

and one quarter years since January, 1966, just 437 Department of Defense contract facilities in the Southeast region—less than eight percent of known facilities—have been visited.

The head of the Department of Defense's Southeast Region contract compliance operation has informed his supervisors that he needs *six to seven* times his present staff to perform his job adequately.

The General Services Administration contract compliance operation is much smaller than that of the Department of Defense and less regionalized; accordingly the hearing touched on the nationwide operation of GSA contract compliance, centered in Washington, D.C.

To supervise equal employment opportunity with respect to GSA contracts in the amount of \$1,350,400,000,¹⁶ the General Services Administration provides three professionals in Washington and ten compliance investigators in the field. One investigator covers the entire seven-State Southeast region;¹⁷ he devotes a portion of his time to matters other than contract compliance as well.

Nationwide the GSA contract compliance operation has assumed responsibility for approximately 5,000 facilities.¹⁸ In the one and one half years since September, 1966, somewhat over 500 facilities—about 10 percent—have been subjected to a compliance review visit.

Department of Defense officials estimate that noncompliance is found in 85 percent of compliance visits in the Southeast Region. The contractor in such cases is told what steps he must take to correct the noncompliance. The second vital element in enforcement is the follow-up visit taken after an initial visit in which deficiencies are disclosed, to insure that the contractor is remedying the deficiencies. Yet in the vast majority of cases no such follow-up has been made. In 95 percent of all contract compliance inspections conducted by the Department in the Southeast Region since January, 1966, the investigator recommended a follow-up revisit, yet in only 10 percent of the cases has a revisit been made.

Kenneth Eppert, head of the Department's contract compliance in the Southeast Region, acknowledged the effects of this situation on the attitudes of contractors.

"Mr. GLICKSTEIN. Do you think that [the] companies that you weren't able to revisit, but companies where you did find some deficiencies and wrote to them about the deficiencies, do you think that they are terribly concerned about what the consequences of not complying are?"

"Mr. EPERT. No. Well, let me phrase it this way: I do not believe that you should ever tell a company that you are going to re-visit them unless you visit them and if you don't re-visit them they are human beings like we are. The success of our program in my estimation is not necessarily the initial call, [in] the initial call I am sure we could put down many things which we expect to be done, but certainly the re-visit, * * * is the point to start, because there you have an opportunity to actually see what action had been taken on the recommendations that you might have made."

Referring to the relation between staff size and work load, Civil Rights Compliance Officer Robert Harlan, a contract compliance official of the General Services Administration, characterized the system of compliance reviews as "a sort of a hit and miss thing." He testified:

"Now, * * * you can recognize the horrendous task that it is to do these follow-ups. I mean this program, as it is being run, is basically project awareness. We do have the responsibility of making these people aware that there is a clause in their contract, and that this clause means just as much as any other clause. But * * * we are operating under horrendous conditions so far as the actual issuance of sanctions."

The inadequacy of staff, in addition to hampering the program of follow-up reviews, also undermines another important phase of contract compliance enforcement—the "pre-award" inspection. Under the "pre-award" survey program, any company receiving a publicly advertised Federal contract of \$1 million or more, which has not been the subject of a compliance review within the last six months,

¹⁶ For fiscal 1968, through February 1, 1968.

¹⁷ GSA's "Region 4," comprised of the States listed in note 14 above. In Alabama alone, GSA has contracts in the amount of \$15,614,193, for fiscal 1968, through February 1, 1968.

¹⁸ This estimate is based on a "Primary Interest Agency" listing of government contractors, compiled in 1966, and on supplemental data, reported to GSA contract compliance officials, on new GSA contractors since that time. Because this supplemental data is incomplete, there are probably several thousand additional contractor facilities for which GSA contract compliance is responsible, but which are unknown to it.