

"From the Army letter of 21 September, it appears that the Signal Corps is running a development program parallel to a production program for the same equipment. I am aware of the GAO Reports on the IN-108 Radiacmeter and the AN/PPS-4 Radar procurement wherein the Army previously did exactly the same thing in continuing development with parallel production which resulted in the waste of millions of tax dollars. (Comp. Gen. B-146834 and B-146906.)

"It is for these very reasons that I hereby request the GAO to identify for me by name, rank and grade, title of all civilian and military personnel who are involved in the AN/PRC-25 and AN/PRC-77 development and production including engineering, logistic and contracting officials with particular emphasis on those names of Army employees common to AN/PPS-4 and IM-108 Radiacmeter procurements.

"In addition, I request that the GAO audit RCA Contract 89511 in an effort to recapture possible excess profits which must have been realized under a \$20.5 Million award for radio sets at a unit price of \$2,156.91 (after \$2.2 Million had already been paid RCA for development) in a non-competitive procurement for that equipment which RCA subsequently quoted at \$843.37 per unit the very instant the force of competition was introduced into the procurement for the same radio.

"And finally, it is requested that I be supplied a summary of DD-250 Documents which cover shipments made by RCA under contracts 01292 initiated March 21, 1965, and 10410, showing line for line, item for item, shipping dates.

"When the audit is complete under Contract 89511, please arrange to supply me with a completely priced bill of materials for the radio set supplied by RCA under that contract, showing item for item prices and sources, which I want to use for comparison with other information from other manufacturers covering this same equipment.

"Very truly yours,

"PETER H. DOMINICK,
"U.S. Senator."

MILITARY PROCUREMENT PRACTICES¹

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 19, 1967, I delivered an initial floor speech concerning questionable military procurement policies and procedures. It concerned two Army contracts. Both were awarded to big business firms although substantially lower bids were on file from small business firms. Specifically, one award was given to Northrop Northronics—a division of Northrop Aviation—the high bidder, over Customs Packaging Co., the low bidder. The other award was given to Radio Corp. of America, the high bidder over Decitron Electronics Corp., the low bidder.

The first contract involved a shoulder-borne portable flame weapon. The other contract involved a portable walkie-talkie radio set. In both transactions the procedures used to justify the excessive cost to the taxpayers seemed to me to be so highly questionable that I urged that Congress proceed with a thorough investigation of our military procurement policies.

The case involving my constituent, Custom Packaging Co., Aurora, Colo., clearly pointed out a serious shortcoming in our ability to properly review transactions involving millions upon millions of the taxpayers' dollars. Congress has depended upon the Comptroller General of the United States to accomplish the technical aspects of this review. The Comptroller General has acknowledged that this is not being done.

In response to the protest filed by my constituent, the Comptroller General responded in part as follows:

"Your claim of improper use by the procuring activity of proprietary information contained in Custom's unsolicited proposal is categorically denied by responsible and knowledgeable technical personnel of the Department of the Army. And while your rebuttal and other correspondence dealing with this allegation strongly disputes the conclusion reached by the Army Technical Personnel, we have no alternative but to accept the facts as reported by the Army. In factual disputes, such as here, which are technically beyond the competence of our office because of the scientific or engineering concepts involved, we must accord a significant degree of finality to the Administrative position."

¹ Reprinted from Congressional Record, 90th Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 4, 1967.