

Y 4
.P 84/10
M 28/28

GOVERNMENT
Storage

89/4
88/110
H28/28

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON
OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 10441, H.R. 11095, and Related Bills

BILLS TO AMEND TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, TO
PROVIDE CERTAIN MAILING PRIVILEGES WITH RESPECT
TO MEMBERS OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES, AND FOR
OTHER PURPOSES

AUGUST 18; SEPTEMBER 23, 1965

Printed for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1965

53-269

TOM MURRAY, Tennessee, *Chairman*

JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana	ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York	H. R. GROSS, Iowa
DAVID N. HENDERSON, North Carolina	GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana	EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona	ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Kansas
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey	ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania
LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Texas	JOHN H. BUCHANAN, Jr., Alabama
HARLEY O. STAGGERS, West Virginia	JAMES T. BROYHILL, North Carolina
ROBERT N. C. NIX, Pennsylvania	
JOE R. POOL, Texas	
WILLIAM J. GREEN, Pennsylvania	
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, Hawaii	
PAUL J. KREBS, New Jersey	
RAYMOND F. CLEVINGER, Michigan	
JAMES M. HANLEY, New York	
JOHN V. TUNNEY, California	

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES

JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana, *Chairman*
THADDEUS J. DULSKI, New York
ARNOLD OLSEN, Montana
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
DOMINICK V. DANIELS, New Jersey
JOE R. POOL, Texas

ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, Kansas
GLENN CUNNINGHAM, Nebraska
ALBERT W. JOHNSON, Pennsylvania

TOM MURRAY, Tennessee

ROBERT J. CORBETT, Pennsylvania

CONTENTS

Statement of—

Culver, Hon. John C., a Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa.....	Page 10
Griffiths, Hon. Martha W., a Representative in Congress from the State of Michigan.....	13
Hanley, Hon. James M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	4
Harvey, Hon. James, Congressman from Michigan.....	15
Lambert, Maj. Gen. J. C., the Adjutant General, Department of the Army; accompanied by Lt. Col. R. J. Reynolds, representing Army-Air Force Postal Service; Lt. N. H. Pearsall, Postal Affairs Section, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; and Capt. B. R. King, Postal and Security Courier Operations Division, Headquarters, USAF.....	19, 35
Morse, Hon. F. Bradford, a Representative in Congress from the State of Massachusetts.....	11
Multer, Hon. Abraham J., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	13
Murphy, Hon. John M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York.....	12
Nicholson, Hon. Ralph W., Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Finance, accompanied by A. C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations.....	16, 27
Talcott, Hon. Burt L., a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	9
Tipton, Stuart G., president, Air Transport Association, letter to Congressman James Morrison.....	38
Wilson, Hon. Bob, a Representative in Congress from the State of California.....	12

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 18, 1965

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in room 219, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Thaddeus J. Dulski (acting chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DULSKI. The subcommittee will come to order.

This morning, the Subcommittee on Postal Rates is beginning hearings on legislation to permit mail to be sent without cost to members of the Armed Forces who are serving in overseas areas. Some of the proposals before our committee relate only to first-class letter mail, others relate to all first-class mail, and still others include parcel post.

(The bill, H.R. 10441, follows:)

[H.R. 10441, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

"§ 4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations

"(a) First-class letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, shall be carried as airmail, at no cost to the sender, when mailed by—

"(1) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty as defined in sections 101(4) and 101(22) of title 10, United States Code, and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, if—

"(A) the letter is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

"(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (A); or

"(2) a member of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation at an Armed Forces post office and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, or a post office of the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member, if—

"(A) the member is accorded free mailing privileges by his own government;

"(B) the foreign nation extends similar free mailing privileges to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States serving with, or in, a unit under the control of a command of that foreign nation;

"(C) the member is serving with, or in, a unit under the operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States;

"(D) the letter is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (D) (i); and

"(E) the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member has agreed to assume all international postal transmit charges incurred."

"(b) The Department of Defense shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the equivalent amount of postage due, as determined by the Postmaster General, for matter sent in the mails under authority of subsection (a) of this section."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding

"Sec. 4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations" immediately below

"Sec. 4168. Correspondence of members of diplomatic corps and consuls of countries of Postal Union of Americas and Spain".

SEC. 2. Section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In addition to parcels to which it is otherwise applicable, the eighth zone includes, for purposes of this section only, except as provided by paragraph (4) of this subsection, parcels transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone.

"(4) Except as provided in paragraph (5) of this subsection, the rates of postage on air parcel post transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and Army and Air Force post offices and naval vessels and commands, when the address is in care of Fleet Post Office, New York, New York, or San Francisco, California, shall be the applicable zone rates shown in paragraph (1) of this subsection for mail between the place of mailing or delivery within the United States, its territories or possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and the city of the postmaster serving the Army or Air Force post office or Navy or Fleet post office concerned.

"(5) Parcels not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined mailed and addressed to members of the United States Armed Forces in care of Fleet Post Office, New York, New York, or San Francisco, California—

"(A) shall be chargeable for postage at fourth-class (parcel post) zone rates according to the distance between the point of mailing and the point of embarkation, but such parcels shall not be chargeable for postage in excess of the rate for the fifth zone; and

"(B) shall be treated as air parcel post.

"(6) The Department of Defense shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the difference between any postage paid by the sender and the total allocated cost incurred by the Postal Establishment for matter sent in the mails under authority of paragraph (5) of this subsection."

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Morrison, the chairman of the subcommittee, has been detained at another hearing, and has submitted the following statement:

I have sponsored H.R. 10441 which includes first-class letter mail and parcel post. Similar legislation has been sponsored by Mr. Dulski (H.R. 10011) and Mr. Hanley (H.R. 10141), members of our committee, and by 13 other Members of the House.

This legislation provides that first-class letter mail sent by a member of the Armed Forces while on active duty in a combat zone, or while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces as a result of being on active duty in a combat zone, will be sent at no charge to the sender. The President will determine the combat zones.

H.R. 10141 also extends similar privileges, under certain conditions, to members of the Armed Forces of a friendly foreign nation, when they are serving under the control of a U.S. command. The Department of Defense will be required to transfer to the Post Office Department the amount of postage due.

The bill further provides that parcels up to 5 pounds may be mailed by air to a member of the Armed Forces stationed in certain overseas areas at fourth-class (parcel post) rates, between the point of mailing and the point of embarkation. No parcel of this type will be charged in excess of the rates of the fifth zone. The Department of Defense will be required to transfer to the Post Office Department the difference between the postage paid and the total allocated cost incurred by the postal system.

I want to say, as one of the ranking members on the subcommittee, Mr. Morrison also looks at the welfare of the entire Nation.

I feel that this bill he has introduced, H.R. 10441, has a great deal of merit, and we hope to pass it today and have speedy action in the House.

I sponsored H.R. 10011, to provide free mailing privileges for members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam. It is the type of legislation which will demonstrate the concern of Congress for American troops who serve in hostile foreign lands.

The people who served in the Armed Forces in World War II and the Korean conflict know of the difficulty of acquiring the necessary materials to write a letter. Under combat conditions, it is virtually impossible to procure these items. In the case of stamps, it is especially difficult to keep them usable under combat conditions. When traveling through mud or water, the stamps either stick together or stick to uniforms, and are virtually useless.

Further consideration must also be given to the problem of buying stamps in a foreign land. In the United States, we merely walk to the corner drugstore or post office and purchase whatever we need. This is not the case outside the United States. Stamps are sold only in certain buildings and even certain cities in underdeveloped countries. This is further complicated by the infrequency, under combat conditions, with which Armed Forces personnel are able to get to the localities which sell stamps.

There is no doubt about the necessity of this type of legislation, as demonstrated by the number of bills introduced by various Members of Congress.

Consideration must also be given to the encouraging of communications from the people of the United States to the military personnel in overseas combat areas. To receive a letter or a small parcel from home is a tremendous boost to morale. It provides the Armed Forces member who receives it with a realization that the people back home know where he is, and care about what he is doing.

The Congress must provide the means for effective and meaningful communication between our fighting men and the people of the United States.

I urge favorable consideration of this legislation so that our troops in overseas combat areas have every opportunity to communicate with their loved ones.

Our first witness today is, shall we say, a neighbor of mine from the great city of Syracuse, the Honorable James M. Hanley.

Jim, will you step forward?

We congratulate you in introducing the legislation.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. HANLEY, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS, FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank you for allowing me to come and speak this morning in behalf of H.R. 10141, a bill to provide mail privileges for certain members of the Armed Forces and for those sending parcels to our servicemen in combat areas.

Those of us who have served in the Armed Forces know how much we looked forward to mail call and the expectation of receiving a letter or package from home. Hearing from the folks back home always gave me a lift, and I am sure it still boosts the morale of American servicemen stationed in distant outposts throughout the world.

It is only fitting that we who owe our safety and security at home to the dedication and response to the call of duty of our servicemen overseas should do all we can to facilitate the exchange of private communications between military personnel and their loved ones here at home. In order to promote this objective, I have introduced H.R. 10141. With your permission, I would like to discuss some of the provisions of this bill with you this morning.

The first provision of H.R. 10141 to be noted is that it grants mail privileges to military personnel serving in combat zones. Although Vietnam is the only area involved at present, such a stipulation would eliminate the necessity of introducing similar legislation to include any other area of the world which might develop into a combat zone in the future.

Section 1 of H.R. 10141 grants free mailing privileges to the servicemen themselves. This benefit has been accorded combat personnel in the past, specifically during World War II and Korea. Apparently, the sentiments of many members are favorable toward granting this privilege to servicemen in Vietnam.

Only last week, the Senate passed an amendment to the military pay bill granting franking privileges to the military serving in that theater. In our own body, the introduction of several bills proposing this benefit seems indicative of a desire to do something in this area.

While we are making it easier for servicemen in combat zones to write home, it seems appropriate that we also try to encourage communication to them by their loved ones. The problem here revolves around the cost of mailing small packages.

A constituent of mine with a son in Vietnam brought this problem to my attention. She related that although she would like to send many more small articles to her son, the cost of mailing them under the present rate system made this prohibitive in many instances.

As you are aware, parcels destined for servicemen sent via surface mail are sent at fourth-class rates. Rates are determined on the basis of the number of postal zones that must be crossed from the point of mailing to the port of embarkation. The cost of delivery from the port to the serviceman abroad is paid by the Department of Defense.

Parcels sent via air parcel post to the military abroad are also sent as fourth-class mail, but the rate is the flat eighth zone rate for that class regardless of the distance between the point of mailing and the port of embarkation. Thus, the cost of a package via air parcel post sent through New York City would be the same whether mailed in my city of Syracuse, a distance of about 270 miles, or in Los Angeles, 3,000 miles away.

Although the cost of air parcel post is much higher than surface parcel post if one lives close to the particular port of embarkation, the great difference in time taken for delivery between the two systems makes this means almost necessary.

For example, once a package arrives at the San Francisco post office destined for a serviceman in Korea, it takes approximately 30 days to arrive if sent by surface mail as opposed to 3 or 4 days if sent via air parcel post. A package from New York to Great Britain takes about 10 to 13 days by surface transport and only 2 days by air. From New York to Germany, the time is 12 to 14 days by surface mail and 2 days by air.

Thus, the time difference would make the use of air parcel post the only practical means, and it is here that the cost for sending small and inexpensive articles does not make the effort economically practical.

Under H.R. 10141, packages to servicemen are to be treated as air parcel post, but the mailing charge is to be at fourth-class surface rates. There is also to be a reduction in the maximum rate to be paid. Instead of applying the fourth-class rate all across the eight postal zones, it is proposed that the maximum rate be the present fifth-zone rate for fourth-class parcels.

Therefore, anyone sending a package a distance in excess of 1,000 miles, the limit of the fifth zone, to the port of embarkation would not be required to pay the applicable sixth-, seventh-, or eighth-zone rate. Those mailing within a 1,000-mile radius of the port of embarkation would still pay the appropriate zone rate, but those beyond this radius would not pay the additional rates of the last three zones.

Thus, a package sent from Syracuse to Germany via New York City would still pay the zone 3 fourth-class rate applicable for distances up to 300 miles. However, a package sent to the Far East via San Francisco from Syracuse would no longer be charged the eighth-zone rate applicable for distances beyond 1,800 miles, but rather the rate would be that of the fifth zone.

Since the cost problem arises mainly in regard to small packages, a further provision of H.R. 10141 limits the cost-reduction privilege to parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined.

This completes my remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I would again like to thank you and the subcommittee for your indulgence in allowing me the time to discuss this bill with you.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Hanley. If anyone, you are quite an authority. From your war record, you are very familiar with what the boys are facing today in Vietnam. And I am sure all the facts you have discussed in your statement have a great deal of merit and will have the consideration of our committee.

I am very happy to have a New Yorker with us this morning.

Mr. Arnold Olsen.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

I am very happy to greet our colleague Mr. Hanley here this morning and very glad that he has taken this advance interest in this legislation, brought it to the committee, and I am sure that we are going to successfully pass it.

Thank you very much.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you.

At this time, I would ask that what has been sent to me be put in the record if there is no objection.

There are letters from the Department of the Army, the Office of the Postmaster General, and the Bureau of the Budget.

(The letters referred to follow:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1965.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request to the Secretary of Defense for the views of the Department of Defense on H.R. 10441, 89th Congress, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The Department of the Army has been assigned responsibility for expressing the views of the Department of Defense on this bill.

The title of the bill generally states its purpose.

While the Department of Defense favors the free mail provision enacted by the Congress in the recent military pay bill, it is believed that a broader coverage such as is here proposed should be enacted. H.R. 10441 would provide free airmail service to members of the U.S. Armed Forces serving in an overseas area designated by the President as one where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, or engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent. Also it would provide free airmail service to those members hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of such service. Both of the foregoing provisions would be extended to members of friendly foreign nations on a reciprocal basis. The Department of Defense feels both of these provisions are desirable.

The Department of Defense favors new paragraphs (3) and (4) to section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code, as contained in H.R. 10441. The Department, however, opposes paragraphs (5) and (6) to section 4303(d) for the following reasons:

(a) The military postal transportation budget would be increased significantly inasmuch as the military pays transportation costs for moving mail from continental U.S. aerial gateways to military facilities overseas. For example, the average overseas worldwide cost to the Department of Defense for transporting a 5-pound parcel overseas by air is \$4.25. The same parcel would be transported by surface at a cost of 32 cents, or \$3.93 less than each 5-pound air parcel. In the case of Vietnam, the cost for a 5-pound parcel by air to the Department of Defense is \$6.80, by surface 50 cents. Thus, based on a troop strength of 125,000, and with each serviceman receiving 12 5-pound parcels per year, the increased postal transportation costs to the military would be \$9,450,000 per year.

(b) The combined capability of commercial airlines and the Military Air Transport Service could be taxed unnecessarily by this requirement. This bill would further complicate the problem in that it would increase airlift requirements and necessitate some airlift by foreign air carriers which in turn would have an impact on the outflow of gold.

(c) In both World War II and the Korean war the free transportation of letter mail was a concessionary benefit enjoyed only by the military. This bill would establish a precedent in that for the first time benefits would be extended to both the military and the public. It would therefore appear inappropriate to impose additional requirements on military budgets for enactment of legislation in which the mailing public would benefit as much as, or more than, the servicemen.

(d) The additional requirement for airlift of parcels will result in delay of air letter mail by placing it in competition with parcel post. A 5-pound parcel is equivalent in weight to 215 letters; thus, it is readily apparent that a delay of any consequence in letter mail would have a demoralizing impact on the morale of servicemen stationed overseas.

(e) At the present time military supply depots are required to mail certain critical logistic items by surface transportation because of the limited airlift capability. The bill would increase the airlift burden and might result in the diversion of additional critical items from airlift to surface transportation.

(f) Airmail for Vietnam is limited to one entry airport. From there it is broken out and distributed to the various military elements. This in-country distribution is accomplished almost exclusively by aircraft because of the inadequacy of road networks, and because roads cannot be made sufficiently secure against hostile attacks by the Vietcong. Enactment of this portion of the bill would overtax the present facilities of the sole operating airmail terminal, and would also overtax the in-country mail distribution capability of the aircraft from that terminal. On the other hand, surface mail is received at two ports, one in the north and one in the south, and in-country distribution is made directly from these ports. This relieves the in-country airlift problem.

