

ered. These agencies include the Coast Guard, Department of Commerce, Tennessee Valley Authority, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Reclamation and the Canal Zone Government.

There is a time lag of about eighteen months between the awarding of prime contracts and the time they come before the Renegotiation Board for review, if they ever do. So the impact upon the Board's activities as a result of the huge step-up in Defense procurement for Vietnam has not yet been felt. When it does hit, it will confront a Board hamstrung not only by statutory limitations and with its jurisdiction narrowly defined. It will also find a Board seriously reduced in manpower. The Board's activities are conducted today with less than twenty-five per cent of the personnel it had during the Korean War.

The profiteers who intentionally gouge the Government for excessive profits during a time of war are also guilty of consciously withdrawing efficiency from our industrial capacity. These private-businessmen profiteers are in reality guilty of sabotage.

It is a peculiar system of national values when young men are vilified and sent to the penitentiary for refusing conscription—a method of coercion the opposition to which was responsible in large part for the formation of the United States—while contractors and corporate executives are permitted to stay home and profiteer off the people in a time of war. In light of the heavy sacrifices made by the men who do the fighting and dying, one would expect that those who do business with the Government would not take advantage of the situation by profiteering.

Our history has been one of rampant war profiteering, and I am convinced, as even the limited annual reports of the Renegotiation Board reveal, that profiteering is going on now, is increasing, and will continue to increase unless something more realistic is done to stop it. For this reason, I have introduced legislation to put some meaning into renegotiation. My bill, H.R. 6792, would bring the floor for contracts subject to renegotiation back down to \$250,000, eliminate the all-important standard commercial articles exemption, eliminate the competitive bid-construction exemption, eliminate other exemptions with respect to subcontracts, and place TVA under coverage of the Act.

These changes would restore the Board to approximately the condition it was in and the strength it had at the outbreak of the Korean War. There is no excuse for not taking proper safeguards against profiteering. By confining the Board the way it is restricted at present, we have, in effect, locked up the policeman on the beat in the middle of a crime wave.

But powerful forces are moving to do just that. Last year a serious effort was made to kill the Board by not extending the Renegotiation Act. The Act was extended, until 1968. An even more serious effort to kill it will surely be made next year. In the meantime, an investigation of the Renegotiation Act was authorized. Both the law and the Board have been examined and investigated several times. The latest Congressional investigation of the Board was as recent as 1962.

What we ought to be investigating is not the Board, but profiteering itself. A full-fledged Congressional investigation into profiteering, in which the names of contractors and corporations who have taken excessive profits in the past would be revealed, and in which the appropriate officials could be examined, would be both a revealing and an enlightening lesson. It could lead to important new legislation.

The title of his article is "War Profiteering." He states:

The facts make it clear that profiteering is taking place on a considerable scale. There is evidence that it is on the upswing.

He goes on to say:

War profiteers grow fatter and richer. When elected public officials, the press, and other news media ignore the issue. It is in the absence of public attention today that the profiteer can push his special interest legislation with one hand, while pocketing excess profits with the other.