

Mr. ROMNEY. Yes.

Mr. TUTTLE. My first clue came when you visited my office on July 2. It did turn out that we had received the implementation issuance of one of the military departments in one of our divisions, but it hadn't been brought to my attention.

Mr. ROMNEY. Which one was that?

Mr. TUTTLE. I believe it was the Air Force implementation.

Mr. ROMNEY. And that implementation did have as an attachment to it the new language for groups 15 and 16 setting out the exceptions?

Mr. TUTTLE. That is correct. This Air Force implementation sheet had just been received in the first part of July I'm told, and so the Division Director hadn't had a chance to bring it to our attention for a discussion of what to do.

We feel, Mr. Romney, that the way this program works with so many field people involved and all of them with a need to be knowledgeable, that ultimately we would have received the other two service implementations or had them brought to our attention probably by a GSA regional office. We are on the mailing list for many DOD, DSA, and military service issuances, but they have so many vehicles for issuance that we certainly are not on all of them in our central office.

Mr. ROMNEY. I would like to go back in history a little bit, Mr. Tuttle, back to November of 1965, when the various Federal agencies were being asked to comment on the proposed GSA revision of the Federal Property Management Regulations 101-46, that is, the exchange/sale regulations. These are regulations which were issued in March of 1966 and became effective in July of 1966.

The Department of Agriculture commenting to the Commissioner, Mr. Howard Greenberg, said this:

Both the Forest Service and the Agricultural Research Service operate a small fleet of aircraft. These agencies usually replace one or more units each year. For many years we have disposed of the released units either by exchange or sale and applied the exchange allowance or proceeds of sale toward the cost of replacement. This action has been followed with components and accessories.

The matter of the desirability of exchanging and selling the aircraft parts then was brought to your attention back in 1965 but no exception was granted with respect to that. I am wondering whether now having granted the exception to the Defense Department you might want to consider the same thing for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TUTTLE. You are speaking only of aircraft parts, not an aircraft itself.

Mr. ROMNEY. That's correct. I said that the comment in the Department's letter of November 22, 1965, covered both aircraft and parts.

Mr. TUTTLE. It is too early to tell. This is part of the evaluation job that I know the committee feels that we should be doing and we feel we are doing. The limited exception given to Defense—we would like to talk with DOD a year from now and see how much value it has had before considering whether to make a permanent change in the regulation. At the present time, of course, the exception is granted only to the Department of Defense.

The Agriculture Department has never come back on that particular request. Most of the airplanes that they operate are excess