(g) The Department of Defense is continually striving to increase the ratio of combat troops to support troops. However, the bill would be a backward step in attempting to achieve the optimum combat/support ratio in that the mailing public would tend to mail more parcels because of cheaper rates. Thus, the increased mail volumes would create a requirement for additional postal personnel to handle the mail.

(h) The Department of Defense is opposed to the provision which would transfer funds to the Post Office Department to offset the difference between air parcel post and fourth-class rates paid by the sender. In the past the military has never paid for movement of mail within the continental United States, and it is felt that a precedent should not be set wherein the general mailing public would benefit at the expense of the military budgets.

The Department of the Army on behalf of the Department of Defense strongly favors enactment of H.R. 10441 subject to the following deletions for the reasons set forth above:

(a) On page 5, delete the phrase "Except as provided in paragraph (5) of this subsection," appearing on lines 4 and 5.

(b) Delete all of the bill after line 16 on page 5.

The worldwide fiscal impact of H.R. 10441 is not known to the Department of Defense. However, with regard to Vietnam only, the cost of providing air service for surface parcels of 5 pounds or under would amount to approximately \$9,450,000 per year for 125,000 military personnel.

This report has been coordinated within the Department of Defense in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this report for the consideration of the committee.

Sincerely,

STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary of the Army.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1965.

HON. TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your request for our comments on H.R. 10441, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to the members of our Armed Forces.

The first purpose of the legislation is to grant air mail free postage to first-class letter mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces from Vietnam to

persons in the United States, including Puerto Rico and the possessions. It would also extend the privilege to other areas in which the President determines members of the Armed Forces are engaged in combat.

While we believe that the question of free mailing privileges for the Armed Forces in Vietnam and other combat areas is a matter for determination by the Department of Defense and the Congress, this Department favors the principle of extending the free mail privilege to our fighting men. Such extension has been the established practice of our Government during prior periods of hostilities, and it is our belief that our men presently serving in Vietnam should be accorded similar treatment.

Further, the legislation provides for an adjustment in the method of charging postage for air parcel post sent to or from Army or Navy Post Offices and the United States so that the method of charging is the same as for surface parcels and reduces the cost of such parcels. The Department favors this provision.

We feel, however, that one feature of H.R. 10441 is unsatisfactory. It causes difficult logistical problems, and creates cost to the Government out of proportion to the benefit provided. This feature is the provision for the shipment by air of small parcels up to a 5-pound weight. We understand that the Department of Defense opposes this provision and we concur with that objection.

We note that the legislation has provision for us to be reimbursed by the Department of Defense for the concessionary postage privileges. This is necessary to be consistent with the break-even requirement of the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (39 U.S.C. 2302(c)(4)).

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1965.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
*Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This has reference to your request for the views of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to H.R. 6274, a bill which provides certain mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces. We are also commenting on H.R. 10441, a bill with a generally similar purpose, which we believe preferable to H.R. 6274, and to the provisions of the recently enacted military pay bill which authorizes free postage from combat zones.

We believe that the provisions of H.R. 10441 with respect to free mailing privileges are preferable to those in the military pay bill and in H.R. 6274 because (1) the free mailing privileges are specifically defined as applying to first-class letter mail and cards, and (2) provision is made for reimbursement by the Department of Defense for the loss of revenue incurred by the Post Office Department as a result of this special concession to assist a defense activity.

Section 2 of H.R. 10441, however, would amend section 4303 of title 39, United States Code, to authorize the mailing of parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth to servicemen overseas by air parcel post at substantially reduced rates. The Department of Defense, with the concurrence of the Post Office Department, opposes this provision, for the reasons set forth in their respective reports. We concur with the views of these agencies and recommend that paragraphs 5 and 6 of the amending language be stricken from the bill.

If amended as recommended above, the Bureau of the Budget would favor enactment of H.R. 10441.

Sincerely yours,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

Mr. DULSKI. The next witness is the gentleman from California, Hon. Burt L. Talcott.

Very happy to see you, Congressman Talcott.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BURT L. TALCOTT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Olsen, I have a brief statement which I prefer to read if I may.

Mr. DULSKI. Go right ahead.

Mr. TALCOTT. Thank you for the opportunity to offer testimony in support of legislation to boost morale of our Armed Forces in Vietnam and their families and friends at home. Any of you who have served overseas with the armed services during World War II or the Korean conflict know the importance of receiving timely news and packages from home, and vice versa, in sustaining the morale of troops and their families.

In my opinion, the need is even more urgent during the Vietnam crisis to facilitate mail delivery. As a service to military personnel, Congress wisely permitted the mailing of first-class matter from members of the Armed Forces, in combat zones, to persons in the United States free of charge during most of the recent conflicts. It was carried by air, if so marked, without charge.

A number of the bills now before the subcommittee restore this provision. I commend these Members for introducing such bills.

To complement this service, I recommend approval of my bill, H.R. 9882, which would permit the sending of small parcels by airmail to personnel in the armed services serving in Vietnam at regular parcel post rates.

My bill pertaining to parcels appears to be the first introduced in the House, and I am glad that so many distinguished Members have found it to have enough merit to sponsor similar or improved bills. I notice others would increase the rate limitations to 5 pounds while retaining the girth limitation of 60 inches.

It is my sincere belief, of course, although it may sound "corny," that the receipt of a small package containing homemade cake, candy, or cookies would have a beneficial effect far outweighing the slight cost to the Treasury. A small package could bring personal items not available in Vietnam, but which are uniquely buoyant to the morale of the servicemen and satisfying to the folks at home.

The size of the parcel is not important. Small parcels would impose less burden on the mail and transportation facilities and personnel. Small parcels encourage ingenuity which is especially appreciated. Small parcels encourage higher frequency of mailings which is better than fewer, but larger, mailings.

The thought is as impressive as the cargo. I believe that if you accepted recommendations from the ladies, who will initiate most of the mailings, they would recommend weight limits of 2 to 3 pounds and girth limits of about 44 inches.

The famous wartime Red Cross prisoner-of-war parcels had a combined length and girth of only 39 inches. And these were greatly appreciated, I can tell you.

Senders who want to send more can readily do so by sending multiple packages; or they can pay the regular rates. Smaller rather than larger parcels are appreciated most by the servicemen overseas. Too great a disparity in the size is likely to be embarrassing to the recipients—or their buddies. Smaller packages can be more easily

and securely wrapped and packaged. Articles damaged in transit are especially disappointing to servicemen overseas.

So I respectfully urge the subcommittee to approve a proposal of this nature.

When I was working on this bill, one of my constituents suggested that persons in the Peace Corps should be given the benefit which I have proposed for military personnel. Specifically, that families of Peace Corps volunteers should be allowed to send small airmail packages to volunteers overseas at reduced rates. Your consideration of this idea would be greatly appreciated.

It has been a privilege for me to testify this morning. Thank you very much.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Congressman, for your very brief but precise statement. I am sure that the committee will take under advisement any suggestions you have made.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to comment and compliment Mr. Talcott, a former Montanan and now a Californian, a colleague of ours, on this splendid presentation.

And I think you have won your point. We appreciate your comments.

Mr. TALCOTT. Thank you very much.

Mr. DULSKI. The next witness is Hon. John C. Culver, of Iowa.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. CULVER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to offer this testimony to members of this distinguished committee on the question of free mailing privileges for our military personnel in Vietnam and other combat zones.

I believe we are all aware of the vital role which mail has traditionally played in maintaining the morale of our Armed Forces stationed at remote points on the globe. It is unquestionably desirable that all appropriate steps be taken by our Government at this time to insure the continuation of proper communication between men at the frontlines and their families and friends at home.

I, therefore, introduced on June 17 of this year, a bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail dispatched by members of the Armed Forces on active duty in Vietnam and other combat zones. The purpose of this legislation is to assist in overcoming the recognized difficulty encountered by military personnel under combat conditions in obtaining access to a sufficient supply of postage stamps. There is, I feel, ample precedent for legislation of this nature since similar provisions were enacted by the Congress both at the time of World War II and the Korean conflict.

For these reasons, I am extremely pleased that the Congress, in approving the Armed Forces pay increase bill last week, seized the opportunity to extend this valuable privilege to servicemen stationed in Vietnam. However, I am grateful that this committee has indicated its intention to further clarify these provisions through the hearings this morning.

I feel that additional direction is necessary to more accurately establish the absorption of the costs involved in this service. Inas-

much as the important purposes served by this proposal are properly the function of the Department of Defense, I would respectfully recommend that provision be made that the costs of this operation to the Post Office Department be reimbursed from funds appropriated for the Defense Department. This refinement would further insure that no increase in postal rates will result from the granting of this service.

Again, allow me to commend the committee for promptly responding to the needs of our servicemen in this area.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Culver.

The next witness is the distinguished gentlemen from Massachusetts, Hon. F. Bradford Morse.

**STATEMENT OF HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE, A REPRESENTATIVE
IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I think that you and your committee are rendering a service in holding hearings on legislation to provide free mailing privileges for our troops in Vietnam. As a sponsor of one of the bills, H.R. 9714, which would provide free mailing privileges for first-class mail, post cards, and postal cards, I am pleased to have an opportunity to speak in its support.

The provision of this privilege has a respectable history. During the Civil War and the Spanish-American War American troops were permitted to mail letters without postage, but the postage was collected at its destination.

During the First World War, the practice was repeated and the scope of the privilege increased. By an act of Congress in 1917, letters from soldiers, sailors, and marines stationed in foreign countries were given postage-free status. Our allies also contributed. France permitted the free use of its mails for our forces and permitted packages to be sent duty free.

In World War II, similar legislation was enacted and the privilege was extended to include members of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Again in the Korean conflict, the Congress enacted S. 3876, which gave mailing privileges to those stationed in Korea and other "combat zones or theaters of military operations" designated by the President. The Executive order which implemented this legislation restricted this to "Korea and other such areas."

It seems clear that the present emergency in Vietnam is every bit as serious as that in Korea. Recent statements by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State have indicated that U.S. presence may be required in Vietnam for an extended period of time.

The provision by the Congress of free mailing privileges to our Armed Forces is more than a gesture. It is a symbol of our concern for their welfare and morale and a tangible expression of our pride in the work they are doing on our behalf.

I hope that you will report the legislation favorably.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Morse.

The next witness is Hon. John M. Murphy.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK**

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as the sponsor of H.R. 9986, a bill similar to several bills under consideration by this subcommittee to provide free postage for first-class mail sent by members of our Armed Forces in Vietnam, I earnestly urge the speedy adoption of this proposed legislation so that our fighting men who are risking their lives in Vietnam are not prevented from communicating with their families because they do not have stamps. I can assure you it is heartbreaking to read a letter from a mother telling me she was "waiting in agony for 3 weeks" for a letter from her son at the Beinhua Airbase, and then to be told by him that he could not mail his letter because "there was no place to buy stamps." This was only one of numerous letters from my constituents telling the same pathetic story that our servicemen fighting in the jungle could not obtain stamps for letters home.

Letter writing in that part of the world presents other problems, too. I can personally remember the difficulty I had, during the Korean war, trying to seal a soggy envelope after a week of heavy rain; our American men in Vietnam have to cope with the problems of not only sodden writing paper but a lack of stamps as well.

I believe it would be a great boost to the morale of our men in Vietnam—and to the families at home—if all mail could be sent back to the United States by airmail, postage free.

I believe the funds to cover the cost of these mailings should be provided in the Department of Defense appropriations and that the Department of Defense should reimburse the Post Office Department for the cost of handling the mailing in the United States. The Department of Defense will, of course, provide for the handling of the mail from the combat zone to the APO office in the United States.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for giving me this opportunity to present to the subcommittee my views on this proposed legislation.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

The next witness is Hon. Bob Wilson of California.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BOB WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN
CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

Mr. WILSON. This is both literally and figuratively a frank statement about improving the morale of our fighting men in Vietnam. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 9744, which would provide free mailing privileges for members of the Armed Forces serving in the Vietnam combat in which we are now engaged.

The purpose of the bill is to show these courageous men and women who are serving the cause of freedom that we here at home appreciate their service to their country. In function, it would require no new massive expenditures, no new unprecedented procedures, or any other Federal inconvenience. In results, it should reap great benefits both to those who are fighting and those who wait to hear from them at home.

We hear much today about the shirkers, the draft dodgers, the draft-card burners, the coddled dropouts, and those who prate against our Nation defending the cause of freedom in Asia. This demoralizing

news cannot do the morale of our fighting forces any good. By passing this bill, we can demonstrate in a tangible way that we in the Congress do care about these representatives of our fighting forces abroad, that we are interested in their welfare and in providing them with communication by free mail with their families.

This bill is not a frill. It really is born out of the realities of conditions in Vietnam. Post offices are not handy for units fighting in the rice paddies. Men soaked in monsoon rains find it difficult to keep stamps in usable condition.

We granted this mailing privilege to our Armed Forces in World War II and during the Korean conflict. This is every bit as much a war as were those engagements.

The first-class frank for our first-class fighting men is an obligation that Congress should meet with great dispatch. I urge immediate action on my bill.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Wilson.

The next witness is Hon. Martha W. Griffiths.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much for permitting me to appear here on behalf of my bill, H.R. 5790.

Intensification of the military effort in Vietnam has prompted Congress once again to extend postal privileges to members of the Armed Forces. The provision, which was included in the recently passed military pay bill, allows free postage for first-class letter mail sent by servicemen in Vietnam and other areas the President may designate as combat zones.

Although this provision embodies the scope of the bill I had introduced for this purpose, H.R. 5790, and which is before this committee, I now feel that serious consideration should be given to extending this privilege to cover airmail postage and possibly parcel post. Whatever the expenditure, this is a cost that I am sure the American people are willing to pay. The many letters I received in support of this type of legislation clearly indicate that Americans view this as a responsibility to be borne on the homefront. One Michigan man expressed this feeling succinctly by asking, "For the sake of morale, not to mention common decency, can't something be done * * *?"

The boys overseas are our boys who have left their homes and families to fight with their lives for their country and for freedom. It would ease the Nation's conscience in knowing that everything is being done to make their wearisome burdens a little lighter.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mrs. Griffiths.

The next witness is Hon. Abraham J. Multer.

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before your committee on behalf of my bill, H.R. 1105.

It is the purpose of my bill, H.R. 1105 introduced January 4, 1965, to provide free postage for first-class letter matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States to any person in the United

States. A member of the Armed Forces is any person on active duty or in active service and the United States includes the several States, the District of Columbia, the territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. The bill authorizes the Postmaster General to prescribe the rules and regulations governing such mail.

On August 11 of this year when the Senate was considering H.R. 9075, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the basic pay for members of the uniformed service, Senator Cotton offered an amendment to the bill which would amend chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, relating to miscellaneous rights and benefits of members of the Armed Forces. This amendment would be new section 1040 and would give free first-class mail privileges to members of the Armed Forces in Vietnam until such time as the President determines that Vietnam is no longer a combat area. Similar free first-class privileges would also be available in any other area which the President determines are combat areas. This bill has been passed by both Houses and is now on the President's desk awaiting his signature. I believe it is reasonable to assume that in due course the President will sign the bill and that the "free postage" section of the bill will become law.

I therefore intend to address myself to H.R. 1105 in relation to this proposed section 1040 which we can expect will be signed into law by the President.

The bill we are considering differs from section 1040 in that the privilege of free postage for first-class matter is provided for all members of the Armed Forces in active service or on active duty without regard to the area of the world in which the member of the Armed Forces might be, while section 1040 extends such privileges only when he is in Vietnam or in any other area of the world which the President has determined is a combat zone.

I don't believe section 1040 does the job; it fails to go far enough. Section 1040 does not apply to all members of the Armed Forces; it applies only to those members who are in Vietnam or any other area which the President may determine is a combat zone.

When the matter of section 1040 was before the Senate several Senators compared the free postage privilege in that section with the free postage privileges extended to members of the Armed Forces serving in World Wars I and II. What they failed to realize was that the free first-class postage privilege in those wars was available to all members of the Armed Forces and not only to those in the combat zone.

The Department of Defense opposes this type of legislation on the ground that stamps are easily available and post offices accessible to members of the Armed Forces in areas other than combat zones. I believe that the base of their objection is too narrow to sustain such broad determination.

