

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Well, supply those names, too—and I would like to know how much experience those people have had, and what kind of training, and how long the contracting officers have been letting this go along.

I would also like to know what kind of training the contracting officer has that permitted a bid in which the contractor rented the equipment. I am sure you won't have any objection to supplying that.

Mr. MORRIS. We will be glad to respond.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. The name of the contracting officers and what kind of training they had.

Mr. MORRIS. GAO has not yet identified to us these cases.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. They are going to. We have got the information that they are going to.

(Information following was subsequently supplied:)

We have contacted the GAO and asked them to supply the names of the 21 contractors covered in their review of the controls of Government-owned property in contractors' plans (B-140389) dated 28 November 1967. When these contractors are identified to us, we will obtain the names of the contracting officers, the property administrators, and supply to the committee the information requested by Congresswoman Griffiths.

(DOD later supplied the following:)

We have considered how to best respond to Mrs. Griffiths' request for the names of the contracting officers who are responsible for permitting contractors to use government-owned equipment for the manufacture of commercial products. We have again reviewed the GAO report dated November 24 covering the use of government-owned property in contractors' plants and we have considered the numerous facilities contracts and the amendments thereto which govern the use of the facilities at plants reviewed by GAO.

It is apparent that the terms and conditions of the contracts, some of which were executed many years ago and which have been amended many times over the years to expand or modify the conditions covering the availability of the government-owned property, were properly executed and were in compliance with the ASPR pending at the time.

The GAO has considered the contract conditions and the individuals involved. In Appendix 2, Pages 85 through 89 of the Report to the Congress dated November 24, GAO has published the names of the principal officers they identified as responsible for the administration of the activities discussed in their report. We believe these officials are properly designated and are, in the final analysis, responsible for the performance of this function. Local contracting officers and property administrators should be held accountable for acting in accordance with published policies and procedures.

With respect to the training which contracting officers receive, the DOD testimony covered briefly the training courses now established to provide uniform joint training and career development in the procurement field. In addition to our regularly scheduled training programs, traveling teams are sent to major procurement activities to orient procurement personnel in new techniques and programs. While not all contracting officers receive training each year, we are trying to maintain schedules which permit 8,000 students each year to complete one or more of the 43 DOD approved courses.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Now, I would like to ask you this—because, of course, you see, this is not going to show up as war profiteering, as Mr. Rumsfeld has pointed out, because under the rules a contractor could do that, and under the rules the Renegotiation Board is going to permit him 6 percent on the cost. But, it is going to show up as a real windfall when you start handing out the dividends, or start paying the management that thought it up. So, the contracting officer, in my opinion, and the negotiator, did an exceedingly poor job, and the Defense Department ought to be very concerned about that.