

BeC well.
John Beery

Dear Mr. Beery:

I AM SORRY I HAVE NOT RESPONDED
TO YOUR TELEPHONE CALLS BUT I DID
NOT FEEL OUR TESTS WERE AT ALL
CONCLUSIVE IN COMPARING SUICKEM UP
WITH COMPETITIVE PRODUCTS.

TO DATE WE HAVE ONLY RUN COMPARATIVE
TESTS IN ONE HUMIDITY CABINET ON OUR
GUN STEELS AND FIND YOUR PRODUCT
AS EFFECTIVE AS OUR CURRENT PROTECTIVE
AGENTS BUT NO OBVIOUS IMPROVEMENT.
WE HAVE NOT RUN ANY LUBRICITY TESTS
AS WE DO NOT HAVE SUCH A TEST
DESIGNED AND DEPEND ON TRAIN ERROR
OVER A LONG PERIOD OF USE.

OUR CURRENT PROTECTION AGENT
IS DILUTED WITH A SOLVENT AND AS
SUCH IS ONLY A SMALL FRACTION OF
THE COST OF SUICKEM UP. IT IS
DOING A GOOD JOB AND WE REALLY
HAVE NO REASON TO REPLACE THIS
PRODUCT.

ON OUR DEVELOPMENT AND HUSBAND
GUNS WE USE WD-40 AND HAVE BEEN
PLEASED WITH THE PROTECTION AND GU
FUNCTION FOR MANY YEARS. WE ONLY
USE SMALL QUANTITIES, PURCHASING IN 1102
CANS AS NEEDED.

AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THE ABOVE
WE DO NOT HAVE A NEED FOR A NEW