The Department of Defense regards postal service in the same light as it regards other services or products for which the serviceman is expected to pay. Postal service is the line of communication between the serviceman and his people back home with whom he has strong emotional ties. Mail from back home is always a morale booster to

the serviceman. We ought to do everything we can to encourage and to assist the flow of mail between the serviceman and his people. And this applies to both servicemen in and out of the combat zone. It is not a matter of available stamps and accessible post offices; it is a matter of morale. Whoever has experienced or participated in a mail call in the Armed Forces can never forget that experience.

Let the servicemen know that his Government is concerned about his welfare and that it will assist him to communicate with those he left behind. Let him know that his Government is carrying his mail free. It will boost his morale and help to make him a better fighting man.

I understand that the July 12, 1950, act to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in specified areas has expired by its terms and therefore section 2 of my bill which would repeal that act is no longer needed and may be stricken from it before reporting it to the House.

I urge this committee to favorably report H.R. 1105.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you, Mr. Multer.

The next witness is Hon. James Harvey of Michigan.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES HARVEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am most grateful for this opportunity to present my views on legislation dealing with postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States. I realize a variety of legislation has been introduced on this subject and I just wish to take a few minutes to express my full support of legislation in this area.

My bill, as you know, provides for free postage for first-class mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States. There are no restrictions regarding place of duty, whether it be a designated combat area or stateside, under H.R. 6694.

It is my personal belief that free postage for first-class mail for our servicemen is a small fringe benefit indeed for men serving our country.

Permit me to quote from a letter I received from a serviceman. He wrote:

May I commend you for sponsoring H.R. 6694. This bill is needed not because of the monetary expense in buying stamps but because stamps are not always available at the time of need. Since telephoning one's friends and relatives is quite expensive, writing is one's main source of communication.

It is my hope that, in the dangerous times confronting our Nation, we can in this small way show our further respect and appreciation of our servicemen. They deserve this special postage allowance. Thank you.

Again, we meet with the distinguished Assistant Postmaster General, Hon. Ralph W. Nicholson of the Bureau of Finance, accompanied by Mr. A. C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations.

Today, you just changed partners, didn't you.

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH W. NICHOLSON, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF FINANCE, ACCOMPANIED BY A. C. HAHN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF OPERATIONS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Thank you. It is a pleasure for me and another New Yorker, to be here with you today.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Olsen, a regular flow of letters between servicemen and their families and friends is generally viewed as being helpful to morale. Under most normal circumstances, the Department of Defense maintains postal facilities so that servicemen everywhere can have access to postal services of all kinds. However, in combat zones, the provision of adequate postal facilities is frequently impracticable or the cost of providing such facilities is excessive.

The determination of the value of mail from a morale point of view and the practicability of providing complete postal facilities in the field is primarily a matter for decision by the Department of Defense.

The postal operations covered by the bill present no serious problems to the Department. Inasmuch as the purposes of the bill support the purposes of the Department of Defense, the bill appropriately provides that the costs or losses of the postal operations involved shall be reimbursed to the Post Office Department by the Department of Defense.

The bill that I am referring to and analyzing here is H.R. 10441, and it provides three services that may be described in general terms as follows:

1. A free first-class letter mail service. The Department favors the provision of a free letter service for designated combat zones. H.R. 10441 specifies that the free service refers to first-class letter mail, whereas the provision in the Military Pay Act is undesirably imprecise. The language in the Military Pay Act would provide free service on material weighing up to 70 pounds, a scope that is unnecessarily large and one that would create serious logistical and cost problems.

2. The bill before you corrects an inequity in charging for air parcel post to and from the United States and military installations. H.R. 10441 corrects the air parcel rate so that the charges follow the same pattern as for surface parcels—namely, that the only postage to be paid is the postage for the domestic movement of the parcel. The Department favors this aspect of the bill.

3. The bill provides a special air service for parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight or 60 inches in length and girth combined, with postage to be charged at the surface parcel post rate to the point of embarkation, but in no case would the charge be greater than that for the fifth zone. Although this is a matter primarily for determination by the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department opposes it. We understand that the Department of Defense is also opposed to this provision.

From a postal point of view, the service can be provided and from a financial point of view, the Department would be unaffected inasmuch as we would be reimbursed for the postage concession on this service. However, we believe that this provision does not serve the central purpose intended with sufficient precision to make it desirable.

We assume the purpose is to provide low cost, speedy service on small articles for servicemen in areas where such articles are not otherwise available, and to relieve the family and friends of normal postage costs. However, since personnel in combat zones cannot be identified by their postal address to an APO or an FPO, all parcels addressed to APO's and FPO's throughout the world would be eligible for this service.

Thus, a serviceman in a highly civilized city with access to post exchanges, to commissaries, or to civilian establishments of all kinds, could be sent cookies, tooth paste, or other similar items at a subsidized rate. The senders of such subsidized parcels would not be limited to the family or friends of servicemen in combat zones. The favorable rate would be available to the whole mailing public and could and probably would be used by commercial firms selling goods by mail or even for sending unsolicited merchandise to servicemen throughout the world at the subsidized rate.

We believe the logistical problem of providing air transport and delivery of a considerable volume of parcels would cause problems to the Department of Defense. The cost of such a service would be out of proportion to the benefits provided those few servicemen who need them. For these reasons, we are opposed to the provision of the special 5-pound air parcel service.

We believe reimbursement to the Department for free first-class letter mail and, in the event that the special parcel service is maintained, for loss on parcel operations is entirely appropriate. Since 1953 particularly, Congress has indicated its belief in this principle.

In 1953, the Department began to receive reimbursement for congressional franked mail. It previously was carried free. Also, in 1953, the subsidy to airlines previously part of the payments made for carrying mail were eliminated and the subsidies administered directly by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

In 1958, Congress passed the Postal Policy Act providing that postal patrons should pay for postal services and that the revenue should be adjusted so as approximately to equal cost. The cost or loss on special services for servicemen should not be a part of the postal costs charged to users of the mail.

Inasmuch as H.R. 10441 has as its purposes the improvement of morale and the provision of a means of maintaining postal service in the absence of adequate postal facilities in combat zones, the purposes are those of the Department of Defense. The cost of the activity is a Defense cost rather than a postal cost, so reimbursement is entirely proper.

Furthermore, by having the cost a part of the Defense budgets, it will be reviewed periodically by the Department of Defense and the Congress as part of the budget process so that the service can be extended, curtailed, or eliminated, depending on the basic problems involved.

We would like to suggest consideration of the following additional provisions that would simplify or clarify administration of the bill to assure the intent of Congress is fulfilled:

1. Provide that this bill be subject to such regulations that the Secretary of Defense and the Postmaster General may jointly devise. For example, problems may arise as to the eligibility of personnel serving in a combat zone. Is the crew of an aircraft based outside a combat zone eligible for free letter mail?

Since this is continuing legislation, many problems of definition and intent could arise in the future. Such problems could be met by such regulations.

2. Qualify requirement for air service. H.R. 10441 requires air service. Air transport may not always be available, particularly in combat zones. The intent is to give mail the fastest possible transport, not to limit that transport only to air. The intent would be served by language such as "carried as airmail, dependent upon air-space availability therefor," for example.

Except for the special 5-pound parcel service, the Post Office Department favors adoption of H.R. 10441.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you very much, Mr. Nicholson, for your contribution.

Now, as I understand it, the Department favors the whole concept of the bill except this last provision of 5 pounds.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes.

Mr. DULSKI. Is it not true that some of the mail is carried by the Air Force? Would they be reimbursed? They are part of defense. Would they be reimbursed also?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes. The overseas cost of parcel or letter transport is paid for by the Department of Defense.

Mr. DULSKI. I know that I was in Germany last year, and there are certain contracts that leave points in Frankfurt and distribute mail.

Now, supposing that the mail is being carried from Los Angeles into Hawaii and the Philippines. Would that same transport be allowed from the Philippines into the combat zone? Would they be reimbursed from Los Angeles or would they be reimbursed from the Philippines?

Mr. NICHOLSON. If I may, I would like to ask Chris Hahn to answer that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HAHN. Mr. Chairman, the military people here might be better able to comment on this question. I do know generally that we use commercial transportation, commercial airlines, for transporting the mail where they are available. These costs beyond the U.S. limits are paid for by the military.

Within the United States, which would include, of course, Hawaii, the costs are paid for out of postal appropriations.

But I think the answer is that if commercial service is available beyond the Philippines to the point of destination that it would be used rather than military aircraft if I understand your question.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you very much.

The committee has no further questions.

Thank you very much, Mr. Nicholson.

The next witness we have the pleasure and privilege to have is Maj. Gen. J. C. Lambert, the Adjutant General of the Department of the Army, accompanied by Lt. Col. R. J. Reynolds, representing the Army-Air Force Postal Service; Lt. N. H. Pearsall, Postal Affairs Section, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations; and Capt. B. R. King, Postal and Security Courier Operations Division, Headquarters, USAF.

We are very happy to have you with us this morning, gentlemen.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. J. C. LAMBERT, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY; ACCOMPANIED BY LT. COL. R. J. REYNOLDS, REPRESENTING ARMY-AIR FORCE POSTAL SERVICE; LT. N. H. PEARSALL, POSTAL AFFAIRS SECTION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS; AND CAPT. B. R. KING, POSTAL AND SECURITY COURIER OPERATIONS DIVISION, HEADQUARTERS, USAF

General LAMBERT. Thank you very much, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I am Maj. Gen. Joe C. Lambert, the Adjutant General, Department of the Army. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. I represent the Department of the Army for that purpose.

I have with me today, as you have announced, Lt. Col. Ronald Reynolds, Capt. Billy R. King, and Lt. N. H. Pearsall, representing the three services.

Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared statement which, with your indulgence, I would like to present.

Mr. DULSKI. Go right ahead, sir.

General LAMBERT. Although the Department of Defense favors the free mail provision enacted by Congress in the recent military pay bill, it is believed that broader coverage proposed by H.R. 10441 should be enacted. H.R. 10441 provides free air letter mail privileges for service personnel serving in an oversea area designated by the President as one where our Armed Forces are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States or engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force or serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent party.

This benefit is extended to members hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces as a result of disease or injury incurred because of such service and also on a reciprocal basis to military personnel of friendly foreign nations serving with a unit under the operational control of a U.S. Command.

The Department of Defense strongly favors this portion of the proposed legislation. In this connection, I would like to read the following message recently received from Headquarters, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam:

Have read article entitled "Free Mail OK Seen for Vietnam" in Army Times issue of July 7. News enthusiastically received by all members this command. However, for this privilege to be truly beneficial for personnel serving in remote areas such as Vietnam, it should insure airmail from Vietnam to ultimate destination in continental United States. Personnel here are utilizing airmail almost exclusively because of time required for boat shipment of mail to continental United States plus the additional delay of surface transportation to destination within the United States. Loss of time in surface mail delivery regardless of good motives would have deleterious effect on morale.

The Department favors enactment of that portion of H.R. 10441 (proposed subsections (3) and (4) of section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code) which establishes air parcel post rates to and from overseas military post offices commensurate with the air service which the Post Office Department actually provides and pays for.

This would involve establishing a rate by which the Post Office Department would be paid for carrying the mail from the mailing point to the city which serves the military post office for mail sent from the United States and from the city serving the military post office to the ultimate destination for mail sent from a military post office.

At present, the military pays the eighth-zone rate for all air parcels originating in the United States for an overseas destination, regardless of the point of mailing within the United States. However, the only air service for which the Post Office Department pays is the air transportation between the post office of origin or delivery in the United States and the city through which the military post office is served.

The Department of Defense is opposed to proposed subsections (5) and (6) of section 4303(d) which provide airlift service for parcels mailed at the fourth-class surface rates not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined and addressed to service personnel overseas, and to reimbursement to the Post Office Department, for generally the following reasons:

(a) The combined capability of commercial airlines and the Military Air Transport Service could be taxed unnecessarily by this requirement. This might require the use of some foreign air carriers. Certain critical logistic items might have to be transported by surface instead of airlift. Further, the fact that one 5-pound parcel equals the weight of 215 letters brings out the impact of this portion of the bill.

(b) In certain areas, entry airports are limited. In the case of Vietnam, there is only one whereas it has two surface ports—one in the north and south. The latter eases in-country distribution.

(c) For the first time, mail benefits heretofore extended to military personnel in time of conflict would be expanded to the general public.

(d) The military postal transportation budget would be increased significantly inasmuch as the military pays transportation costs for moving mail from continental United States aerial gateways to military facilities overseas. Although no attempt has been made to determine the financial impact on a worldwide basis, the increased cost for Vietnam alone would be \$9,450,000.

(e) The Department of Defense is opposed to the provision which would transfer funds to the Post Office Department to offset the difference between air parcel post and fourth-class rates paid by the sender. In the past, the military has never paid for movement of mail within the continental United States, and it is felt that a precedent should not be set wherein the general mailing public would benefit at the expense of the military budgets.

The Department of Defense has not budgeted for any funds which would be required should H.R. 10441 be enacted in its present form, and additional funds would be needed.

I have appreciated this opportunity of appearing before the committee and shall be happy to answer any questions you may have on this bill.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you very much, General, for your contribution to our deliberations on this very important legislation.

I have one question, General. Do you have any cost estimate for the letter part of the bill? We have the parcel post.

General LAMBERT. Yes, sir. We have a cost estimate of \$1,450,000.

Mr. DULSKI. What would be just for the——

General LAMBERT. That is for first-class mail based on the experience factor of mail now transmitted to and from Vietnam.

Mr. DULSKI. Are you talking of first-class letter mail or just first-class mail?

General LAMBERT. I am speaking of the first-class letter mail which under the provisions of this bill would be transported by air.

Mr. DULSKI. This is the cost of the parcel post. It would almost run six times as much would it not?

General LAMBERT. Sir?

Mr. DULSKI. It would be about six times as much just for parcel post?

General LAMBERT. Yes.

Mr. DULSKI. I have no further questions.

We are very happy to have with us Congressman Daniels from New Jersey.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I was late in getting here. I had an executive meeting of the Education Labor Committee so I missed the earlier part of the testimony of the general. So, therefore, I am not in a position to ask any questions at this time.

Mr. DULSKI. Another member of our committee is Mr. Ellsworth, from Kansas.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, I, too, am sorry I did not get here. I am just now reading your full statement and want to say how much we appreciate your coming over here and giving us the benefit of your views and the views of the Army and Department of Defense on this important piece of legislation.

I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DULSKI. Thank you.

Mr. Pool from Texas.

Mr. POOL. I have no questions. I am sorry I was unable to get here.

Mr. DULSKI. We have no further questions.

MAILING PRIVILEGES OF THE U.S. ARMED FORCES

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1965

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTAL RATES OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m. in room 215, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. James H. Morrison (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. MORRISON. The subcommittee will come to order.

The subcommittee will take up this morning H.R. 11095.

We had a hearing on August 18 on similar bills to extend mailing privileges to members of the U.S. Armed Forces overseas.

As was agreed by the subcommittee after our last session, I have held several meetings with representatives of the Department of Defense and the Post Office Department.

As a result of those meetings, I sponsored a new bill, H.R. 11095, and have scheduled the hearing this morning so that we may receive testimony on the new proposal.

The bill, H.R. 11095, and reports from the Post Office Department and the Bureau of the Budget will be placed in the record at this point. (The bill, H.R. 11095, and the reports referred to follow:)

[H.R. 11095, 89th Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the United States Armed Forces, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following section:

“§ 4169. Mailing privileges of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations

“(a) First-class letter mail, including postal cards and post cards, shall be carried as airmail, at no cost to the sender, when mailed by—

“(1) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty as defined in sections 101(4) and 101(22) of title 10, United States Code, and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, if—

“(A) the letter is mailed by the member at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

“(B) the member is hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (A); or

"(2) a member of an armed force of a friendly foreign nation at an Armed Forces post office and addressed to a place within the delivery limits of a United States post office, or a post office of the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member, if—

"(A) the member is accorded free mailing privileges by his own government;

"(B) the foreign nation extends similar free mailing privileges to a member of the Armed Forces of the United States serving with, or in, a unit under the control of a command of that foreign nation;

"(C) the member is serving with, or in, a unit under the operational control of a command of the Armed Forces of the United States;

"(D) the letter is mailed by the member—

"(i) at an Armed Forces post office established under section 705(d) of this title in an overseas area, as designated by the President, where the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, engaged in military operations involving armed conflict with a hostile foreign force, or serving with a friendly foreign force in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent; or

"(ii) while hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces of the United States as a result of disease or injury incurred as a result of service in an overseas area designated by the President under clause (D)(i); and

"(E) the nation in whose armed forces the sender is a member has agreed to assume all international postal transportation charges incurred.

