

established as to description, use, maintenance costs, and type of buildings. All of this you have already. It might be something should be developed that would give this Nation an immediate readout on what kind of space requirements we have, where we can meet it, how we can best meet it on the basis of our current record, rather than trying to keep it all in your head and in your agency's top field agents who are keeping up with those records.

Mr. KNOTT. Right.

Mr. BROOKS. It would be more available to you. It would enable you and your staff to more readily meet these needs. You wouldn't have to keep remembering that you need x space for x couple of agencies. You would just have it all laid out. And this would include, of course, the possibility of building them on a reimbursable basis so there isn't any misunderstanding about your right to deal for them and to get them a better price and better, more usable space.

Mr. KNOTT. Of course, this varies, Mr. Chairman, under the present practice. This varies from agency to agency.

The Department of Agriculture, while it has special-purpose facilities—forestry labs, entomology labs, and various kinds of special-purpose laboratories—has no difficulty in coming to GSA on a reimbursable basis and asking us to build those laboratories nationwide.

The Department of Interior, when it fell heir to the water pollution program, felt that it should build the water-pollution laboratories that GSA previously built for HEW. We find some indication on the part of HEW now, in the Public Health Service area particularly, that they would prefer to build some of their own facilities.

While GSA, in the Public Buildings Act of 1959, has an area of responsibility for general-purpose buildings, I am sure I don't need to tell you that the final result is one of compromise, and it does not cover all the buildings. And while GSA is often referred to as the greatest and the largest construction agency of the Government—nothing could be further from the truth—and has the greatest proliferation in the construction field of government of almost any activity I know of, and while it would not occur to me we ought to be building dams for the Bureau of Reclamation or for the Corps of Engineers, certainly in the buildings field, we have built everything from small post office buildings up to atomic reactors.

And I believe we have the competence to do that. The very fact that we are not doing that has made it necessary for us to cut back several in our staff. Because, for our own account, in our recommendations for the fiscal year 1969, we felt that it was the time when construction costs were increasing at the rate of about 7 percent a year, and we had a number of projects last year on which we had to get supplemental funds in order to make awards on the contract, so we made a recommendation that we have a complete moratorium on construction funding in our fiscal year 1969 budget.

That was accepted in the House and I expect will be accepted in the Senate. And as far as I know we are the only agency in Government that has done that. Because of that we have the lowest budget that the agency has submitted in 9 years. But it does have its impact on our ability to hold together a force of qualified, experienced people who are able to carry on a program of construction for other agencies.

In 1968 we still received from other agencies some part of \$157 million for construction of their projects. We expect to receive proba-