

petition, and defend it in this fashion, I say it makes almost meaningless the things that I have said in praise, as I frankly have thought that we were moving in this direction.

When I heard the testimony yesterday in regard to the noncompliance with the Truth in Negotiations Act, when I still see, after all my correspondence on getting Government out of business, the military in this instance, engaging in the generalities we have had before without zeroing in on crucial questions like commissaries and so forth, and I don't want to get into a hot subject particularly, because I find that I can't cope with that, but at least I would like to have the list of the inventory that you mention in your statement.

I think the better way for me to proceed is to go over this statement and your answer, and as best I can present the reasons why I have made these statements.

I can't express my disappointment more. This generality that you have given us here, and the evasive answers, after all the work that we have been trying to do in this thing—

Mr. IGNATIUS. Mr. Curtis, I must respond because of the admiration I have for the guidance you have given us, and when you say evasive answers, if you will give me an example of that, I will be as forthright as I possibly can. I thought I was being forthright in saying that we have followed rules—

Representative CURTIS. Well, for example, in saying that it only applies to 4.6 percent of your procurement. What has that got to do with the issue?

Mr. IGNATIUS. What it has to do with the issue is that we must be very careful, particularly in a hearing associated with economy in Government, that we not spend money beyond the benefit that is attained from it.

Representative CURTIS. Of course that is an understandable principle, but that is not an answer. If what the GAO tells us is true, these small contractors just automatically put it on their own records, whether it was bid or not, and then you give us this answer that it will require a great reporting system. When we come to the detail, this is the kind of thing I regard as an evasive answer. The Federal Government has an annual bill that is approaching \$2 billion in the use of computers, so that we can bring about this kind of reporting by process. You dismiss this matter and say you are following procedures of 1959, and that it only applies to 4.6 percent, which I suspect is about \$2 billion worth of goods.

But the main thing I am concerned about is the coverup or the misuse of the term "competitive bidding" which has become sort of a checkpoint that I have used myself over a period of years, to test out the progress. Now I find, after listening to this, that I am going to have to review in my own mind all that has gone on in the past.

I know you are well aware that the Armed Services Committee has been accusing the Defense Department of rigging figures for years in their claims of benefits. I have defended you on the floor of the House. I was shaken a bit when I made a suggestion that maybe we get some outside people to evaluate your savings. I did not get a very good response in the Defense Department on it. Frankly, it just shakes me to the point where maybe I have to review what I have said in the past about our progress here.