"(b) The Department of Defense shall transfer to the Post Office Department as postal revenue, out of any appropriations or funds available to the Department of Defense, as a necessary expense of the appropriations or funds and of the activities concerned, the equivalent amount of postage due, as determined by the Postmaster General, for matter sent in the mails under authority of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) Subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall be administered under such conditions, and under such regulations, as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Defense jointly may prescribe."

(b) The table of contents of chapter 57 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding

"4169. Mailing privilege of members of United States Armed Forces and of friendly foreign nations."

immediately below

"4168. Correspondence of members of diplomatic corps and consuls of countries of Postal Union of Americas and Spain."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 4303(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by amended by striking out paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(3) In addition to parcels to which it is otherwise applicable, the eighth zone includes, for purposes of this section only, except as provided by paragraph (4) of this subsection, parcels transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone.

"(4) Except as provided in paragraph (5) of this subsection, the rates of postage on air parcel post transported between the United States, its territories and possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and Army, Air Force, and Fleet post offices, shall be the applicable zone rates shown in paragraph (1) of this subsection for mail between the place of mailing or delivery within the United States, its territories or possessions or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Canal Zone, and the city of the postmaster serving the Army, Air Force, or Fleet post office concerned.

"(5) Parcels not exceeding five pounds in weight and sixty inches in length and girth combined mailed and addressed to members of the United States Armed Forces in care of Army, Air Force, and Fleet post offices in overseas combat areas as designated by the President—

"(A) shall be treated as air parcel post between the point of mailing and the point of embarkation and shall be chargeable for postage at fourth-class (parcel post) zone rates according to the distance between such points, but such parcels shall not be chargeable for postage in excess of the rate for the fifth zone; and

"(B) shall be transported by air from the point of embarkation on a space available basis, under such conditions and regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe and at rates approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for the transportation of Military Official Mail.

"(6) Paragraphs (4) and (5) of this subsection shall be administered under such conditions, and under such regulations, as the Postmaster General and the Secretary of Defense jointly may prescribe."

(b) Section 2303(a)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "and" at the end of subparagraph (H);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (I) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(J) reduced rates of postage as provided by paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4303(d) of this title."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1040 of title 10, United States Code (relating to free postage for the United States Armed Forces in combat zones), is hereby repealed.

(b) The analysis of chapter 53 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out

"1040. Free postage from combat zones."

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1965.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to the oral request of your committee for our views on H.R. 11095, relating to certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces.

The purpose of this legislation would be to grant combat personnel airmail free postage to first-class letter mail sent to persons in the United States, including Puerto Rico and the possessions. Similar privilege, under certain conditions, would also be made applicable to members of the armed forces of friendly foreign nations serving under U.S. command and to hospitalized personnel.

Though the question of free mailing privileges for the Armed Forces in combat areas is a matter for determination by the Department of Defense and the Congress we favor the principle of extending the free mail privilege to our fighting men. Such extension has been the established practice of our Government during prior periods of hostilities, and it is our belief that combat personnel, such as those in Vietnam, should be accorded similar treatment.

The legislation, in addition to the first-class letter mail privilege, provides for a special small parcel service up to 5 pounds in weight. While the bill as submitted to the Department limited that service to overseas combat areas designated by the President, we understand that provision will be broadened to include all APO-FPO addresses. If the provision regarding overseas combat areas remained unchanged, we would object on the grounds that it would present the Department with an unworkable operating arrangement. While that problem would be removed by generalizing the special parcel service to all APO-FPO addresses, we must object on other grounds.

We assume the purpose of the special parcel service is to provide low cost, speedy service on small articles for servicemen in areas where such articles are not otherwise available, and to relieve the family and friends of normal postage costs. However, a serviceman in a highly civilized city with access to post exchanges, to commissaries, or to civilian establishments of all kinds could be sent cookies, toothpaste, or other similar items at a subsidized rate. The senders of such subsidized parcels would not be limited to the family or friends of servicemen in combat zones. The favorable rate would be available to the whole mailing public and could, and probably would, be used by commercial firms selling goods by mail, or even for sending unsolicited merchandise to servicemen throughout the world at the subsidized rate. The cost of such a service would be out of proportion to the benefits provided the relatively few servicemen who need them. For these reasons we are opposed to the provision of the special 5-pound air parcel service.

We note that the legislation in section 2(a) (4) provides for an adjustment in the method of charging postage for air parcel post sent to or from Army or Navy post offices and the United States so that the method of charging is the same as for surface parcels and reduces the cost of such parcels. The Department favors this provision.

We note, however, that the legislation further provides for equivalent postage reimbursement from the Defense Department to the Post Office Department with respect to letter mail, but treats the revenue loss resulting from the special small

parcel service as a "public service" item under section 2303 of title 39, United States Code. To be consistent, we believe that this parcel service, if adopted, should have the same reimbursement feature as letter mail. This position we think entirely appropriate, and in accord with the intent of Congress since 1953.

It was then that the Department began to receive reimbursement for congressional franked mail. It previously was carried free. Also in 1953 the subsidy to airlines, previously part of the payments made for carrying mail, were eliminated and the subsidies administered directly by the Civil Aeronautics Board. In 1958 Congress passed the Postal Policy Act providing that postal patrons should pay for postal services and that the revenue should be adjusted so as approximately to equal cost. The cost or loss on special services for servicemen should not be a part of the postal costs charged to users of the mail.

Inasmuch as H.R. 11095 has as its purposes the improvement of morale of our combat forces, the purposes are those of the Department of Defense. The cost of the activity is a Defense cost rather than a postal cost, so reimbursement is entirely proper.

Furthermore, by having the cost a part of the Defense budgets, it will be reviewed periodically by the Department of Defense and the Congress as part of the budget process so that the service can be extended, curtailed, or eliminated, depending on the basic problems involved.

Finally, we note that the legislation, as drawn, contains a technical error. The reference to paragraph "(4)" on page 7, line 4, should be omitted.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program there is no objection to the submission of this report to the committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
Postmaster General.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1965.

HON. TOM MURRAY,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to the oral request of your committee for the views of the Bureau of the Budget with respect to H.R. 11095, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide certain mailing privileges with respect to members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Section 2 of the bill provides, among other things, for the shipment of parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined to servicemen in combat areas overseas by air at reduced rates, with the qualification that air transportation from the point of embarkation shall be on a space available basis. We understand that it is planned to broaden this provision to include all servicemen overseas.

The Department of Defense and the Post Office Department oppose enactment of this provision, for reasons which they will present to your committee. The Bureau of the Budget concurs with their views, and recommends that this provision be eliminated from the bill.

With this amendment, the Bureau of the Budget would have no objection to the enactment of H.R. 11095.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP S. HUGHES,
Assistant Director for Legislative Reference.

MR. MORRISON. The first witness this morning is Hon. Ralph W. Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Finance, accompanied by Mr. A. C. Hahn, Deputy Assistant Postmaster General, Bureau of Operations.

At the outset let me make this observation. We have urged the various agencies affected to do everything possible to assist in working out this problem.

I had high hopes that we could come up with a solution which would be satisfactory with both the Post Office Department and the Department of Defense.

I am confident this subcommittee will report this bill favorably to help our servicemen overseas and if it gets on the floor of the House, I think it will pass.

Therefore it behooves us to take a positive viewpoint in resolving any problems in this measure, rather than a negative viewpoint, and see whether we can come up with a proper solution.

If we adopt a positive attitude rather than a negative attitude, and not show 15 to 17 reasons as to why it cannot be done, concentrate on how it can be done—let us try to arrive at a positive approach—I think we can do it. If my prediction is correct we can come up with something. I don't think there is any member of either the subcommittee or the full committee which wants to put an undue burden on the Post Office Department or the Defense Department. However, I will tell you this: I think our subcommittee is pretty much in unison and we will come out with a bill.

What I hope is that we can come out with a bill which you will help bring about through a positive direction in trying to help us in bringing out such a bill.

It does not make much difference to me so far as machinery is concerned or the way it is operated. I would like to see measures worked out which would be the easiest measures to work it out. The end result is what this subcommittee is very anxious to bring about.

I understand the Department's main objection is from the standpoint of cost. Perhaps you can tell us about that and any other objections you might have and any other suggestions you might have as to how we can bring this about.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thought that was a fine statement of the sentiment of this subcommittee, and as far as I know it is of the full committee. I want it on the record that that is my reaction to your opening statement and I second everything you said in your approach to it.

Mr. MORRISON. Thank you.

Mr. Nicholson?

STATEMENT OF HON. RALPH W. NICHOLSON, ASSISTANT POST-MASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF FINANCE

Mr. NICHOLSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased that we are generally in support of this bill. We think it is a very fine bill. It is the one aspect of a special 5-pound parcel service to which I will address myself in the statement, if I may, and then perhaps afterward I can join the chairman in struggling to find a more positive point of view toward the 5-pound parcel.

With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall proceed with the statement.

Mr. MORRISON. Proceed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, in the main we favor H.R. 11095 and feel that it is a useful clarification and broadening of existing authority under which certain mailing privileges are extended to personnel in designated combat zones.

One aspect of the bill, however, poses some serious problems that we cannot overcome. I refer to the provision of a special service for

5-pound parcels. The reasons for our objections will be outlined later.

The first section of the bill provides, under certain conditions for free first-class letter mail, carried as airmail, when originated by United States or friendly foreign troops serving in designated combat areas or by personnel hospitalized as a result of such service. Although this is a matter primarily for determination by the Department of Defense, we believe that such a service is necessary because of the difficulty of maintaining adequate postal facilities in the field under combat conditions and because even when stamps and other postal materials are available to troops serving in those areas the stamps can become unusable because of the rugged conditions to which both the men and their possessions are subjected. Thus the provision of free mail under the prescribed conditions enables servicemen in combat areas to send letters home whereas otherwise they might not be able to do so.

The provision that the Department of Defense will reimburse the Post Office Department for the cost to the Post Office Department of this letter mail service is appropriate inasmuch as the cost to the Post Office is at least partly in lieu of extra costs that might be incurred by the Department of Defense in maintaining complete postal facilities in the field under combat conditions. Furthermore, to the extent that easy and frequent communications with friends and relatives at home contribute to morale and effectiveness of our servicemen in combat areas, this letter mail service supports a defense mission.

Section 2 of H.R. 11095 corrects an inequity in handling parcels addressed to servicemen overseas that the Post Office Department for some time has wanted to correct.

I might add that Congressman Tunney, of this committee, has been in touch with our Department and has encouraged us to find a way to solve this previous inequity. Your bill does this.

At present surface parcel post and air parcel post are charged for according to different principles. The air parcels are charged for the domestic eighth zone postage regardless of the distance traveled between the point of origin and the port of embarkation. The bill provides that air parcel post addressed to servicemen will be charged only for the domestic distance traveled, thus applying the same principle to air parcels as presently prevails for surface parcels.

The correction of this inequity will enable many people in the United States to send air parcels to servicemen overseas at a savings. This provision applies to all service personnel—it is not limited to those people serving in combat areas. We favor the correction of this inequity.

Section 2, in addition, provides a special subsidized postage rate for parcels not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined. Under terms of this provision such parcels, when mailed and addressed to members of the Armed Forces will be treated as air parcel post within the United States and will be charged postage at surface rates, but in no event would the postage charged exceed the charge for the fifth zone.

As the bill stands, the service is provided for addresses in designated combat areas only, but I understand this limitation will probably be deleted by later action.

The Post Office Department opposes this provision of H.R. 11095 for two reasons—and here I am assuming that addressees may be located at any APO or FPO around the world.

First, significant cost will be incurred in providing the subsidized rate. Precise estimates of costs cannot be made because we cannot accurately anticipate the volume of parcels that might be generated. The bill provides the subsidized parcel service to addressees at APO's and FPO's throughout the world, and the special rate is available to any mailer in the United States whether he be an individual, a retail store, or a mail-order concern. We anticipate that the special rate will not only serve the purposes of the family and friends who want to send cakes or cookies or personal items to the servicemen, but it will also make possible commercial activities that seem unrelated to the general intent of the bill as a whole.

For example, in the domestic service merchandise is being sent to people who have not ordered it. It is conceivable that unsolicited merchandise for sale could be sent to servicemen at this low postage rate. In any event—whether or not the serviceman has access to post exchanges, commissaries, or other Government or regular commercial facilities—a subsidized postage rate can be used by anyone to send him any kind of article whether he needs it or not. We anticipate a large volume of such parcels.

Although we cannot estimate volume of usage with great precision, we can estimate the amount of the subsidy per parcel. We calculate it will cost \$1.05 over and above postage paid for each parcel carried to a west coast port of embarkation and 47 cents per parcel to an east coast port. This cost is only the cost for the domestic portion of the service provided. The Department of Defense picks up the parcels at the port of embarkation and transports them to their ultimate destination at no cost to the Post Office Department.

The Department of Defense has estimated 30,000 tons of such parcels. Assuming an average weight of 3 pounds per parcel, this means 20 million parcels. If the average loss per parcel is 75 cents, the cost of the subsidy is \$15 million.

We feel that the cost of this service is out of proportion to the benefit provided servicemen overseas or to the families of those servicemen who most appropriately would be the ones to be benefited by the subsidy.

Now turning to the second reason. The Department views the provision of free letter mail originated in combat zones as a practical matter. We are not aware that anyone has advocated the free mail on the grounds that the cost of postage represented a hardship financially. Unlike the letter mail provision, a special 5-pound parcel is proposed for the purpose of giving financial relief to all mailers in the United States who wish to send parcels to servicemen. I am aware that individual families have said that sending parcels to servicemen presents an economic problem. However, to subsidize the rate for all mailers regardless of economic justification seems unwarranted.

For these reasons we oppose the provision of a special 5-pound parcel rate.

Section 2 of the bill further provides that the cost to the Post Office Department of the special 5-pound parcel rate will be charged to

public services. In the event that this provision of the bill is enacted, we do not believe that the cost should be a part of postal costs.

The fact that an activity is charged to public services does not relieve the Department of the cost of that service, nor the need to have sufficient appropriations to cover the added cost created by that activity. The only thing that public service identification means is that this extra cost is set aside as not recoverable by postage charges made to the other users of the mail. In other words the extra cost is present, this cost cannot be recovered from postal revenues. It therefore increases the total deficit of the Department and it is paid for by the taxpayers.

The cost of the public services has been increasing very rapidly. In 1960, the first year the cost of public services was determined under the Postal Policy Act of 1958, public services totaled \$37.4 million. In 1965 public services exceeded \$500 million. This thirteenfold increase in 5 years has taken place partly because of changed definitions for calculating costs, partly because of increased usage encouraged by the favorable rates provided, and partly because additional items such as the one proposed for the 5-pound parcels have been added. This \$500 million is presently being financed by the taxpayers and is not recoverable through postage rates charged to regular users of the mail.

Whether or not charged to public services, the cost of the additional parcels generated as a result of the 5-pound parcel provision would have to be borne by the Department. Our 1966 appropriations do not cover this extra cost, nor do we have the ability to absorb this extra cost. A request for a supplemental appropriation is currently pending before the House because we cannot finance our current activities out of available funds.

The mechanism of identifying this activity as a public service simply means that the public as a whole would pay for the cost of the activity as a part of postal expenditures. We do not believe that such a cost should be intermingled with postal costs, but that instead it should be a part of the cost of our military operations overseas. The fact that servicemen are serving overseas does not result from any program or purpose of the Post Office Department, but rather for a defense purpose. Particularly since 1953 the Congress has consistently indicated that the Post Office Department should be reimbursed for services performed for other branches or departments of Government.

Although I have spent more time in my statement discussing just the one aspect of the bill that we do not favor, I hope this fact does not obscure the Post Office Department's endorsement of the other very desirable characteristics of H.R. 11095. We believe the purposes in general are good, and we concur in those purposes. We favor the passage of H.R. 11095 with the deletion of those aspects dealing with the special 5-pound parcel.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Nicholson, if I heard you correctly, you said some of that would be sent to those men in the armed services without solicitation?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Would that be c.o.d.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Possibly c.o.d., yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you think that any solicitation would be made to those men in the armed services without being sent c.o.d.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes. I think perhaps it is more likely it would not be sent c.o.d. One of the practices is simply to send the merchandise, either with a bill enclosed or to send the merchandise and then later send billing for that merchandise.

