REPORTS RELATING TO SERVICE-TYPE AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTIVITIES CONDUCTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Report title or subject	Reference	Date
Operation of a dairy farm by the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., Department of the Navy (we found that it would be more economical to rely on commercial sources for dairy	B-156167	Mar. 23, 1966
products) Savings available through more extensive use of contract vehicle service and of certain mail-handling equipment, Post Office Department Failure to curtail operation at Government expense of military commissary stores in confailure to curtail operation at Government expense of military commissary stores in confailure to curtail operation at Government	B-114874	Nov. 29, 1965
Failure to curtail operation at Government expense or immusity of the tinental United States where adequate commercial facilities are available, Department of Defense. Letter to the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee concerning commissary stores	B-146875	Apr. 16, 1964
(contents restricted) Letter to Hon. Thomas B. Curtis concerning commissary stores (contents restricted) Followup review of Government production compared to procurement of weapons and re-	B-146875 1 B-146875 1	July 9, 1964 Dec. 14, 1964
placing orders with arsenals without comparing costs with prices of commercial	B-146848	Aug. 31, 1964
Sources). Unnecessary costs resulting from Government production of M-60 machineguns and repair parts rather than procurement from the commercial source, Department of the Army_nnecessary costs resulting from Government production of M-14 rifle repair parts rather Unnecessary costs.	B-146883	Aug. 21, 1964
Unnecessary costs resulting from Government production of mark the tendency than procurement from commercial sources, Department of the Army. Letters to Hon. Harold T. Johnson concerning maintenance of radio equipment (contents	B-146848	Feb. 7, 1964
restricted)(Contents restricted)	B-148347 1 B-148347 1	June 29, 1962 Oct. 22, 1962

¹ Information in these reports not to be released to persons outside GAO without the approval of the congressional official to whom the report is addressed.

Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee, December 18, 1967.

Hon. Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Staats: Enclosed is a copy of a letter dated December 8, 1967 from the Honorable William B. Widnall concerning testimony given to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government by Mr. Lewis R. Caveney on November 30, 1967

Will you please investigate the points raised by this letter and report to the Subcommittee? At the present time, no date has been set for additional hearings but I would appreciate your report as soon as your staff load will permit.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Chairman.

House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., December 8, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE, Chairman, Joint Economic Committee, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee on November 30, Mr. Lewis R. Caveney of the Bryant Computer Products Division of Ex-Cell-o Corporation noted one instance in which had the Government procured a computer system on the basis of buying from peripheral manufacturers rather than from one systems manufacturer the savings to the Government in that one instance alone would have amounted to \$429,250. He also stated that this savings was just the initial cost savings, that additional savings were possible in the one instance, from a savings on 336 square feet of space, at \$100 per square foot, according to the General Services Administration, and a savings on the number of individual parts which required maintenance and manpower. Mr. Caveney contended that his figures in this one instance could be substantiated by the General Accounting Office.

My inquiry, then, is this: Could the General Accounting Office both substantiate the instance Mr. Caveney referred to and go one step further and study computer procurements in both the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense to determine what savings could accrue to the Federal