

said in very careful words what you are saying, it is not a recommendation, it is merely meaning these particular items are qualified, I think most people when they read that would look at the publication, the seal, and read the names and say these are the four best permanent-type antifreezes that are in the country. That would be what most people would almost inevitably come to the conclusion when they read that.

As a result of that, and this is what I am really thinking of, it would mean in effect that every antifreeze manufacturer in the country would have to come to you to be qualified right away because they would want to get their name on that list. They would say we have to do that. They would all be in and you would have a couple of hundred applications the very next day, wouldn't you, to get on that qualifying list?

Mr. ABERSFELLER. Certainly that would be important. There are others.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. There are eight rather than four. Almost every antifreeze manufacturer in the country is on your list, if not every one.

Mr. ABERSFELLER. I don't think so.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Anyone we ever heard of is.

Mr. ABERSFELLER. I am talking about antifreezes available for sale. Sometimes they are marketed under other brand names. But Gulf is on there and so is Zerex and Windo.

Mr. WYDLER. Practically everyone would be forced—not just about antifreezes but this would become practically the rule of the game. You would have to become a Government-qualified product manufacturer, even if you didn't want to sell to the Government, because you would have to get your name on these lists if they were to be distributed.

Mr. ABERSFELLER. I would agree it carries that connotation. If I may digress to tell you a story supporting that contention, a short time ago we had some difficulty with a major manufacturer of copying equipment in our negotiation process. We weren't able to get the kind of prices we thought we should have. As a result, in investigation we found nine agencies had contracted independently with this particular firm. So very quietly we thought—at least I sent a letter to each of the nine agencies and explained the circumstances I thought rather clearly and asked them to cancel that contract. So far as we have been able to tell, this letter of mine got in the hands of a New York broker and the stock the next day dropped six points.

Now, there was no implication at all that this product was unsatisfactory. It is quite a satisfactory product. The problem was simply one of price. Yet that letter seemed to have that kind of impact.

This is one of the reasons that we are so deeply concerned about what we publish being proper and right, because the influence of the Federal Government is substantial in the minds of a great many people and its insistence or statement, even by implication, that a particular product does or doesn't have certain characteristics is carried forth I think with some evidence that this is the product to buy.

In our advertising done by contractors that do business with the Federal Government we do not allow any which would indicate a sponsorship or endorsement of the product, primarily because of the reasons that I just mentioned. We don't want to get involved in saying