

There appears to be a similar pattern in both of the instances I have cited today, and I am certain there must be others. I suggest that Congress may be well advised at this time to begin an indepth investigation into our military procurement procedures. We owe it to our taxpayers that every step be taken by those spending the taxpayers' funds to insure highest efficiency at the lowest cost. And we owe it to the small businessman that he be treated equitably and fairly in his dealings with Federal procurement officials. There seems to be growing reason to question whether either is being done in many cases coming to light at present.

UNNECESSARY COSTS IN PROCUREMENT OF RADAR SETS¹

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, I delivered a speech concerning two different Army procurements, one of which involved the AN/PRC-25 and AN/PRC-77 radio sets awarded to Radio Corporation of America in a multi-year procurement which the Army attempted to justify on the basis of lack of manufacturing drawings and also because of a supposed urgency for delivery. This award was made to RCA in spite of the fact that a small business firm had on file a bid which was lower by almost \$1 million for this identical equipment.

The claim by the Army regarding the lack of manufacturing drawings appears as specious as the urgency of delivery claim is fallacious. I have been reliably informed that the drawings do exist and that delivery of these radio sets 2 years from now is not urgent.

Mr. President, on September 21, 1967, I received a letter from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army signed by the Honorable Robert A. Brooks, which actually states that drawings are not available and, I quote:

"RCA was awarded a contract in June 1966 to produce the initial production quantities while further design changes and improvements were being affected."

Mr. Brooks goes on to state that:

"As a matter of fact, due to design changes resulting from concurrent field tests, the final procurement package will not be available until early December, 1967."

In other words, Mr. President, what Mr. Brooks is saying is that the Army is engaged in a development program running parallel with two production contracts which exceed \$20 million for portable walkie-talkie radio sets.

This is the exact same practice that has been investigated by the General Accounting Office on radar set AN/PPS-4 and radiacmeter IM-108/PPD involving millions upon millions of dollars wasted by the Army in producing electronic equipment in quantity before the design was frozen.

In the case of the IM-108/PD radiacmeter, five separate and distinct contracts were awarded for 59,776 units, resulting in a waste of the taxpayers funds of a total of \$2.9 million for defective equipment. Moreover, in its decision rendered on this case, the General Accounting Office recommended that the engineers in charge of that fiasco be fired, and they were in fact removed from the Government payroll only long enough for the national press to give its attention to more important matters. Whereupon, the Army quietly reinstated these same men, using as an excuse the fact that they had admitted they were wrong and promised not to do it again. This is incredible, but true.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reports from the Comptroller General Nos. B-146834 and B-146906 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"UNNECESSARY COSTS INCURRED IN SOLE-SOURCE PROCUREMENT OF PORTABLE RADAR SETS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

"(Report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General of the United States, October 1964)

"To the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate:

"Our review of sole-source procurements by the Department of the Army disclosed that the Government had incurred unnecessary costs of more than \$2.2

¹ Reprinted from Congressional Record, 90th Cong., 1st sess., Sept. 28, 1967.