

though only one bid was received. I did not say that you would automatically have a competitive situation on the submission of one—you said it, and I think if we check the record we will find you said it.

Representative RUMSFELD. I did not say you said that. I said you said the competitive price was achieved, and I wrote it down when you used the hypothetical case saying that \$4.90 was the competitive price that was achieved. And, it is not necessarily the competitive price. It is what you think might be a competitive price, if you had had competitive bidding which in your hypothetical case you did not.

Mr. IGNATIUS. We got one bid, that is true, in that hypothetical case.

Representative RUMSFELD. And you don't have the vaguest idea if that is a competitive bid or if that bid is a competitive price, other than your previous experience.

Mr. IGNATIUS. Previous experience is often useful in evaluating a current situation. That is all I was trying to say. And if it isn't competitive, we shouldn't count it as such.

Representative RUMSFELD. It seems to me that there is a tendency to attempt to bury the committee here in percentages and statistics, without really getting down to the hard facts of defining our terms and seeing what in fact the problem has been.

The GAO report was carefully worded. It was not a wild report. It was very cautiously and carefully drafted—their statement, I mean, to the committee—and the statement to the committee certainly doesn't jibe with the considerably different picture you have painted of your successes and lack of successes.

Now if there are problems in the regulations, if there are problems in the procedures, I think there ought to be enough candor on the part of the Department of Defense to come in, and talk about them and see if we can't point towards improving them, rather than saying how you have made the "analysis repeatedly" and you have "followed them vigorously" and "devoted and sincere efforts" and "the facts speak for themselves." I wrote down those four or five quotes, which don't add to my input, and I am being very sincere.

Mr. IGNATIUS. I know you are, sir, and so am I. I believe we are at some disadvantage with draft GAO reports that we haven't seen, and testimony that preceded us by only a day, to answer specific comments that are made, and without the chance to confer with the people who have made them.

The point that I attempted to make to the chairman is that we always are receptive to GAO reports. We learn from them. The record speaks for itself. We welcome this look from the outside, and we will address these reports in a systematic and objective way, as we always do.

We have not had an opportunity to do that as yet, since we just got them. We will do that, and if they disclose any wrong application of the rules that govern us, we will reassess the rules as the chairman asked me to do. We will be happy to do that. This is part of normal administration of responsibilities.

Representative RUMSFELD. Mr. Curtis estimated that the portion you were talking about—where it might not be advantageous from a cost standpoint, to audit more fully—he estimated it was about \$2 billion—the 4.6 percent. Is that pretty close?