

General Motors Delco Radio Division, \$556,152.

The report contains the following incredible admission:

"We could not independently evaluate the technical aspects of the proposals, nor could we determine from an engineering standpoint whether the Agency's technical evaluations were reasonable. Furthermore, many of the Agency's technical evaluations were not adequately documented. However, our review disclosed that the Agency's engineers responsible for evaluating the proposals were in general agreement that RCA's proposal was the best."

Of course, they would.

Mr. President, I think we ought to think about this for a second. Here is the Office of the Comptroller General which is designed to be at least Congress agency to determine whether the executive departments of the Government are operating in the best interests of the taxpayers and in the best interests of the country. Yet, they have said now on three consecutive occasions that they were not qualified to analyze the scientific and other material which forms the basis of the Army's decision. Consequently, the only thing they can do is accept the Army's decision, even when in the Comptroller General's report it says it is not documented, and the Army's opinion has been based on the claimed lack of technical competency of companies like International Telephone & Telegraph.

Can we conceive of any more ridiculous position than having the Army come up and try to tell the Comptroller General or anybody else that ITT or Bendix or Advanced Communications or General Motors cannot build a portable radio? It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard of.

Here we have another \$500,000—that is not a great amount in the present budget—thrown down the drain solely because the Army wants to deal with RCA to the exclusion of everybody else. I say it is amazing indeed.

I am informed today that the Army is right this minute scheduling \$8.5 million in this fiscal year into sole-source noncompetitive production for the AN/PRC-62() radio set that I have just finished talking about, where we have bids from five perfectly competent companies that are far lower than the bid from RCA. In view of what has transpired, it will come as no surprise when RCA is announced as the lucky company that is going to get this "urgent" award—much to its happy surprise.

I would not be surprised next month to learn that the Army has generated another of its classic "urgent" requirements—this time for shoulder-borne flame weapons to be produced by Nortronics on a noncompetitive basis, because the Army will say they need them in a hurry, even though they have a 2-year development program already in operation.

The Senate Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am a member, has recently held hearings, during the course of which I was assured by Mr. Robert Moot, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, that SBA is going to be far more vigorous in seeking corrective action in this area. We have been promised a report on the cases which I have previously reported to the Senate. I am looking forward to receiving these reports.

Mr. President, I believe that this free ride on the taxpayers' back has gone on long enough. Surely, not every research and development program has to come up devoid of manufacturing drawings, precisely in point of time to coincide with an overpowering, overriding demand for immediate delivery. Certainly, we should be capable of orderly planning that would allow open competitive bidding for our military requirements. As it is today, less than 15 percent of all the money spent by the Pentagon—the billions of dollars that we spend—is awarded under contracts based on competitive bidding and public opening of bids. This situation exists in spite of the fact that it is common knowledge that competitive bidding reduces the cost from 30 to 50 percent under noncompetitive costs.

Mr. President, as I have said, this is the third speech I have made on this subject, and the third series of contracts I have brought up. I hope to bring up more such instances in the future, because the point I am making is that somewhere something is wrong in the Army procurement system. One result of this wrong is that tax funds are being spent at a rate far in excess of what is needed. Another result is that the low bidder, time and time again, has been knocked out as the eventual procurer of the contract, and it is given to the big companies that already seem to have a great number of defense contracts. This situation raises questions in my mind and, I believe, in the minds of all of us.