Mr. MORRISON. How much in your opinion would be c.o.d. and how much would not be c.o.d.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wouldn't---

Mr. MORRISON. From your experience and your position in the Post Office Department what percentage would be c.o.d.—50-50, 60-40, 80-20?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I regret I cannot be precise, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORRISON. Give an approximate answer.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I cannot push it that far.

Mr. MORRISON. Will it be a preponderance one way as opposed to the other?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I only suggest that this is a practice in the domestic service. It has not been available in the overseas service. This special rate may encourage such usage.

Mr. MORRISON. If you do not want to base it upon your experience from a knowledgeable standpoint, would you venture a guess as to the amount?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I can now be a little more knowledgeable, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Hahn has given me some information which causes me to correct my earlier statement.

Paragraph 6 of section 2 of the postal agreement between the Post Office Department and the Department of Defense reads as follows:

Decline acceptance for mailing of collect undelivered c.o.d. mail addressed to naval vessels or military post offices and not forward such mail to those vessels or post offices.

Thus I was incorrect in saying that c.o.d. was a possibility. Thus I can answer your question definitively; namely, that to the extent any such unsolicited merchandise is sent to servicemen all of it will be on a basis other than c.o.d.

Mr. MORRISON. So these will be 100 percent solicited and nothing c.o.d.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir; not necessarily solicitation. It could be sent unsolicited.

Mr. MORRISON. So there would be no c.o.d.?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. How many packages are sent to you a year without being solicited?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Perhaps five or six.

Mr. MORRISON. What is the average value for each package?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not accept them, Mr. Chairman. I return them. I really don't know the value of the merchandise value.

Mr. MORRISON. Then how do you know whether it is free or not? With my curiosity, if I got a package, I would open it up. If I did not want it I would send it back.

Do you always return the packages without opening them?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will either let them go by without opening them or let them stand on the mail stand and do nothing about them; yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. How do you know what is in that package? How do you know whether somebody is sending you a gift or whether to charge for it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Apparently I think my reaction, which is not a very good legal opinion probably, is that I feel if I open the package or conceivably could have used the merchandise that I would become obligated to pay for it, and since I have only marginal interest in it in the first place I don't want to expose myself to that legal liability.

Mr. MORRISON. Suppose somebody sent you a necktie as a gift? Suppose another company sent you a necktie with a charge of \$1. Do you send both those packages back without opening them, especially if he is in Paris or distances away, and does not telephone you because it costs more to telephone you than it does to get in touch with you, and they seldom ever send cablegrams, they just go ahead and send you a necktie with a little card on it and when they get back home they find it.

If not, how do you distinguish whether it is a gift or not?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I simply make a judgment based on the return address or the nature of the mailing itself.

Mr. MORRISON. On the other hand presumably that same company could be sending you an unsolicited tie, and ask you to send them \$2, \$1, or whatever the price is, could it be a gift?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. How will you distinguish it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. It is difficult.

Mr. MORRISON. I know how difficult it is but what has been your experience?

Mr. NICHOLSON. So far as I know I have not made the wrong decision so far.

Mr. MORRISON. How do you know you have not?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I, of course, don't know for sure.

Mr. MORRISON. How many packages have you sent back? You said you had five unsolicited requests a year. How many others were over that you don't know of?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I can't say. In any event, the parcel was transported through the mail and reached me. Whether or not I transported it back, if I transported them all back then these unsolicited merchandise packages would have traveled through the mail twice.

Mr. DANIELS. Do you feel there is any obligation on your part to return a package which has been sent through the mail unsolicited?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I say this is only a lay opinion, Mr. Daniels. I feel that technically—

Mr. DANIELS. I am a lawyer. You know what I do? If I don't like them I throw them in the wastepaper basket.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I felt I had no obligation to protect it, safeguard it, or return it. Being an insecure layman I sometimes feel that I do have an obligation to return them.

Mr. DANIELS. You should have counsel in the Post Office Department giving you advice. I personally do not think there is any legal obligation or responsibility on your part, whether you open it or not. I don't see how you can make a determination as to whether it is free unless you examined it to find out for sure. If it was something you had not ordered, I do not see where there is any obligation on your part to return it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I appreciate that very good advice, but I think it is the fact that the individual does not know his obligation that makes the unsolicited merchandise business a profitmaking business. Even though it is unsolicited, may recipients do feel obligated to pay for it.

Mr. MORRISON. You stated you got six. How do you know they were unsolicited and how do you know what was in the package if you did not open it?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I believe I indicated this was my belief, or my estimate of the number I might get in a year. Of course, unless I made a determination, parcel by parcel, I could not make a definitive statement it was five or six or that I did or did not identify each parcel correctly.

Mr. MORRISON. A man in your position is entirely different from a man in the service, who perhaps sends an allotment back to his wife and children. He does not have a lot of money to spend, particularly if he is in a combat area.

Regardless of where he is, or under what circumstances, do you not think that there would be less chance of a business concern sending him an unsolicited amount of merchandise than to you?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. If you say you received six how many do you think a man overseas in the Armed Forces would get?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would think because of the possible difference in disposable income he would get fewer, so that on the one hand it would be something less than six.

However, on the other hand I believe he is a specialized market and there might be some mailers who would have merchandise specifically tailored or attractive to that particular market and therefore there could be more than the average number addressed to this particular kind of a consumer in a remote area who might be viewed as having needs or lack of access to sources of supply which could generate an unusual quantity of mail addressed to those people.

I am thinking, for example, perhaps or razorblades and aftershave lotion and some such kit of materials which might be particularly attractive to servicemen. I have no knowledge this might take place but it is conceivable that particular kinds of goods could be packaged and sent to servicemen either unsolicited or on a mail order basis.

Mr. MORRISON. In the last 12 months I received two unsolicited packages. One was a bunch of fountain pens and the other contained pencils. Frankly they were good bargains so I kept them and mailed the money back. I was glad they sent them to me.

I am a Congressman whose salary is \$30,000 a year, and receive only two unsolicited packages. Therefore I am not too impressed with your statement about mail being sent overseas to these people unsolicited.

As far as the cost of this bill is concerned, frankly, I think that is a congressional decision as to whether the Post Office Department should charge it off as a public service or whether it should be charged to the Defense Department.

Since you are not in favor of the 5-pound parcel to be treated as air parcel post, are you in favor of 4 pounds?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you in favor of 3 pounds?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you in favor of 2 pounds?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you in favor of 1 pound?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you in favor of a half pound?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. A quarter pound?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir. If I may, might I speak in general about this 5-pound-parcel provision?

Mr. MORRISON. I do not think the committee is committed to 5 pounds. If 5 pounds is too great a burden then I think we are flexible enough to cut it down. Perhaps 3 pounds or some other weight would be more adequate.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The reason I am against it, at whatever size or weight, Mr. Chairman, is that parcels now being addressed to APO's and FPO's pay only the domestic postage rate. With passage of this bill the air parcel post and surface parcel post, even though it is going to Vietnam, is charged for at the postage rate for only the domestic portion of the travel. Thus the transport of parcels regardless of size, whatever legal size, is already being priced at what I believe is a fine value, a good bargain for the mailing public.

Further to reduce the rate of postage below the domestic rate or to provide a mode of service and charge for it at a lesser rate seems to me to be adding an additional relief of postage costs which under the circumstances I feel is unnecessary.

Furthermore, I think the purpose in our spirit and our intent here is to help those servicemen who are in combat areas where they do not have access, perhaps, to the best variety of merchandise, or possibly their meals, their diet, is somewhat restricted.

Mr. MORRISON. It has been brought out that the combat areas are classified and thus not practical for a person back home to know where a serviceman is located. All they know is an APO number. Therefore, you indicate that it is impossible from a practical standpoint to judge where the package should go.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If I may carry that a little further along, I recognize the administrative problem of restricting the mailing to the combat area, but assuming that this problem is a financial one and a financial problem to those members of the serviceman's family or friends and relatives, the present proposal seems to be rather a blunt instrument. To help a relatively few people deserving of the help, the rate would be made available to the whole mailing public, regardless of their need for such a favorable rate.

Mr. MORRISON. It is made available to them now at an increased rate. Wealthy people with sons and husbands in the service can avail themselves of it, but people in many circumstances cannot. That is just. The issue before Congress is how to make it available to everybody.

Mr. DANIELS. May I ask one question.

Mr. Nicholson, if we put a limitation on mail going overseas to our servicemen, that it shall not apply to unsolicited material or merchandise, would that affect your position?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes, sir; that would reduce the total quantity that might otherwise go.

Mr. DANIELS. In other words, trying to do away with unsolicited matter which goes through the mail. In many cases the GI might not want it or he did not ask for it and it is just loading the mail down with a lot of surplus matter. When it is unsolicited and the serviceman makes known that fact to the military or the Post Office authorities, it would give them the right to dump it.

Mr. MORRISON. They do that with c.o.d. which has been refused. I think this problem has been built up out of proportion. No corporation or business firm in its right mind would send matter overseas and all over the world. There might be one or two minor exceptions. We could draft an amendment to take care of that situation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It lessens it, Mr. Congressman, but does not remove it.

Mr. MORRISON. The Department is against it because it costs money. It is going to help the folks back home and is going to help the soldiers, even though it will cost money.

Thank you very much, Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Hahn.

The next gentleman we would like to hear from is Maj. Gen. J. C. Lambert, the Adjutant General of the Department of the Army.

STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. J. C. LAMBERT, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY; ACCOMPANIED BY RAYMOND M. KENNEY, JR., TRANSPORTATION AND SYSTEMS DIVISION, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS); LT. COL. R. J. REYNOLDS, REPRESENTING ARMY-AIR FORCE POSTAL SERVICE; LT. COL. EDWARD A. DINGIVAN, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE (INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS); AND LT. N. H. PEARSALL, POSTAL AFFAIRS SECTION, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Maj. Gen. Joe C. Lambert, the Adjutant General of the Department of the Army. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation.

Mr. MORRISON. I wonder if you could hit the high points of your statement and file your statement for the record.

General LAMBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Without objection, it is so ordered. The gentleman's statement will be filed.

(General Lambert's prepared statement follows:)

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JOE C. LAMBERT, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Maj. Gen. Joe C. Lambert, The Adjutant General, Department of the Army. The Department of the Army has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. I represent the Department of the Army for that purpose. I have with me departmental witnesses for the purpose of assisting in answering any questions that you may have.

I have a prepared statement which I would like to present to the committee. The Department of Defense favors the free mailing provisions of H.R. 11095 because it provides broader coverage than that contained in Public Law 89-132,

approved August 21, 1965. The bill provides free air letter mail privileges for service personnel serving in an overseas area designated by the President as one where our Armed Forces are engaged in action against an enemy of the United States, or engaged in military operations involving conflict with an opposing foreign force, or serving with friendly foreign forces engaged in an armed conflict in which the United States is not a belligerent party. This benefit is extended to members hospitalized in a facility under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces as a result of disease or injury incurred because of such service and also, on a reciprocal basis, to military personnel of friendly foreign nations serving with a unit under the operational control of a U.S. command. The Department of Defense strongly favors this portion of the proposed legislation. In this connection, I would like to read the following message recently received from Headquarters, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam: "Have read article entitled 'Free Mail OK Seen for Vietnam' in Army Times issue of July 7. News enthusiastically received by all members this command. However, for this privilege to be truly beneficial for personnel serving in remote areas such as Vietnam, it should insure airmail from Vietnam to ultimate destination to CONUS. Personnel here are utilizing airmail almost exclusively because of time required for boat shipment of mail to CONUS plus the additional delay of surface transportation to destination within CONUS. Loss of time in surface mail delivery regardless of good motives would have deleterious effect on morale."

Public Law 89-132, which now contains the free mailing privilege for our personnel in Vietnam, did not specifically provide for airlift of letters, although the legislative history shows that such was the intent of the Congress. Further, it did not provide for hospitalized personnel or foreign contingents. Nevertheless, the Post Office Department and the Department of Defense administratively provided airlift service and the extension of the benefit to hospitalized U.S. personnel is provided, as well as to ships in the combat area.

The Department also favors that portion of H.R. 11095 (new sec. 40303(d) (3) and (4) of title 39, United States Code) which establishes air parcel post rates to and from overseas military post offices commensurate with the air service which the Post Office Department actually provides and pays for. This would involve establishing a rate by which the Post Office Department would be paid for carrying the mail from the mailing point to the city which serves the military post office for mail sent from the United States and from the city serving the military post office to the ultimate destination for mail sent from a military post office. At present, the military pays the eighth zone rate for all air parcels originating in the United States for an overseas destination, regardless of the point of mailing within the United States. However, the only air service for which the Post Office Department pays is the air transportation between the post office of origin or delivery in the United States and the city through which the military post office is served.

The Department of Defense opposes the enactment of proposed section 4303(d) (5) of title 39, United States Code, for the following reasons:

1. During periods of conflict, airlift space historically becomes critical because it must be reserved for high priority logistical support necessary to the combat effort. The Department of Defense, however, has always recognized the importance of written communications to and from service personnel. Therefore, airlift space for first-class letters postpaid airmail has always been provided if possible. In addition, every effort has always been made to airlift parcels if prepaid at the air postage rate. However, during World War II air parcels were limited to 2 ounces, and during the Korean war to 2 pounds. Even so, there was no guarantee given that airlift would be afforded because of the criticality of airlift space. The proposed legislation creates a new class of subsidized service requiring utilization of airlift in the United States, and possible airlift overseas for nonpriority mail, even though in emergencies airlift capability might not be adequate to accommodate priority mails. No restrictions are presently in effect for air parcel post, and if the sender of a parcel feels that a delivery date prior to normal surface transit time is required, it may be sent as air parcel post at the sender's option. Proposed section 4303(d) (4) of title 39 reduces the air-parcel-post rates to assist the sender in this regard.

2. The Department of Defense considers it unrealistic to create a new special category of mail to be moved by air and to offer any reasonable prospects of moving this new category on a space-available basis, unless airlines for self-interest create capacity beyond that which would otherwise be economically sound. In periods when U.S. forces are committed to combat, airlift becomes a critical asset and every effort is made to optimize its use. It is the view of the Depart-

ment of Defense that H.R. 11095 would result in the generation of such volume of this new category of airlift mail that it could not be reasonably accommodated.

By giving worldwide application to H.R. 11095 permanent statutory mail service would be established which, in effect, would give no special benefit to those forces engaged in combat. As a matter of fact forces in noncombat areas would probably be the major beneficiaries from H.R. 11095 contrary to what the Department of Defense believes the committee's intent to be. In the present situation the preponderance of airlift space that may be available would be to the European area, not South Vietnam. The Department of Defense believes in such case passage of H.R. 11095 as now written would adversely effect the morale of those whom this committee intended to be benefited.

3. For the foreseeable future the Department of Defense expects commercial cargo airlift capability, in relation to military requirements, to be in short supply. This fact is significant since the Department of Defense is primarily dependent on the Post Office Department which in turn is dependent on civil air carriers for the movement of priority mail. Mail addressed to military post offices overseas moves in military aircraft only when no scheduled U.S. air carrier is normally available or when the volume of priority mail simply demands use of military airlift to meet essential needs that cannot otherwise be met. It would be inappropriate as well as militarily unacceptable to expect the Military Air Transport Service to otherwise supplement the airlift available to the Post Office Department to move nonpriority mail in lieu of more urgent military traffic.

4. In addition to the considerations covered above, it must be noted that the potential economic impact on the Department of Defense would be significant. The rate charged to the Department of Defense for the overseas portion of the movement would be the same as that for the transportation of priority military official mail. As a principle the Department of Defense does not feel it is proper for the Government to be charged the same rate for nonpriority space available mail as for priority official mail. It is conservatively estimated that 82 tons of parcels per day would be eligible for airlift if H.R. 11095 were enacted. The additional cost to the Department of Defense would amount to approximately \$31 million annually for overocean lift, not to mention the added cost to the Government for providing airlift between point of mailing and the air gateway. In the view of the Department of Defense the cost of such service would be out of proportion to the benefits provided, particularly in view of the excellent surface transportation now being provided at a fraction of the airlift cost.

