erty left in France. So the French may come in with what we might call a negative plan and say they will return it to farmland and it will cost more to return it to farmland. NATO expects the same thing.

There is another thing. Almost all the air bases except Chateauroux were funded with United States and NATO funding. Take a runway, the NATO criteria might say 14 inches of concrete and the U.S. criteria might say 18 inches. NATO pays for 14 inches and we pay for 4. They might say a generator does not meet their criteria.

Mr. MONAGAN. Does NATO receive any funds from the sales?

Mr. GILROY. No. They have not tried to sell but NATO has put out a memorandum to its member nations that if they have need to take it and they say they will put in a claim against France. They have not determined what kind of claim it will be. It is our understanding a man in the State Department is trying to establish a basis for a claim against France. They do not know what basis they will pursue. In some of these bases, since we have an interest and NATO has an interest, we should perhaps have the same type plan.

Another thing is if NATO gets a settlement for this runway we talked about where we paid for 4 inches, if NATO gets $10,000, NATO would owe $2,500 to the United States and the other $7,500 would be split among the 14 members. NATO told me last Tuesday they don't know how they will handle these claims. But this is on realty rather than removable property.

Mr. ROMNEY. On the removable property, aren't the FESO and MLS people sometimes working at cross purposes?

Mr. GILROY. I don't think I understand the question "at cross purposes."

Mr. ROMNEY. FESO's objective is to sell.

Mr. GILROY. Yes.

Mr. ROMNEY. And MLS's objective is not necessarily to sell right now but to take a broader view of the disposal. My question is whether you have had any indication that those responsible for the FESO operation are not able to carry out what they think their job is?

Mr. GILROY. I think there is one important area, and that is that FESO is holding back selling or attempting to sell that property that the French have not indicated an interest in. FESO is now a part of MLS since we moved out of France. They are holding back at all these installations. This economic cost analysis is being made, and in this regard FESO is holding back. On the other hand, FESO is continuing to sell any property that remained in France after we moved out that is virtually scrap.

The Air Force tried to get everything out that was excess by November 1 because they thought it would take 5 months to process the sale, and that meant it would take until March 31. Then the Army had a bigger problem because they had more supplies to move and in December, after discussions with the French, they found out they could shorten this 5 months to 75 days, which gave them to January 15 to move the excesses out.

Mrs. HECKLER. Is the most economical way to dispose of the movable property which can be detached from the real estate to sell it to France?