

launchers and with existing production facilities adequate for this procurement."

You had already made that determination before you received this unsolicited offer?

Mr. TASSIN. It was our opinion at that time, sir, that Chromcraft was the only one who possessed these facilities and capabilities. However, if another concern could come in and demonstrate to us that they could produce these launchers in the time required, or a portion of them, it is altogether probable or possible that we would have given them an opportunity not only to quote—

Mr. ROBACK. I understand.

Mr. TASSIN (continuing). But to receive a portion of the award.

Mr. ROBACK. I understand. All I asked you was what would you have had to do, since you had already made a D. & F.; that is, a determination and finding.

Suppose the firm came in with low prices and you wanted to give them a chance, what would you have had to do? This is all I ask.

Mr. TASSIN. We would have awarded a portion to the other concern and we would not have had to amend these requirements since this was our opinion at the time it was made.

Mr. ROBACK. Would you have had to cancel the D. & F.?

Mr. TASSIN. The matter of signing an exception to D. & F. does not automatically preclude competition. In fact, the ASPR says that even though there is a public exigency existing that this should not be used to obviate competition.

(Off the record.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Proceed.

1965 COMPETITION

Mr. ROBACK. That was the last in time, that competition? When was the next prior competition?

My records show there was a competition in 1965 on 0547.

Mr. TASSIN. The last prior competition, sir, was on contract NOW-65-0547-f, modification No. 3 to that contract.

Mr. ROBACK. Now we had a little interchange yesterday, and it was unclear whether the competition was on the modification or on the initial contract. Have you examined your information and can you clarify it?

Mr. TASSIN. Yes, sir, and it was on the modification No. 3 for a quantity of 12,000 LAU-3/A rocket launchers.

Mr. ROBACK. We raised the question then and the substance of the report at the time was that this was on the initial contract it was believed, but we asked why was the competition introduced at modification No. 3. Why No. 3?

Captain McMorries. Can you respond to that?

Mr. TASSIN. I do not have the answer to that at this time. There was a rather urgent—

Mr. ROBACK. You have been preparing for this hearing for several weeks. You knew of our interest. And you knew of the committee's interest in the competitive problem, and you mean to say you do not know?