For the foregoing reasons, the Department of Defense strongly recommends that H.R. 11095 be amended to delete proposed section 4303(d) (5) and (6) of title 39, United States Code. As thus amended, the Department of Defense urges enactment of the bill.

I have appreciated this opportunity of appearing before the committee and shall be happy to answer any questions you may have on the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. As you know, at our last meeting we discussed this matter thoroughly. Some objections which were raised have been removed by the bill before us.

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I have with me this morning Colonel Reynolds, the chief of the Army-Air Force postal service, Mr. Raymond Kenney, Office of the Secretary of Defense from the installations and logistics area, Colonel Dingivan, of the Air Force, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force, and Lieutenant Pearsall, of the U.S. Navy.

The Department of Defense, as was the previous position, supports that part of the bill which provides for the air movement of first-class mail. The Department of Defense does not endorse the movement of parcels on the basis that is provided in the bill today. The departmental objection is based on the transportation limitations and the costs.

Mr. MORRISON. General, suppose a bill were to become law and stated that the package would not displace one person nor one bit of equipment, but would be taken only whenever possible. Would that not solve a great deal of your objection?

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, that proposal has been considered at length. I have Mr. Kenney from the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and I would like him to speak to your question.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe one of the problems without a further limitation in that regard is that the mail does move by commercial carriers, and there could be a tendency on the part of the carriers to add additional capacity to move this mail which they would not otherwise add because of economic justifications, since this mail would move at a rate that is more than double the freight rate now charged for the movement of Defense freight.

Mr. MORRISON. You brought that up at the last meeting. I think you said the commercial airlines would not have the capability to handle the APO facilities. I have a letter dated September 7, 1965, from the Air Transport Association, which reads as follows:

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 7, 1965.

HON. JAMES MORRISON,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Postal Rates,
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Air Transport Association, in behalf of the scheduled certificated airlines of the United States, would like to comment on your bill, H.R. 10441, and on statements made during hearings on it. The bill would provide free mailing privileges for Armed Forces personnel serving in certain overseas posts. This objective is certainly a most worthy and commendable one, and we support it.

During the recent hearings in your subcommittee on this bill, the Department of Defense witness suggested that the capability of the commercial airlines could be taxed unnecessarily by the requirement that airlift service be provided for parcels mailed at the fourth-class surface rates not exceeding 5 pounds in weight and 60 inches in length and girth combined and addressed to Armed Forces personnel overseas.

We believe that concern over this possibility is unfounded and the following additional facts are pertinent to the question. The airlines feel that they have the capability to transport this mail and would be happy to do so. The only limitations on airline capacity that might arise would be due to artificial restrictions imposed on the U.S.-flag international carriers by foreign governments. The U.S. Government is currently negotiating with certain foreign governments for relief from these artificial restrictions, and we hope and believe the Government will be successful so that our carriers are free to meet the requirements which would be imposed under H.R. 10441 in transporting mail to and from Vietnam as well as other countries which may be involved in the future.

The U.S.-flag air carrier industry has never failed, when asked, to meet the capacity requirements of the Department of Defense. With present equipment and aircraft now on order, we are in a better position than ever to fulfill these requirements.

Although no comment was made regarding airline capability to handle letter mail service provided for in H.R. 10441, the carriers are certainly willing and able to accommodate all of this mail that may be tendered.

We are pleased to note, Mr. Chairman, that H.R. 10441 provides that this Armed Forces mail will also be carried by air within the United States. The air carriers have already demonstrated that they can be of service in speeding the movement of the mail domestically as well as internationally, and would welcome a further opportunity to do so.

Cordially,

STUART G. TIPTON.

Mr. MORRISON. They say they look forward to an opportunity to carry this mail.

Assuming the commercial airlines can get it to San Francisco or to New York, are there still some objections, even though the parcels would not displace any personnel or military equipment, but taken only if there were space available?

Mr. KENNEY. There are two points in connection with that, sir. One is the point I was trying to make, that carriers could add, on what would otherwise be an uneconomic basis, new equipment simply to accommodate the mails and thus create a space availability situation, because this would be actually a windfall in terms of freight rates.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. If I may interrupt the witness, Mr. Chairman, what if we provided in the law that this did not go at airmail rate or any kind of mail rate at all, but just went at commercial freight rate, suppose we provided that right in the law, would that not prohibit and prevent the commercial carriers from adding equipment so as to take advantage of what you describe as a windfall? Then there would not be any windfall.

Mr. KENNEY. If we talk in terms of the rates not applicable to military freight, it would certainly inhibit that increase.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I think that should be kept in mind.

Mr. MORRISON. The airlines say they can handle it with the equipment they have and have on order. How do you know that it will be that large? Is it not a matter of opinion?

General LAMBERT. If I may answer, Mr. Chairman, based on our experience at the present ports and the postal concentration centers, they are handling about 82 tons of parcels a day of varying weights. I am referring to all types of parcels going through the postal concentration centers.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you mean military supplies?

General LAMBERT. That is personal. I am stating that from the standpoint of the three postal concentration centers.

Mr. MORRISON. Following Mr. Ellsworth's suggestion, which may be a good one, requiring it to be hauled at airfreight rates on a space available basis, what is wrong with that?

Mr. KENNEY. I think the effect, Mr. Chairman, in connection with that would be that the forces in Vietnam would probably get a lesser benefit because our primary logistic effort is to the Vietnam area. The availability of space at the present time I am sure is more in the Atlantic.

Mr. MORRISON. Maybe we could write into the report that if at any one place too great a volume piled up in a specified time period and it was estimated the mail could not be taken out within a reasonable length of time by air, it would go by surface. Where it could go by air, you would take it by air; otherwise it would have to go by surface.

Certainly, at various times you have plenty of space that is not utilized in airlifts.

Mr. KENNEY. There are occasions when there is space that is not utilized, but as a practical problem, taking a 2-week backlog of mail, assuming that as a factor, this would, I am sure, create a large problem in handling at the airmail facilities, which are not overly spacious at this time. Providing security for this mail and then the retransfer of mail to surface shipping, I think would cause quite a considerable problem.

Mr. MORRISON. There are going to be problems and delays when you transport mail anyway. I received a letter a couple of days ago from Louisiana which took a week to arrive here. I do not know why it was delayed a week. Nevertheless, you cannot possibly avoid having problems. Certainly, the Post Office Department and the

Military Establishment have ingenuity enough, if they cannot move this mail by air, they can place it on surface transportation.

General LAMBERT. Going back again, this mail destined for APO's overseas is brought into the postal concentration centers at the port. The postal concentration centers will move the letter mail. They are already moving it. It is the storage of, we will say, 82 tons of parcels a day over a period, we will say, of a week or 10 days awaiting some type of air or surface transportation. I am sure Mr. Nicholson and Mr. Hahn can explain the postal concentration centers' storage facilities that are available now.

Mr. MORRISON. If it is not big enough, build another one or rent another one. The Government does not mind renting a building for domestic mail or domestic handling of mail. I think they ought to be more anxious to try to facilitate the servicemen's mail.

General LAMBERT. Suppose we have 25 tons in San Francisco today and we cannot move a single pound aboard an aircraft. We do have a ship going out today. Would the committee expect us to hold that 2 weeks waiting for aircraft?

Mr. MORRISON. No. The committee would expect whoever was in charge to use their own judgment, and it could be ascertained by experience whether you would have an opportunity to move it by air or whether you must send it by ship. If your good judgment dictates it should go by ship, put it on the ship. You gentlemen in the Defense Department take a completely negative attitude as to how it can be done.

Why do you not try to figure out a way you can do it so we pass a bill that will help these people?

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, we want to help them, too. That is our purpose in being here.

Mr. MORRISON. I just cannot believe that the Defense Department is trying to arrive at a solution to this problem, because I am convinced that you are doing everything you can not only to throw cold water on it, but to say that it is absolutely impossible.

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, we are placing priority on men, ammunition, weapons, and military equipment.

Mr. MORRISON. Every member on this committee and every Member of Congress places that same priority, but this is not interfering with that priority one bit. I have said three times here today and I have told you in meetings before that this would not interfere with the transportation of any personnel or any equipment.

Suppose the commander in chief of the U.S. Army, Lyndon B. Johnson, ordered that it be done, how would you do it?

General LAMBERT. We would undertake to do it, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. How?

General LAMBERT. That would require a further study by the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORRISON. Just how would you do it?

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer for the Department of Defense the mechanical steps they would take to solve the problem, but I am confident—

Mr. MORRISON. With all your experience and your good judgment, explain just what would have to be done to put it into effect if you were given that order today?

General LAMBERT. I would say within the limitations of funds available—

Mr. MORRISON. Assuming that the money was forthcoming, assuming that you were given the order, how would you do it?

General LAMBERT. I would place a request on the Department of Defense for enough aircraft to move it.

Mr. MORRISON. How many additional aircraft do you think it would take?

Mr. KENNEY. The Department of Defense is not in the position of moving the mail in its own aircraft. The only time we do this is when there is no commercial service available to points in Greenland and other places where commercial carriers do not operate. It would not be a question of the Department of Defense adding aircraft to move this, but, rather, the commercial air carriers adding capacity to move the mail.

Mr. MORRISON. Who carries these airmail parcels today?

Mr. KENNEY. The commercial carriers.

Mr. MORRISON. Then why are you worried?

Mr. KENNEY. Frankly, I do not believe, taking the military requirements in toto and the requirements that are forecast, that the commercial carriers can meet the requirements. They can in certain areas. They do have space.

Mr. MORRISON. You or somebody representing the Defense Department led me to believe the commercial carriers in the United States could not do it and they have come back and said they could.

Mr. KENNEY. I believe, sir, when we were talking, at the time there were requirements that we were putting on the carriers, and particularly in the Pacific, that they could just barely meet. The postal requirements were almost equivalent to the capacity being operated by the carriers in the Pacific. I think the conversation at our last discussion was to the effect that there was some space in the Atlantic in particular that could be used for the movement of this mail, but this would not get us to Vietnam, obviously.

Mr. MORRISON. In other words, the military does not handle any of this mail or the parcel post, at all.

Mr. KENNEY. Only to those places where there is no commercial airline service.

Mr. MORRISON. Where is that?

Mr. KENNEY. This would be to places like Greenland, the north country, Kwajalein, Labrador, Azores, where there is no scheduled commercial service.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you not have airlines to the Azores?

Mr. KENNEY. Not at the base. It is on another island.

Mr. MORRISON. If this bill were enacted on the basis of availability and thus not displace any military personnel or anybody connected with the military personnel or any cargo, would you still have objection to it?

Mr. KENNEY. I would say that this would soften some of the objections, speaking personally.

Mr. MORRISON. If it would soften it, what objection would be left?

Mr. KENNEY. I believe that the forces in combat would not be the ones that were receiving the major benefit.

Mr. MORRISON. Suppose they did not, so what? You cannot sit here and tell me that some of the people in combat in certain places

would not get it. I do not say they would all get it, but I do not think you can just wave your hand and say none of them in combat will get it, because I think some of them would.

Mr. KENNEY. I just stated that they would not be the major beneficiaries. I think this could create morale problems for those who are in combat, knowing that people who are not are the major beneficiaries.

Mr. MORRISON. That is an opinion, and you are certainly entitled to your opinion. However, I cannot help but differ with you very strongly. If Congress were to put this legislation into effect, certainly people in the Armed Forces all over the world would benefit by it.

On the other hand, I do not take the position that because a fellow is in Germany he should not have an opportunity the same as if he were in Vietnam, because it is not up to him that he is in Germany rather than Vietnam or vice versa. He goes where he is ordered.

Mr. KENNEY. The forces in Germany have very excellent ocean transportation service available right at this time, 7- or 8-day sailings.

Mr. MORRISON. That is true, but they could still avail themselves of air transportation, also. What would be necessary, in your viewpoint, if you were ordered by the commander in chief to put this into effect, aside from asking the airlines for more planes, as General Lambert said?

Mr. KENNEY. My personal idea would be that additional facilities would be required simply to accommodate the storage for whatever time might be necessary to arrange the transportation.

Mr. MORRISON. At how many APO centers?

Mr. KENNEY. You would have two, basically.

Mr. MORRISON. Where are those two?

Mr. KENNEY. This would be in New York and in San Francisco. In addition, there would be an additional manpower problem. I am not qualified to estimate how many more this would be.

Mr. MORRISON. Manpower of what type, and where?

Mr. KENNEY. It would be clerical-type people to keep track of it and those who would have to handle it, that category, at the two domestic locations.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you not know additional personnel are hired constantly by the Post Office Department where the natural growth requires it?

Mr. KENNEY. I realize that, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you think if they need them in San Francisco or New York they could not get them?

Mr. KENNEY. I have no doubt they could get them.

Mr. MORRISON. Let's assume we can solve that manpower problem.

Mr. KENNEY. Going beyond that, getting to the oversea areas where we would have to handle the mail, we would have an increased requirement for personnel to handle it and make distributions to the forces. In Vietnam this would add an additional workload to the tactical aircraft that are now used to move some of the mail to the troops away from the major concentration areas.

Mr. MORRISON. You just said the people in combat areas—and Vietnam is the principal combat area—would not get much benefit from this.

Mr. KENNEY. That which they did get would be an added burden. Overseas in the airmail terminals we would have the same kind of situation, and we would have to distribute this mail. We would have different possibilities, one of which would be the use of foreign-flag airlines at a greatly increased cost, because we could not control the rates charged by those carriers. We would have to use our own intratheater kind of airlift that is now engaged in moving military supplies or we would have to use the foreign railroads or trucklines, and things of that sort.

Mr. MORRISON. You are doing that now. You would just have to do a little bit more. When I was in Europe in 1955 or 1956, I saw Defense installations over there which in many instances would hire 2,000, 3,000, or 5,000 nationals, sometimes even more. They did not have any manpower problem there.

Mr. KENNEY. I would guess that the personnel and the transportation facilities could be obtained. The problem is that we are trying to cut down in every area the flow of gold. We are trying to reduce indigenous personnel and activities. This would simply add to that and would make our gold flow problem more difficult.

Mr. MORRISON. I cannot agree with you. I do not think it would add increase to the flow of gold that much. This country has contracts in Africa for uranium. We have, I believe, something like \$300 million in contracts to pay for that uranium. I think the contract is down to about \$60 million now. That \$240 million went out of the country in gold, where agricultural products such as wheat and other agricultural products that can be stored here by the Government should have been bartered for a great deal of that amount. If this country can afford to do that, the fact that some gold would be taken out of this country by the measure before us would not be a roadblock to this program.

Suppose we made this reduced rate and said none of it could go by air, would you have any objection to that?

Mr. KENNEY. I could not answer that.

Mr. MORRISON. You answered the rest of them. Why can't you answer this?

Mr. KENNEY. You asked whether or not we would object to it. I cannot speak as to whether the Department of Defense would object to it. I would say, again, sir—

Mr. MORRISON. Do not speak for the Department of Defense. Just speak for yourself.

Mr. KENNEY. I would say this would very definitely limit the impact.

Mr. MORRISON. In other words, you personally would not have any objection to servicemen getting this if it went by air in the United States and then went by surface after it left the United States, at a reduced rate?

Mr. KENNEY. Certainly from my personal view the objections we raised were on different items, and this would certainly eliminate the objection in terms of the increased workload on air and the matter of collecting backlogs at the facilities.

Mr. MORRISON. How about you, General?

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, the movement of mail within the United States is strictly a Post Office Department responsibility.

The Defense responsibility commences at the port. I do not think we are qualified in Defense to discuss what rates should or should not be charged for the intra-U.S. movement. That is a Post Office Department responsibility. Once the mail is at the port we will move it, as we are moving it today, through Sea Express or through whatever space is available for the movement of parcels. The first-class mail is moving by air. I do not think we are qualified to discuss the internal U.S. movement.

Mr. MORRISON. Suppose Congress in its judgment said that people back home could send mail to servicemen at reduced rates and it went by surface transportation from these APO ports. Would you have any objection to Congress passing that type of legislation?

General LAMBERT. No, sir. That is exactly the position we are in today. The postage rates are being paid from the point of origin to the port. The Defense Department is underwriting the expense of movement from the port to the APO.

Mr. MORRISON. Regardless of the method of transportation, if we give this reduced rate it would certainly increase the volume. Even though that volume were increased, and went from these ports by surface, would the Defense Department favor it, Bill?

