

Mrs. KELLY. Any questions, Mr. Frelinghuysen?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Panzer has made his points and I have no questions.

Mr. MONAGAN. The provisions of this bill would meet all your requirements?

Mr. PANZER. Yes. My only possible objection might be that we would be contaminated by somebody objecting to another part of the bill. I support the provisions as they are.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Panzer, do you feel that those who qualified under the Bulgarian claims program and have not received 100 percent on their awards, should be reimbursed before we begin looking for new claimants?

Mr. PANZER. I have no actual knowledge of the Bulgarian thing since I am not really interested.

Mrs. KELLY. Do you feel that everybody who has been given an award should receive 100 percent on the dollar insofar as this is possible?

Mr. PANZER. In this particular case the money has been paid in and it has no other purpose than to be distributed to these people. Everybody concedes that. That is really its only purpose. Everybody is very apologetic about why the money has not been distributed.

Mrs. KELLY. What I am trying to say is this: there are two major issues in controversy in the bill before us: the Italian and the Polish claims provisions. Then there is some controversy regarding Bulgarian claims. Now, taking the Polish case first, would you recommend that funds received by the U.S. Government to settle those claims be paid to those who have already qualified—or should this program be reopened?

Mr. PANZER. I feel that is a controversial area. I have tried to limit my testimony to the most noncontroversial.

Mrs. KELLY. As an outstanding lawyer, you could give us your opinion.

Mr. PANZER. I would prefer not to comment. We have been so hurt by being embroiled with other people's troubles that I would not like to get into it.

Mrs. KELLY. In other words, you want action?

Mr. PANZER. Yes.

Mrs. KELLY. Thank you very much, Mr. Panzer.

(The following was subsequently submitted for inclusion in the record:)

LAW OFFICES OF IRVING R. M. PANZER,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1967.

Hon. EDNA F. KELLY,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Europe, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. KELLY: At the conclusion of my testimony on June 27 on H.R. 9063, at which I limited my remarks to the Rumanian provision, you asked me several questions about other matters that had been touched in earlier testimony. Some of those matters are not now in the bill and would, of course, require amendment of the bill. I was attempting to restrict my remarks to the Rumanian provisions, which are essential, and so I politely declined to comment on any other matters.

On reflection, I think I should make one thing clear. I support the present bill and I am opposed to any amendment of this bill whatsoever. As I said in my testimony and in my prepared statement, it has been the misfortune of the Rumanian provisions always to suffer by reason of some other controversy which then dragged down the entire omnibus bill. That is just what will happen now if