

Mr. STAATS. There is nothing wrong with it.

Representative GRIFFITHS. I don't think there is either.

Mr. STAATS. We are not saying that there is anything wrong with it.

Representative RUMSFELD. In effect you are, because what you do is you issue a report that has no names, and then unless some Congressman asks for the names, no names will ever be supplied.

If some Congressman asks for the names, then over a period of a month or two, 60 days at the most, the name might be forthcoming. Public officials serve in a goldfish bowl, and there are plenty of people anxious in line to run for public office, and so, too, with contractors. They know when they enter into a contract with the Federal Government that the relationship they enter into is different than it is when they enter into a contract in the private sector, because they are dealing with taxpayers' money and there is no shortage of people standing in line for Government contracts.

Mr. STAATS. Take the case of the report we did under the Truth in Negotiations law. We had 242 different contracts there. We are not interested in a case like that in pointing a finger at individual contractors. We are interested in finding out whether the Government itself is carrying out the regulations which have been issued.

Representative RUMSFELD. You are talking about the other half of the question. I was obviously referring to the other side.

Mr. STAATS. Basically we are interested in whether the Government itself is carrying out its contracting operations adequately and in accordance with the law. We are not interested in trying contractors per se when, as in the case we are talking about here, the Armed Services Procurement Regulation is primarily at fault.

Representative RUMSFELD. I appreciate there are two sides to it.

Chairman PROXMIRE. Why can't we change the regulations or change the policies and simply provide that immediately when the report is made, the contractor specified in the report will be notified and given an opportunity to comment, and within 2 weeks, it will be disclosed.

Representative RUMSFELD. That doesn't solve it because they are not specifying contractors in the report.

Chairman PROXMIRE. You can't very well specify, if the contractors haven't had an opportunity to read the particular report. They may have worked with them right along.

Representative RUMSFELD. You mean the contractor referred to but not specified.

Chairman PROXMIRE. That is right. Two weeks wouldn't make the reports stale. Two weeks would be an ample opportunity to give a reply.

Mr. STAATS. In this case I would be surprised if it would take more than 2 weeks to supply this information. I want to emphasize again, though, Mrs. Griffiths, that if we feel that there has been something wrong with respect to the performance by the contractor himself, we will not hesitate to name the contractor.

I want to make this very clear as a part of my statement of the policy that we follow. We would still give the contractor the right to state his position on it.

The line we have attempted to draw, and again we are not infallible, is that if we are trying to get at a basic problem of the regulations, of