General LAMBERT. Our surface-handling capabilities are substantially greater than our air-handling capabilities, both at the ports of embarkation and the ports of debarkation. I cannot imagine that there would be such an increase that it would tax our surface capabilities away from the ports.

Mr. MORRISON. Colonel Reynolds said at the city of destination there would be trouble with personnel. What is the difference, as far as the destination is concerned, between increase in volume by air or increase by surface? Is there one rule that applies to surface and another that applies to air? It seems to me the volume is the same whether it goes by air or surface.

Colonel REYNOLDS. We were talking about a 2-week accumulation.

Mr. MORRISON. Do not say 2 weeks. I am not committed to 2 weeks.

Colonel REYNOLDS. On surface mailings we book the shipping several days before the ship departs. We also have about a 72-hour period where we can backload mail before the ship departs. So, the mail is concentrated and the surface frequencies are such that we do not get any big accumulations. By the combination of the surface frequencies coupled with the backloading feature, we keep an even flow of mail. The mail keeps moving through the house to the pier on to the ship. So, we do not get any accumulation. We have an even flow.

Mr. MORRISON. If with your ingenuity and ability you can arrange for that to happen by surface, I am of the opinion that you likewise could handle the extra volume and wherever possible move it by air with the same efficiency that you operate today. It just means programing to handle a greater volume.

Colonel REYNOLDS. There is another problem involved with air. Airmail and air parcel post are sacked in different equipment than surface parcel post. It is pure economics. The cost to the Defense Department worldwide of a No. 1 sack to haul by air without anything in it is a little over \$1.50. So, we use lightweight equipment for parcels. When the Post Office distributed this to us at the gateways

in lightweight equipment, if there wasn't any air available we would have to turn it back and have it resacked into surface equipment and then haul it to the piers. There would be another handling for the Post Office. While we were determining that no space was available, we could have missed a ship. So we program our mail as it generates through the house to the pier on to the ship, and we try to keep the house clean.

Mr. MORRISON. Do not some of the packages have to be transferred to light sacks?

Colonel REYNOLDS. No, sir. All of our surface mail goes in surface equipment.

Mr. MORRISON. For instance, an airmail letter is mailed for the APO out of Washington. From there it goes to New York. Suppose they are all going to one installation overseas. Do you take that in the lighter sack?

Colonel REYNOLDS. No, sir. If it is airmail it goes to the airport mail facility at Kennedy International Airport and is distributed by the APO unit and goes into lightweight equipment.

Mr. MORRISON. Is it taken out of that bag?

Colonel REYNOLDS. No, sir, because it is moving by air.

Mr. MORRISON. I know, but if it was put in a heavy bag here?

Colonel REYNOLDS. No, sir. If it is airmail it moves in the domestic system in lightweight equipment, also.

Mr. MORRISON. All right, why couldn't these packages be put in lightweight equipment?

Colonel REYNOLDS. They have to go to the gateway to get further distribution before they are made up.

Mr. MORRISON. In the same way the letters have to be distributed.

Colonel REYNOLDS. I am talking, sir, about the distribution problem at the gateway, San Francisco or New York not at the point of origin.

Mr. MORRISON. I realize that, but you made the statement that they come in big bags and have to be transferred to light bags. Why could they not be put in light bags initially?

Colonel REYNOLDS. That is what I thought I said. If we were to distribute these parcels with the possibility of airlift, they would be distributed in lightweight equipment. Then if we find there is no airlift today and we have a boat that we are backloading today, the logical thing is to keep that mail moving, get it on that ship that we know is going tomorrow afternoon, rather than hold it. Then the Post Office will have to take it out. They perform this function for us.

Mr. MORRISON. Why could they not put that lightweight bag on the boat?

Colonel REYNOLDS. The lightweight equipment is quite expensive, and there is not so much of it that it can be tied up on a long boat trip. It is flown back as empty equipment at the carrier's expense.

Mr. MORRISON. How much is the difference in the cost of the lightweight and heavyweight bag?

Colonel REYNOLDS. To our Department?

Mr. MORRISON. Anybody.

Colonel REYNOLDS. In transportation, over ocean transportation—

Mr. MORRISON. I am talking about the cost of the material.

Colonel REYNOLDS. I would have to defer to the Post Office Department on that question.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Nicholson, do you know the cost?

Mr. NICHOLSON. No, sir; we do not.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not believe that the lightweight bag would cost that much more. What is the weight of a heavyweight bag?

Colonel REYNOLDS. The No. 1 sack rounded off is 3 pounds.

Mr. MORRISON. What is the weight of a lightweight bag?

Colonel REYNOLDS. Approximately 12 ounces.

Mr. MORRISON. If the parcels went by air, the Post Office Department could try to use lightweight bags if possible. Nevertheless, if parcels were loaded in a heavyweight bag which weighed only 3 pounds and went by plane on a space-available basis, the cost would be completely inconsequential.

Colonel REYNOLDS. At the request of the military departments we asked the Post Office Department to devise a special lightweight equipment.

Mr. MORRISON. I am for that, but there are instances when it is better to put the pound and a half on there than to try to change bags, because of time and cost. You gentlemen take a position against anything that will change the present practice.

You stated at the destination, additional volume and manpower would be needed. I think that is not insurmountable and could be easily worked out. The use of lightweight as opposed to heavyweight bags could certainly be worked out.

There is too much grassroots support for this bill for Congress to ignore it. I think Congress is going to do something about it.

We have tried to give ample opportunity to you to come up with some feasible plan. I do not think you are going to convince Congress there is not a lot of space that could be utilized. Some of it might be delayed a few days, maybe a week or longer, but that would be a calculated risk in trying to get it there quicker.

I think it is worth the risk. Frankly, I think the delay would be the exception rather than the rule.

The period of time that you are to hold the mail should be left to your judgment.

I think you are taking the wrong attitude in trying to block this legislation.

I am sure the members of the committee would like to come up with something that you would approve but you have not been very constructive in trying to help us work out the problems.

Mr. DANIELS. A couple of weeks ago I was down in the Post Office Department where they conduct the Department research and development, to inspect the scanning machines, electronically operated machines. While down there, members of the committee were shown a cellophane bag which the Post Office Department now is testing for the purpose of use in place of sacks. This cellophane bag is hard and durable, very strong. After it is opened, it is disposable and does not have to be sent back.

I think if the Defense Department would check with the Post Office Department and get their heads together, perhaps these bags could be utilized for overseas shipment of mail.

Colonel REYNOLDS. We use the equipment as furnished by the Post Office Department. If the Post Office Department goes into this, I am sure we will avail ourselves of it.

Mr. DANIELS. They are researching this, and perhaps it can be developed to the point that it can be fully utilized in the overseas shipment of mail.

Mr. MORRISON. You take the position that you are against this legislation. On the other hand, you could say if Congress is determined to enact it over our objections, here is what we would like to see done.

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am representing the three services. I am not in a position to commit them as to what they would like to see done in the event the legislation is enacted.

Mr. MORRISON. I think you could be helpful to yourself, helpful to the committee, helpful to the Post Office Department, and certainly helpful to the people of the United States who would take advantage of this opportunity to communicate with their relatives and friends overseas in the service.

If our committee can come out with something which would be less objectionable to you I would certainly like to see it done.

When we first discussed this I said "If you do not like our plan help us come up with a better plan."

Then we had another meeting, and you took a lot of exceptions to the bill introduced, I tried to remedy those objections by introducing the bill which is before us now.

Perhaps we should introduce a third bill. Time is getting short but I will do anything so far as my responsibility as chairman of this subcommittee is concerned, and I am sure the other members will, to try to work out something which would be least offensive to you.

I hope you will talk to the other services in the next day or two and supply us with some constructive suggestions.

If you do it would be our gain. If you do not perhaps it would be our loss. We will have to proceed either way.

General LAMBERT. Both the Post Office Department and the Defense Department are moving the letter communication between the parents and the men overseas. That is being moved today. The prepaid air parcels are being moved.

The Defense objection is the undertaking to move by air or perhaps holding out to the public that we will move by air, parcels which are paid at the fourth-class rates.

Mr. MORRISON. That is the guts of the bill.

General LAMBERT. I know it.

Mr. MORRISON. The way it is now with people in exceptionally good circumstances they can send a package every day. A wealthy woman married to a GI can send a parcel every day without financial strain at all.

A mother and father under good circumstances can do likewise.

However, there are a lot of people who have a lot of problems financially and are not able to do this. Frankly I think they should have this opportunity.

If you read some of the mail I get from some of these people who have sons in the service, they have a very difficult time. In some cases they have to appeal to welfare. When this is done it must be verified whether or not the recipients are eligible for welfare. It costs \$4. Sometimes they don't even have the \$4 and they must borrow it.

Nonetheless, those people have sons in the armed services overseas and it is a tremendous financial burden on them and even to those in a little higher financial status.

Frankly I think these people should have the same opportunity as those who are more fortunate financially.

Again I say you certainly could help us to arrive at the best solution of this problem which is facing us today.

Frankly, I do not think you have tried too hard.

Colonel REYNOLDS. Except in isolated instances we have very fine surface service to our troops and they are getting the service for which they are paying.

Mr. MORRISON. No doubt about it. On the other hand there is no reason we should not try to improve it.

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I think that perhaps from all the discussion we are rather leaving the impression that our servicemen overseas are in need of food, clothing, medicine, toilet items. They are not in need. They either have it or have access to it.

In substance, what we are talking about now are the fruit and candies and cakes and perishable items which would have a very low survivability in Vietnam or in any other hot, humid climate.

That, in effect, is what they need but it is not—I do not say they need it. They don't need it from the standpoint of nutrition. They might need it from the standpoint of feeling that they have something from home.

Mr. MORRISON. From razor blades unsolicited we are now in the fruitcake atmosphere. I do not agree with you that all these packages will contain perishable goods.

It may or may not be something they need. It may be a proposition of feeling love and affection from parents back home.

Sometimes they like to show appreciation of love and affection and admiration by some little token, or a gift of several pounds.

Television coverage in the Vietnam combat area has shown us here in the United States that the highlight of the day is when the mail comes in by helicopter.

They may have a lot of people in those helicopters, but the particular program I saw showed a big helicopter bringing in a mail sack with some packages and letters to these eager fellows who had been on a 5-mile hunt of Vietcong guerrillas. The commentator said the greatest moment of their lives was when they got this mail and packages from back home—and he added, "But not enough."

Either he didn't know what he was talking about, either he was deliberately taking a picture of what did not exist, or he was telling the truth. I believe he was telling the truth, and I believe that that man in charge of that program for the broadcasting company wanted the people back home to get a picture of these men in combat. The climax of the program regarded this mail. Only one thing was left wanting—not enough mail got out of the helicopter and they could have carried a lot more than the one package.

We can surmise they were satisfied, but the people who saw the broadcast would get the impression that the helicopter could have brought 100 times as much mail and packages as it did.

General LAMBERT. Mr. Chairman, I spent approximately 12 of the last 20-plus years in overseas assignments. I can say without reserva-

tion that neither the Department of Defense nor the services have ever underestimated the morale value of mail.

Mr. MORRISON. Then why are you not for this bill?

General LAMBERT. We are for the movement of these parcels within the space we have today and what we are moving.

Mr. MORRISON. Let us give the commercial airlines a chance to see what they can do. Testimony today brought out you do not transport these packages. That is done by a private service on a ship. Why not try the air?

In your own testimony you seem to talk about cakes and everything and perishability of it. Air delivery would prevent its being stale when it was delivered.

General LAMBERT. I am speaking of the basic needs of the servicemen and what they are now provided. The only thing we could be thinking of in connection with these parcels are the food-type items. They don't need socks, they don't need neckties, do not need toilet items.

Mr. MORRISON. No; but in my humble judgment they need some expression that somebody back home cares enough to send them a package or something else showing how much they are missed. Some poor mother might have made some jelly she wants to send.

General LAMBERT. I think we are speaking of the difference in 2 days for a shipment to Germany versus 9 or 8 days. We are speaking of 3 days to Vietnam versus 17 to 20 days.

Mr. MORRISON. What is wrong with that? Is anything wrong with encouraging air transportation? You may recall when old Winnie Smith flew to Washington with the first bag of mail from New York City. A plane was not readily available then to carry enough mail, and it was very costly. We encouraged it. We encouraged aviation so much that we had a subsidy for many years for aviation. Why can't we encourage aviation a little more, especially when the recipients and benefactors will be our servicemen overseas?

General LAMBERT. Our estimate of the Defense cost of this bill, Mr. Chairman, as it is now written, would be \$31 million. We are speaking of \$128 a ton versus \$1,029 a ton.

Mr. MORRISON. Assume there was no cost involved—you still said you would not be for the bill.

I think that the cost of something like this is a decision not necessarily for the Department to make but for the Congress to make.

General LAMBERT. I am not attempting to say we have the responsibility for the decision. I am saying within the moneys appropriated by the Congress it would take this much money out of it.

Mr. MORRISON. There is no doubt it would be a substantial cost, but look at the substantial benefit.

Mr. Martiny?

Mr. MARTINY. We have a question on the cost item. You indicated it was \$1,029 per ton?

Colonel REYNOLDS. \$1,029 to move a ton of airmail at the rate specified by this proposed legislation. That is the worldwide average.

Mr. MARTINY. Is that the military official mail rate?

Colonel REYNOLDS. 27.3 cents is the per ton-mile rate.

Mr. MARTINY. Mr. Kenney mentioned earlier there would be a tendency for it to be a windfall for the air carriers. What did you

have in mind in that respect? Was there a different rate which should be used?

Mr. KENNEY. Yes; it would certainly be an incentive for carriers to add to their capacity simply to move this mail and thus create space available which they otherwise——

Mr. MORRISON. What is wrong with that?

Mr. KENNEY. This is certainly a direct subsidy by the Government of the airlines.

Mr. MORRISON. Haven't we been subsidizing them over the years? They have been subsidized ever since I have been in Congress.

Mr. KENNEY. We are trying to get them on an economic basis. We are not subsidizing the international carriers at the present time.

Mr. MARTINY. Is there another rate that is cheaper?

Mr. KENNEY. Not for mail. There is for the movement of freight. Our contracts are considerably cheaper.

Mr. MARTINY. Would it be possible to move these parcels at an air freight rate?

Mr. KENNEY. I would think this would be a judgment of the Civil Aeronautics Board which actually sets the rates.

Mr. MARTINY. Could the language in the bill be changed to require the rates to be based on air freight rather than military official mail? Would that make a difference in the cost of \$31 million?

Mr. KENNEY. In cost, the rate charged the Department of Defense for the movement of freight is something in the neighborhood of 10 cents per ton-mile. This would make a large difference.

Mr. MARTINY. More than half as much. That would remove a lot of the objection that you people have to the cost, would it not?

Mr. KENNEY. This would certainly reduce the cost by more than half.

Mr. MORRISON. You said you want to get these people out of subsidy. Who is "we"?

Mr. KENNEY. The national program.

Mr. MORRISON. You said "we." Are you speaking of the taxpayer, Defense?

Mr. KENNEY. I think this is the national program of trying to eliminate subsidies in all areas except where they are absolutely necessary.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you an official in the national program to eliminate subsidies?

Mr. KENNEY. I think this is the national objective.

Mr. MORRISON. Have you an association? You said "We."

Mr. KENNEY. I refer to the Civil Aeronautics Board who administers airline regulation and which is responsible for looking after that part of it. This has been the program they have been following for a number of years.

Mr. MORRISON. In other words, you are speaking from the standpoint of the CAB. Whether this would be called a subsidy or a public service, the basic reason behind this is to help the serviceman and his relatives, friends, and others, to take part in this program.

How will you get away from the fact that the commercial airline has to carry it? They are carrying it now. You said they would have to implement their program. In natural growth they have to add to and implement their program, month in and month out. What is the reason they could not do this with additional planes if necessary?

Mr. KENNEY. I think they could. This would be an incentive.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you see anything wrong with that?

Mr. KENNEY. In terms of the price the Government would pay, yes, sir, I do.

Mr. MORRISON. What is wrong with it?

Mr. KENNEY. First of all, the rate for the movement of this mail is far above the rate for movement of freight. This actually gets into a freight category.

Mr. MORRISON. Do you mean to say that all mail should pay for itself?

Mr. KENNEY. In terms of the rate I think this is a matter that the Civil Aeronautics Board has to determine with regard to economics, what the proper rate should be.

