

POSITION OF COMPETITORS

Mr. LUMAN. Mr. Tassin, you indicated that the competition was not on a modification but on a basic contract. Were you talking about the competition of six firms? According to the data we received from the Navy, there was a contract with Chromcraft, 65-0547-f, and this contract had five modifications. The third modification lists here six firms solicited and two responses and exception 2 used. Is that the competition you referred to?

Mr. TASSIN. That is what I am speaking to; yes, sir.

Mr. LUMAN. Do you think it was a fair competition in the sense that in the previous modification of that contract the Chromcraft Co. had been awarded almost 40,000 launchers of the LAU-3/A, and this was a bid for 12,000 of the same launcher? Did that put any competitor on any kind of equal footing? This was within 30 days of the signing of this modification for 12,000 launchers. Chromcraft had been sole source awarded almost 40,000 of the same product.

Mr. TASSIN. I can't say it would put them on an equal footing, but let us put it this way. Our competitive system is such that if an individual is, and I will have to use the word "fortuitous" enough to be in production and adequate time is available to compete the item, we have no authority that I know of to equalize this competitor advantage by giving him any sort of a premium price in order to make him more competitive.

Mr. ROBACK. We understand the rules of the game. But what was the happy inspiration that led to a competition on modification No. 3 of the contract when the bulk of the thing had already been sole sourced?

Mr. TASSIN. There was more time available between the requirement initiation and the deliveries that were to be made for that quantity of launchers.

Mr. ROBACK. What was the time difference?

Mr. TASSIN. I will have to supply it. I don't have the information available here.

Mr. ROBACK. How do you measure the time difference?

Mr. TASSIN. We measure the time difference from the contemplated date of award to the date that production, or production deliveries, must commence.

Mr. ROBACK. The contract was signed when?

Mr. SHILLITO. It says May 3, 1965.

Mr. TASSIN. Modification No. 3 on that contract—

Mr. ROBACK. I am talking about prime award.

Mr. TASSIN. The prime award, sir, that was June 3, 1965.

Mr. SHILLITO. May 3.

Mr. ROBACK. Chromcraft Corp., 65-0547-f, initial award.

Mr. TASSIN. My record shows June 3, 1965, sir.

Mr. ROBACK. Was the competition for the main award?

Mr. TASSIN. Yes, sir. That was the date the contract was awarded.

Mr. LUMAN. Your summary here shows the contract date to be May 3, 1965. The other information shows modification No. 1 to be June 3, 1965, which added 3,000 more rockets.

Mr. TASSIN. I will have to clarify that with you. I have differing information here, sir. I think we will have to clarify that.