

not sure why, since you have a million dollars in your pocket, you have to find eligible claimants for it.

I can understand the Dodecanese situation, but that is something different. I don't see why the Italians have a special break.

Mr. RE. There is no question of Italians here.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I mean with respect to claims in Italy.

Mr. RE. They are American nationals.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I understand.

Mr. RE. I would have to agree with you, sir, if we didn't have money left over. It isn't a question of money burning in somebody's pocket. The question is: Are we going to permit the late filed claims to be adjudicated.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. My question is: Why should we? This bill would allow it. It isn't necessarily a hostile question, but I would like to know why.

Mr. RE. It is a matter of policy. We say that if a person has a valid claim, and that claim has not been adjudicated solely because of late filing, and there is money left over—

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. But you were the one who was critical of the late filers. You said if you extend a deadline there are always going to be people who are going to take advantage of it.

Mr. RE. There is a vast difference in a situation where we have made awards in excess of \$100 million, and after all payments are made we will only have \$40 million, as distinguished from a situation where everybody has gotten 100 cents on the dollar and there is money left over. I would say the late filers in these two situations are not in the same position.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If you read the proceedings in the record—

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Frelinghuysen, I wonder if you would allow Mr. Selden to ask a question at this point? He has another meeting to attend in a few minutes.

Mr. SELDEN. I wanted to ask this question. Is there a difference in this bill and the bill that this subcommittee reported out last year?

Mr. RE. This bill makes no reference at all to the Polish situation.

Mr. SELDEN. Why?

Mr. RE. Because that program has already been terminated by the Commission as of March 31, 1966. That problem is no longer before us and is no longer vital.

Mr. SELDEN. Was it in last year's bill?

Mr. RE. Yes, it was.

Mr. SELDEN. Why? The program had expired prior to the passage of that bill by this subcommittee?

Mr. RE. It had not expired prior to the introduction of the bill.

Mr. SELDEN. You said it expired March 31, 1966, and we didn't report that bill out until August, as I remember.

Mr. RE. As of the time the bill was introduced, the problem was not moot. It became moot because of the passage of time.

Mr. SELDEN. Did you state that to the committee last year when we were having hearings on it?

Mr. RE. We didn't ask for the extension of that program. Last year when Mr. McGuire testified on my behalf, we indicated that we did not favor reopening, or extension of the program, although some people did wish that the program be extended.