The Forest Service case was an example of a hardship case. I think it is in the file that we furnished to you. The Forest Service had an aircraft in the hands of a State and the State had planned to acquire a new one and use the exchange allowance of an old one. The State legislature had already acted on the thing, and had appropriated funds on the basis of the net amount needed to buy the new aircraft.

So the Forest Service asked for an exception, a one-time exception on that basis. That's a hardship case.

Mr. ROMNEY. I would like to ask if you could tell us how many of these requests for waivers have been received——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Seven.

Mr. ROMNEY. How many have been approved, how many have been denied, how many are pending?

Mr. GRIFFIN. There have been seven received. One has been rejected, three continuing waivers have been granted, and three one-time waivers have been granted.

Mr. ROMNEY. Two of the continuing waivers dealt with the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, did they not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That's right.

Mr. ROMNEY. The Department of State's original request was for a complete exemption from part 101–46.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Right.

Mr. ROMNEY. However, the waiver was only granted with respect to the 30 categories of ineligible items, is that correct?

Mr. GRIFFIN. That's correct.

Mr. ROMNEY. But the USIA, which made a request for essentially the same reasons, since it was operating overseas, was only given an exception, a waiver with respect to groups 41 and 71, and I wonder if you could comment why the State Department should have had the entire 30 categories but USIA only two.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Romney, that the State Department was not consulted on the development of the reg, because they are not a major domestic generator of excess and surplus property. When they brought the matter to us for discussion, it was readily apparent that the property at this time which becomes excess to their needs overseas is not eligible for donation. And a provision would have been included in the reg to exempt these overseas sales by the State Department until such time as we complete the study, which is going on now, and we undoubtedly would review it then.

Now, on the USIA, it has been my experience overseas that there is considerable support in the way of furniture and furnishings given to USIA by both the State Department and the AID missions, so USIA itself owns considerably less property. So USIA brought to our attention the two categories of property which they have in more abundance and which gave them a continuing problem, and the review was conducted on the request they made. But I am sure that the significant fact is that they have considerably fewer types of property. I don't think that USIA maintains many vehicles and rolling equipment overseas. Practically all of their support comes from the embassy or the country team approach.

Mr. ROMNEY. Let me ask a technical question of Mr. Tuttle with respect to the State Department's exemption from the 30 categories. Once this exemption was granted, did these 30 categories then merge