, because they would not need the funds to purchase this equipment?

Mr. BOUTIN. Yes, that is absolutely true. And also their budgetary requirements would be adjusted to the user charge that they would pay to GSA, rather than the rental that they would pay the manufacturers—whatever difference there may be in that area.

You would have in one great, big pot the total financial requirements within the framework of the revolving fund. And the only thing the agencies would then have would be the user charge that they would pay the General Services.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. The only thought I had, Mr. Chairman, is, I think, when we do prepare the report, we ought to have some financial analysis and anticipation of the costs of this program.

Mr. BROOKS. I think we can get this in fairly good terms.

Mr. BOUTIN. But it would have to be flexible, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. We might meet some opposition on the floor if we cannot logically say this is going to cost X. We cannot just come in with an open-end desire.

Mr. BROOKS. To be fair about it, there is no way to know what HEW or what some of the given constituent agencies of the Congress are going to require. Take the Labor Department. It has a request for a certain capacity, and it is approved by the appropriate legislative committees. To implement that requirement that Congress has passed, it will need a certain type of machinery. You cannot anticipate exactly what this requirement will be.

That requirement would then have to be met out of the pool of equipment available to your GSA-ADP pool. And if GSA had equipment that would meet that need, then GSA would issue it to the Department of Labor.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am sure an analysis can be made, Mr. Chairman, of an approximate.

Mr. BROOKS. Well, we can get some figures, and we will. But, as he said, it would be flexible. We might be able to, and I would be hopeful that we could, get a pro rata saving—it is a little difficult—of purchase over lease of a given dollar input to the revolving fund.

In other words, say \$275 million expenditure over a 5-year period would result in a \$148 million saving. And we might be able to relate the input to the savings as opposed to the present and old system.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Stinson.

Mr. STINSON. Would you go along with the Comptroller General's figure of \$275 million as the total capital outlay for providing the necessary equipment?

Mr. BOUTIN. We would really have no fix on this, you see, because the Comptroller General and his staff are the ones that have done this valuation, have made this evaluation, after long months of study. And, of course, that \$275 million is related to the 523 machines. So when you start looking overall, it is pretty hard to pinpoint.