

completely. He was picked up late in 1943. This is the one class of people injured during the war who received no compensation whatever.

Mrs. KELLY. If this committee decided to do that, would it then have to reopen other claims programs for the same reason?

Mr. REITER. No; only the personal injury claims. There were relatively few personal injury claims. The great bulk of the Italian claims were claims for property damage.

Mrs. KELLY. I am asking about other countries which are also under this act.

Mr. REITER. This would only apply to people who were injured in Italy.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Monagan.

Mr. MONAGAN. There were personal injury claims allowed for another class of Italians?

Mr. REITER. Americans who suffered damage after 1943. I know of two, and I have cited them, and would like to place one of the decisions into my exhibits as exhibit E, and the decision in the Hauss claim as exhibit F. There were at least two cases of Americans who were injured in Italy after 1943 who were paid.

Mr. MONAGAN. They were paid after 1943, but there was a limitation in time for the period for which they could qualify, is that it?

Mr. REITER. These were all American citizens, and the original statute said that anyone who was injured during the war with Italy between 1939 and 1947 when the treaty of peace was signed could qualify.

The then Commission—I don't think the Commission now would do it—apparently in some cases applied a rule that after 1943 when we had an armistice with one government of Italy in southern Italy any claims arising after that were not compensable because we were not at war with Italy. This is not only contrary to the statute, but unrealistic.

Mr. MONAGAN. Is that ruling a matter of record?

Mr. REITER. It is. I have it in my statement, and a copy is appended as exhibit G. A factual affidavit on the Hauss claim is exhibit G.

I have two other points which I would like to make briefly. First of all, I am concerned about the provision in the International Claims Settlement Act for the divesting of property on the part of people who came to this country from Rumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria and who are natural people, whose property it was decided wouldn't be confiscated. They decided if the people could apply for them they would have the right to be returned to the owners. However, they put a 1-year limitation on the application for the divesting of this property. Unfortunately, some people, like a Mr. Ghitescu, could not get out of Rumania in time. In fact, he was arrested for his pro-Western activities, was lodged in a prison, and was killed.

His family finally managed to get out in 1962. They applied for the divesting of their property. They were told, "I am sorry. It is too late."

There are funds which the Office of Alien Property still has. These people are in need, and they should, it seems to me, have the same rights as the people who for some reason, namely their complete political passivity, neutralism, were able to escape earlier. Therefore, I propose an amendment to permit these people to have their property divested so long as there are funds available for the purpose.