

Mr. WOLL. We have never found it necessary to put that date.

Mr. MONAGAN. Maybe you ought to get a new form.

Mr. WOLL. This is a military form we have been using.

Mr. ROMNEY. There is no need for the bill of lading number?

Mr. WOLL. No, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. Or the voucher number?

Mr. WOLL. No, sir; or at least we have not found a need to date.

Mr. MONAGAN. Wouldn't that help to follow up this property to determine whether or not delivery had been made and obviate some of the difficulty at the other end, this identification and use?

Mr. WOLL. It probably would, but the same criteria would have to be used. The AID mission would have to check with the shipping company in the country to which the property was going to ascertain the date of receipt in the country.

Mr. MIKUS. May I interject something on the bill of lading? We looked at Mr. Gren's accounting system and the key piece of information for him is the bill of lading.

Mrs. HECKLER. Who is Mr. Gren?

Mr. MIKUS. He is the AID mission's controller in Turkey.

Mr. WOLL. In answer to Congresswoman's Heckler's question as to how much property has been shipped out of this installation to Vietnam, from July 1, 1966, to May 6 of this year, \$4,165,255.

Mr. MONAGAN. In acquisition cost?

Mr. WOLL. Yes, sir; in acquisition cost. And our total outshipments from all of our European operations through March 31 were \$11.8 million.

Mr. ROMNEY. One final question, Mr. Woll. Mr. Waters, at our prior hearings, stated he anticipated the weekly man-hour rate by your contractor's operation here might reach 9,000 hours?

Mr. WOLL. Yes.

Mr. ROMNEY. Will this involve an amendment to your present contract?

Mr. WOLL. No, sir.

Mr. ROMNEY. Does it represent an expansion of the contractor's present capability?

Mr. WOLL. Only in terms of hiring additional employees by the contractor. His capability would be expanded with more people, but his facilities are capable of producing this production.

Mr. ROMNEY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MONAGAN. The hearing is adjourned.

(Thereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the hearing was concluded and the subcommittee proceeded to visit the premises of plant No. 1, the Hoboken/Antwerp plant, of J. & M. Adriaenssens N.V.; also one of the company's warehouses. Following lunch, the subcommittee proceeded to visit the dock area at Antwerp and plant No. 2 of the company, known as the Hansa plant, which inspections were concluded at 4 p.m.)