Mr. MORRISON. In one sense of the word, yes, but in this particular bill we are setting a rate, the fifth zone rate.

Mr. KENNEY. You are speaking of postage within the United States.

Mr. MORRISON. This is all over.

Mr. KENNEY. The Department of Defense is paying and we then would pay the airlines 27.3 cents per ton-mile.

Mr. MORRISON. Whether it is charged to the Defense Department or the Post Office, the taxpayer pays that. Is that not correct?

Mr. KENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORRISON. You say you are against this bill because the mailers do not pay the full rate. Are you for it where they pay the full rate?

Mr. KENNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. You are against it because they get a cheaper rate that doesn't pay for itself. Do you know if the rate charged today pays for itself?

Mr. KENNEY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Why wouldn't you be worried that perhaps today's program is not proper? I am not so sure it pays for itself.

Mr. KENNEY. Our objection is based on the added cost to the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORRISON. But your money comes from the taxpayers, just as it does to the Post Office Department. Why would you be worried about it? If it comes primarily from the taxpayer, why would you not worry about some service the Post Office Department gives which does not pay for itself?

Mr. KENNEY. I am worried from the standpoint of the taxpayer anytime we are not operating most efficiently and economically.

Mr. MORRISON. Let us go further. We try to operate efficiently. I hope this program would be operated efficiently and economically and still give good air transport service.

On the other hand, where mail service is costing a certain segment of the taxpayers more money today, than they are paying for are you for or against that?

Mr. KENNEY. I believe that the Government and the Congress, in its wisdom, has decided that the public service demands a service that cannot be supported on an economic basis by the user of the service.

Mr. MORRISON. So you are for a certain amount of public service which is done in the Post Office Department where it does not pay for itself?

Mr. KENNEY. Certainly. I believe that decision has been made.

Mr. MORRISON. This will not pay for itself, but you are against this.

Mr. KENNEY. From the Department of Defense standpoint I object to the added cost to the Department.

Mr. MORRISON. One the other hand, these expenses of boats comes from the taxpayers. You say that is all right. The defense Department was in this business when they had to pay for it as a public service. It still costs the taxpayer money and comes from taxes we pay the Government. The greatest beneficiary are those in our Armed Forces overseas. You are against that part of it?

Mr. KENNEY. Sir, what I am saying is that from the Department of Defense standpoint and what we are trying to do is to give you the view that we would object to the additional cost. This is a view which we are communicating to you.

Then I think Congress looks at the Defense objections and the other aspects of the overall situation and then must make its judgment.

Mr. MORRISON. By the same token, suppose one advanced plane costs a million dollars and another plane that was not so advanced costs a half million dollars, if you buy 100 of them or 1,000 of them you are going to double the expense to the Department. Are you for that?

Mr. KENNEY. If we need the airplane.

Mr. MORRISON. Are you for this if you need this air transportation?

Mr. KENNEY. If we need it, I certainly could not object.

Mr. MORRISON. Then because you do object, you think we do not need it?

Mr. KENNEY. I think that is right, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Your objection is because you think we do not need it.

Mr. KENNEY. The objection is the cost and, frankly, the Department of Defense feels that the costs exceed the benefits.

Mr. MORRISON. Who makes that decision? Whose opinion is that?

Mr. KENNEY. This is the Department of Defense view.

Mr. MORRISON. Did you make it?

Mr. KENNEY. No, sir; not I personally. This is the judgment of a number of people who have looked at this. It is not only my judgment?

Mr. MORRISON. You just reflect their judgment?

Mr. KENNEY. The testimony that General Lambert gave in his statement was the consensus of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORRISON. I surely cannot understand your reasoning that it is all right to give public service when it does not pay for itself if the Post Office Department has to pay for it, but it is not right to give it to our military personnel overseas where they benefit from it if it adds to the costs of the Defense Department.

Mr. KENNEY. I think my point was that a decision has been made, and a proper decision, on these other public service items. Once that decision is made, I certainly do not object to that.

Mr. MORRISON. We change that all the time.

Mr. KENNEY. This is correct. I would imagine——

Mr. MORRISON. We may change it again in January.

Mr. KENNEY. I understand that, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Just because a decision is made does not mean that that puts the tag on it right or wrong because we made the decision.

Mr. KENNEY. No; and I might not agree with it, but again, when those in authority make the decision, I must support it.

Mr. MORRISON. If Congress makes this decision to go ahead and airlift this parcel post, are you going to agree with it?

Mr. KENNEY. I might not agree, but we will do everything we can to implement the decision.

Mr. MORRISON. You could not very well do otherwise.

Mr. KENNEY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. General Lambert, I do not care whether you or one of your associates, as you see fit, answers, but there are a couple of points I would like to pin down for the record.

Section 2, line 10 on page 6, provides that the 5-pound parcels, and I quote:

Shall be transported by air from the point of embarkation on a space-available basis under such conditions and regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe.

I would like to pose this assumption to you gentlemen: Assuming that of your 82-ton estimate per day, 30 tons moves through the port of embarkation, APO San Francisco. Assuming that space available by air is only 10 tons today, tomorrow and in the immediate foreseeable future, say 3 or 4 days, does not this language permit a decision that only 10 tons will move by air to Vietnam and the other 20 tons may be dispatched by surface and need not remain there to overtax or expand storage facilities?

General LAMBERT. I would like to answer that in the sense that we are living with and fighting with those people in Vietnam or in the other part of Asia they may be in. To have an advantage based on a space available for one group who happen to have parcels when airspace is available, another group who would have parcels that would come by surface, I think would be very inequitable, and it would be difficult for a commander to explain to his people.

Mr. JOHNSON. Under this language you could do what I asked, is that not correct, sir? I did not really ask whether from a morale standpoint there would be a balance of poor morale because one fellow got something sooner than another, but this could be done under this authority. You would not have to hold it in the port just because there was not space available.

General LAMBERT. The postal concentration center at San Francisco serves a large number of APO's throughout the entire Pacific. There are various planes scheduled, various ships scheduled. Some touch more than two ports or three ports. Others do not. That, again, is a handling problem, which they are now handling. Going back again, I would say from the standpoint of objection from a morale standpoint, I did not say it could or could not be done. We would do whatever the law said to do.

Mr. JOHNSON. My question really was directed at the gentleman's earlier statement to the effect that the facilities at the port of embarkation would become overtaxed by material piling up at the rate of 30 tons a day for 7 days or 10 days. I want to clear this up, because the authority contained in this language permits the Secretary of Defense

to issue regulations and, in the language of the bill itself, permits you to send these 5-pound packages by surface when the airspace is not available. If it is not available this minute, it could be sent on the next surface vessel. That is my position, sir.

I think your answer is in the affirmative. The legislative language says that to me.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Johnson, I would agree that we could do that.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to proceed to another point, sir. The next question: The issue is raised of a windfall to the airlines by putting on additional space. This is implicit in the language, but there is also a built-in control because the Secretary of Defense has authority to control this absolutely, under the language of paragraph (b), taking into account the landing facilities at the various stopping points across the Pacific, the landing facilities and storage facilities, the transport and delivery facilities in Vietnam. The Secretary of Defense regulations could control the amount of additional airspace and cargo space made available by air carriers within the ambit of this phrase "space-available basis." So, there would be no logistic problem, as I see it. The corollary would be this would tend to reduce and could control any excessive windfall to the air carriers. Do you agree with that conclusion?

Mr. KENNEY. I could not quite read that. That was not my impression, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will state as an affirmative matter that the regulations of the Secretary of Defense would not be very forward looking if they did not take into account the facilities, the logistics problems at points across the Pacific, and the receiving capacity in Vietnam the storage and delivery facilities there. Because of the great volume of personnel, first-class letter mail and military equipment and supplies moving there, I am confident that there is a limitation on receiving facilities.

Mr. KENNEY. To Vietnam, I am most certain there would be.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to establish the fact this would cut down the excessive windfall in that area, at least.

Mr. KENNEY. This would certainly do that, I would think, to Vietnam. I would like to add one other thing with respect to Vietnam. The same situation does not apply in other parts of the world. For a period of about 6 months there was no space available in any significant volume on the west coast. We had to go to the Civil Aeronautics Board to get them to get together with the carriers and permit adjustments in some of their scheduling, particularly in the Atlantic. Flights were taken off that and were put out in the Pacific to meet our requirements. The only alternative to this would have been to go to a foreign flag, and in some cases this was necessary to move personal effects of our men. The problem of space in the Pacific is most critical.

Mr. MORRISON. It appears to me that if the condition you just spoke of still exists, then a large part of the parcel post at the lower rate would increase the volume which would go by surface transportation as it is now.

Mr. KENNEY. To Vietnam, yes.

Mr. MORRISON. But that would not necessarily be the case in many places in the rest of the world. On the other hand, I just cannot quite agree with you that that will be the situation all the time. I still believe that it is going to be feast and famine as far as air trans-

portation is concerned. Sometimes you will have a lot of room, and sometimes you will not have the room.

The very basis of this bill is that when they do have the room, they carry it. If a fellow is lucky enough to get something by air, fine. If a fellow does not get it by air, that delay was caused by the fact that there wasn't any available room on that particular plane or at that time to send it by air, and he had to get it by surface. They are getting it by surface, and this does not change the situation as it exists now. It just improves it where it is possible to do it.

As far as the windfall, you can call it windfall, you can call it money, you can call it currency, anything you want. I call it dollars. You say it will cost \$30 million. I do not know how much it will cost. I do not know whether the figures are entirely accurate. Maybe they are or maybe they are not. No matter how many millions it costs, somebody is going to get an advantage from that, whoever performs the service. You are not giving them that money. If there is an increase in volume which has to go through shipping, they will earn it. If some of the lines buy extra planes to take it, they will earn it. If they do buy planes, a lot of people will have employment making the planes who may be out of work at some of these installations today.

Be that as it may, what is wrong, whether it be surface transportation that will earn the money or air transportation? To me, that is the American free enterprise way.

Mr. KENNEY. That is right, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. It seems to me when you say windfall, there is something terrible about somebody getting paid for performing a service. I do not think there is anything terrible about it. I think it is the American way.

Mr. KENNEY. The only point with respect to the rate, the rate that is charged for the movement of military freight is the rate found by the Civil Aeronautics Board to be fair and reasonable and affords a reasonable profit to the carriers.

This rate is more than twice that. I do not mind anyone earning it, but when I use the term "windfall," I think this is what it might be.

Mr. MORRISON. Whether you call it a windfall, no matter what you call it, even if the airline hauled this at cost and did not make a dime on it, even if the surface means of transportation hauled it at cost and did not make a dime, you still would not be satisfied and you would still be against it. So, if they do make a profit, so what? If they hauled it for nothing, for their cost, you still would not be satisfied and would not be for this bill.

Mr. KENNEY. We were objecting to the costs to the Department of Defense.

Mr. MORRISON. There is no doubt about it. If you were running an airline, would you haul this material free?

Mr. KENNEY. No, sir, I couldn't afford to.

Mr. MORRISON. Would you haul it at bare cost if you owned or ran an airline?

Mr. KENNEY. Not operating an airline, I do not know but this would be a fine gesture.

Mr. MORRISON. Would you do it if you owned an airline? Come on, be honest with the committee. Would you or would you not?

Mr. KENNEY. I would not buy aircraft to operate this.

Mr. MORRISON. Would you do it at bare cost if you owned an airline?

Mr. KENNEY. Yes, I would do it. I am not sure whether the Civil Aeronautics Board would agree.

Mr. MORRISON. Assuming the Civil Aeronautics Board agreed, you would do it at cost?

Mr. KENNEY. With space that I had available which would not otherwise be used, yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Would you do it at 5 percent below cost?

Mr. KENNEY. No, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. Would you do it at 1 percent below cost?

Mr. KENNEY. I do not think I could stay in business on that basis.

Mr. MORRISON. Suppose this was a fairly wealthy airline.

Mr. KENNEY. If I were operating it, it probably would not be one of those.

Mr. MORRISON. But you would do it at cost?

Mr. KENNEY. For the space that I had available not otherwise being used, yes, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. On the other hand, would you haul passengers who could not afford to pay the fare? Would you haul them at cost if you had the space available?

Mr. KENNEY. If the Civil Aeronautics Board said this was the way that the airline should operate.

Mr. MORRISON. No, I am not saying this was the way. You own an airline.

Mr. KENNEY. I would not move freight for anyone at cost.

Mr. MORRISON. Then you are contradicting yourself.

Mr. KENNEY. I would move it for the Department of Defense, something that was serving the Armed Forces and the national interest, but not just for anyone who wanted to ship something by air simply because I had the space available.

Mr. MORRISON. But if you owned an airline or if you were a shipowner, you would haul it free?

Mr. KENNEY. Again, on the same basis, yes.

Mr. MORRISON. Why is it that you think the shipowners want a profit out of this? If you would do it, why do you not think they ought to do it?

Mr. KENNEY. If they want to and want to make such a proposal, we would be happy to entertain that.

Mr. MORRISON. I know, but since you are so cost-conscious, it looks like you would object to even surface people being paid.

Mr. KENNEY. I do not object to anyone being paid. I think they are entitled to a fair return on their investment and a fair price for the service they render.

Mr. MORRISON. Now you say the airlines have a right to make a profit.

Mr. KENNEY. I think this is the system under which we operate. Anyone who provides a service is entitled to a fair return on their investment.

Mr. MORRISON. I just do not see how you or anyone else in the Defense Department or any individual can expect either surface transportation or air transportation to haul free of charge.

Mr. KENNEY. We do not expect that, sir.

Mr. MORRISON. I do not think you will find anybody who will.

Mr. KENNEY. I do not think I made the statement we expected anyone to.

Mr. MORRISON. No, but you said you would if you owned an airline.

Mr. KENNEY. You asked me if I would be willing to. Under certain conditions, I would. I do not know of any airline that has offered this at the moment.

Mr. MORRISON. No. You talk about Defense airlines. I have seen airlines do some pretty public-spirited things. I remember when I helped get one of the airlines to take over an exchange theatrical group which was going to help our relations in other countries. They said they would be glad to do it. They provided two Constellations or DC-7's. They said, "We will be glad to do it if the CAB agrees." The CAB agreed because it was a worthwhile project.

Mr. KENNEY. If I gave you the impression, sir, that I expected or would want them to haul it free of charge or below cost, I want to correct that impression.

Mr. MORRISON. You want them to make a profit?

Mr. KENNEY. Also, I would say we have the highest regard for the airlines. They have provided valuable support to the Department of Defense in the past, they are at the present, and I am sure they will in the future. This is not directed in any sense as derogatory of the airlines. I merely made the observation with respect to the rate.

Mr. MORRISON. You just do not want to subsidize them.

Mr. KENNEY. I really do not feel it is necessary.

Mr. MORRISON. Gentlemen, we appreciate your coming before the committee.

One last request—that you go back and talk to the people who make the policy for Defense. I do this in a spirit of compromise, begging and pleading with you to see if you cannot take this new bill and go back and talk to all those who are involved in making this policy and see if you cannot come up with some helpful suggestions or suggested compromise, and you and the people in the Post Office Department maybe meet with counsel sometime tomorrow, if possible—if that is too early, then the first of next week—in a spirit of seeing if you cannot stretch a point and, instead of arriving at a negative position of being against it, maybe looking at it with the idea that there is a probability or possibility, as you may see fit to judge it, and maybe help this committee and at the same time help the Defense Department and the Post Office Department in coming up with a plan.

In other words, you take the position that you are against it, but if in its wisdom Congress decides to enact it, tell us you think this or that should be changed in the bill, or this would help it to be more workable. I am surely hopeful that you can make a contribution to the situation the committee finds itself in now. I urged that on you gentlemen the first time we met. It has not been able to be worked out up until now. I am hoping after what has transpired here in the committee and the experience we have had up to now with each other, maybe whatever decision or conclusion you reach as a result of my request will be helpful both to the committee and the Departments.

If you can do this by tomorrow, fine. If you cannot do it by tomorrow, then by Monday. If we do not have a conflict in schedule we shall call a meeting maybe Tuesday or Wednesday of next week and consider the legislation at that time.

(Thereupon, the subcommittee adjourned, September 23, 1965, at 1 p.m.)

The Secretary: No, but you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under

certain conditions I would. I do not know of any other that has

been at the moment.

Mr. Kennedy: No, you will find it would if you turned an

address.

Mr. Kennedy: You asked me if I would be willing to be under



