

we could only speak by analogy to prior programs. The very best figure that the Commission could come up with is 2,500 or more.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. What would be the total amount?

Dr. RE. We would have no idea there. We were able to estimate the Cuban claims a little better. We, there, came up with a figure of perhaps a billion and a half, something around that figure.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Haven't you been using a figure of around \$56 million?

Dr. RE. Not the Commission.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I have a couple of other questions. I am wondering why this bill is so late coming to our committee for consideration.

Dr. RE. I have no idea, sir.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Do you know when the Senate passed the bill?

Dr. RE. This is not an administration bill. We are merely giving our views as to the bill.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. You are in support of it?

Dr. RE. Yes; we are in support of the content of the bill but we are not familiar with the manner in which it was brought to the attention of the subcommittee.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Are there any advantages to the companies involved in the adjudication of these claims as far as a tax advantage or anything of that nature is concerned?

Dr. RE. Well, sir, I am not prepared to discuss tax advantages or other advantages other than to say that there is an advantage accruing to all claimants in knowing precisely what the amount was, and those advantages stemming from the availability of witnesses, records, and testimony. In other words, there is an advantage in knowing exactly what was the value of the property taken from you.

As for the appropriation of funds, which is a question that the chairman asked before we recessed, Mr. Kearney has already indicated, and I think I did also in my testimony, that there is absolutely no provision here for an appropriation. As a matter of fact, I wonder if I may read the phraseology of the last sentence of section 501 of the Cuban claims bill that we are now administering.

Section 501 of the Cuban bill concludes as follows:

This title shall not be construed as authorizing an appropriation or as any intention to authorize an appropriation for the purpose of paying such claims.

So if any claimant deems himself misled by the enactment of this legislation he surely cannot find comfort in the phraseology of the statute.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. If the gentleman would yield, what Mr. Broomfield was trying to establish, I believe, is that if a claim is adjudicated, does the claimant then have some preferred status as far as tax benefits if he is not paid?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. I think this is an important question. I see nothing wrong in it. It is just a matter of finding out what is the advantage other than the fact that these things have been going on now for 16 years. I think it is strange to me that it hasn't been done long before this. Sixteen years is an awful long time to wait to have these adjudicated. There must be some advantage to the claimants to have this done. That is all I am trying to find out. What is the reason for it?

Mr. CAMERON. If it was my client I would have written it off. I would have taken credit.