

the people in France, were designed for emergency purposes, not for daily filling of Germany's requirements.

Mr. MONAGAN. The actual property allocated to the support-type personnel would be pretty limited, in relation to total tonnage and value, would it not?

General CASE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONAGAN. We talked about beds and household equipment and that sort of thing, and automobiles, to some extent?

Mr. ZARETZKY. It might be automobiles.

Mr. MONAGAN. My other question related to the value of the 70,000 tons of property, 8.5 percent, which became available for reutilization purposes or ultimate disposal action. Do you have that figure?

Mr. ZARETZKY. I believe we have some figures on that. Our general rule of thumb is that our equipment is valued at about \$1 a pound. It usually works out that way, surprisingly.

General CASE. In France the value of the mission stocks that went to PDO was \$20 million.

Mr. MONAGAN. Acquisition value?

Mr. ZARETZKY. Yes. The estimate is \$33 million.

Mr. MONAGAN. Of the 70,000 tons, how much was sold? Do you have that figure? By that I mean public sale, disposed of in that way.

Mr. ZARETZKY. I had in my statement a figure of how much was sold through December of last year. Here I believe I stated that we sold \$15.5 million worth in the first half of this fiscal year. That is, July to December.

Mr. MONAGAN. Was that at public sale?

Mr. ZARETZKY. That is right. Invitation for bid.

Mr. MONAGAN. Is there any way of telling how much of that was scrap and how much was—

Mr. ZARETZKY. Well, generally our scrap percentage of our total runs somewhere above 60 percent and our last report we submitted to the Congress showed it was 61 percent last year.

Mr. MONAGAN. What I have in mind is whether a procedure was followed that would guarantee that items that might be used by AID or other Government agencies would be preserved prior to their disposition.

Mr. ZARETZKY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONAGAN. That was done in this instance?

Mr. ZARETZKY. Yes, sir. Every single item was listed and shown, made available, to other U.S. Government agencies for their possible utilization. In fact, they sat right with us as we developed the listings.

Mr. MONAGAN. The 86,000 tons that have been returned to the United States as excess to theater requirements, do you know whether there has been any determination that any of that is excess to DOD requirements subsequent to its removal here?

Mr. ZARETZKY. The first time we find that we brought something back that is no longer required, there will be a letter going out saying, "How come?"

My answer is no.

General HEISER. For the Department of the Army, may I say that the objective and the intent, sir, was to bring nothing back here except that for which we had valid requirements. So while there may have been something returned by mistake, we don't know about it.

Mr. MONAGAN. Do you have some questions?